

# Leeds Studies in English

**Article:**

R. W. McTurk, "'Cynewulf and Cyneheard" and the Icelandic Sagas', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 12, (1981), 81-127

**Permanent URL:**

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=121532&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=121532&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

## "CYNEWULF AND CYNEHEARD" AND THE ICELANDIC SAGAS<sup>1</sup>

By R.W. McTURK

The story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard (C&C) told under the year 755 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*<sup>2</sup> is of great potential interest to students of literature for several reasons. Just as Caedmon's *Hymn* represents, however indirectly, the very beginnings of a certain type of English narrative poetry, so does C&C represent the very beginnings of English narrative prose. Like Caedmon's *Hymn* also, C&C raises questions about the nature of oral as opposed to written composition, and the transition from the former to the latter.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, the exceptional fact that this story deals mainly with events of some thirty years after the year under which it is recorded, yet brings them into connection with an event assigned to that year,<sup>4</sup> shows a reaching towards "plot" as opposed to "story" as these two concepts are distinguished by formalist critics. According to this distinction, "'Story' is simply the basic succession of events",<sup>5</sup> such as one might expect to find in a chronicle, whereas ". . . plot is the narrative as actually shaped . . . for maximum emotional effect and thematic interest".<sup>6</sup> C&C, I would suggest, is a case, *par excellence*, for testing the validity of this distinction, even though I shall hardly be doing so here, and will not be using the terms "story" and "plot" in these very specific senses.

What I should like to attempt is an investigation of the claim made so often that C&C is in one way or another comparable to an Icelandic saga.<sup>7</sup> First, for convenience, the text of the annal for 755 in the Parker Chronicle (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 173, cited as A) is reproduced below, based on that of Charles Plummer's edition<sup>8</sup> and collated with the facsimile of the manuscript edited by Robin Flower and Hugh Smith.<sup>9</sup> Substantial variants are given in the textual notes from the four other versions of the Chronicle which have independent value for restoring the text of C&C in its earliest recoverable form.<sup>10</sup> These are the Cotton manuscripts Tiberius A, vi (B; transcribed from microfilm by my colleague Peter Orton),<sup>11</sup> Tiberius B. i (C; edited by Harry August Rositzke),<sup>12</sup> and Tiberius B. iv (D; edited by E. Classen and F.E. Harmer);<sup>13</sup> and the Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 636 (E; edited by Plummer).<sup>14</sup> Plummer's text of the annal as found in Old English in the bilingual and greatly abridged version of the Chronicle known as F (i.e. MS Cotton Domitian A. viii), is also reproduced below, as are his references to the Latin text of the annal in that version (F.Lat.).<sup>15</sup> Contracted forms have been silently expanded except in certain cases in the textual notes where neglect of such forms might give rise to doubt or ambiguity. It should be noted that the superior figures in the Old English texts reproduced below refer to the textual notes which immediately follow

them, and should not be confused with those elsewhere in the present article, which refer, of course, to the footnotes.

## THE TEXT

A.755. Her Cynewulf benam Sigebryht<sup>1</sup> his rices<sup>2</sup> and  
 West Seaxna wiotan for unryhtum dædum, buton  
 Hamtunscire; and he hæfde þa op<sup>3</sup> he ofslog þone  
 aldormon þe him lengest<sup>4</sup> wunode; and hiene þa  
 Cynewulf on<sup>5</sup> Andred adræfde, and he þær wunade op  
 5 þæt<sup>6</sup> hiene an swan<sup>7</sup> ofstang æt Pryfetes flodan; and<sup>8</sup> he<sup>9</sup>  
 wrac þone aldormon Cumbran; and se<sup>10</sup> Cynewulf oft<sup>11</sup>  
 miclum gefeohtum feaht<sup>12</sup> uuip Bretwalum<sup>13</sup>; and ymb xxxi<sup>14</sup>  
 wintra<sup>15</sup> þæs þe he rice hæfde, he wolde adræfan<sup>16</sup> anne  
 æþeling se<sup>17</sup> wæs Cyneheard haten<sup>18</sup>, and<sup>19</sup> se Cyneheard<sup>20</sup> was  
 10 þæs<sup>21</sup> Sigebryhtes broþur; and<sup>22</sup> þa geascode<sup>23</sup> he þone  
 cyning lytle<sup>24</sup> werode on wifcyppe<sup>25</sup> on Merantune, and<sup>26</sup> hine  
 þær<sup>27</sup> berad, and þone bur<sup>28</sup> utan beeode<sup>29</sup> ær<sup>30</sup> hine þa  
 men onfundon<sup>31</sup> þe mid þam kyninge wærun.  
 And<sup>32</sup> þa ongeat se cyning þæt, and he<sup>33</sup> on þa duru  
 15 eode<sup>34</sup>, and þa unheanlice hine werede, op<sup>35</sup> he on þone  
 æþeling locude, and<sup>36</sup> þa ut ræde on hine<sup>37</sup>, and hine miclum  
 gewundode. And hie alle<sup>38</sup> on þone Cyning wærun feohtende<sup>39</sup>  
 op þæt<sup>40</sup> hie hine ofslægenne<sup>41</sup> hæfdon; and<sup>42</sup> þa on<sup>43</sup> þæs wifes  
 gebærum onfundon þæs cyninges þegnas þa unstillnesse,  
 20 and þa<sup>44</sup> þider urnon swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wearþ  
 and<sup>45</sup> radost<sup>46</sup>; and hiera<sup>47</sup> se æþeling gehwelc<sup>48</sup> feoh and  
 feorh<sup>49</sup> gebead<sup>50</sup>, and hiera<sup>51</sup> nænig<sup>52</sup> hit gebicgean<sup>53</sup> nolde<sup>54</sup>. Ac  
 hie<sup>55</sup> simle feohtende wæran op<sup>56</sup> hie alle lægon<sup>57</sup> butan anum  
 Bryttiscum<sup>58</sup> gisle, and se swipe<sup>59</sup> gewundad wæs.  
 25 Ða on morgenne<sup>60</sup> gehierdun þæt þæs cyniges þegnas  
 þe him beaftan<sup>61</sup> wærun þæt se cyning ofslagen wæs<sup>62</sup>,  
 þa ridon hie<sup>63</sup> þider, and his aldormon Osríc, and  
 Wiferþ his þegn, and þa men þe he beaftan<sup>64</sup> him<sup>65</sup> læfde  
 ær<sup>66</sup>, and þone æþeling on þære byrig metton<sup>67</sup> þær se cyning  
 30 ofslægen læg, and<sup>68</sup> þa<sup>69</sup> gatuhim to<sup>70</sup> belocen hæfdon  
 and þa<sup>71</sup> þær to eodon; and<sup>72</sup> þa gebead<sup>73</sup> he him hiera  
 agenne dom feos and londes gif hie him þæs rices upon<sup>74</sup>,  
 and him cypdon<sup>75</sup> þæt hiera mægas him mid wæron þa þe him  
 from noldon; and<sup>76</sup> þa cuædon hie þæt him nænig<sup>77</sup> mæg  
 35 leofra nære þonne hiera hlaford, and<sup>78</sup> hie næfre his  
 banan folgian noldon, and<sup>79</sup> þa budon hie hiera mægum þæt  
 hie<sup>80</sup> gesunde from eodon; and<sup>81</sup> hie cuædon þæt tæ<sup>82</sup> ilce  
 hiera geferum geboden wære, þe ær mid þam cyninge wærun;  
 þa cuædon hie þæt<sup>83</sup> hie hie<sup>84</sup> þæs<sup>85</sup> ne onmunden<sup>86</sup> 'þon<sup>87</sup> ma þe  
 40 eowre<sup>88</sup> geferan þe mid þam cyninge ofslægene wærun<sup>89</sup>.  
 And<sup>90</sup> hie þa ymb þa gatuhim feohtende wæron oppæt<sup>91</sup> hie þærinne<sup>92</sup>  
 fulgon<sup>93</sup>, and þone æþeling ofslogon, and þa men þe him  
 mid<sup>94</sup> wærun alle butan anum, se wæs<sup>95</sup> þæs aldormonnes<sup>96</sup>  
 godsunu, and he his feorh generede, and þeah<sup>97</sup> he<sup>98</sup> was  
 45 oft gewundad. And<sup>99</sup> se Cynewulf riccode xxxi wintra<sup>100</sup>  
 and his lic lip æt<sup>101</sup> Wintanceastre, and þæs æþelinges  
 æt<sup>102</sup> Ascanmynster, and hiera ryhtfæderencyn<sup>103</sup> gæþ to  
 Cerdice.

And þy ilcan geara mon ofslog Æþelbald Miercna 50  
 cyning on Seccandune, and his lic lip<sup>104</sup> on Hreopadune<sup>105</sup>;  
 and<sup>106</sup> Beornræd feng<sup>107</sup> to rice, and<sup>108</sup> lytle hwile heold and  
 unfeþealice; and þy<sup>109</sup> ilcan geara Offa<sup>110</sup> feng<sup>111</sup> to<sup>112</sup> rice,  
 and<sup>113</sup> heold xxxviii wintra<sup>114</sup>. And his sunu Egferþ<sup>115</sup> heold<sup>116</sup>  
 xli daga ond c daga. Se Offa was<sup>117</sup> Þincgferþing<sup>118</sup>, Þincg- 55  
 ferþ Eanwulfing, Eanwulf Osmoding, Osmod Eawing, Eawa  
 Pybing, Pybba Creoding, Creoda Cynewalding, Cynewald  
 Cnebbing, Cnebba Iceling, Icel Eomaring, Eomær Angel-  
 þowing, Angelþeow Offing, Offa Wærmunding, Wærmund  
 Wihtlæging, Wihtlæg Wodening. 60

F.755. Her Cynewulf benam Siberte cinge<sup>119</sup> his rice. And  
 Sibertes broðer, Cynehard gehaten, ofsloh Cynewulf on  
 Merantune<sup>120</sup>. And he rixode xxxi gear. And ðas ylcan  
 gearas man ofsloh Æþelbald Myrcena cing on Hreopandune.  
 And Offa gefeng Myrcena rice<sup>121</sup>, geflyndon Beornrede<sup>122</sup>.

1. Sigebrinte BC; Sigebryhte his mæge D, Sigebrinte his mæge E
2. rice E      3. þ with stroke through neck, as if þæt B      4. C  
 adds mid      5. of C      6. For op þæt B has þ with stroke through  
 neck, as if þæt; C has op þ with stroke through necks, as if opæt  
þæt      7. an swan hine D      8. D omits and . . . Cumbran; E omits  
and      9. se B; sæ swan E      10. Omitted B, C      11. of D; B and  
 C add mid      12. feahht mycclum gefeahhtum E      13. Brytwealas D;  
Britwealas E      14. xxi D; xvi E      15. So B, C, D, E; wint A
16. B adds ut      17. þe D      18. D omits haten and se Cyneheard;  
gehaten E      19. Omitted E      20. B omits se Cyneheard, for which  
 C has he      21. Omitted C      22. Omitted B      23. acsode E
24. lyt E      25. wifcyððan E      26. B adds he      27. B adds inne
28. For þone bur B and C have þa burh      29. ymb eodan B; beeodan C;  
beeodon D, E      30. þ with stroke through neck, as if þæt B
31. onfundan B; onfundon C; afundan E      32. Omitted B
33. Omitted B      34. uteode B, C      35. þ with stroke through neck,  
 as if þæt B      36. C omits and . . . gewundode      37. on hine rædde  
 B      38. C adds þa      39. feohtende precedes wæron B, C, D, E
40. for op þæt B has þ with stroke through neck, as if þæt      41. of  
slagen E      42. Omitted B      43. For on . . . unstillnesse B has:  
onfundan þ (with stroke through neck, i.e. þæt; interlined) þas  
kinges geferan on ðas wifes unstillnesse      44. Omitted B, C
45. Omitted B, C, D, E      46. Omitted B, C; raðost D, hraðost E
47. him þa C; omitted E      48. æghwylcum B, C      49. For feoh and  
feorh B has feorh and feoh      50. bead B, C, D, E      51. heo E
52. nan B      53. For hit gebicgean B has þas onfon; C, D and E have  
þicgan, with hit omitted.      54. wolde B; noldan E      55. B adds  
on hine      56. B adds þ with stroke through neck, i.e. þæt
57. ofslagene wæron E      58. Bryttiscan C, Brytwyliscum D, E
59. For swipe . . . was B has: was swipe fordod, and C has: was  
forwundod      60. mergen B, C; morgen D, E      61. b(e)aftan precedes  
him, B, C      62. was precedes ofslegen (sic), B, C      63. Omitted E
64. For beaftan . . . ær B has ær him bæftan læfde; C ær beaftan  
læfde      65. him precedes beaftan D, E      66. ær precedes læfde D
67. gemettun C, gemetton E      68. B adds hie þa, C and hi, E heo
69. For þa . . . to C has him þa gatu to      70. to . . . he him  
 inserted on margin E, where him appears as heom. See Plummer I, 49,

n.6 71. hi(e) B, C 72. Omitted B 73. bead B, C, D, E  
 74. geuban B 75. cypde B, cyðde D, cydde E 76. Omitted B  
 77. nan B 78. B adds þ with stroke through neck, i.e. þæt  
 79. Omitted B 80. B, C and D add him; E adds neom 81. For  
and hie cuædon B has þa cuædan hie 82. So A; for þæt tæt B has  
þ (with stroke through neck) þæt; C and E have þ þ (with strokes  
 through neck); D has þ (with stroke through neck) 83. So A; for  
þæt E has þþ with strokes through neck, as if þæt þæt 84. This  
 second hie interlined A; omitted B, C, E; appears as hit (sic) D  
 85. B adds hie sylfe 86. amundan B; amundon C; gemundon E  
 87. þe B, C; þonne E 88. heora B, D, E 89. waron precedes  
ofslagene D, and precedes of slagene E 90. E omits and 91. So  
 A; þ (with stroke through neck, as if þæt) B; op þ (with strokes  
 through neck, as if opæt þæt) C; oð D, E 92. þar in E  
 93. wurdon B; flugon E 94. mid precedes him B, C, D, E 95. C  
 omits se was, for which B has þ (with stroke through neck, as if  
þæt) was 96. duxes C 97. Omitted D, E 98. Omitted B  
 99. Omitted B, C 100. So B, D, E; wint A; geara C 101. on B,  
 C, D, E 102. on D, E 103. The en in fæderen added above the  
 line A (-fædren- D; -fæderan- E) 104. ræsteð D, restað E  
 105. D and E add and he ricsade (rixade E) xli wintra 106. E  
 adds þa 107. feng precedes Beornred E 108. B and C add hit  
 109. þa E 110. D adds geflemde Beo[r]nred and; E adds geflymde  
Beornred and 111. feng precedes offa B; feng þa Offa C  
 112. D and E add þam 113. B adds þ (with stroke through neck,  
 i.e. þæt) 114. So B, C, D, E; wint A 115. þ supplied above  
 the line A; Ecgferð his sunu B, C 116. Omitted B, C 117. Was  
se Offa D 118. D and E omit the remainder of the genealogy  
 119. cinge inserted above the line 120. on Merantune inserted  
 above the line; apud Meredune F.Lat. 121. rice inserted above  
 the line 122. fugato Bernredo rege herede Adelb[aldi] F.Lat.

One reason for the comparison of this story with the Icelandic sagas has been the fact that "divided loyalties"<sup>16</sup> and more specifically "loyalty to one's lord vs. loyalty to one's kin"<sup>17</sup> form a large part of its subject-matter. That there should have been relatives of Cynewulf's supporters among those of Cyneheard (see ll.34-41 of the text) becomes readily understandable when it is recognized that the two men were related to each other, and presumably numbered kinsmen among their followers. That they were related is made clear at the end of the story, where it is said that "their direct paternal ancestry goes back to Cerdic" (ll.48-9); and in the D and E manuscripts the annal begins with the statement that, with the help of the West Saxon council, Cynewulf deprived his kinsman Sigebryht (later revealed as Cyneheard's brother, as in A, ll.10-11) of the greater part of his kingdom (see textual note 1, above). This seems to reflect a growing recognition in the course of the manuscript tradition of the importance of the relationship between Cynewulf and the brothers Sigebryht and Cyneheard for an appreciation of the story; and the emphasis on the relationship at the beginning and end of the story in these manuscripts is reminiscent of the

rhetorical device in Old English poetry known as the "envelope pattern", whereby a passage with its own unity of content may be marked at the end by repetition of words and ideas (or either) which have been introduced at the beginning.<sup>18</sup> Francis Joseph Battaglia, who has noticed this emphasis on the relationship (though without comparing it to the envelope pattern), also draws attention to the interesting fact that the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman chronicler Gaimar, whose sources possibly included a version of the Chronicle now lost,<sup>19</sup> appears to speak of Cynewulf and Cyneheard as uncle and nephew respectively, at lines 1909-16 of his *Estoire des Engleis* (cf. also lines 1827-35):

[Cheol]wlf regnat vint e un an,	Cynewulf reigned twenty-one years.
Asez suffri peine e ahan;	He endured much pain and trouble.
A Wincestre la l'unt ported,	They carried him to Winchester,
Par grant honur l'unt enterred,	With great honour they buried him
	there.
E ses nevoz qui sunt ocis;	And his nephews who were killed,
A [Axemunstre] fud l'un mis,	One they placed at Axminster,
L'autre enterrent a [Defurel],	The other they interred at Defurel
[Kenehard] ot nun li dancel.	Cyneheard was the youth's name. <sup>20</sup>

If this was indeed their relationship, then it must be assumed that they were paternal uncle and brother's son, since the Chronicle makes it clear that they are both related to Cerdic through their direct paternal ancestry. Now if this was known or believed to be their relationship from the earliest stages of the story's transmission, the fact that they were at odds with each other and caused each other's deaths would make their story all the more tragically ironic, since there is evidence for a special relationship between uncle and nephew in early Germanic society. Although the relationship between uncle and brother's son is less widely attested than that between uncle and sister's son,<sup>21</sup> the former relationship has been given some prominence recently by the discussion of whether or not it is implied in *Beowulf* that Hroþulf, the fraternal nephew of Hroðgar, king of the Danes, broke the peaceful association between himself and his paternal uncle implied by the word *sib*, which alliterates in *Beowulf*, as in *Widsið* (where its form is *sibbe*), with the word specifying their relationship (*Beowulf* 1164: suhtergefæderan; *Widsið* 46: suhtorfædran). Kenneth Sisam, indeed, argues persuasively against the view that this particular association came to be broken, and implies that the alliteration in these passages serves if anything to re-affirm the essentially peaceful and friendly nature of this type of relationship.<sup>22</sup> A comparable instance of alliteration, which Sisam does not mention, occurs at lines 1900-06 of *Genesis A*, where Abraham is speaking to his fraternal nephew Lot and where the Old English poet makes considerably more of this relationship than does his biblical source, where Abraham goes no further than to describe himself and Lot as "brethren" (*fratres*):

Ic eom fædera þin  
 sibgebyrdum, þu min suhterga.  
 ne sceolon unc betweonan teonan weaxan,  
 wroht wriðian — ne þæt wille god —

Ac wit synt gemagas. unc gemæne ne sceal  
 elles awiht nymbe ealltela  
 lufu langsumu . . .<sup>23</sup>

This is not the place to enter into the discussion of Hroþulf's alleged treachery, Sisam's rejection of which has been re-affirmed with additional supporting evidence by Gerald Morgan.<sup>24</sup> What can be said here, however, is that, in the case of *Beowulf*, while there is no doubt of the nature of the family relationship between Hroðgar and Hroþulf, there is considerable doubt as to whether this relationship ever became hostile; whereas in the case of C&C, while there is no doubt of the mutual hostility of Cynewulf and Cyneheard and of the fact that they were related, there is some doubt, though also some evidence, that their family relationship was the same as that of Hroðgar and Hroþulf. If this evidence can be accepted, then the adjective "tragic", which is applied so often and so dubiously to the subject-matter of the *Beowulf* and *Widsið* references,<sup>25</sup> is given an additional appropriateness in its application to C&C.<sup>26</sup> Whatever the precise nature of his kinship with Cyneheard, Cynewulf's loyalties may be seen as divided between kinship with the brothers Sigebryht and Cyneheard on the one hand and a sense of what is right for the kingdom on the other, the latter consideration causing him to expel Sigebryht for his wicked deeds (ll.1-2); while Cyneheard's loyalties, it may be assumed, are divided between kinship with Cynewulf on the one hand and, on the other, a claim to the throne through being the brother of the former king Sigebryht, whom Cynewulf had deposed. It is against this background that the position of the kinsmen fighting on opposing sides must be understood.

Perhaps the best-known instance of a tragic conflict between kinsmen in the Icelandic sagas is the one culminating in chapter 49 of *Laxdæla saga* in the slaying by Bolli of his first cousin Kjartan at the instigation of Bolli's wife Guðrún, whose motivation is basically jealousy born of unappeased love for Kjartan. Kjartan and Bolli are not uncle and nephew (though "their direct paternal ancestry" goes back to a certain Höskuldr) and the reasons for the hostility between them are quite different from those behind the mutual enmity of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, but one of the loyalties confronting each of them and conflicting with another loyalty (in this case love) is that of kinship.<sup>27</sup> In this respect their story may be compared with C&C. Less well-known, though more relevant to C&C, is the potential conflict of loyalties between a paternal uncle and brother's son hinted at in chapter 19 of *Vatnsdæla saga*, where a certain Sæmundr hears from a neighbour of the misbehaviour (perhaps comparable to the "wicked deeds" of Sigebryht) on the part of his fraternal nephew Hrolleifr. When he comments that no great harm would be done if villains such as Hrolleifr were slain, he is reminded of the ties of kinship and the duty of vengeance when the neighbour points out that he would think differently if this actually happened in the case under discussion.<sup>28</sup>

It is chiefly, however, against the background of the assumption that the Icelandic sagas are predominantly oral in origin that C&C has been compared with them. Since this assumption has been

very seriously challenged in the course of this century - mainly from the mid-nineteen-thirties onwards<sup>29</sup> - it is perhaps surprising that it has been used so frequently and persistently as a basis for the comparison, even until quite recently. In fairness, however, it should be pointed out that the recognition of the contribution of oral tradition to the composition of the Icelandic sagas has never been wholly abandoned, and has, indeed, been re-asserted with considerable forthrightness in the course of the past decade.<sup>30</sup> The earliest instance I have been able to find of the comparison of C&C with the Icelandic sagas is in the first edition of Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, published in 1876, where Sweet drew attention to the change from indirect to direct speech in C&C, pointing out that such changes were frequent in Icelandic;<sup>31</sup> and in 1881 Richard Heinzel listed this feature as one of the characteristics of oral style in the Icelandic family sagas, quoting the relevant part of C&C as a comparable Old English example.<sup>32</sup> Plummer in 1899 described the annal for 755 as the one "which most recalls" the Icelandic sagas, and suggested that it, like them, "may have been developed orally before it was written down".<sup>33</sup> E.V. Gordon, in the first edition of his *Introduction to Old Norse* (1927), described a saga as "originally an oral prose story" and mentioned C&C as an example of "an Anglo-Saxon saga".<sup>34</sup> Francis P. Magoun in 1933 compared the prose of C&C with that of "the Icelandic historical and family sagas" briefly and unspecifically;<sup>35</sup> and R.H. Hodgkin in 1935 suggested that C&C was "orally handed down in vivid and colloquial prose after the manner of the Icelandic sagas".<sup>36</sup> In his *Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England* (1939), C.E. Wright partly defined "saga" as a "story that has crystallized in the course of its oral transmission (in prose form)",<sup>37</sup> and suggested that Icelandic literature offered many parallels to C&C, which he discussed as the one surviving vernacular example of an Anglo-Saxon saga.<sup>38</sup> In 1940 C.L. Wrenn, following up Magoun's hint, discussed C&C as "A saga of the Anglo Saxons", defining a saga as "a narrative in prose treating some well-known historical family or hero in a more or less fixed, orally controlled style, handed down in a tradition consciously and carefully preserved, and finally committed to writing".<sup>39</sup> Despite the strong and largely valid criticisms of Wrenn's arguments two years later by G. Turville-Petre, in an article which deserves to be better-known than it seems in fact to be,<sup>40</sup> Wrenn repeated his arguments in summarized form, and with no reference to G. Turville-Petre, in his *Study of Old English Literature* (1967).<sup>41</sup> G. Turville-Petre's "Notes on the Intellectual History of the Icelanders" (1942) led him to the conclusion that the "five or six generations of learning and literary study, native and European", which lay behind the Icelandic family sagas, made it "improbable that the sagas can supply many examples of pure oral style".<sup>42</sup> Roger Fowler gives some weight to Wright's views on C&C in relation to the Icelandic sagas in his selection of *Old English Prose and Verse* (1966),<sup>43</sup> in which the story is included, while the 1971 revision of *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*, which also includes it, points out similarities of theme, motif, tone and style between it and the Icelandic family sagas, and refers generally in this context to the view that the story "may have been developed and transmitted orally for some time before being written down in its present form".<sup>44</sup> The views of Joan Turville-Petre,



whose article "The Narrative Style in Old English" (1974) refers to the Icelandic sagas in connection with C&C, will be discussed below.<sup>45</sup>

To test the validity of this comparison, it will be necessary to examine the extent to which features of oral narrative are present in C&C, and to keep in mind while doing so those features of such narrative which have been found in the Icelandic sagas. Richard Heinzel's *Beschreibung der isländischen Saga* (1881)<sup>46</sup> may serve as a basis for investigating the style of the story from this point of view; while for investigating its form use will be made of the various writings on the "laws" of oral narrative by Axel Olrik, many of whose examples are taken from the Icelandic sagas.<sup>47</sup> The uniqueness in Old English literature of C&C, emphasized in particular by Joan Turville-Petre,<sup>48</sup> means that we have nothing with which to compare it in looking for a similarity of style between it and other works in Old English which might point to the kind of stylistic uniformity which Knut Liestøl regarded as a mark of the predominantly oral background to the Icelandic family sagas.<sup>49</sup> Features of its style of the kind listed by Heinzel as characteristic of oral narrative are what must rather be looked for. It should be noted that Heinzel's examples are exclusively from the family sagas, and thus do not by any means account for the entire range of Icelandic saga literature, though it is to be hoped that the thoroughness of his investigation of that particular type of saga provides sufficient grounds for cautious generalization about other types as well. He gives two lists of ways in which oral style reveals itself in the sagas, one under the heading of "Language",<sup>50</sup> the other under that of "Aesthetic Effect".<sup>51</sup> The second may be taken first.

Heinzel begins by drawing attention to the characteristic failure of oral narrative to mention a physical gesture made in the course of direct speech by one of the characters, even though it is clear from what is said that such a gesture forms part of the narrative. In such cases it is left to the narrator himself to make the gesture. There is no example of this in C&C, which contains only one brief passage of direct speech (at ll.40-1); this passage follows on immediately from one in indirect speech and does, indeed, itself appear as indirect in three out of the five relevant manuscripts (see textual note 88, above). If the A and C manuscripts are followed, however, and it is taken as direct speech, there is no denying that it *could* be accompanied in oral delivery by a gesture of some kind on the part of the narrator, but it is not necessary for an understanding of the passage to assume that it was meant to be; nor is there anything in the text to warrant such an assumption.

Heinzel next mentions phrasal repetition as a feature of oral narrative, particularly in cases of scene-change, where the narrative uses a particular phrase in shifting its concern from one character to another, and then returns to the first character with the use of the same phrase. There is one not very convincing example of this particular type of repetition in C&C; first the verb adrafan is used in the sentence reporting Cynewulf's expulsion of Sigebyht: and hiene þa Cynewulf on Andred adrafde (ll.4-5); then the fortunes of Sigebyht are followed until his slaying; and then, when Cynewulf again becomes the subject of the narrative's concern, it is stated that he often fought great battles against the Britons and that,

after he had ruled for thirty-one years, he wished to expel - wolde adraefan, 1.9 - Sigebryht's brother Cyneheard. Further instances of phrasal repetition will be given below.

Heinzel next mentions as an oral feature the explicit announcement of scene-changes, such as is found, for instance, in the first chapter of *Njáls saga*; "Now the saga moves west to Breiðafjarðadalir . . .". This is not found in C&C, though a number of places are mentioned by name, and the locations of events are for the most part clear. The one exception to this is the whereabouts of Cynewulf's followers other than those who were with him at Merantun at the point when these others hear the news of his death there; they had evidently been "left behind" by Cynewulf (11.26-7, 29-30), but it is not stated where. It is fair to add that, with one possible exception, discussed below, sufficient information is given for a clear understanding of the events at Merantun; John Earle's description of "the arrangements of a Saxon residence", quoted by Plummer,<sup>52</sup> may be necessary for a modern reader, but would have been superfluous for the earliest hearers or readers of the story.

Heinzel's next item, which involves on the one hand the omission, and on the other the repetition, of expressions with such meanings as "he said" either introducing or following passages of direct speech, is not relevant to C&C, where the only passage of direct speech occurs as a continuation of an indirect statement, as indicated above.

Heinzel's next item may be called reference backward, the repetition of information which the narrator has apparently forgotten he has given earlier. It is tempting to include as an example of this tendency of oral narrative the repeated reference in C&C to Cynewulf's reign of thirty-one years (11.8-9, 46), but great caution must be exercised here. One of the exceptional features of the annal for 755 is the fact that, in dealing with Cynewulf and Cyneheard, it is dealing with events dating from some thirty years after the year with which it is ostensibly concerned; the story of these later events appears to have been inserted into the annal for 755 (correct date 757) because of its connection with Cynewulf's partial deposition of Sigebryht, which is clearly stated to have taken place then.<sup>53</sup> It is obvious that the inserted narrative ends after the reference to the paternal ancestry of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, when the annalist returns to the year of Sigebryht's partial deposition, with the phrase And by ilcan gear . . . (1.50); what is not so obvious, however, is precisely at what stage of the annal the inserted narrative begins. The wording of the annal is such as to allow the conclusion that, while the partial deposition of Sigebryht clearly took place in the year with which the annal is primarily meant to be dealing (i.e. 755, correct date 757), the events described subsequently to this and prior to the outbreak of hostilities between Cynewulf and Cyneheard twenty-nine years later could well have taken place at different stages during the long intervening period. These are Sigebryht's retention of Hampshire until he slew the loyal ealdorman; his expulsion by Cynewulf into Andred; his death at the hand of a swineherd in revenge for the ealdorman's death; and Cynewulf's frequent battles against the Britons. The important question for present purposes is not so much

when precisely these events took place as whether they were originally intended to form part of this annal, or whether they constitute part of the insertion.<sup>54</sup> If the former, then it is unlikely that the repeated reference to thirty-one years is a feature of oral narrative of the kind described by Heinzel; it is more likely to represent an attempt by the chronicler to adapt the story of later events to the relatively early annalistic environment into which he is fitting it, and in this case the repetition would be an example of the "loose organization" which Olrik sees as one of the surest marks of literary cultivation.<sup>55</sup> If the latter, on the other hand, then the repetition would have been present in the narrative in whatever form it became available to the annalist for insertion, and the possibility remains open that it was originally of the kind characteristic of oral narrative.

The next feature listed by Heinzel may be called reference forward, the temporary interruption of the narrative to refer forward to events which take place later than those with which it is immediately concerned. These later events may or may not be dealt with at a subsequent stage of the narrative. The only possible example of this in C&C is the account outlined above of the events leading up to Sigebryht's death, some of which could have taken place after the first of Cynewulf's battles against the Britons, mentioned in the following sentence. However, it cannot be said that the narrative is needlessly interrupted here, as is sometimes the case in Heinzel's examples from the sagas.<sup>56</sup> Although it is not made clear precisely why Cynewulf later wishes to expel Cyneheard, it is presumably because he sees the latter, as Sigebryht's brother, as a rival claimant to the throne;<sup>57</sup> and the potential danger to Cynewulf from Cyneheard as a rival would be all the greater once the former king Sigebryht, whom Cynewulf had deposed, was dead. This consideration, if accepted, makes it quite appropriate for the narrative to make clear to the reader or listener that Sigebryht is already dead before the conflict between Cynewulf and Cyneheard is introduced, as it is with the mention of Cynewulf's wish to expel Cyneheard in the sentence immediately following the one about Cynewulf's battles against the Britons. This latter sentence should, moreover, probably be regarded as a comment on Cynewulf's qualities as a king rather than as referring to events which have been partly anticipated chronologically by those previously reported.

Heinzel next mentions the frequent assumption in oral narrative that details of a piece of information already given are known to the listener, even though they have not in fact been mentioned. There is one obvious example of this in C&C: the name of the ealdorman slain by Sigebryht, Cumbra, is given only when the ealdorman is mentioned for the second time, when an awareness of who is meant seems to be assumed. Another possible example, which depends, however, on whether the manuscripts B and C (as opposed to A, D, and E) are followed, emerges when it is noticed that these two manuscripts refer to the building surrounded by Cyneheard and his followers when surprising Cynewulf at Merantun as pa burh, "the fortress", rather than as pone bur, "the lady's bower" (see 1.13 and textual note 28, above). If this reading were accepted, the detail of the door to which Cynewulf goes to defend himself (1.15) would need to be

explained, since the word duru, as Earle makes clear, is used for "the entrance to any of the enclosed buildings" as opposed to that of the fortress as a whole. It would thus be left to the reader or listener to conclude that Cyneheard's men had made their way through the outer gate of the fortress to the door of the lady's bower. However, the reading (þone bur) of the A, D and E manuscripts is almost certainly the correct one.<sup>58</sup> As indicated above, the locations of the events at Merantun (a name which itself implies an enclosed, fortified area)<sup>59</sup> need give rise to no further confusion, provided the lay-out of the place is understood. Any possible confusion arising out of the use of pronouns in the account of the parley between Cyneheard and Cynewulf's second group of followers (ll.32-41) will be dealt with below.

Characteristic also of oral reporting, according to Heinzel, is the economy with which the narrator's opinions and feelings are conveyed, and the strong impression they nevertheless make when they are expressed, however briefly. It is certainly true that, in C&C, the impression made by the opinions and feelings of the author or narrator is all the stronger for the brevity and infrequency with which they are expressed. The brief reference to the wicked deeds of Sigebryht (l.2), and the statement that he slew the ealdorman who stood by him longest (ll.3-4), are enough to convey a strongly negative impression of his kingship and character, while a correspondingly positive one of Cynewulf's is sufficiently conveyed by the brief statement that he often fought great battles against the Britons (ll.7-8), and by the adverb unheanlice, "nobly", used to describe his self-defence at the door of the lady's bower at Merantun (l.16). However, while something of a contrast between Sigebryht and Cynewulf is established by these expressions, it should not be thought that a contrast is similarly established between Cynewulf and Cyneheard, as seems to be partly implied by Tom H. Towers's remarks,<sup>60</sup> since no overt comment is made on Cyneheard's character at any stage of the annal.

Turning now to the more specifically linguistic features of oral style noted by Heinzel,<sup>61</sup> we may begin by drawing attention to instances of phrasal repetition other than the one involving a scene-change, noted above. The most pronounced of these in C&C is perhaps the way the present participle feohtende is used three times with the verb "to be" to form a past continuous tense.<sup>62</sup> This usage is in each case followed by a subordinating conjunction meaning "until" which introduces the report of a death - in the first case that of Cynewulf (ll.18-19); in the second that of Cynewulf's first group of followers at Merantun, apart from the hostage (ll.24-5); and in the third that of Cyneheard and his followers, apart from the godson of ealdorman Osric (ll.42-5). The repeated phrase thus serves to underline the tragic similarity of the climaxes of the three fights at Merantun, as Hodgkin's treatment of this part of the story helps to show.<sup>63</sup> Another instance of repetition is the way the phrase þa men þe he beæftan him læfde ær (ll.29-30) virtually repeats the earlier phrase þas cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan wærun (ll.26-7); this is clearly a case of phrasal repetition, even if a semantic distinction is here intended between þegnas ("thanes") and men ("the rank and file").<sup>64</sup> It differs from the other case just

noted, however, in making relatively little structural contribution to the narrative; and it would, indeed, be possible to remove the later phrase (together with the and introducing it) without seriously disturbing the sense of the passage. Repetition involving redundancy of expression seems, however, to be as much a feature of the oral mode as the repetition which underlines the similarity of successive episodes.<sup>65</sup> The adverb clause þær se cyning ofslægen læg (11.30-31), which largely repeats the earlier noun clause þæt se cyning ofslægen wæs (1.27), is perhaps not strictly necessary, either, to an understanding of the passage, though it does clarify the fact that Cyneheard has not left Merantun since his victory over Cynewulf and his retinue, and also serves to hint strongly at the motivation of vengeance lying behind the arrival of Osric's party at Merantun. Repetition is also evident, finally, in the way the followers of Cyneheard who are related to members of Osric's party respond to the latter's offer of a safe-conduct. They explain that a similar offer had been made to the king's men (and refused): þæt tāt ilce hiera geferum geboden wære, þe ær mid þam cyninge wærun (11.38-9); and then go on to say that they do not care for such an offer 'þon ma þe eowre geferan þe mid þam cyninge ofslægene wærun' (11.40-41). This repetition, as Joan Turville-Petre shows, serves "to enforce the parallelism of the two fights",<sup>66</sup> that is to say, of the second and third fights at Merantun. It may thus be compared with the threefold repetition of fehtende, etc., in having a structural function.

Heinzel next points out the tendency for a noun occurring as the subject in one sentence to be repeated as such in the sentence immediately following, even though the use of a pronoun in the second sentence would be quite unambiguous. The only conceivable example of this in C&C is the sentence and se Cyneheard wæs þæs Sigebryhtes broþur following on from the phrase anne æþeling se wæs Cyneheard haten (11.9-11). This case differs from Heinzel's examples, however, in that the proper noun Cyneheard occurs first not as a subject, but as part of the predicate in a relative clause, and in the fact that the noun repeated in the following sentence is preceded there by a co-ordinating conjunction and by a demonstrative pronoun. In the majority of Heinzel's examples, moreover, the second sentence does not have an explanatory function, as here, but is reporting the next stage of the narrative.<sup>67</sup>

Heinzel next mentions the frequent tendency for sentences to be introduced with a pronominal subject where a connective meaning "and" would be sufficient. His examples from Old Icelandic each contain a continuous series of short sentences following on from one in which a person is introduced by name (but with the noun maðr, meaning "a man", as the strict grammatical subject). These sentences each begin with the third person pronoun hann and are not linked by any connective either to each other or to the initial sentence.<sup>68</sup> There is nothing quite comparable to this in C&C, though there are occasional examples of the third person pronoun being used as a subject where it could be omitted, since it is linked by the connective and to a preceding clause or sentence which has the same subject. The most obvious example of this occurs in the co-ordinate clauses And þa ongeat se cyning þæt, and he on þa duru eode (11.15-

16); others, perhaps more doubtful (because intervening material might here make reference back to the subject necessary) are, on the one hand: op þæt hiene an swan ofstang . . . and he wræc þone aldormon . . . (11.5-7), and, on the other: se Cynewulf oft miclum gefeohtum feaht uuiþ Bretwalum; and . . . he wolde adrafan anne æpeling . . . (11.7-10). More doubtful still, because it is not certain here whether the subject of the sentence introduced by he is the same as that of the preceding clause (i.e. the godson as opposed to the ealdorman) is: se was þæs aldormonnes godsunu, and he his feorh generede (11.44-5).<sup>69</sup> On the whole, however, it is striking how often the subject pronoun is omitted when and is used in this way, as the following examples show: . . . and hine þar berad (11.12-13); . . . and þa unheanlice hine werede (1.16); . . . and þone æpeling on þære byrig metton (1.30); . . . and þone æpeling ofslogon (1.43). The B, D and E manuscripts, as opposed to A and C, provide another example in having . . . and him cypde, etc., as opposed to . . . and him cypdon (see 1.34, textual note 75).

Heinzel next mentions "ellipses", which include the omission of the indicative and subjunctive forms of the auxiliary verbs "to be" and "to have". Heinzel here refers to section 185 of G.F.V. Lund's *Oldnordisk ordføjningslære* (1862), where it is stated that the Old Norse auxiliary hafa ("to have") may be omitted when a verbal form with auxiliary vera ("to be") precedes the context in which auxiliary hafa would normally be used. Lund's examples of the omission of hafa, which are from poetry as well as prose, seem to show, however, that the conditions under which this verb may be omitted as an auxiliary are not in fact as restricted as his statement suggests; and his examples, taken together with Heinzel's, also show that in certain circumstances (which may perhaps be loosely termed "rhythmical") omission of the verb hafa in a possessive rather than an auxiliary sense may occur in Old Norse poetry and prose.<sup>70</sup> In C&C there are certainly no examples of the omission of the verb habban "to have", in a possessive sense; nor do there seem to be any cases of omission of habban ("to have") or of wesan ("to be") as auxiliaries. It may however be noted that, in the clause ær hine þa men onfunden þe mid þam kyninge wærun (11.13-14), the form onfunden, which is found in the A and D versions of the chronicle and which Roger Fowler correctly parses as the third person plural of the preterite subjunctive of the verb onfindan, is identical in form with the past participle of that verb;<sup>71</sup> and that, when used with habban, the past participle in Old English, whether or not it agrees with the object grammatically, may sometimes be taken as an adjectival expression referring to the object of habban (or indeed as an adverbial expression referring to the verb habban itself) rather than as a participle used, as more often in present-day English, to form a compound tense.<sup>72</sup> If these considerations are kept in mind, and if the instance of onfunden in the clause quoted is for the moment regarded as a past participle, it might seem as though there were an example here of omission of the verb "to have" as an auxiliary (in this case hafdon), such as is sometimes found in subordinate clauses in modern German and Swedish,<sup>73</sup> and that the clause meant literally "before the men who were with the king had him (in a state of being) discovered". This is highly improbable, however, since this usage in German, from which the Swedish one

derives, does not appear to have become established until the sixteenth century,<sup>74</sup> and the usage is, moreover, primarily a characteristic of these languages as written rather than spoken, and for this reason hardly comparable to the omission of auxiliaries in Old Icelandic noted by Heinzl as a mark of oral style.

Still under the heading of "ellipses", Heinzl next mentions "the frequent omission [in the family sagas] of pronouns, prepositional phrases, and particles, by means of which references, connections, oppositions and motivations are expressed".<sup>75</sup> Here may be noted, in C&C, the omission of the pronoun subject in the co-ordinate clause and þa gatu him to belocen hæfdon (1.31; see textual notes 68-9, above); possibly also in the one immediately following it: and þa þær to eodon (1.32; if þa may be taken as an adverb here, as Joan Turville-Petre and others take it);<sup>76</sup> and certainly in the later one beginning and him cyþdon þæt . . . (1.34). In these three cases the subject is to a greater or lesser extent different from that of the immediately preceding co-ordinate clause; they are not comparable, therefore, to the examples of omission of the pronoun subject treated above. The omission of the preposition mid may also be noted here; this might reasonably be expected to occur, though with different meanings, before the phrases miclum gefohtum (1.8; see textual note 11, above) and lytle werode (1.12).

In the same context, Heinzl goes on to say of the family sagas that "In a fluent modern translation it would at numerous points be necessary to insert such expressions as: also, there, then, (over) against, that is (as much as) to say, precisely, but, on the other hand, for (the reason that), thereby, before this, thereupon, etc., all of which exist in Icelandic as in other languages, but which are used in certain types of sentence and certain fields of literature more sparingly than in others"<sup>77</sup> - more sparingly, that is, in passages which reflect oral style. In his examples Heinzl quotes two passages containing instances of repetition which, because of the absence of expressions of the kind he has listed, have a somewhat staccato effect; he suggests that they would read less strangely if Icelandic particles such as ok (meaning "and") and enn (meaning "yet again", "further") were added. It may be noted that the German word *wider*, reproduced as "(over) against" in the list just quoted, may in combination with certain other elements occasionally convey the meaning "in return", "back (again)", as well as "against", "in the face of". Heinzl's subsequent mention of Icelandic enn may seem to raise the question of whether the word *wider* in his list is in fact a misprint for German *wieder*, meaning "again" rather than "against", though also having the meaning of "back (again)", "in return".<sup>78</sup> However this may be, it just so happens that in Joan Turville-Petre's translation of C&C, where she claims to "have kept as close as possible to the sentence structure of the original",<sup>79</sup> two of the most striking apparent additions to the original are in fact ones which have respectively the meanings of "against", "face to face with", on the one hand, and "back again", "in return", on the other. The former meaning occurs in the clause "until he came face to face with the prince" used to translate op he on þone apeling locude (11.16-17), and the latter occurs in the expression "replied" used twice to translate the verb cuadon (11.35-38) in the

passage describing the parley at Merantun between Cyneheard's party and Cynewulf's second group of followers. Close reading of Joan Turville-Petre's article shows, however, that these expressions are not intended as semantic additions to the original; they reflect her view that the annal for 755 in the Parker Chronicle differs from the remainder of the early Chronicle (by which she means the annals A.D. 1-891, and more particularly 734-891, in the Parker manuscript) in, among other things, the fact that it uses the terminative conjunctions op and op þæt to indicate purpose or result or "cause inherent in the context", and in the fact that it "makes a distinction between the clause-connectives ond (sequence) and ond þa (new action)". The first of these differences explains the emphasis in her translation on Cynewulf's coming "face to face" with Cyneheard; this, for Cynewulf, was "the moment of decision", and his reason for abandoning his defence in the doorway in order to rush out at Cyneheard.<sup>80</sup> Joan Turville-Petre does not point out that her interpretation of this particular part of the annal finds some support in Aethelweard's Chronicle, which had access to a lost version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* relatively close to the original,<sup>81</sup> and which here reads . . . *ianuam prosiluit, defendit auide tela. Ast composita mente ruit super clitonem . . .*<sup>82</sup> The second of the differences just mentioned, the distinction made in this annal between and and and þa, helps to explain Joan Turville-Petre's use of the word "replied", with which she translates two instances of cuædon, the first of them (cuædon hie, l.35) preceded by and þa, and the second (hie cuædon, l.38) by and. The first of these usages makes it clear, after an offer made by Cyneheard and a remark made by Cyneheard and his followers (where the use in the latter case only of a plural form of the verb, cybdon, l.34, might give rise to confusion) that a new group of people (i.e. Cynewulf's second group of followers) is speaking; and the second shows the close connection (so close that no new action is involved) between the offer of the safe-conduct made by Cynewulf's supporters to their kinsmen on Cyneheard's side, and the reaction of the latter group to the offer. As Joan Turville-Petre points out, the reply of the kinsmen "is immediately annexed with ond (not set off by Ond þa, as a new event)".<sup>83</sup> Thus the use of the word "replied" in these two instances, while it may disguise the fact that two different clause-connectives are here used in the Old English, at least reflects with reasonable accuracy the meaning of the contexts in which they occur. These expressions, then, are not to be regarded as semantic additions to the original; they arise naturally out of what the translator believes to be the meaning of the text, and are not comparable to the kind of additions which Heinzel believes modern translators need to make to passages in Old Icelandic which have the staccato effect of an originally oral mode.

Indeed, while Joan Turville-Petre does not discuss the extent of the oral as opposed to the written background of the story as preserved in the Parker Chronicle, she seems to regard the stylistic features of it to which she draws attention as reflecting a literary rather than an oral development. As already indicated, she finds that C&C shows a more elaborate use of clause-connectives than is found elsewhere in the early Chronicle, the style of which in general



she describes as basically "'paratactic' in the sense that 'and' is the chief connective, and the only common subordinate clauses are those of time, content (introduced by 'that'), and definition (relative)". "This kind of style", she goes on to say, "was developed by the writers of the Icelandic family sagas, and taken about as far as it could go". She suggests that the style of the early chronicle, while "it cannot be compared with the Icelandic in range or complexity", is nevertheless "capable of similar development", and that development of a kind does take place in C&C, the style of which is "more complex than the norm of the early Chronicle",<sup>84</sup> exacting "a higher frequency of the connectives used sparingly in the annals".<sup>85</sup> Unfortunately, however, she does not compare this stylistic development with that of the Icelandic family sagas, except to the extent of noting the compression of the sentence in which Cyneheard is said to have heard by enquiry of Cynewulf's presence at Merantun (and þa geascode he þone cyning lytle werode on wifcyppe on Merantune, 11.11-12), and later mentioning that "Marked grammatical compression [in the family sagas] is commonly taken as a refinement, though not always a happy one".<sup>86</sup> Her remarks suggest that, while she may not find the Icelandic and the Old English developments directly comparable, both of them, in her view, are primarily literary; she uses the terms "writer" and "deliberate stylist" for whoever created, with only "a restricted choice of grammatical connectives", the "pattern of cause and effect"<sup>87</sup> which makes up C&C, and concludes that its style was "appropriate to a literary form which does not seem to have been developed".<sup>88</sup>

Once the functions in C&C of the connectives and and and þa, as described by Joan Turville-Petre, have been recognized, there is relatively little need for the bracketed explanations of "who's who" which so many of its translators have found necessary in rendering into modern English the passage describing the parley between Cyneheard's party and Cynewulf's second group of followers. If the plural form cypdon (1.34) in this passage is accepted as the correct reading, the and introducing it (without a subject pronoun) shows that the verb indicates, in Joan Turville-Petre's phrase, "the continuation or development of a decisive event"<sup>89</sup> (in this case Cyneheard's offer of terms as reported in the sentence beginning And þa gebead he . . ., 1.32), and that the understood subject is Cyneheard and his followers. In the sentence reporting the offer of a safe-conduct by Cynewulf's supporters to their kinsmen on the side of Cyneheard (11.36-7) it is perhaps necessary to make clear that although the verb budon is introduced by and þa, indicating a new action, its subject (hie) refers to the same group of people (i.e. Cynewulf's supporters) as does that of the main verb (cuædon, 1.35) of the preceding sentence; though the action is new, those responsible for it are still the same. Finally, it needs to be understood that the subject pronoun hie in the phrase and hie cuædon (1.38), which begins the sentence following the one just discussed (in which the safe-conduct is offered) does not refer to the same people as the subject of that sentence; it refers to the rejectors, rather than to the makers, of the offer. Although "sequence",<sup>90</sup> as indicated by and, is indeed present here, the sequence in question is that of a reply to an offer, rather than furtherance of the same

event.

Apart from in this passage, it is striking how few additions to the original have been made by modern translators of all or part of C&C; Benjamin Thorpe's translation of 1861,<sup>91</sup> and Earle's partial one of 1890,<sup>92</sup> show indeed how little really needs to be added even in translating this passage, where it is not so much the omission of pronouns as the use of them in preference to more specific designations which is likely to cause confusion. In general, the modern translations of the story show very few additions of the kind listed by Heinzel as necessary for adapting to a modern reader's taste passages of Old Icelandic which show the relative disconnectedness of an originally oral style. What additions there are in the modern translations turn out on close inspection to be mostly superfluous. The possessive "his", for instance, is added by most translators in rendering the phrase for unryhtum dædum (1.2) as "for his unrighteous deeds", etc., but the translations of G.N. Garmonsway ("for unlawful actions")<sup>93</sup> and Towers ("because of unlawful deeds")<sup>94</sup> show this to be superfluous. Hodgkin, furthermore, adds a superfluous "all" in translating buton Hamtunscire (11.2-3) as "all save Hampshire".<sup>95</sup> A tendency to make the style less abrupt by translating the preterite with a pluperfect is apparent in the way Thorpe, Towers, Battaglia,<sup>96</sup> and James H. Wilson<sup>97</sup> translate the clause þe him lengest wunode (11.3-4), though there is no reason why the preterite should not be retained in a modern translation (the case of ofslagen was, 1.27, translated by Dorothy Whitelock as "had been slain",<sup>98</sup> is rather different, since here the passive construction emphasizes "the state arising from the action",<sup>99</sup> for which a pluperfect translation seems quite appropriate). Instead of simply rendering and . . . þa as "and . . . then" in the sentence and hine þa Cynewulf on Andred adræfde (11.4-5), Wilson gives the phrase "for this murder", without allowing the reader to work out for himself the question of whether such a translation is necessary, or even accurate. Some have translated the sentence and he wrac þone aldorman Cumbran (11.6-7) by presenting the verb as an infinitive of purpose ("to avenge the ealdorman . . ."; see Magoun's<sup>100</sup> and Hodgkin's translations) or as a present participle with "thus" or "thereby" (see Wilson, Garmonsway), and others by keeping the simple form of the past tense but adding either "thus" (Wright)<sup>101</sup> or bracketed explanations of who is involved (see Wrenn,<sup>102</sup> Charles Moorman,<sup>103</sup> Towers); whereas Whitelock and Joan Turville-Petre adapt the original only to the extent of giving a progressive form of the past tense, with "and he was avenging (the) ealdorman Cumbra".<sup>104</sup> Here, it must be admitted, some such adaptation is perhaps necessary in order to convey that this sentence is an explanation of the content of the subordinate clause immediately preceding it: op þæt hiene an swan ofstang at Pryfetes flodan (11.5-6). Henry Petrie conveys this adequately by omission rather than addition; he simply omits the pronoun while retaining the preterite tense: "and avenged the ealdorman Cumbra".<sup>105</sup> It may be noted that Wright, beginning with the sentence and þa geascode he . . . (1.11), which incidentally he translates as a temporal clause, uses "but" more than once as a translation of and, which most other translators have found unnecessary. Towers adds a "then" in translating the phrase and

hine þær berad (11.12-13) which follows the sentence reporting Cyneheard's discovery of Cynewulf's whereabouts, and Earle substitutes "there" for "then" in translating and þa unheanlice hine werede (1.16), no doubt intending to emphasize the fact, made clear in the preceding sentence, that Cynewulf is defending himself in the doorway of the bur. Both additions seem superfluous. It is doubtful, moreover, how far the phrase hiera nænig (1.23) has the emphatic meaning of "not one of them" which Petrie, Thorpe, Earle, Hodgkin, Towers and Whitelock give it; and Hodgkin's addition of the phrase "the main body of" in translating þæs cyninges þegnas (1.26) is by no means essential as an explanation of which group of Cynewulf's followers is in question, since it has already been made clear that the first group, apart from one man, has died with him at Merantun, and, if there is any doubt on the point, the clause þe him beaftan wærun (1.27; translated by Hodgkin as "who had been left behind") and later amplified by the clause and þa men þe he beaftan him læfde ær, 11.29-30, makes it quite clear that a second group, based elsewhere, is meant. In translating this latter clause, and also, in some cases, the rather later one þe ær mid þam cyninge wærun (1.39), Petrie and other translators add adverbial expressions meaning "previously" to the pluperfect tense, whereas either the pluperfect alone, or the adverbial expressions with the preterite, would have been sufficient. Wrenn adds a superfluous "all" in translating and þa men þe him mid wæron alle butan anum (11.43-4) as "and all the men who were with him, all except one"; and the simple word oft (1.46), meaning "often", hardly seems to require the translation "again and again", and "in many places", which Magoun and Wright give it respectively.

Wrenn's addition in brackets of "there was" (after "and") in translating the phrase and his aldormon Osric which immediately follows the sentence þa ridon hie þider (1.28) leads naturally to a discussion of the next feature of oral style listed by Heinzel: the tendency for part of a sentence to be indicated first by a pronoun and later by a noun. Wrenn's placing of "there was" with the verb in the singular before the phrase his aldormon Osric seems to leave in a loose grammatical context the two co-ordinate phrases immediately following the mention of Osric: and Wiferþ his þegn, and þa men þe he beaftan him læfde ær (11.28-30), whereas Joán Turville-Petre's translation, which seems to have the support of Magoun's, Wright's, and Whitelock's, accounts satisfactorily for these two phrases in relation to the one about Osric by taking the introductory and of the latter phrase as a co-ordinating adverb meaning "both", and the two following instances of and as co-ordinating conjunctions meaning "and . . . and also".<sup>106</sup> All three phrases are thus clearly seen as in apposition to the pronoun hie. If this is accepted, then the passage may be regarded as an example of what Heinzel is here discussing, though it should be pointed out that, while the nouns in Heinzel's examples from Icelandic may sometimes occur, as here, in a co-ordinate series, no such series from among his examples is ever introduced (i.e. preceded) by a co-ordinating adverb (meaning, for instance, "both", or "not only") as this one seems to be.<sup>107</sup> It is of course conceivable that the use of and in this series may be intended to separate Osric and Wiferþ from the remainder of the group

in some way, perhaps indicating that they approached Merantun by a route or routes different from that travelled by the party referred to in the phrase þa men þe he beaftan him læfde ær (ll.29-30). This possibility is off-set, however, by the fact that this phrase is a virtual repetition of the one in the preceding sentence: þæs cyninges þegnas þe him beaftan warun (ll.26-7), to which the pronoun hie (l.28) refers.<sup>108</sup> This last consideration, incidentally, brings up another difference between the Old English passage and its Icelandic parallels, for whereas here the referent of the pronoun is already sufficiently clear from the immediately preceding context, this is by no means always the case in the Old Icelandic examples quoted by Heinzel.<sup>109</sup>

Heinzel's next category is what he calls "abandonment of the construction", to which he gives the plural heading "anacolutha" in his table of contents.<sup>110</sup> He seems particularly concerned here with instances in the family sagas of the infinitive being used in a subordinate clause where the subjunctive has been used in a subordinate clause which precedes it, and with which it is co-ordinate. C&C has no examples of anacoluthon in this sense (which might indeed be hard to find elsewhere in Old English), though if "anacoluthon" is taken to mean "an instance of anacoluthia" in the relatively broad sense of "want of strict grammatical coherence",<sup>111</sup> a number of examples of it may be found there. It is presumably in this sense that Sweet is using the word in describing the style of C&C as "full of anacoluthons".<sup>112</sup> In the opening sentence of the annal, the plural expression West Seaxna wiotan seems to have been tacked on by the conjunction and to the end of the sentence Her Cynewulf benam Sigebryht his rices and thus co-ordinated with the subject of that sentence, which, however, is singular and takes a singular form of the verb. Although all the translations I have seen take the singular and plural expressions together as a joint plural subject of the sentence, a pedantically accurate translation ought, perhaps, strictly to read: "In this year Cynewulf deprived Sigebryht of his kingdom, and (so did) the councillors of the West Saxons . . .". Attention has already been drawn to the sentence and þa geascode he þone cyning lytle werode on wifcybbe on Merantune (ll.11-12) where, as Joan Turville-Petre shows, the verb geascode, meaning "found out by enquiry", which it might be thought would be followed by a clause of noun or adverb type, in fact seems to have þone cyning as a direct object, followed by three adverbial phrases as complements to that object.<sup>113</sup> It is conceivable, however, that the sentence should be viewed differently, that is, as an example of an accusative and infinitive construction with the construction "abandoned" insofar as the infinitive (of a verb meaning "to be") has been omitted; if so, then þone cyning would be not so much a direct object as a subject accusative participating in a construction of this type with the infinitive understood and the adverbial phrases as predicate.<sup>114</sup> If this suggestion were accepted, it might mean that this sentence was less an example of "exploitation of grammar" than Joan Turville-Petre claims, and closer to the characteristics of oral style than her remarks imply.<sup>115</sup> The suggestion is open to doubt, however, and should not be pressed too far. A much clearer instance of anacoluthon is the confusion of number in the co-ordinate clause and þa þider

urnon swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wearþ . . . (1.21), where the pronominal expression swa hwelc swa, meaning "whoever" and occurring in the singular, has a plural predicate preceding it. This example is, indeed, comparable to the first two cases listed by F.S. Cawley under the heading of "anacoluthon" in his discussion of the "oral style" of *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða*.<sup>116</sup> The somewhat loose construction of the sentence describing Cynewulf's supporters riding to Merantun (11.28-30) has been dealt with above.<sup>117</sup> Notice should be taken here of the use of the subjunctive nære in the sentence and þa cuædon hie þæt him nænig mæg leofra nære þonne hiera hlaford, and of the indicative noldon in the immediately following co-ordinate clause, and hie næfre his banan folgian noldon (11.35-7). If this clause can be seen as co-ordinate with the noun clause (introduced by þæt) of the preceding sentence, and hence itself a noun clause, then the sentence provides an example of anacoluthon in that the subjunctive used in the initial subordinate clause is replaced by the indicative in the one following and co-ordinate with it. Fluctuation between the subjunctive and the indicative is common enough in Old English noun clauses, and often of small significance semantically, as Bruce Mitchell makes clear, but his examples do not include instances of such fluctuation occurring in noun clauses co-ordinate with each other.<sup>118</sup> It is just possible, however, that the clause and hie næfre his banan folgian noldon (11.36-7) may be co-ordinate not with the subordinate clause, introduced by þæt, in the preceding sentence, but with the main clause of that sentence, and þa cuædon hie (1.35). In this case, there is nothing illogical about the use of the indicative noldon in the co-ordinate clause, and anacoluthon cannot be said to be present.

Heinzel's final category is the change from indirect to direct speech, of which there is one example in C&C - an example which, however, occurs only in manuscripts A and C; the other relevant ones (i.e. B, D, and E) present the passage in question as an example of sustained indirect statement. This is, of course, the sentence þa cuædon hie þæt hie hie þæs ne onmunden 'þon ma þe eowre geferan þe mid þam cyninge ofslagene wærun' (11.40-41). Heinzel distinguishes among his Icelandic examples between, on the one hand, those in which the change to direct speech does not occur until an indirect statement, or an accusative and infinitive construction, appears to have first been completed, and, on the other, those in which such constructions are, as it were, interrupted and continued by elements which logically belong to direct speech. He seems to regard the example from C&C - to which he refers briefly in a footnote<sup>119</sup> - as comparable to the latter category, even though the indirect statement - þa cuædon hie þæt hie hie þæs ne onmunden (1.40) - could be regarded as complete in itself. His reason for this is presumably that he sees the indirect report of what was actually said as incomplete; what was said, apparently, was not simply: "we do not care for that", but "we care for that no more than did your companions who were slain with the king". Although it is hardly relevant to C&C, it may be noted for the sake of completeness that Heinzel goes on to speak under this heading of cases in the sagas where information which, in the context, ought strictly to be given in direct speech by one of the characters, is in fact

provided by the author, but is nevertheless referred to in a subsequent passage of direct (or occasionally indirect) speech as though it had been given earlier by the speaker. Heinzel distinguishes cases of this kind from those in which a passage of direct speech placed in the mouth of a saga-character is interrupted by a parenthetical statement by the author.

The foregoing analysis, then, has failed to reveal much in the text of C&C that is closely comparable to the features of oral style listed by Heinzel as characteristic of the Icelandic family sagas. It should be recognized, however, that C&C is very much shorter than the average Icelandic saga,<sup>120</sup> and can hardly be expected to show all these features, or large numbers of any one of them. The ones most clearly exemplified in it are: the apparent assumption that sufficient information has been given, the economy with which feelings and opinions are expressed, phrasal repetition, anacoluthon, and the change from indirect to direct speech. Thus, while the evidence for oral style in C&C is not particularly striking, it is not so slight as to rule out the possibility that the story has retained some features from an oral stage of its transmission.

Turning now from the style to the characteristic form of oral narrative, we may look in C&C for examples of the "laws" of such narrative defined by Axel Olrik and so-called because, in his view, "they limit the freedom of composition of oral literature in a much different and more rigid way than in our written literature".<sup>121</sup> Olrik's findings on this subject were first published in extended form in Danish in 1908;<sup>122</sup> then in a somewhat altered form in 1909 in a German version<sup>123</sup> of which an English translation has since been published by Alan Dundes in his *Study of Folklore* (1965),<sup>124</sup> and then in their fullest form in a Danish version of 1921, based on an unfinished manuscript and appearing four years after Olrik's death.<sup>125</sup> Dundes could write in 1965 that these findings had "withstood the criticisms of the passing years and . . . continue to excite each new generation of folklorists,"<sup>126</sup> and in 1976 David Buchan made use of them in studying the background of the Scottish ballads in oral and literary tradition.<sup>127</sup> It should be noted that Olrik's examples are by no means restricted to the Icelandic family sagas (as Heinzel's are), or even to Icelandic literature; and that he seems to find fewer examples of the laws in the family sagas (*Íslendinga sögur*)<sup>128</sup> than in the sagas of antiquity (*fornaldarsögur*), particularly *Völsunga saga*, *Ragnars saga loðbrókar*, and *Hrólfs saga kraka*. The present analysis will be based on the 1921 version of his study, with occasional glances at the earlier versions; and to facilitate reference back and forth the laws may conveniently be numbered 1-20.

Four points may be made before the analysis is undertaken. First, it has recently been emphasized by Peter Foote, with regard to the background of the Icelandic sagas, that "admitting oral tradition is not the same as admitting historical truth".<sup>129</sup> One reason for the validity of this statement is the fact that oral narrative often (though by no means always) deals with fantastic and supernatural happenings; another is the fact that the stylization which is profoundly characteristic of such narrative (as a discussion of its laws will show) may often reduce the complexity and variety

of historical events to a patterned, memorable form, thus reducing their historicity at the same time. Now in C&C there are no fantastic or supernatural events, and while there seems to be a certain amount of patterning in the form of parallelism, this, it should be recognized, could have been dictated by the events themselves as they actually happened, and might represent, not the stylization characteristic of oral narrative, but an accurate reporting of historical events. As far as I can discover, there is nothing in C&C which could not reasonably have happened during the period with which it deals; and it seems, indeed, to have been regarded as a reliable account by a number of modern historians.<sup>130</sup> It should be remembered that, while parallelism is often a mark of the stylizing tendency of oral tradition, it may sometimes reflect historical truth. Secondly, it has been emphasized above that the bulk of C&C deals with events of some thirty years after the year under which it is recorded, and that the account of these later events appears to have been inserted into the annal for 755 because of a connection between these events and one clearly assigned to that year.<sup>131</sup> Now this situation, in which a separate source, oral or written, has been added to an already existing annal, could result in a certain amount of inconsistency, omission, and repetitiveness which would then have to be attributed to the annalist's failure to adapt his source successfully to its new environment, rather than to the forgetfulness or stylizing tendency of an oral narrator. This, too, should be borne in mind in the course of the forthcoming analysis. Thirdly, these first two points should not prevent recognition of the possibility that, in cases where parallelism and consistency seem to be lacking in C&C, this may be due to a lack of these qualities in the actual events recorded, and to the failure of these events to become stylized in oral tradition, rather than to the failure of a compiler to correlate his materials. It should not be forgotten that the story may in such cases be following what G. Turville-Petre has called "the disordered course of life itself".<sup>132</sup> Fourthly, the terms "scene" and "summary", which will be used below, may be clarified here. Olrik himself uses the term "scene" in discussing one aspect of the presentation of oral narrative, as will be shown;<sup>133</sup> and Hodgkin uses it with reference to C&C, dividing the account of the three fights at Merantun into three "scenes" respectively.<sup>134</sup> Much more recently, Carol Clover has investigated the use of scene in the Icelandic sagas, maintaining that this feature of saga composition derives ultimately from oral tradition. She defines a scene as "a kind of miniature, visual drama",<sup>135</sup> with a tripartite structure of preface, dramatic encounter, and conclusion. "Summary and general statements (about time, situation, etc.) are relegated to the preface or conclusion" so that the central part of each scene "stands alone as drama". "The drama may consist of direct or indirect discourse or, commonly, a combination of the two (sometimes effected by anacoluthon). In the dramatic encounter the narrator provides exactly . . . the ingredients for stage drama: mainly dialogue . . . together with precise and concrete stage directions of necessary accompanying movements and gestures".<sup>136</sup> Hodgkin may not have been thinking in precisely these terms when he used the word "scene" for each of the three fighting episodes in C&C, but there is no doubt that each fight is presented very much in the

manner of an Icelandic saga scene as described by Clover. The account of the first fight, ll.15-19, presents Cynewulf's confrontation with Cyneheard as "a miniature, visual drama" without dialogue; the account of the second fight, ll.19-25, may be said to present a dramatic encounter in the form of a reported exchange between Cyneheard and Cynewulf's first group of loyal followers; and that of the third, ll.26-46, presents one in the form of an exchange in indirect speech - breaking at one point into direct speech - between Cyneheard and his followers on the one hand and Cynewulf's second group of supporters on the other. Furthermore, each account is prefaced and concluded with summary and general statements relating to time and situation. Summary seems to intrude even on the central parts of these three scenes, however, particularly the second one, where the absence of detailed "stage directions" and the predominance of reported over direct speech raises the question of whether the three episodes are, in fact, summaries of ones which were presented even more scenically at an earlier stage of the story's transmission. However this may be, there is no doubt that "summary" is the appropriate word for the narrative mode of the opening lines of the annal, down to line 14, where relations between the characters are not presented as dramatic encounters, and where, indeed, there is a tendency to over-summarize, with the result that insufficient information is given for following the thread of the narrative, as will be shown below.

The early part of the annal, in particular, needs to be closely investigated before it can be decided how far C&C obeys the law of perspicuity or clear arrangement (1), whereby oral narrative reflects only very selectively the variety of real life. This is certainly generally true of C&C; for while it deals ostensibly with the reign of Cynewulf, it is obviously highly selective, having far fewer events and characters than Cynewulf is likely to have encountered during his twenty-nine year reign; and the factors affecting the lives of the characters are infinitely fewer in the story than is likely to have been the case in reality. On the other hand, it can hardly be said that the events leading up to the mutual hostility of Cynewulf and Cyneheard are presented in such a way as to give an impression of "clear arrangement"; on the contrary, they are presented disjointedly, and apparently incompletely. From the opening sentence of the annal, in which it is told how Cynewulf partly deposed Sigebryht with the help of the West Saxon council, it might be expected that Sigebryht would retaliate in some way, and that the story would move naturally towards a confrontation between these two men, in accordance with the laws of unity and direct continuity of plot (see (9), (11), below). In fact, however, Sigebryht slays his own loyal ealdorman, whereupon Cynewulf banishes him to Andred for reasons which, though they may be guessed at, are certainly not stated.<sup>137</sup> Sigebryht then remains in Andred until he is slain by a swineherd who is avenging the ealdorman. Only after this event and the mention of Cynewulf's battles and the length of his reign is his wish to expel Cyneheard, Sigebryht's brother, mentioned. Why Cynewulf should wish to expel him may again be guessed at, but is not made clear.<sup>138</sup> Once the threat has been posed, however, and Cyneheard has retaliated by attacking Cynewulf at Merantun, the narrative proceeds according to the logic of loyalty and revenge towards an inevitable



conclusion - the defeat or victory of one side or the other. Even at this stage, however, as has been shown above, the story is not free of uncertainties and ambiguities which, while they may have been exaggerated by modern translators, also offend to some extent against the law of perspicuity.

One manifestation of this law, according to Olrik, is the law of two to a scene (2), whereby oral narrative does not allow more than two characters to appear in the foreground of the story at one time. While it is true that C&C tends to deal with its more prominent characters two at a time (Cynewulf and Sigebryht; Sigebryht and Cumbra; Sigebryht and the swineherd; Cynewulf and Cyneheard; Osric and Wiferþ) it certainly does not ignore other characters (the West Saxon council, the woman, and the supporters of Cynewulf and Cyneheard), and the tendency towards summary in C&C, noted above, means that there is no clear example in it of the situation whereby, according to this law, the arrival of a new character involves one of the two already "on stage" either disappearing or receding into the background. Of the three scenes noted above, it is in the first (11.15-19), where Cynewulf and Cyneheard confront each other, that the law comes closest to being obeyed; in the second (11.19-25), Cyneheard confronts a group rather than an individual, and a group which, while it may react as one person, can hardly be described as homogeneous, since it evidently includes a British hostage. In the third scene (11.26-46), the change from the singular to the plural in the third person of verbs introducing reported speech at 11.32-4 suggests, as Joan Turville-Petre has shown, collective support of Cyneheard's bid for the kingship by his followers<sup>139</sup> who, it might be argued, are here speaking for and with him as one person. However, it later emerges that among their number is a group of people related to the supporters of Cynewulf led by Osric and Wiferþ; it is to this group alone, not to Cyneheard and his entire following, that the passage of direct speech is given, so that the impression of just one voice speaking for Cyneheard's party is hardly sustained. There is the further problem that the other party on stage in this scene (11.26-46), Cynewulf's second group of supporters, is represented not by one person (unless it be the dead and "offstage" Cynewulf) but two - Osric and Wiferþ (see further (16), below). In no sense can it be said that the law of two to a scene is obeyed in the second and third scenes.

According to the law of patterning (3), characters and episodes in oral narrative which, though different, are of the same kind, are deliberately made as like each other as possible. This law seems to be generally followed in C&C. The "formal patterning" of C&C has been well illustrated by Ruth Waterhouse, who points out similarities of presentation between Cyneheard's attack on Cynewulf at Merantun (11.11-16) and the approach of Osric and his companions to Merantun the following morning (11.26-32); and also between different stages of events at Merantun, showing that a material offer in exchange for the kingship is twice made by Cyneheard, and is twice rejected, and that in both cases the ensuing battle leads to all on one side dying except one person (11.21-5; 32-46).<sup>140</sup> Examples have already been given of ways in which repetition of certain phrases helps to emphasize the similarity of the different fights at Merantun.

Waterhouse also makes the important if relatively obvious point that the story of Sigebryht, Cumbra, and the swineherd in the early part of the annal has the same basic subject-matter as the account of events at Merantun: loyalty to a lord leading to revenge for his slaying. As shown above, the two stories are linked verbally by references to Cynewulf's banishment of Sigebryht and his intended banishment of Cyneheard.<sup>141</sup>

It should be recognized that while the laws of patterning (3), repetition (4), and progression (5) may be seen as distinct from each other at the level of narrative form, they may also combine with each other at that level, and may often employ repetition of wording and phrasing at the level of style. According to the law of repetition (4), the same or effectively the same information is repeated<sup>142</sup> when it is sufficiently important to require emphasis. Oral narrative prefers repetition to detailed description when emphasis is required. Of the possible cases of this law in C&C three have already been discussed, and may be taken here in the order in which they have been mentioned above.<sup>143</sup> The first of them, found only in the D and E manuscripts, where Sigebryht is referred to as a kinsman of Cynewulf in the opening sentence of the annal (see textual note 1, above), is the reference at the beginning and end of the story (11.1, 48-9) to the family relationship between Cynewulf and the brothers Sigebryht and Cyneheard. This, on the face of it, is hardly likely to reflect the repetition characteristic of oral narrative, since the opening sentence of the annal is, of all the sentences in C&C, the one most likely to have belonged originally to the annal rather than to the inserted narrative.<sup>144</sup> The reference here to Cynewulf's kinship with Sigebryht, whatever its textual history, is more likely to reflect adjustment of the inserted narrative to the annal by an annalist or scribe than to indicate repetition as an oral feature. However, the possibility that the repeated reference was included in written versions of the story because of an awareness that it formed part of an oral version should not be discounted. The second possible case, the repeated reference to the length of Cynewulf's reign (11.8-9; 46) is only doubtfully an example of the story's debt to oral tradition, as shown above, and differs from the case just discussed in that it hardly conveys information of great importance for the story's development. The third, the repeated reference to people "left behind" by Cynewulf (11.26-7, 29-30), is a relatively safe example of the law, since it is perhaps necessary at this stage of the narrative to emphasize that Cynewulf had supporters other than those who died with him at Merantun. A possible fourth case is the co-ordinate clause and þa þær to eodon (1.32), which at a cursory glance might seem to repeat the earlier clause þa ridon hie þider (1.28); it is certainly true that the later clause could be removed without seriously disturbing the sense of the passage in which both clauses occur. The impression of repetition here is enhanced by the fact that the co-ordinate clause immediately preceding the later of these two clauses: and þa gatu him to belocen hæfdon (1.31) is printed between dashes in a number of modern editions.<sup>145</sup> Close reading of the passage suggests, however, that the clause þa ridon hie þider refers to a journey to Merantun made from a considerable distance,

whereas and þa þær to eodon refers to an approach to the gates made by Osric and his followers once it was discovered (1.30) that Cyneheard was inside. In other words it reports a later, more specific stage of the approach to Merantun than the earlier clause, and can hardly be said to repeat it.

Next to be considered is the law of progression (5), whereby, for example, the hero of a folk-tale undertakes three adventures which become progressively more difficult,<sup>146</sup> or of which only the third is successful. Alternatively (and here the law may combine with those of contrast (14), (15), discussed below), a difficult task may be undertaken by three brothers, of whom only the youngest succeeds. Thus the person involved need not be the same at different stages in the series for the law to be fulfilled, provided that the element of progression is present. The three fights with which C&C is mainly concerned, though not linked by the presence of the same hero in each case (see further (18), below), show the law of progression insofar as they are treated at increasingly greater length, and are linked thematically by the fact that each of them illustrates, as Magoun has shown, "the unwavering loyalty of the *comitatus* to its overlord".<sup>147</sup>

C&C also seems to obey the law of restriction to action (6), whereby every quality of a person or thing must be expressed in action; otherwise it is out of place in oral narrative. As shown above in the context of the economy with which feelings are expressed in C&C, the contrasting characters of Sigeþryht and Cynewulf are conveyed by reference to their actions in the earlier part of the story, including the first fight at Merantun; and whether or not speech, reported or otherwise, may be regarded as action,<sup>148</sup> it is certainly true that, in the later part, the speeches by members of the opposing sides at Merantun lead naturally to the heroic actions which culminate in the tragic climaxes of the second and third fights.

By the law of plastic lucidity or of tableau-scenes (7), each episode in oral narrative presents the imagination with a clear, vivid picture, showing characters involved in actions or scenes which are sufficiently exceptional to be memorable, and which have, indeed, "a certain quality of persistence through time".<sup>149</sup> Obedience to this law is not particularly striking in C&C, where summary tends to intrude upon scene, as shown above, but the brief presentation of Cynewulf rushing at Cyneheard from the doorway of the lady's bower (11.15-18) certainly has this quality, and may be cited as an example.

According to the logic of oral narrative (8), information is rarely provided which does not in some way affect the plot; irrelevant material is eschewed. Furthermore, newly introduced material is given a prominence directly related to its significance for the plot. The structure of C&C will be discussed more fully below; it may be assumed for the moment that its "main plot" is the story of the hostility between Cynewulf and Cyneheard as narrated from 11.8-46. While this law seems to be generally present in C&C, it is not always easy to show how it manifests itself, largely because of the summary character, noted above, of the early part of the story in particular. It is not so much that irrelevant material is introduced

as that insufficient relevant material is provided. To understand the position of the kinsmen fighting on opposing sides at Merantun, for instance, it would be helpful to know more about the kinship between Cynewulf and the brothers Sigebyrht and Cyneheard; and to understand the conflict between Cynewulf and Cyneheard, it would be useful to know more about Cynewulf's precise reasons for wishing to expel Cyneheard. The prominence given to the fact that Cyneheard was Sigebyrht's brother strongly suggests the relevance of this information to the mutual hostility of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, and hence to the main plot; but it is not easy to show exactly why or how it is relevant, since insufficient information has been given. Is Cyneheard primarily interested in the throne, as suggested earlier, or is he primarily "seeking revenge for his brother's deposition", as suggested by Waterhouse?<sup>150</sup> Or have there been other hostilities between Cynewulf and either or both of these two brothers which are not mentioned? The truth lies most probably in a combination of these possibilities, but hardly emerges fully from the information provided. This truncated quality of the opening lines of the annal makes it difficult to determine what the main plot of the story is until Cyneheard has been introduced and his attack on Merantun mentioned; and this in turn makes it hard to decide just what is or is not relevant to it. Once these difficulties have been recognized, however, it is possible to show that much of what might seem to be irrelevant on its introduction is in fact made use of later in such a way as to confirm its relevance; though the possibility that information has been included primarily to satisfy the demands of historical tradition, rather than with any conscious thought of its relevance to other parts of a narrative structure, should, of course, at all times be remembered. If, as already assumed, the main plot of the story has to do with the hostility between Cynewulf and Sigebyrht's brother Cyneheard, it might not seem strictly relevant to mention the West Saxon council (and West Seaxna wiotan) in the opening sentence of the annal as having shared with Cynewulf the responsibility for Sigebyrht's deposition (though see (15), below). However, if H. Munro Chadwick is right in claiming that the specific mention of Cynewulf in this sentence suggests conspiracy rather than a formal deposition of Sigebyrht by the West Saxon council,<sup>151</sup> then the mention of the council raises the question of which of its members, if any, remained loyal to Sigebyrht; and this question is answered, partly by the reference to Hampshire at the end of the sentence, and partly by the reference, in the immediately following sentence, to the "ealdorman who stood by him longest" (11.3-4), later identified as Cumbra, who was presumably the ealdorman of Hampshire.<sup>152</sup> Now the story of Cumbra's slaying by Sigebyrht and the swineherd's revenge is highly relevant in subject-matter to the main plot, as emphasized by Waterhouse, and pointed out above;<sup>153</sup> so the mention of the West Saxon council in the opening sentence may be said to introduce this story, which may now be identified as a subsidiary plot paralleling the main plot in subject-matter. The mention of Sigebyrht's expulsion into Andred, which completes the process of his deposition, turns out to have an obvious, if unspecified relevance to the main plot in that it adds to the reasons for hostility between Cynewulf and Cyneheard, though it is more immediately relevant to the

subsidiary plot in that it helps to explain the circumstances of Sigebyrht's death, in ascribing it specifically to a swineherd and locating it at Privett.<sup>154</sup> If there is any doubt as to the reason for the swineherd's slaying of Sigebyrht, this is explained in the co-ordinate clause stating that he was avenging the ealdorman. The reference to Cynewulf's "great battles against the Britons", mentioned after the completion of the subsidiary plot (11.7-8), is perhaps not strictly relevant to the advancement of the main plot, but it at least raises expectations about Cynewulf's presentation as a warrior-hero which are fulfilled in the one scene where Cynewulf is at all closely visualized (11.15-19); and it is linked to this scene verbally by the word miclum (11.8, 17), even though the two uses of the word are not exactly parallel.<sup>155</sup> The presence of this reference in C&C may in any case be accounted for in terms of other laws of oral narrative discussed above (6), and below (14). Thus the opening lines of the annal, including the subsidiary plot and the reference to Cynewulf's battles against the Britons, may be said to form an introduction to the main plot, which latter extends from the end of 1.8 to the beginning of 1.46, after which it is followed by a short epilogue (ending at 1.49), the presence of which may be explained in terms of the law of closing (20), discussed below. Within the main plot, the logic of oral narrative is mostly followed, apart from the fact that, in contrast to the mention of ealdorman Osric (1.28), whose godson, it later emerges (11.44-6), is the one survivor of the third fight at Merantun on Cyneheard's side (cf. the law of patterning (3), above), the mention by name of Wiferþ is hard to explain in terms of this logic; though it may conceivably be accounted for in terms of the law of two to a scene (2) or the law of twins (16).

According to the law of unity of plot (9), the typical oral narrative moves naturally towards a single event as its conclusion and excludes everything irrelevant to it. Enough has been said above in connection with laws 1 and 8 to show that this law is not consistently followed in C&C; the confrontation between Cynewulf and Sigebyrht, which might be expected from what is said in the opening sentence of the annal, never in fact occurs, and it is only after the main plot has begun in earnest with Cyneheard's attack on Merantun that the story can be said to move naturally towards an inevitable conclusion. The subsidiary plot referred to above, which begins in earnest with Sigebyrht's slaying of Cumbra, finds a natural conclusion, it is true, in the slaying of Sigebyrht by the swineherd in revenge for Cumbra's death (cf. the logic of oral narrative (8), above), but its movement towards that conclusion is somewhat impeded by the mention of Cynewulf's expulsion of Sigebyrht into Andred, the relevance of which to the subsidiary plot, noted above, only emerges when Sigebyrht's death has been reported; initially it revives the expectations raised by the opening sentence of a conflict between Cynewulf and Sigebyrht, which are never fulfilled.

The laws of oral narrative distinguish between epic unity and ideal unity of plot (10). The former, the simpler form of unity, is apparent when every detail of the narrative contributes towards bringing about an event, the possibility of which has been suspected from the beginning; while the latter involves two or more instances

of epic unity being placed side by side without themselves being linked by epic unity, so that individual characters and the problems confronting them may be dealt with all the more fully. Enough has been said above in connection with laws (1), (8), and (9) to show that, in the main plot of C&C, epic unity is well exemplified; once Cynewulf's wish to expel Cyneheard is mentioned, everything in the story contributes more or less directly to the ultimate victory of Cynewulf's side over Cyneheard's - an outcome which may reasonably be suspected (if not predicted) from the mention of the proposed expulsion onwards. Suspicion as to the final outcome is assisted by the early reference to Cynewulf's "small company" (1.12) of followers at Merantun, which is enough to indicate that there are other followers elsewhere who will avenge him in the event of his defeat with this company, as is in fact the case. Epic unity is also apparent in the subsidiary plot, though less strikingly so; the mention of Cynewulf's expulsion of Sigebryht into Andred, which later emerges as relevant to the circumstances of Sigebryht's death, at first distracts attention from the subsidiary plot in seeming to point towards a conflict between Cynewulf and Sigebryht rather than to one between Sigebryht and an avenger of the ealdorman he has slain. Since no mention is made of Cyneheard either in the subsidiary plot or at any other stage of the introduction, it cannot be said that any part of the introduction is linked to the main plot by epic unity. What can be said, however, is that the subsidiary plot and the main plot are linked by ideal unity, in that they both have the same fundamental subject-matter, as pointed out above: revenge arising from loyalty to a slain lord (cf. the law of patterning (3), above). According to Olrik, the linking of two instances of epic unity by an idea rather than by the same leading character is acceptable according to the law of ideal unity, even though it is a relatively "late, reflective" manifestation of it.<sup>156</sup>

According to the law of direct continuity of plot (11), oral narrative moves steadily forward to what is causally and temporally the next stage in the story, without reverting to any previous incident or allowing a change of scene unless the plot itself requires such a change. This law is certainly obeyed in the main plot of C&C; and if it is imperfectly obeyed in the introduction this is because insufficient relevant material is provided rather than because irrelevant material disturbs the continuity. The passing over of Cynewulf's long reign in a few words would not in itself represent a violation of this law if it could be shown that this long period separated two events between which there was a direct causal relationship, and that nothing during the time separating them was essential to the plot, but the impression actually given is that important events do take place during this period which are not mentioned, and which, had they been recorded, would have helped to explain Cynewulf's precise reasons for wishing to expel Cyneheard, and perhaps revealed a link by epic unity between the introduction and the main plot. Even in the subsidiary plot, which otherwise seems to follow the law of continuity, the precise causal relationship between Sigebryht's slaying of his loyal ealdorman and his expulsion by Cynewulf into Andred is hard to determine.<sup>157</sup> Although important events seem to be omitted from

the introduction, those which are recorded are clearly in correct chronological order, with the possible exception of one or more of Cynewulf's battles against the Britons, as shown above.<sup>158</sup> Olrik allows two exceptions to this law, and exemplifies both from the Icelandic sagas: (a) a new story may be introduced in the course of dialogue; and (b) the main plot may be temporarily brought to an end at a suitable moment in order to introduce new events which are seen to merge with the main plot only when they have been fully dealt with themselves. The first of these is obviously not relevant here; but if Olrik's term "main plot" (*hovedhandlingen*)<sup>159</sup> may be modified slightly to suit the narrative structure of C&C, as outlined under (8), above, it is possible that some of the anomalies of its introduction may be partly explained in terms of the second exception. For instance, it seems that the subsidiary plot is temporarily brought to an end with the mention of Sigebryht's slaying of his loyal ealdorman, and that the reference to Cynewulf's expulsion of Sigebryht into Andred, which immediately follows, is irrelevant to this plot's concern. However, it is seen to merge with the subsidiary plot when it is found that the expulsion provides a setting for the swineherd's slaying of Sigebryht in vengeance for the slaying of the ealdorman. Secondly, it might be thought that the story's concern with the mutual hostility of Cynewulf and Sigebryht had come to an end with the former's expulsion of the latter into Andred, since a confrontation between them is obviously no longer possible after the swineherd's slaying of Sigebryht, in which the subsidiary plot culminates. When Cynewulf is mentioned again, it is in the context of his battles against the Britons, and it seems as though the story is now concerned with his qualities as a king rather than with these earlier events. However, it soon emerges that Cynewulf is at odds with Sigebryht's brother Cyneheard, and this is enough to establish a link, however imperfectly explained, between the present concern of the story and the earlier references to Cynewulf.

The law of concentration on a central character (12) is clearly obeyed in C&C; Cynewulf is mentioned at the very beginning and end of the story, and even participates in the subsidiary plot, the main character of which, however, seems to be Sigebryht. After Cynewulf's death, which may reasonably be regarded as the climax of the story as a whole, it is loyalty to him which prevents his two groups of followers from accepting the terms offered them by Cyneheard, and which thus leads to the second and third fights at Merantun.

At the same time, the law of two main characters (13) is also obeyed in C&C; according to this, a second character may become almost as important as the main character for the development of the plot. In C&C this second character is of course Cyneheard, whose presence makes itself felt from the beginning of the main plot onwards, and who is specifically mentioned together with Cynewulf (though not, like him, by name) in the closing lines of the story. It is Cyneheard who initiates the first fight at Merantun, and whose actions test and confirm the loyalty of Cynewulf's followers from which the second and third fights arise. It should be emphasized that it is Cyneheard, rather than Osric, who is the second main character in C&C; Magoun's remark that "Osric is in every sense the

hero of the occasion", where by "occasion" he seems to mean the entire Merantun affair rather than just the third fight,<sup>160</sup> gives an exaggerated impression of his importance. It should also be stressed that, in C&C, the law of two main characters is hardly obeyed to the extent that, as sometimes happens in oral narrative, the second main character arouses more sympathy than the main character, thus becoming the "actual hero", while the main character becomes merely the "formal hero".

As for the law of contrast (14), whereby two characters appearing at the same time are contrasted in character and often in action, enough has been said above in the context of the economy with which feelings are expressed in C&C to show that this law is obeyed here at least to the extent that Cynewulf and Sigebryht are contrasted in character and action, even though Cynewulf and Cyneheard are not; and it may be added that the loyalty of Sigebryht's ealdorman, and that of the swineherd who avenges his death, are made to contrast with the wickedness of Sigebryht in slaying his loyal follower. The lack of a contrast between Cynewulf and Cyneheard may be compared with the paucity of marked contrasts between opponents in the Icelandic family sagas, where, as Grønbech has noted, the maintenance of honour through vengeance by each of the feuding parties is the chief concern of the narrative, and little preference is indicated for one side as opposed to the other, with the result that the family sagas, apart from *Njáls saga*, are "desperately poor in villains".<sup>161</sup> A further element of contrast becomes apparent in C&C if Sigebryht is regarded as the main character of the subsidiary plot. This plot then contrasts with the main plot in having an evil as opposed to a noble lord as its main character.

A further specification of the law of contrast requires that it should work outwards from the central character to the less important characters (15), rather than the other way round; in other words, the qualities of the central character should be reasonably well established before the contrast is effected. This is hardly true of C&C, where nothing is said about Cynewulf's qualities until after Sigebryht's evil character has been sufficiently indicated by the references to his "wicked deeds" and to his slaying of his own loyal ealdorman. Prior to these references the only hint given that Cynewulf's actions are to be approved of is the reference to the West Saxon council's support of Cynewulf, which may be intended to give this impression. On the other hand, if Sigebryht is seen as the main character of the subsidiary plot, then the law of contrast may be seen working outwards from him to other characters; his wickedness is first established, and is then seen to contrast with the loyalty of the ealdorman Cumbra and the swineherd.

According to the law of twins (16), two characters who appear as partners in the same or much the same role make a less strong impression individually than one person would in that role. While it might seem tempting to take as an example of this the two survivors of the battles at Merantun, mentioned above as an example of the law of patterning (3), it should be remembered that these have been fighting on different sides, and cannot be seen as partners, whereas each of Olrik's examples involves either brothers or members of the same group. The nearest, perhaps, that C&C comes to this



law is in the presentation of Osric and Wiferþ, though their presentation in the same role is hardly sustained, since Wiferþ is mentioned only once. If, as seems likely, these two are the leaders of the group "left behind" that comes to Merantun to avenge Cynewulf's death,<sup>162</sup> then they seem to make, as a pair, a rather less striking impression in this role than just one leader, such as Cynewulf, might have done.

By the law of three (17), oral narrative shows a fondness for the number three with regard to characters, objects, and successive events. Obedience to this law is relatively rare in the Icelandic family sagas, as Olrik indicates, naming *Hávarðar saga Ísfirðings* as the one family saga in which it is prominent<sup>163</sup> (cf. the law of contrast (14), above). It appears in C&C in the three scenes depicting the events at Merantun, and is reinforced by the phrasal repetition which, as shown above, underlines the tragic similarity of the climaxes of these scenes. The main plot may be said to have three main characters, as the title of Magoun's article, "Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Osric",<sup>164</sup> implies, and so may the subsidiary plot, in the persons of Sigebryht, Cumbra, and the swineherd.

Closely linked with the law of three is the law of terminal stress (18), whereby the last member in a series of characters or events is the most important for the plot and consequently receives the most emphasis. Initial stress, on the other hand, which in Olrik's examples appears only in series of characters (both human and divine), is given to the figure who is formally rather than functionally the most important in such a series.<sup>165</sup> It is certainly true that in C&C the last of the three scenes depicting the events at Merantun is given greater emphasis than the other two with regard to length and detail of presentation. The first of these, however, although it is the shortest, has its own vividness and haunting quality, as suggested above in connection with (7), and cannot be regarded as having a purely formal importance, any more than Cynewulf, who plays a prominent part in it, can be regarded as a merely formal hero (cf. the law of two main characters (13), above). Of Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Osric, who may be regarded as the main characters of each of these three scenes respectively, it is Cynewulf who is most clearly visualized and who remains most distinctly in the mind, yet the emphasis which he thus receives indicates an importance much more functional than formal, since his heroic death is of the greatest significance for the main plot, which would, indeed, be impossible without it. Thus, while the law of terminal stress is to some extent obeyed in C&C, it cannot be said that initial stress is used here in the sense in which Olrik applies the term to oral narrative, even though it is certainly present in the story. As for the subsidiary plot, in which Sigebryht, Cumbra and the swineherd may be said to form a series in the order in which they are first referred to, more emphasis seems to be given to Sigebryht than to either of the other two characters, whose loyalty combines to contrast with Sigebryht's wickedness, as shown above in connection with the law of contrast (14). This instance of initial stress also seems to indicate functional rather than formal importance, however, since it is Sigebryht's wickedness which initiates the subsidiary plot, and without which it would be impossible.

Since the opening sentence of C&C, at the very least, shows the conventions of annalistic writing rather than those of oral tradition,<sup>166</sup> it is unlikely that the story will show much adherence to the law of opening (19), whereby, in oral narrative, a story begins with a change in its atmosphere from calm to excitement, and with a movement of its concern from the single to the many, and from the habitual to the unusual. There is certainly little leisure for calm at the beginning of C&C, with its abrupt account of Cynewulf's partial deposition of Sigebyrt, with the support of the West Saxon council; however, the law is obeyed in the grammatical sense that the first sentence moves from a singular subject governing a verb in the singular to an additional plural subject governing the same verb by anacoluthon and placed after the verb and its direct and indirect objects, both of which are in the singular.<sup>167</sup> In this sense the concern of the sentence moves "from the single to the many". The point at which the introduction leads into the main plot (at ll.8-9), may be said to show a movement from the habitual to the unusual in referring first to Cynewulf's frequent battles against the Britons and then to his wish to expel Cyneheard after ruling for thirty-one years.

Finally, C&C can be shown to obey the law of closing (20), whereby oral narrative tends not to stop abruptly after the final decisive event of the story - in this case the defeat by Osric and his followers of Cyneheard and his - but allows the atmosphere to change from excitement to calm, and the concern of the story to move away somewhat from its principal events and characters. This is effected in C&C by the second reference to the length of Cynewulf's reign, and by the references to the whereabouts of the graves of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, and to their descent from Cerdic.

Thus, while the evidence for the formal characteristics of oral narrative in C&C is not overwhelming, it is perhaps rather more impressive than the evidence for oral style assembled earlier. Over half the twenty laws listed by Olrik seem to be fairly closely followed in C&C, particularly those of patterning (3), progression (5), and restriction to action (6); the ones relating to logic (8), and to unity (9), (10) and continuity (11) of plot; and those involving a central character (12), two main characters (13), contrast (14), the number three (17), and closing (20). The formal evidence seems to suggest rather more forcibly than the stylistic evidence that the story has retained a number of features from an oral stage of its transmission.<sup>168</sup>

The main reason for the present investigation has been the fact that, with the notable exception of Joan Turville-Petre's study, comparison of C&C with the Icelandic sagas has been made chiefly against the background of the assumption that these were largely oral in origin. Although this assumption has been seriously challenged in the course of the century, as was pointed out earlier, there have been signs of a cautious return to it among students of the sagas in recent years.<sup>169</sup> Preben Meulengracht Sørensen, for instance, writing in 1977, has emphasized strongly the interaction of the oral and written traditions in medieval Iceland, and the danger of seeing the one as separate from the other: "We must surely assume", he writes, "that the authors of the sagas were

story-tellers, and first and foremost story-tellers. They wrote because they had learnt the art of story-telling, and had the oral presentation of the written saga in mind as they wrote".<sup>170</sup> A major herald of this relatively new approach was Theodore M. Andersson, whose detailed investigation of *The Problem of Icelandic Saga Origins*, published in 1964, led him to the following conclusion: "The writer undoubtedly could and did use written sources, supplementary oral sources, his own imagination, and above all his own words, but his art and presumably the framework of his story were given him by tradition. The inspiration of the sagas is ultimately oral".<sup>171</sup> As P.G. Foote says, commenting on Andersson's conclusions, "We should like to know more about the art",<sup>172</sup> and the approaches of Heinzel, Olrik, and Clover discussed here might, if closely and extensively applied to the sagas, help to provide the increased knowledge required. As for "the framework", Andersson has himself provided a starting-point for further investigation with his *Icelandic Family Saga. An Analytic Reading*, published in 1966. Here he outlines a structural pattern which he finds recurring in a number of family sagas and which, he believes, "might also serve to describe the oral stories that must have preceded and pre-conditioned the written sagas".<sup>173</sup> I should like to conclude this paper with a short discussion of Andersson's pattern in relation to C&C, which he does not mention. First, however, I should point out that his definition and use of this pattern have been sternly criticized by a number of reviewers. Some have found, for instance, that his identification of the pattern is based on a faulty analysis of *Þorsteins þátr stangarhöggs*, from which he derives it;<sup>174</sup> some have raised the question of whether it is appropriate to derive a pattern supposedly characteristic of the family sagas from a *þátr*, which is not necessarily the same type of narrative as a saga;<sup>175</sup> some have found the pattern acceptable as an analysis of *Þorsteins þátr*, yet unacceptable as a structural norm for many of the family sagas;<sup>176</sup> and some have found that Andersson's discussion of only twenty-four of these sagas limits the validity of his conclusions,<sup>177</sup> one critic pointing out that *Flóamanna saga*, which is among the family sagas omitted from Andersson's analysis, fails completely to fit his pattern,<sup>178</sup> and another suggesting that his investigation might profitably have been extended to include the closely related kings' sagas.<sup>179</sup> On the other hand, Richard F. Allen has written, in his book on *Njáls saga*: "One may take issue with Andersson's analyses of individual sagas, but the pattern he has perceived does appear again and again, not only in the family sagas but in the episodes of *Sturlunga saga*, and the terse anecdotes of the *Landnámabók*";<sup>180</sup> and *Króka-Refs saga*, another of the family sagas excluded from Andersson's analysis, has recently been shown to conform quite neatly to his pattern.<sup>181</sup>

The pattern falls into six parts: introduction, conflict, climax, revenge, reconciliation, and aftermath. The main function of the introduction is to present the characters; however, it is not essential for all of them to be presented in the introduction. Andersson takes account of the fact that in some sagas characters may be introduced "at the beginning of a new section",<sup>182</sup> as Cyneheard is in C&C according to the analysis given above, where it was suggested that the introduction to C&C takes up the first eight

lines of the story; Cyneheard is not in fact introduced until 1.10. What has been said above about the subsidiary plot, which forms part of the introduction, may be compared with Andersson's view that the introduction to a family saga may consist of "an almost independent story which serves to adumbrate the personalities of the saga or the unfolding plot".<sup>183</sup> The next four parts of Andersson's pattern - conflict, climax, revenge and reconciliation - may be considered within the framework of the main plot of C&C, which according to the above analysis extends from 11.8-46 of the text. It is clear from the opening lines of this section that a conflict develops between Cynewulf and Cyneheard, even though the "insult or injury"<sup>184</sup> generally required to touch off the conflict in a family saga is not specified here; and that this conflict rises to a climax with the death of Cynewulf. Now, at the risk of applying Andersson's pattern to C&C from without, rather than allowing its presence or absence to emerge from the text itself, it may be noted that revenge and reconciliation should, according to the pattern, follow next, in that order. It can hardly be said that reconciliation takes place in C&C, unless the survival of the ealdorman's godson mentioned at 11.44-5, may be taken as an example of it - if it may indeed be deduced from the text that his life was saved or spared by the ealdorman.<sup>185</sup> However, it is undoubtedly true that two attempts at reconciliation are made by Cyneheard, when he offers terms in exchange for the kingship to each of Cynewulf's two groups of followers. In both cases, however, the offer is rejected for reasons of loyalty, which leads to a heroic but unsuccessful attempt at revenge by the first group (11.22-5), and to a successful accomplishment of it by the second (11.32-44). Thus, while the dominant feature of this part of the story is revenge, the possibility of reconciliation is twice indicated. Finally, the brief passage (11.46-9) described above as an epilogue may be said to consist of "concluding notes not strictly pertinent to the plot",<sup>186</sup> which is how Andersson defines "aftermath", the sixth and final part of his pattern.

Andersson's pattern can thus be shown to combine reasonably well with the other schemes of division applied here to the story under discussion, and provides yet another interesting opportunity for comparison between "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" and the Icelandic sagas.

NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> I am grateful to my colleagues Professor T.A. Shippey, Peter Orton and Elizabeth Cook; to Drs Richard F. Byrn and C.D.M. Cossar, both of the German Department, University of Leeds; to Denis Bethell of the Department of Medieval History, University College Dublin; and to Joan Turville-Petre, of Somerville College, Oxford, for help, advice, and encouragement on different aspects of this paper. I am also grateful to Professor Desmond Slay, of the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, for conversations which, as long ago as 1969, greatly increased my interest in the subject of this paper. Errors naturally remain entirely mine.
- <sup>2</sup> The correct date of the year of Cynewulf's accession, which forms the starting-point for the events of C&C, is in fact 757. Its assignment to the year 755 is due to a chronological dislocation from the mid eighth to the mid ninth century in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which has resulted in most events being dated two years too early during that period. See *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Charles Plummer on the basis of an edition by John Earle, 2 vols., (Oxford, 1892-9); rev. Dorothy Whitelock, 1952), II, pp.cii-iii. The information given in the text of C&C, 11.8 and 46, that Cynewulf reigned for thirty-one years, is also erroneous; he reigned in fact for twenty-nine, and his death is briefly recorded under the year 784 (correct date 786), in the following words: "Her Cyneheard ofslog Cynewulf cyning, and he þær wearþ ofslægen, and lxxxiiii monna mid him". It seems likely that the word he here refers to Cyneheard, and that the eighty-four men referred to were his followers, rather than, as Francis P. Magoun and C.L. Wrenn believed, the "small company" who died with Cynewulf at Merantun. See Magoun, "Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Osric", *Anglia* 57 (1933), 361-76, p.366, and Wrenn, "A Saga of the Anglo-Saxons", *History, New Series*, 25 (1940), 208-15, p.214. For criticism of Magoun on this point, see Francis Joseph Battaglia, "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 755: the Missing Evidence for a Traditional Reading", *PMLA* 81 (1966), 173-8, p.174, n.7, and Ruth Waterhouse, "The Theme and Structure of 755 *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70 (1969), 630-40, p.632, n.1; cf. also p.640.
- <sup>3</sup> See *Three Northumbrian Poems*, ed. A.H. Smith (rev. ed., London, 1968), pp.10-15; C.L. Wrenn, "The Poetry of Caedmon", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 32 (1947), 277-95, and the reviews of Wrenn, "Caedmon", by Kemp Malone and George Kane in *Medium Evum* 17 (1948), 56-7 and *The Modern Language Review* 43 (1948), 250-2 respectively; Francis P. Magoun, Jr., "Bede's story of Caedman: the Case History of an Anglo-Saxon Oral Singer", *Speculum* 30 (1955), 49-63; Kemp Malone, "Caedmon and English Poetry", *Modern Language Notes* 76 (1961), 193-5; Robert D. Stevick, "The Oral-Formulaic Analyses of Old English Verse", *Speculum* 37 (1962), 382-9.
- <sup>4</sup> It deals mainly with the deaths of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, which in fact took place twenty-nine years after the accession of Cynewulf, which is assigned to the year 755 (correct date 757). See note 2, above.
- <sup>5</sup> See Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics, New Accents* (London, 1977), p.65.
- <sup>6</sup> See Robert Scholes, *Structuralism in Literature. An Introduction* (New Haven and London, 1974), p.80.
- <sup>7</sup> For documentation of this view, see pp.86-8 below.
- <sup>8</sup> See Plummer, I, pp.46, 48, 50. The paragraphing and line-numbering of the text reproduced here are taken from the story as edited in Joyce Hill,

A.R. Taylor and R.L. Thomson, *Beginning Old English*, Leeds Studies in English (Leeds, 1977), pp.40-1, where the paragraphing is the same as that of the text as printed in *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*, rev. Dorothy Whitelock (Oxford, 1967), pp.1-3.

- <sup>9</sup> See *The Parker Chronicle and Laws (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 173) A Facsimile*, ed. Robin Flower and Hugh Smith, EETS, OS 208 (London, 1941), Fols.10<sup>a</sup>-10<sup>b</sup>.
- <sup>10</sup> For accounts of the manuscript tradition of the Chronicle, see *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. Whitelock (1967), p.1; Plummer, II, pp.xxiii-cii; *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. G.N. Garmonsway, Everyman's Library, (rev.ed., London, 1954), pp.xxxiii-xlii; and *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. Dorothy Whitelock, David C. Douglas and Susie L. Tucker, (London, 1961), pp.xi-xviii.
- <sup>11</sup> I am most grateful to Peter Orton for making his transcript available to me for this purpose.
- <sup>12</sup> See *The C-Text of the Old English Chronicles*, ed. Harry August Rositzke, *Beiträge zur englischen Philologie* 34 (1940), 22-24.
- <sup>13</sup> See *An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from British Museum, Cotton MS., Tiberius B. iv*, ed. E. Classen and F.E. Harmer, Modern Language Texts, English Series (Manchester, 1926), pp.16-17.
- <sup>14</sup> See Plummer, I, pp.47, 49, 50.
- <sup>15</sup> See Plummer, I, pp.46, 47. The Latin text of F has been separately edited by Francis P. Magoun, Jr., "Annales Domitiani Latini: an Edition", *Medieval Studies*, 9 (1947), 235-95.
- <sup>16</sup> See Waterhouse, 630 (note 2, above).
- <sup>17</sup> See *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*, third edition, ed. Frederic G. Cassidy and Richard N. Ringler (New York, 1971), p.138.
- <sup>18</sup> See Adeline Courtney Bartlett, *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, Columbia Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 122 (New York, 1935), p.10.
- <sup>19</sup> See Battaglia, 176 (note 2, above), and Geffrei Gaimar, *L'Estoire des Engleis*, ed. Alexander Bell, Anglo-Norman Text Society XIV-XVI (1956-8) (Oxford, 1960), pp.liiii-iv.
- <sup>20</sup> The text of Gaimar quoted here is that of Bell, pp.57-61; and the translation is quoted from *Lestorie des Engles solum la Translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar*, ed. Thomas Duffy Hardy and Charles Trice Martin, II (translation), Rolls Series (London, 1889), pp.59-63. It should be noted that the line numbers of the translation do not correspond exactly to those of Bell's text. Lines 1827-35 may be quoted from the relevant text and translation as follows:

Kenewlf fud [i] dune regnanz  
 Tant que ot regné [plus de] vint anz.  
 Cel Siebrit k'il ot cacied  
 Ert sun cusin mais par pechied  
 E par conseil de ses baruns  
 Qui furent fols e mult feluns

Cynewulf was then holder of the kingdom  
 Till he had reigned more than twenty years.  
 This Sigebryht whom he had driven out  
 Was his kinsman, but by the instigation  
 And advice of his lords,  
 Who were foolish and wicked,

[Estait li reis vers li marriz. Un frere aveit cil Sïebriz] Qui Kenehard aveit a nun.	The king was angered against him. This Sigebryht had a brother, Whose name was Cyneheard
---	--

There seems little doubt that the Kenewlf mentioned here is the same person as the Cheolwlf mentioned at l.1909. It may be noted that the square brackets in the quotations from Gaimar enclose letters and words supplied by Bell from manuscripts other than the one on which his edition is based.

- <sup>21</sup> For a discussion of the latter relationship, see Francis B. Gummere, "The Sister's Son", in *An English Miscellany presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of his Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. W.P. Ker, A.S. Napier and Walter W. Skeat (Oxford, 1901), pp.133-49.
- <sup>22</sup> See Kenneth Sisam, *The Structure of Beowulf* (Oxford, 1965), pp.34-8, 80-2.
- <sup>23</sup> See *Genesis A: a New Edition*, ed. A.N. Doane (Madison, Wisconsin, 1978), pp.170-1.
- <sup>24</sup> See Gerald Morgan, "The Treachery of Hrothulf", *English Studies* 53 (1972), 1-17.
- <sup>25</sup> See *Widsith, a Study in Old English Heroic Legend*, ed. R.W. Chambers (Cambridge, 1912), p.83 ("this tragic background"); *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnesburg*, ed. Fr. Klaeber (third edition, Boston, Mass., 1950), p.xxxvi ("the two tragic motives"); and *Beowulf with the Finnesburg Fragment*, ed. C.L. Wrenn (third edition, rev. W.F. Bolton, 1973), p.68 ("a tragic atmosphere of foreboding").
- <sup>26</sup> See, for instance, E.V. Gordon, *An Introduction to Old Norse* (Oxford, 1927), p.xlv ("tragic and heroic matter") and *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. Whitelock (1967), p.1 ("the following tragic narrative").
- <sup>27</sup> See the genealogies in *Laxdœla saga . . .*, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, Íslenzk fornrit V (Reykjavík, 1934), pp.294-5.
- <sup>28</sup> See *Vatnsdœla saga . . .*, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, Íslenzk fornrit, VIII (Reykjavík, 1939), pp.50, 53. Both the *Laxdœla* and *Vatnsdœla* cases are noted by Vilhelm Grønbech as examples of threatened relations between kinsmen in his *Vor Folkæt i Oldtiden*, I (Copenhagen, 1955), pp.44, 50-1.
- <sup>29</sup> See Theodore M. Andersson, *The Problem of Icelandic Saga Origins*, Yale Germanic Studies, I (New Haven and London, 1964), pp.69-81.
- <sup>30</sup> See, for instance, G. Turville-Petre, "Scaldic Poetry: History and Literature", *Bibliography of Old Norse-Icelandic Studies 1969* (1970), pp.7-20, see esp. 15-16; M. Chesnutt, "Popular and Learned Elements in the Icelandic Saga Tradition", in *Proceedings of the First International Saga Conference, University of Edinburgh 1971*, ed. Peter Foote, Hermann Pálsson and Desmond Slay (London, 1973), pp.28-65, see esp. 42-51; and Peter Foote, "New Dimensions in 'Njáls Saga'", *Scandinavica* 18 (1979), 49-58, see esp. pp.49-50.
- <sup>31</sup> See Henry Sweet, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader . . .* (Oxford, 1876), p.187.
- <sup>32</sup> See Richard Heinzel, *Beschreibung der isländischen Saga*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch - Historische Classe 97. Band (Wien, 1881; reprinted New York, 1977), pp.292-3 (292, n.1).

- <sup>33</sup> See Plummer II, pp.xix-xx (xix, n.1).
- <sup>34</sup> See Gordon, p.xlv.
- <sup>35</sup> See Magoun, "Cynewulf", 1.
- <sup>36</sup> See R.H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* (Oxford, 1935) II, p.394.
- <sup>37</sup> See C.E. Wright, *The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England* (Edinburgh, 1939), p.viii. Wright's book has been instructively reviewed by A.G. Brodeur in the *Journal of American Folklore* 54 (1941), 88-90.
- <sup>38</sup> See Wright, pp.78-80.
- <sup>39</sup> See Wrenn, "Saga", 208 (note 2, above).
- <sup>40</sup> See G. Turville-Petre, "Notes on the Intellectual History of the Icelanders", *History, New Series*, 27 (1942), 111-23.
- <sup>41</sup> C.L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature* (London, 1967), pp.202-5.
- <sup>42</sup> See G. Turville-Petre, "Intellectual History", 123.
- <sup>43</sup> See Roger Fowler, *Old English Prose and Verse* (London, 1966), pp.4-6.
- <sup>44</sup> See *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*, ed. Cassidy and Ringler (1971), p.138.
- <sup>45</sup> See Joan Turville-Petre, "The Narrative Style in Old English", in *Iceland and the Mediaeval World. Studies in Honour of Ian Maxwell*, ed. Gabriel Turville-Petre and John Stanley Martin (Melbourne, 1974), pp.116-25.
- <sup>46</sup> See note 32, above.
- <sup>47</sup> For documentation of Olrik's writings on this subject, see notes 55 and 122-5, below.
- <sup>48</sup> See Joan Turville-Petre, pp.116, 124.
- <sup>49</sup> See Knut Liestøl, *The Origin of the Icelandic Family Sagas* (Oslo, 1930), pp.26-30.
- <sup>50</sup> See Heinzel, pp.286-94 (note 32, above).
- <sup>51</sup> See Heinzel, pp.298, 300.
- <sup>52</sup> See Plummer, II, p.45.
- <sup>53</sup> See notes 2 and 4, above. For a speculative explanation of how this insertion came to be made, see Wrenn, "Saga", 213.
- <sup>54</sup> Magoun, "Cynewulf", 364, 370, believed that these events, up to and including Cynewulf's battles against the Britons, were meant to form part of the "annal proper".



- 55 See Axel Olrik, "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative", in *The Study of Folklore*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley, California, 1965), pp.129-41, 138.
- 56 See Heinzel, pp.282-4.
- 57 Other possible reasons are discussed below; see p.107 and note 150.
- 58 See Plummer, II, p.45.
- 59 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.118, n.6.
- 60 See Tom H. Towers, "Thematic Unity in the Story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard", *JEGP* 62 (1963), 310-6, esp. pp.314-5. The possibility should be kept in mind that the reference to Sigebryht's "wicked deeds", 1.2, may be intended to represent the opinions of Cynewulf and the West Saxon council, rather than those of the narrator.
- 61 See note 50, above, and the reference there given.
- 62 When the repetition of this construction is being discussed as a possible feature of oral style, it should not be forgotten that the construction itself is particularly common in texts translated from Latin, and is possibly, therefore, of learned as opposed to colloquial origin. See *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Primer* (ninth edition, rev. Norman Davis, Oxford, 1953), p.51; Bruce Mitchell, *A Guide to Old English* (second edition, Oxford, 1968), p.110, and *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*, ed. Cassidy and Ringler (1971), p.115, n.74. It may also be noted that the use of the present participle in Old Icelandic has long been recognized as a feature of learned rather than colloquial style. See Jónas Kristjánsson, *Um Fóstbræðra Sögu*, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar á Íslandi, Rit 1 (Reykjavík, 1972), pp.253-5, 277-8.
- 63 Hodgkin, p.395, divides the Merantun episode into three "scenes", each culminating in the death reported by the use of this construction.
- 64 Joan Turville-Petre, pp.117, 118, uses the term "rank and file" to translate *þa men* here, but nevertheless seems to include this group, together with Osric and Wiferþ, among the number of the king's thanes "in the rear".
- 65 See *The Gospel of Saint Mark*, ed. D.E. Nineham, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (rev.ed., Harmondsworth, 1969), p.40, second footnote.
- 66 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.119.
- 67 See Heinzel, pp.287-8.
- 68 See Heinzel, p.288.
- 69 If *generian* is taken to mean "to keep from destruction, preserve, save", which is the meaning given to this instance of it by T. Northcote Toller in his Supplement to the *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* based on the manuscript collections of Joseph Bosworth, see the edition with addenda by Alistair Campbell (Oxford, 1972), then it will be clear that the meaning in the present context could be either: "he (the godson) saved his (own) life" or "he (the ealdorman) saved his (godson's) life". The former interpretation would be advantageous in the present context, though the latter has the advantage of providing an instance of "reconciliation" in the

context of the pattern found by Theodore M. Andersson in a number of Icelandic family sagas, and outlined below in relation to C&C. See pp.114-15 below.

- 70 See G.F.V. Lund, *Oldnordisk ordføjningslære* (Copenhagen, 1862), pp.468-70; and Heinzel, pp.288-90. In certain of the examples where *hafa* is omitted in a possessive sense, the attributes possessed are presented in a list-like fashion which has a rhythmical effect.
- 71 See Fowler, p.210.
- 72 See Mitchell, pp.109-10; and C.T. Onions, *Modern English Syntax* (London, 1971; a new edition by B.D.H. Miller of Onions' *Advanced English Syntax*), pp.100-1.
- 73 See Erik Wellander, *Riktig svenska. En handledning i svenska språkets vård* (third edition, Stockholm, 1965), pp.25-6, 57, 68, 276.
- 74 See Oskar Erdmann, *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax . . . I* (Stuttgart, 1886), p.112.
- 75 See Heinzel, p.290.
- 76 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.117, "And then they closed in on it", and, for instance, Garmonsway, p.48, "and then they went thereto".
- 77 See Heinzel, p.290. In quoting Heinzel in English I have in some cases given his German expressions a somewhat broader meaning than perhaps he intended, in order to allow for as wide a range as possible of Old Icelandic expressions characteristic of the kind of style to which he is here referring.
- 78 I am grateful to Drs Richard Byrn and Douglas Cossar for confirmation of this information drawn from *Cassell's German & English Dictionary*, ed. Karl Breul and rev. Harold T. Betteridge (eighth edition, London, 1963).
- 79 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.116.
- 80 See Joan Turville-Petre, pp.122, 120.
- 81 See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* trans. Whitelock, Douglas, Tucker (1961), p.xviii.
- 82 See *The Chronicle of Ethelweard*, ed. A. Campbell, Nelson's Medieval Texts (London, 1962), p.23, and his facing translation, "But he came to a decision . . .".
- 83 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.124.
- 84 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.120.
- 85 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.124.
- 86 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.120.

- 87 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.119.
- 88 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.124.
- 89 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.123.
- 90 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.122.
- 91 See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. and trans. Benjamin Thorpe, II (translation), Rolls Series (London, 1861), pp.42-4. After reading Plummer, II, pp.cxxvii-cxxxvii and Bruce Dickins's "Prefatory Note" to Garmonsway, pp.ix-x, I have felt justified in leaving out of account in what follows the translations of Anna Gurney (1819), J. Ingram (1823), J.A. Giles (1847), J. Stevenson (1853) and E.E.C. Gomme (1909).
- 92 See John Earle, *English Prose: its Elements, History, and Usage* (London, 1890), pp.372-4.
- 93 Garmonsway, p.46.
- 94 See Towers, 311 (note 60, above).
- 95 See Hodgkin, p.394.
- 96 See Battaglia, 174 (note 2, above).
- 97 See James H. Wilson, "Cynewulf and Cyneheard: The Falls of Princes", *Papers on Language and Literature* (1977), pp.312-7, see 313.
- 98 See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* trans. Whitelock, Douglas, Tucker (1961), p.31.
- 99 See Mitchell, p.111.
- 100 See Magoun, "Cynewulf", 375.
- 101 See Wright, p.79.
- 102 See Wrenn, "Saga", 211.
- 103 See Charles Moorman, "The 'A.-S. Chronicle' for 755", *Notes and Queries* 199 (1954), 94-8, p.95.
- 104 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.116; and *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* trans. Whitelock, Douglas, Tucker (1961), p.30.
- 105 See *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, ed. Henry Petrie (London, 1848), pp.330-3, see 331.
- 106 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.117. Magoun also has "both" at the appropriate point, where Wright and Whitelock have a dash which suggests much the same interpretation of the passage.
- 107 See Heinzl, pp.290-1.

- 108 This is treated below as an example of the "law" of repetition characteristic of oral narrative; see p.105.
- 109 See Heinzl, pp.290-1. Heinzl's examples from *Póstbrœðra saga* and *Gísla saga*, and his first two examples from *Heiðarvíga saga*, are among those where the referent of the pronoun is not made clear in advance. This usage may be compared with the "abbreviated pronominal expressions" on the one hand and the uses with proper names of the third person singular masculine and feminine on the other in modern Icelandic. See Stefán Einarsson, *Icelandic Grammar, Texts, Glossary* (Baltimore, 1959), pp.122-3.
- 110 See Heinzl, p.308, "Anakoluthien".
- 111 See the quotation given under "Anacoluthia" in the OED.
- 112 See Henry Sweet, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader . . .* (ninth edition, rev. C.T. Onions, Oxford, 1922), p.1.
- 113 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.120.
- 114 An example from Wulfstan's prose of the verb geaccsian (sic) followed by an accusative and infinitive construction is listed by Jacob Zeitlin in his *Accusative with Infinitive and Some Kindred Constructions in English*, Columbia University Studies in English, Series II, Vol. III, No. 3 (New York, 1908), see p.83.
- 115 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.120.
- 116 See *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða* ed. Frank Stanton Cawley (Cambridge, Mass, 1932), p.xliv.
- 117 See p.98, above.
- 118 See Mitchell, pp.68-70.
- 119 See Heinzl, pp.292-3 (292, n.1).
- 120 An idea of the average length of an Icelandic saga may be obtained from Stefán Einarsson's statement: "In length it varies from short stories (þættir) of a page or so to that of a full length novel (Njála)", see his *History of Icelandic Literature* (New York, 1957), p.122.
- 121 See Olrik, in Dundes, p.131 (note 55, above).
- 122 See Axel Olrik, "Episke love i folkedigtningen", *Danske studier* (1908), 69-89.
- 123 See Axel Olrik, "Epische gesetze der volksdichtung", *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 51 (1909), 1-12.
- 124 See note 55, above.
- 125 See Axel Olrik, *Nogle grundsætninger for sagnforskning* ed. Hans Ellekilde, *Danske folkeminder* Nr. 23, (Copenhagen, 1921), pp.66-82.

- 126 See Dundes, p.129.
- 127 See David Buchan, "Oral Tradition and Literary Tradition: The Scottish Ballads", in *Oral Tradition, Literary Tradition: A Symposium. Proceedings of the First International Symposium Organized by the Centre for the Study of Vernacular Literature in the Middle Ages. Held at Odense University 22-23 November, 1976*, ed. Hans Bekker-Nielsen, Peter Foote, Andreas Haarder and Hans Frede Nielsen (Odense, 1977), pp.56-68.
- 128 cf. Otto Springer, "The Style of the Old Icelandic Family Sagas", *JEGP* 38 (1939), 107-28, pp.111-2.
- 129 See Foote, "New Dimensions", 50.
- 130 See, for instance, H. Munro Chadwick, *Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions* (Cambridge, 1905), pp.362-5; Hodgkin, pp.393-5; Dorothy Whitelock, *The Beginnings of English Society, The Pelican History of England*, 2 (rev.ed., Harmondsworth, 1965), pp.32, 37-8, 88; and Peter Hunter Blair, *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England* (second edition, Cambridge, 1977), pp.209-11.
- 131 See notes 2 and 4, above.
- 132 See G. Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature* (Oxford, 1953), p.242.
- 133 See the law of two to a scene, (2), p.104, below.
- 134 See Hodgkin, p.395.
- 135 See Carol J. Clover, "Scene in Saga Composition", *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 89 (1974), 57-83, p.58.
- 136 See Clover, 61. It may be noted that Clover uses the term "anacoluthon" somewhat more widely than Heinzel, allowing it to include changes from indirect to direct speech.
- 137 A possible reason is that Cynewulf feels relatively safe to banish Sigebryht now that the latter no longer has Cumbra's support; another is that Sigebryht's "wicked deeds" pose a greater threat now that Cumbra is no longer alive to contain them.
- 138 Possible reasons for this are discussed above, pp.89-90, and below, pp.106-7.
- 139 See Joan Turville-Petre, p.118.
- 140 See Waterhouse, esp. pp.631-5.
- 141 See pp.88-9, above.
- 142 I have perhaps distinguished rather more rigidly between repetition (4) and patterning (3) than Olrik does himself. Olrik's editor Hans Ellekilde attempts to clarify the distinction by reference to Olrik's lecture notes, pointing out that, in the case of repetition, "the same motif is repeated, whereas patterning reveals itself in the expressions being brought as close to each other as possible. Repetition is a poetic device, but limited

- inventiveness makes an author resort to patterning". See Olrik, *Nogle grundsætninger*, pp.145-6 and p.162, note 1 to section 61. In my opinion this does not say enough; the distinction needs to be clarified further.
- <sup>143</sup> See pp.84-5, 89-90 and 91-2 above.
- <sup>144</sup> As is shown in particular by the opening adverb Her meaning literally "at this place" but having here the temporal meaning of "in this year". This usage, which is comparable to the manner of indicating important years in tables used for calculating the date of Easter, is profoundly characteristic of annalistic writing. See Plummer, II, p.xxii; and Garmonsway, pp.xx-xxv.
- <sup>145</sup> See, for instance, Fowler, p.5; *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. Whitelock (1967), p.2; and Hill, Taylor, Thomson, *Beginning Old English*, p.41.
- <sup>146</sup> It need hardly be said that, in Old English literature, this law is surely best exemplified in *Beowulf*; cf. H.L. Rogers, "Beowulf's Three Great Fights", *Review of English Studies* 6 (1955), 339-55.
- <sup>147</sup> See Magoun, "Cynewulf", 362.
- <sup>148</sup> Phyllis Bentley believes it should be; see her *Some Observations on the Art of Narrative* (London, 1946), p.6.
- <sup>149</sup> See Olrik, in Dundes, p.138.
- <sup>150</sup> See Waterhouse, 635.
- <sup>151</sup> See Chadwick, p.363.
- <sup>152</sup> See *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. Whitelock (1967), p.221.
- <sup>153</sup> In connection with the law of patterning, see p.104, above.
- <sup>154</sup> Magoun "Cynewulf", 369-70 (369, n.5) points out that Privett (Hants.) "is here spoken of as though it were in the Andred Forest which at that time may well have been thought of as extending that far west".
- <sup>155</sup> It is used attributively as an adjective in the first instance, and adverbially in the second.
- <sup>156</sup> See Olrik, *Nogle grundsætninger*, p.72.
- <sup>157</sup> See law (1) and note 137, above.
- <sup>158</sup> In the context of "reference forward", see p.90, above.
- <sup>159</sup> See Olrik, *Nogle grundsætninger*, p.72.
- <sup>160</sup> See Magoun, "Cynewulf", 374.
- <sup>161</sup> See Grønbech, p.92.

- 162 See pp.98-9, above.
- 163 See Olrik, in Dundes, p.134 (where the title of the saga in question is inaccurately presented by Olrik's translator).
- 164 See Magoun, "Cynewulf", 361.
- 165 See Olrik, *Nogle grundsætninger*, pp.75-7.
- 166 See notes 54 and 144, above.
- 167 See the relevant part of the text of C&C, and the discussion of anacoluthon, pp.99-100, above.
- 168 I prefer to leave open the question of whether it was available in oral or written form to the person who introduced it into the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the ninth century. See Plummer, II, pp.cii-vi; Garmonsway, pp.xlii-iv; and *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. Whitelock, Douglas, Tucker (1961), pp.xxi-iii. Three possibilities suggest themselves: either the story had a continuous written history from the time of the events it describes, having been written down shortly after the Merantun affair of 786 and preserved in a written tradition which was used in one of the earliest compilations of the *Chronicle*; or it was preserved continuously in oral tradition from the time of these events, and formed an oral source for this compilation; or it was preserved at first orally, and then written down, and was available in a written version influenced by oral tradition to one or another of the earliest compilers. The third possibility seems the most likely in the light of the findings of this paper. Cf. also Wrenn, "Saga", 213.
- 169 See note 30, above.
- 170 See Preben Meulengracht Sørensen, *Saga og samfund*, Berlingske leksikon bibliotek (Copenhagen, 1977), p.116.
- 171 See Andersson, *Origins*, p.119.
- 172 See P.G. Foote, "Some Account of the Present State of Saga-Research", *Scandinavica* 4 (1965), 115-26, p.121.
- 173 See Theodore M. Andersson, *The Icelandic Family Saga. An Analytic Reading*, *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, 28 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p.309.
- 174 See the review by Bjarne Fidjestøl in *Maal og minne* (1971), 74-84, pp.80-3, and Paul Schach, "Some Observations on the Generation-Gap Theme in the Icelandic Sagas", in *The Epic in Medieval Society. Aesthetic and Moral Values*, ed. Harald Scholler (Tübingen, 1977), pp.361-81, 365-7.
- 175 See the reviews by B.J. Findlay in *Medieval Scandinavia* 1 (1968), 178-84, p.179; and Lars Lönnroth in *Speculum*, 43 (1968), 115-9, pp.115-6.
- 176 See Findlay, 178-81, Lönnroth, 115-6, and the review by R.M. Perkins in *Scandinavica* 6 (1967), 137-9.
- 177 See Perkins, 137, and the review by Njórður P. Njaróvík in *Skírnir* 142 (1968), 173-8, pp.173-4.

- 178 See Perkins, 137.
- 179 See Njarðvík, 177-8.
- 180 See Richard F. Allen, *Fire and Iron. Critical Approaches to Njáls saga* (Pittsburgh, 1971), p.96.
- 181 In a paper on "Pseudoarchaism and Fiction in *Króka-Refs saga*" delivered by Frederic Amory at the Fourth International Saga Conference, Munich, July 30-August 4, 1979 (unpublished).
- 182 See the quotation from Einar Ól. Sveinsson in Andersson, *Family Saga*, p.6.
- 183 See Andersson, *Family Saga*, p.29.
- 184 See Andersson, *Family Saga*, p.29.
- 185 See note 69, above.
- 186 See Andersson, *Family Saga*, p.26.