Utrecht University Library
Partner in Science
Universiteit Utrecht

The relation and development of English and Icelandic outlaw-traditions

https://hdl.handle.net/1874/321435

A. qu. 192. 1935

THE RELATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH AND ICELANDIC OUTLAW-TRADITIONS

J. DE LANGE

BIBLIOTHEEK DER
RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT
UTRECHT.

THE RELATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH AND ICELANDIC OUTLAW-TRADITIONS

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT TE UTRECHT
1779 2619

Diss. Utrecht 1935

THE RELATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH AND ICELANDIC OUTLAW-TRADITIONS

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN DEN GRAAD VAN DOCTOR IN DE LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE AAN DE RIJKS-UNIVERSITEIT TE UTRECHT, OP GEZAG VAN DEN RECTOR MAGNIFICUS Dr. H. BOLKESTEIN, HOOGLEERAAR IN DE FACULTEIT DER LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE, VOLGENS BESLUIT VAN DEN SENAAT DER UNIVERSITEIT TEGEN DE BEDENKINGEN VAN DE FACULTEIT DER LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE, TE VERDEDIGEN OP VRIJDAG 24 MEI 1935, TE 3 UUR DOOR

JOOST DE LANGE

GEBOREN TE AMSTERDAM

HAARLEM — H. D. TJEENK WILLINK & ZOON N.V. — 1935

BIBLIOTHEEK DER
RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT
UTRECHT.

TO MY OLD FRIEND AND TEACHER,

Mrs. M. M. TYBERG

Het is voor mij een groote voldoening bij het voltooien van mijn academische studie mijn hartelijken dank te betuigen aan allen, die tot mijn wetenschappelijke vorming hebben bijgedragen.

In de eerste plaats denk ik daarbij aan U, Hooggeleerde van Hamel, gewaardeerde promotor, en aan den grooten steun en vriendschap, die ik van U heb mogen ondervinden.

Hooggeleerde Fijn van Draat, U hebt mij tijdens mijn studie steeds met raad en daad terzijde gestaan, Uw belangstelling en Uw colleges zal ik immer in dankbaarheid gedenken. Ook aan Uw colleges, Hooggeleerde Swaen, zal ik altijd een aangename herinnering blijven bewaren.

Ten slotte een woord van oprechten dank aan de redactie van de *Nederlandsche Bijdragen op het Gebied van Germaansche Philologie en Linguistiek* voor de eer, die zij mij bewezen heeft door dit proefschrift in deze serie op te nemen.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this treatise was suggested to us by the chapter on *Outlaw Legends* in H. G. Leach's remarkable work: Angevin Britain and Scandinavia [1]. The reading of this book stimulated our desire to make a closer study of the relation between the English and the Scandinavian outlaw-matter and the conditions which influenced their development in either country. The last paragraph of the above-mentioned chapter reads as follows:

> Though racial characteristics are nebulous things and to dogmatize in such matters would be foolish, it may be ventured that, far apart as are the Icelandic outlaws and those of Sherwood in the outward circumstances of their lives, there is in both such a vigorous sense of fair play and such a hatred of injustice that one may attribute it to a common heritage. Yet when we find in the Japanese story of the *Forty-Seven Ronins* an outlaw tale close in motivation, incident, and outcome to the Icelandic, we dare hardly claim that the kinship of Robin Hood and Grettir is more than a pleasant hypothesis [2].

We hope to show in the following pages that the *kinship of Robin Hood and Grettir* is indeed more than a hypothesis, instead of hardly more than a hypothesis. The merry outlaw of Sherwood Forest is not a direct descendant of the gloomy *skógarmaðr* of the Icelandic outlaw-sagas, but they possess common ancestors, who infested the forests of Norway in a period previous to the settlement of Iceland. The proofs of this statement may be derived from the *fornaldar-saga* of Án the archer, in which may be found a kindred tradition to the outlaw-matter of England and Iceland. The existence of a body of outlaw-traditions in this saga about the *fornǫld*, has enabled us to put the whole

investigation on a sounder and less hypothetical basis, and to state with greater accuracy the exact relation of the English and Icelandic traditions.

Our object in view will be then to investigate the points of contact between the English and the Icelandic matter, and the historical, social and traditional currents, by which the outlaw-traditions in both countries have been influenced. To see, furthermore, whether the two developments have influenced each other directly or whether their similarity is due to a common source. Incidentally we intend to show that the English outlaw-matter forms a logical sequence of related traditions, from the end of the 11th to the middle of the 14th century, which only changed externally on account of altered social conditions.

CHAPTER 1

HEREWARD THE SAXON

The first of the English outlaws about whom there exists a consecutive story is Hereward, a historical figure of the Norman Conquest, the last of the Saxons to resist the Norman invaders. He naturally loomed large in the popular imagination and a network of fictitious matter has been woven around his exploits.

The few historical facts about Hereward's life are found in the following sources: 1. Doomsday-book, a Survey of land-owners compiled during the reign of William the Conqueror [1]; 2. the Peterborough-version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle [2]; 3. the Worcester-version of the same chronicle [3]. The quoted Survey informs us of the fact that Hereward held land in Lincolnshire at the time of Edward the Confessor (1042—1066). A certain Oger the Briton is mentioned who holds land of the Abbey of Croyland, which had formerly been held by Hereward, but of which Ulfcytel, the abbot of Croyland, resumed possession on account of Hereward not keeping the agreement. Afterwards Hereward fled from the country [4]. Abbot Ulfcytel was appointed in 1062, so that Hereward's flight, which probably implied the status of outlawry, must have taken place after the above-mentioned date.

The Peterborough-version of the A.S. Chronicle furnishes a lengthy account under the year 1070 of the sack of Peterborough by *Hereward and his genge* [5]. The reason for the ravaging of the

monastery was the appointment of the stern Norman abbot Turold after the death of abbot Brand. The Worcester-version touches only lightly upon this event, which is due to the entry being of purely local interest [6]. The entry about the year 1071 is almost identical in both chronicles and reads as follows:

Earl Morkere comes to Ely by ship and with him are Siward Barn, bishop Aegelwine and many hundreds of men. King William, fearing this concentration of rebel forces at Ely, besieges the island, by land and by sea, constructing an enormous bridge to get across the treacherous marshes. The besieged are soon discouraged and throw themselves upon the mercy of the King, except Hereward, who escapes with several companions.

Later chroniclers, i.e. Florence of Worcester, Simeon of Durham and Henry of Huntingdon, who mention the revolt of Ely, all base their notices upon this entry in the A. S. Chronicle.

The only other fact relating to Hereward, which may rest upon historical foundations, is his quarrel with Frederick of Warren. It is found in the very pro-Norman Liber de Hyda [7], written between 1120 and 1136 and probably belonging to Lewes and not to Hyde Abbey [8]. The trustworthiness of this text is not above suspicion, as it attributes to Hereward the old viking-trick of feigning death in order to enter a town that is resisting a siege. This story is clearly transferred to Hereward from the wellknown tale of the viking Hasting at the siege of Luna. The presence of this fictitious matter warns us to be careful in making use of the Hyde-book as a historical source.

Recapitulating we get the following bare outline of the life of the genuine Hereward: He is born in Lincolnshire, flies from the country after 1062, returns to England and burns Peterborough with a band of outlaws, probably a mixture of Saxons and Danes, in 1070 and assists at the defense of Ely in the following year. He is one of the few that do not surrender to the King and he escapes across the fens. To this may be added

perhaps the quarrel with Frederick of Warren, who is secretly killed by Hereward.

Around these historical facts popular tradition soon collected a wealth of tales, which were committed to writing as early as the beginning of the 12th century. These pseudo-historical sources are the following:

1. Gesta Herwardi [9].
2. Geoffrey Gaimar: Lestorie des Engles (line 5466—5710) [10].
3. Liber Eliensis [11].
4. Ingulf: Historia Croylandensis [12].
5. A genealogical roll of the lords of Brunne and Deeping [13].
6. The so-called Chronicle of John of Peterborough [14].

Of these, only the Gesta and Gaimar represent independent sources. The writer of the Gesta was a monk of Ely, as may be ascertained from the Liber Eliensis, written by another monk of Ely, named Thomas, between 1174 and 1189. Thomas uses the Gesta and speaks of a certain Richard, formerly a monk of Ely, but already dead at the time of writing, as being the author of the Gesta. Richard provides us with information, as to the sources used, in the introductory part of the Gesta, in which he says that he compiled the work, partly from a book in the English language by Leofric the Deacon, Hereward's priest at Brunne, who collected stories about giants and heroes, and partly from oral tradition. Now the Gesta does indeed consist of two rather unequal parts; the first contains a great deal of general and romantic matter about Hereward's adventures abroad and the second is made up of semi-historical and traditional matter pertaining to Hereward's outlaw-life in England. This proves that the statements about his sources are probably correct. A further proof lies in the fact that Richard used an extant written source for the first part of the Gesta, as we hope to prove below. The Gesta was written in the first half of the 12th century, probably about 1130 [15].

Gaimar's Lestorie des Engles was written about 1140. The author is evidently impressed by Hereward's deeds, as he devotes about 250 lines to the Saxon outlaw. Gaimar knows nothing of Hereward's life before the siege of Ely, and from other facts, which he notes and which are not in the Gesta and conversely, it is plain that Gaimar did not know Richard's work and that he may be considered as an independent source.

The Liber Eliensis, which has been treated above, is based on the Gesta and does not constitute an independent source.

Ingulf's Historia Croylandensis is now generally considered as an imposture of the 14th century [16]. The historical Ingulf, succeeded Ulfcytel as abbot of Croyland after the latter's deposition by William the Conqueror in 1085. At first the Hereward-story in the pseudo-Ingulf gives the impression of being older than the Gesta, but on closer inspection it becomes clear that it is only an abridgment of the latter work. A writer of the 14th century could hardly have used independently the same combination of written and oral sources as the author of the Gesta. If we take into account the object of the two writers, the difference in the treatment of the subject-matter may easily be explained. Richard diligently collected everything that he had heard and read about his hero, so that in the second part of the Gesta, where the author has only oral tradition to go upon, the narrative sometimes becomes a tiresome stringing together of unrelated events. He is careful not to leave anything out. The author of the pseudo-Ingulf, on the other hand, has only one object in view, the glorification of the Church, but especially of his own abbey of Croyland, so he carefully selected only the subject-matter that interested him in the Gesta. Hereward's adventures abroad are only cursorily mentioned, but he dwells at length on Hereward's first wife, Turfrida, because she takes the veil at Croyland. Hereward's second wife, on the other hand, is not mentioned at all. Hereward's exploits at

Ely are passed over lightly, but his being knighted by Brand, abbot of Peterborough and the ceremony attendant upon it, is told in detail. From these examples it is obvious that the short form of the Hereward-story in the pseudo-Ingulf is not due to the fact that the latter is based on older sources than the Gesta, but to the fact that the writer of the spurious work had a very different object in view in comparison with Richard's.

Before leaving Ingulf there is one other point to be cleared up in this connection. Freeman writes [17]:

> As to the wife or wives of Hereward, there can be little doubt that Gaimar and the false Ingulf preserve two independent stories, which have been awkwardly rolled together by the writer of the Gesta. Though independent, they are not necessarily contradictory, as Turfrida may have died before Aelfryth made her proposals to Hereward. But the notion of Turfrida going into a monastery to make way for Aelfryth is plainly another form of the story in Ingulf which makes, not herself but her mother, do so.

In other words Freeman accepts Ingulf as an independent authority older than the Gesta. On examining the passage in Ingulf we found that there is another interpretation possible, which is much more probable. The author, after noting Hereward's marriage with Turfrida, goes on to say that a daughter is still living, who married Hugo Evermouth, lord of the village of Deeping and wellknown to the abbey of Croyland. The next sentence reads as follows:

> *Mater autem Turfridae* veniens cum viro suo in Angliam, videnque caduci seculi multiplicia volumina, tandem cum viri sui licentia relicta omni seculi pompa sanctimonialem habitum in nostro monasterio Croylandiae de manu Wlketuli abbatis accepit . . . . . [18]

The following sentence treats of Hereward and his deeds and commences:

> *Pater quidem Herwardus* cum praedicta uxore sua natale solum petens . . .

Freeman construed the first sentence as pertaining to the mother of Turfrida, i.e. the mother of Hereward's wife. The

greatest objection to this interpretation is that it does not account for the contrast that is clearly implied in the two sentences. Moreover, according to this reading *cum viro suo* in the first passage must refer to Hereward's father-in-law, which would seem improbable. So we must look for another solution. Now there are two possibilities:

1. *Turfridae* is a clerical error for *Turfrida.*
2. Hereward's daughter was also called Turfrida and *Mater Turfridae* is equivalent to Hereward's wife.

Sub 1 fits in better with the contrasting sentence-structure, but necessitates an alteration of the text.

Sub 2 assumes something that is not clear from the text.

We are inclined to accept the interpretation sub 1, because if Hereward's daughter was also called Turfrida, the author would have mentioned her name on her first appearance in the story. The writer of the genealogical roll of the lords of Brunne and Deeping, mentioned sub 5, has evidently used the second interpretation, because he calls Hereward's wife as well as his daughter, Turfrida. At any rate it is obvious that *mater Turfridae* does not refer to Hereward's mother-in-law. Therefore we reject Freeman's conclusion that the Gesta took these facts from Ingulf and combined them with the story in Gaimar. We assume exactly the opposite, viz. that Ingulf took his data from the Gesta, but left out Hereward's second wife, because she was of no interest to him (cf. above).

The genealogical rolls sub 5 are of no importance, as they rely mainly on Ingulf for their subject-matter. The author must have seen the Gesta, however, as he speaks of Turfrida as Hereward's *uxor prima* and *uxor legitima*, which presupposes knowledge of Hereward's second marriage.

The Chronicle, incorrectly attributed to John of Peterborough [19], was compiled in the 14th century and contains some entries about Hereward under the years 1068, 1069 and 1071.

These notices have been taken from the Gesta or perhaps from pseudo-Ingulf, which also seems to have served as a source for other passages in this chronicle [20]. The similarity of the following entry in the said chronicle to the corresponding notice in pseudo-Ingulf, seems to point rather to derivation from the latter than from the Gesta:

Ingulf: Hoc in tempore defuncto abbate Burgi praedicto Brando patruo Herwardi, successit Thoroldus alienigena ex collatione regis Willielmi [21].

Chron.: Obiit etiam Brando abbas Burgi, patruus dictie Herewardi le Wake, cui ex regis collatione successit [22].

In both cases abbot Brand is called Hereward's uncle, a fact not mentioned in the Gesta.

The compiler of this chronicle has made some additions and corrections in the matter from which he derived his facts. He is the first to add the cognomen *le Wake* to Hereward's name, a practice which has been followed by many modern writers on the subject. Besides, he has invented the date 1068 for the year of Hereward's return to England, as this date is mentioned in no other source. It is probably approximately correct. The compiler has made one correction in accordance with the Peterborough tradition at his disposal. He has taken the story of the capturing and ransoming of abbot Turold, either from the Gesta or from Ingulf, but he has put it in the chronologically correct place, i.e. before the siege of Ely and not after. This question will be treated more extensively in connection with the corresponding passage in the Gesta.

From the above investigation into the sources of the Hereward-story, we may draw the conclusion that there are only two independent sources to be examined, viz. the Gesta Herwardi and line 5466—5710 of Gaimar's Lestorie des Engles. Of these two the Gesta is the more important from our point of view in being the older and the more elaborate.

As we saw above, the Gesta may be divided into two distinct parts, of which the first embodies the story of Hereward's youth and his adventures in Northumbria, Cornwall, Ireland and Flanders. The second part deals with his outlaw-career in England, his stubborn resistance of William the Conqueror and his final reconciliation with the Norman king. For the sake of clearness we shall insert a short analysis of the first part, with a sectional numbering.

1. Hereward is born in Lincolnshire, his father is called Leofric of Brunne and his mother Aedina, both of noble birth. Hereward is an agile, strong and courageous youth and he excels in play and games. He is always getting into trouble at Brunne and its neighbourhood. At last his father is at his wit's end and asks king Edward to proclaim the boy an exile. Hereward is 18 years old at the time.
2. Hereward sets out on his wandering with one servant, named Martin Lightfoot. His first abode is at the court of his godfather, Giselbert of Gant in Northumbria. The latter has at his court a collection of wild beasts to try the mettle of his young warriors. Hereward wants to fight against the largest bear but Giselbert thinks he is too young and he will not allow it. This bear is called the offspring of that famous Norwegian bear which, according to the tale of the Danes, was half human and whose father had ravished a maiden in the woods and begotten by her Bjǫrn, king of Norway. Hereward gets his chance, however, the next day, when the bear breaks loose and he kills it. He is greatly admired, but at the same time the other warriors envy him and secretly try to murder him. He foils their attempts and decides to leave Northumbria.
3. Hereward now arrives at the court of a petty king of Cornwall, called Alef. He gets into trouble with Ulcus Ferreus, a warrior famous among the Picts and Scots, who is expected

to marry the Cornish princess. It ends in a combat; Hereward is quicker than his adversary and kills him. The followers of Ulcus are furious, but king Alef and his daughter are glad to be rid of the unwelcome suitor and they protect Hereward by putting him in prison. The princess secretly releases him, offers him the sword of Ulcus and sends him on an errand to her lover, an Irish prince.

4. Hereward is received with great honours at the Irish court, but shortly afterwards his two cousins, Siward the White and Siward the Red bring him a message that his father has died and that he has inherited his estate. Before returning to England, Hereward promises to aid the Irish king in the battle against the king of Munster. In this battle he kills the hostile king, who is watching the fight, lying in his tent; with great difficulty Hereward and his followers return to their own army. Some are killed and Hereward's cousins are severely wounded. He gains fresh fame from this exploit.
5. While fighting in the extreme part of Cornwall, a message reaches the Irish prince that his love is again in difficulties, as a new suitor has arrived. The prince immediately sends an embassy of forty men to stress his claims. Hereward also goes to the Cornish court, but in secret and in disguise. When he arrives, he is informed that the marriage-feast is to take place that very day and that the bridegroom is leaving with his bride for his native country the day after. The Irish embassy has been thrown into prison, moreover. Hereward enters the hall as a stranger, and behaves very rudely at the banquet, as he will only accept the drinking-cup from the hands of the princess. She recognizes him, gives him a ring and excuses his bad manners, saying that he is a stranger and not versed in their customs. The minstrel is not satisfied, however, and ridicules the stranger. Hereward snatches the harp from his hands and delights everybody

by his playing and singing. The princess presents him with a cloak and the bridegroom promises him anything he wants except his wife and his country. Hereward demands the release of the Irish embassy. A courtier warns the bridegroom that this stranger might be an enemy in disguise. They intend to capture Hereward and his three companions secretly, but the princess warns Hereward and he escapes. On the next day he waylays the bridegroom, who is returning to his own country with the princess and the Irish prisoners. The princess and the prisoners are liberated and taken to the Irish prince, who can marry her now at last.

6. Hereward now starts on his intended voyage to his own country, though the Irish king wants him to stay at his court and even offers him one of his relatives in marriage. Unfortunately Hereward is twice shipwrecked, once at the Orkneys and the second time in Flanders, where he lands at St. Bertin. At the court of Flanders, he is at first known as Harald, but after some years his real name and identity are discovered. He aids the count of Flanders, Manasar the Old, against his vassal, the count of Guisnes. Hereward vanquishes a nephew of the latter in single combat. This fact greatly impresses the rebel vassal, because his nephew, Hoibrictus, is his principal warrior. So he immediately offers his submission to his feudal lord.
7. At St. Omer lives a maiden, called Turfrida, beautiful and versed in the arts, who is deeply in love with Hereward. The latter has a rival in a noble youth of St. Valéry, who wants to take his life. They meet by chance at a kind of tourney that is held near Pictavia (Poitiers!) and Pontesia (Pontoise). His opponent wears Turfrida's colours. Hereward vanquishes him and sends the captured emblem to Turfrida, together with tokens of his own. He secretly visits his lady-love and he presents himself to her as his

cousin Siward the White, but she recognizes him and shows him all her treasures. Several attempts are made against his life, but they all miscarry. He returns to his lord and is covered with honours, but he does not accept anything before he has won the maiden, Turfrida.

8. Hereward next aids the count of Flanders against Scaldemariland (Zeeland), which has refused to pay its tribute. He and another commander are sent with an army to reenforce the count's claims. The inhabitants threaten to annihilate his army, but Hereward restores confidence in his ranks and overcomes the rebels by means of a stratagem. He offers to settle the issue by single combat, the enemy agree and send their strongest men against him. He kills them one after another by his superior skill. This infuriates his opponents and they rush at him in a mass, but by a feigned retreat he draws them on to where his own forces are lined up and the hostile army is completely destroyed.

After this disaster a new force is recruited from the islands, and the people of Scaldemariland are so sure of their superiority that they send envoys with the following message: the army will be allowed to retreat, but some vessels and the two commanders, Hereward and Rodbritus, shall be delivered to them. They have even brought carts to take away the spoils. After having burnt the carts before the eyes of the messengers, Hereward sends some of the envoys back to their army with rich gifts, the others he keeps in his camp as hostages. In the meanwhile he draws up his army for the coming battle. Some of the rebels, seeing the messengers returning laden with gifts, decide to attack the hostile camp separately in order to get more plunder. They are, however, attacked and driven back by a small body of picked soldiers. The whole rebel army advances to the attack now, clad in the bark of trees, permeated with pitch, resin and incense or

in tunics of boiled leather. Of every two warriors, one is armed with lances and the other carries a sword or battle-axe and a shield, with which he must also protect the other. As they come rushing on, the leader of the Flemish army retreats slowly, drawing them more and more away from their camp. Hereward with a body of horse and foot at the right moment attacks the camp, kills the guards and burns the tents. The rebels bewildered by this sudden attack in their rear, are put to flight. During the night Hereward again attacks the hostile camp and kills many of the leaders of the opposing army. The people of Scaldemariland beg a week's truce, which is granted.

Hereward hears of an exceedingly swift mare in one of the islands. He captures it together with its foal and calls them Swallow and Lightfoot. He has great difficulties in reaching his army again, the island being infested by robbers. At the end of the week's truce the people of Scaldemariland submit and agree to pay twice the tribute they have formerly paid. The army returns home with rich gifts and hostages. In the meantime both the ruling count and his heir have died and everybody in Flanders is in mourning. There is some trouble about the rewards to be offered to the army for its victorious campaign, but in the end everything is satisfactorily settled and Hereward is reconciled with the new count. Shortly afterwards Hereward returns to his native country, taking with him his trusted servant Martin Lightfoot. Turfrida, who has become his wife, is left behind in the care of the two Siwards.

The amount of historical truth contained in sub 1 can only be ascertained from the evidence drawn from the Doomsday-book. Brunne or Bourne was held at the time of Edward the Confessor by Earl Morkere; there is no mention of Leofric. The

only connection with Hereward is that Brunne passed to the same Oger the Briton, who according to the Survey also held lands that formerly belonged to Hereward. So we have no certainty about Hereward's parents, as his mother, Aedina or Ediva, as she is called in Ingulf, is not mentioned in other sources either. We have seen above that there is evidence of Hereward being outlawed after 1062, but whether this happened at the instigation of his father seems very problematical. The way in which Hereward's youth is related reminds one of the youth of the Icelandic Grettir, who had the same troubles at home and who was also outlawed for the first time at an early age.

Sub 2, the fight with the bear, is a wellknown feature of Norwegian and Danish heroic literature. Grettir fights with a bear and so does Bǫdvarr Bjarki at the court of Hrólfr. The story of the bear, who ravishes a maiden in the woods and begets by her a son called Bjǫrn, king of Norway, is a reminiscence of the descent of the famous Siward, earl of Northumbria, who lived in the time of Edward the Confessor and whose traditional story is full of Scandinavian features [23]. We reject Deutschbein's hypothesis that the bear-episode in the Gesta has its origin in a similar event in the story about Bǫdvarr Bjarki [24]. We possess three sources for this episode, viz. the second book of Saxo Grammaticus [25], the Bjarkarímur [26] and the saga of Hrólfr kraki [27]. All these sources agree in one particular, namely, that Bjarki after killing the bear forces his cowardly companion Hjalti to drink of the animal's blood to gain strength and courage. This is the aim of the bear-episode in the stories about Bjarki, whereas in the Gesta Hereward's killing of the bear serves no other purpose than to illustrate his prowess at an early age. The fact that the animal is called a Norwegian bear clearly points to the Scandinavian origin of the episode, but the details do not agree with any particular existing saga.

The keeping of wild animals at the courts of kings and noblemen

is also reported in other sources. Of Emperor Henry the Holy it is said that he staged fights between bears and men covered with honey (about 1019) [28]. Another instance is told of the count of Ardres, who goes to England, where he possesses land, and returns with a bear for the recreation of the people, especially on festival-days (about 1095) [29].

The origin of sub 3 has also been attributed to an event in the career of Bǫðvarr Bjarki, viz. the Bjarki-Agnarr episode, by Deutschbein [30], and again we venture to disagree with him. The saving of a princess from an unwelcome suitor is quite a common feature in the tales of the Middle Ages and it even occurs twice in the present story (cf. sub 5). In other stories and fairy-tales the suitor often takes the shape of a giant. If this episode is to be derived from the Bjarki-story, it should have details in common with it beside general features. Now it is exactly this similarity in detail which we fail to detect.

In the Bjarkarímur the fight between Bjarki and Agnarr takes place during a battle [31]. Bjarki is the vassal of king Hrólfr and Agnarr is the latter's enemy. By killing Agnarr, Bjarki has procured the victory for his lord and he receives Hrólf's daughter, Drífa, in marriage as a reward for his services. It is obvious that the setting is entirely different from the situation at the court of king Alef. The story in Saxo's second book has a greater resemblance to the tale in the Gesta [32]. Agnarr has married Hrólf's sister Hrút and a big marriage-feast is held. One of the usual jokes at table is the throwing of bones. An altercation ensues between Agnarr and Bjarki about this game and Agnarr challenges Bjarki to single combat. Agnarr being of nobler birth, has the first blow. He cuts through Bjarki's helmet and wounds his skull. Bjarki now gives a mighty stroke and cuts the body of his enemy in two. Agnar's followers want to avenge their lord, but they all fall before Bjarki's sword Laufi. Bjarki in his turn receives Hrólf's sister Hrút in marriage. Bjarkamál

has substantially the same account of the fight, but is much shorter and leaves out the bone-throwing and the attack of Agnar's companions at the end. One detail that occurs in all three sources is the fact that Agnarr dies smiling.

It is clear that there is an outward resemblance between Saxo's version of the story and the Ulcus-episode in the Gesta, especially, if we accept Olrik's theory that the bone-throwing is an interpolation [33]. If we examine the details of the combat, however, we find important differences. Agnarr and Bjarki fight with swords and it is the excellency of the latter's brand, Laufi, that decides the combat. In the Gesta only Hereward is armed. He is quicker in his movements than Ulcus, who tries to catch hold of his adversary in order to bring his greater bodily strength into play. He neglects his covering, however, and Hereward gets a chance to thrust his sword into his armour. Ulcus, dying, bewails the misfortune that he has given his trusted sword to his future bride, because otherwise he would never have been killed by such a stripling. Afterwards Hereward receives the sword of Ulcus from the hands of the Cornish princess. It is not clear from the context why Ulcus gave the sword to the princess. It may have been just as a present, but she might also have asked for it in order to save Hereward, and Ulcus relying on his superior strength might have given it to her. This is, however, only a hypothesis which cannot be proved from the text.

The differences between the Ulcus-episode and the Bjarki-Agnarr-episode are too great to allow us to accept Deutschbein's conclusion. There is, — to give one more example —, a distinct dissimilarity in the way Agnarr dies with a smile on his lips, a feature all the Bjarki-sources have in common, and the death of Ulcus, who bewails his ill-luck in giving away his sword! This does, of course, not preclude a northern origin. Stories about saved princesses are of no less common occurrence

in the *fornaldar-sǫgur* than in many other departments of medieval literature. The scene where the Cornish princess hands the sword of Ulcus to Hereward recalls the recovery of a sword for Hrólfr Gautreksson by the daughter of the Irish king in the saga of Hrólfr Gautreksson [34].

Sub 4 contains a reminiscence of a historical event, viz. the battle of Clontarf (1014), as Deutschbein has already pointed out [35]. In this case we meet with a detailed resemblance. In the description of the battle in the Gesta, the main interest is centred around the combat of Hereward with the king of Munster. The peculiar feature of the story is that the king takes no active part in the battle, but stays in his tent. His curious behaviour is entirely accounted for, when we compare this episode with the description of the battle of Clontarf in the Irish and Norse sources. The historical battle was fought between the famous king Brian of Munster and the king of Dublin and his viking allies from England and Scotland. It was the decisive blow which broke up the supremacy of the vikings in Ireland. King Brian, being too old to lead his army to victory in person, stays in his tent and prays, while an attendant tells him about the progress of the battle at regular intervals. Suddenly a small body of vikings approaches under Earl Brodar, who does not recognize the king at first. He takes him for a priest, but one of his followers apprises him of Brian's rank. King Brian cuts off Brodar's legs with one blow, but his own head is cleft by a stroke of the earl's sword. He kills one other viking before he dies. This is the Irish account [36]; in the Icelandic sources Bróðir kills Brian, his followers are slain, but he himself is taken prisoner and disembowelled alive [37].

The details of the battle of Clontarf explain the inactive part of the king of Munster in the Gesta. Moreover, there are other reasons for linking this historical event to the present episode. One of the allies of the king of Dublin, i.e. the Irish

king in the Gesta, is the Orkney jarl Sigurðr Hlǫðvisson. One of the Irish traditions [38], however, mentions two Sigurðs:

> Then arrived there Siograd Finn (the White) and Siograd Donn (the Brown), two sons of Lothair, earl of the Orkney Islands, with the armies of the Orkney Islands with them.

The agreement with Hereward's cousins, the two Siwards, is too striking to be ignored. Brodar, the earl who kills Brian, is called earl of York in some of the Irish sources and ruler of northern Saxonland in others. These data correspond quite satisfactorily with Hereward's native country. The fact that Brodar is killed and Hereward is not, may be explained, of course, by the different character of the two stories. The one represents a historical event, the other makes use of a tale current about this event and uses just as much of it as will fit in with the rest of the narrative. As Hereward had to be kept alive in order to undergo other adventures, it will be plain why the tragic ending of the historical source was changed.

There are sufficient grounds for assuming, with Deutschbein, that the description of the battle between the Irish king and the king of Munster was taken from an Irish tale about the battle of Clontarf, current in England in the 11th century.

In sub 5 we return again to the realm of popular story and fairy-tale. We meet with the same theme that dominates sub 3, i.e. the deliverance of a princess from an unwelcome suitor, cast in a different form. In sub 3 the combat holds the centre of the scene, whereas in sub 5 the interest lies in Hereward's behaviour at the wedding-feast.

Sub 5 is clearly a variation of the *returning husband* motif, so popular among medieval story-tellers. There are signs, moreover, which point to the conclusion that Hereward has replaced the lover or the husband of the underlying version of this episode. In sub 3 the princess not only admires Hereward's boldness of speech and action, but also his exterior, his hair

and his face, and Ulcus evidently fears Hereward as a rival in love. In sub 5 the princess bursts into tears at the banquet, because the stranger's figure reminds her of Hereward! This personal and emotional interest of the princess in Hereward is extremely suspicious and it seems that Hereward is made to play the part that was originally reserved for the lover. The fact that Hereward marries Turfrida in Flanders satisfactorily explains why Hereward could not play the part of the lover at the Cornish court.

The return of the hero in disguise, whether as a minstrel, a pilgrim or a beggar, is also a common feature with this type of story. It occurs, for instance, in the different Horn-versions and in Tristan. The drinking-cupscene and the old nurse, who also recognizes Hereward and strengthens the princess in her belief, are particulars that occur time and again in connection with this theme.

Section 6—8 we may call the Flemish episode of Hereward's life; to this should be added his second sojourn in Flanders, which is analyzed below in connection with the second part of the Gesta, because it evidently belongs to the other Flemish adventures, the subject-matter being distinctly similar.

The Flemish episode is a strange mixture of history and fable. The proper names are for the greater part correct, the geographical as well as the historical ones. The scene is laid in the present north-western part of France, which at that time belonged to the county of Flanders. Guisnes, St. Bertin, St. Omer, St. Valéry, at the mouth of the Somme, all lie quite close together. Pontoise lies somewhat farther south at the confluence of the Seine and the Oise, its usual Latin name was Pontisara, though Pontesium is sometimes found. The connection of Pontoise with Poitiers is very strange, because these places lie miles apart. Poitiers is evidently an error for some other name. The *vice-comes de Pynkenni* (Picquigny, on the Somme be-

tween Abbéville and Amiens), mentioned as an adversary of Hereward during his second stay in Flanders, is correctly named. Lambert of Ardres speaks of a *vice-dominus de Pinkinio* of the same period [39]. The tournament scenes reflect the early days of chivalry, i.e. the latter half of the 11th century. Count Baldwin V of Flanders (1035—1067) took possession of Walcheren and other islands of Zeeland. He waged war with Dirk, count of Holland, on account of these islands in 1045, and in 1061 he presented them to his son, Robert the Frisian. The latter had married Gertrude, the widow of the Dutch count, and acted as guardian for her young son. This Robert also wages war in Frisia and the name Rodbritus, Hereward's fellow general in the war of Scaldemariland, may be a reminiscence of this pugnacious son of Baldwin V.

Leaving aside the place-name Pictavis (Poitiers), which must be an error, we are faced with the following difficulties: 1. Manasar the Old, count of Flanders; 2. Harald and Turfrida; 3. the primitive nature of the people of Scaldemariland.

The name Manasar or Manasse does not occur among the genealogies of the counts of Flanders. Moreover, the name is quite rare among the rest of the Flemish nobility. One instance of the name is found among the nobility present at the consecration of Philip I of France in 1059. This Manasse is listed among the lesser counts and his family or territory are not mentioned. The only families in which we have been able to trace the name, are the related houses of Guisnes and Ardres, but not before the last decades of the 11th century. The first count of Guisnes of this name was a friend of William Rufus, the son of William the Conqueror. Manasse married an English wife, Emma, the widow of Odo of Folkstone. His daughter also married an Englishman [40]. Hereward's adventures in Flanders must have taken place, however, during the reigns of Baldwin V and Baldwin VI (1067—1070). The curious point is that the

name Baldwin is mentioned during Hereward's second sojourn in Flanders, but not in his quality of count of Flanders. He is called *quidam praeclarissimus miles*. The connection of the house of Guisnes with English families seems to point to the conclusion that the author of the Gesta or his written source for the first part of Hereward's adventures, substituted the name of a Flemish nobleman, who was better known in England than the Flemish count himself. Liebermann has come to a similar conclusion [41], but he has gone one step further by asserting that the apposition *the Old* is due to the fact that the author was acquainted with the existence of another Manasse, a relation of the count of Guisnes of that name, who lived in the middle of the 12th century. We reject this conclusion as being too hypothetical.

Lambert of Ardres also has a fantastical story about the viking-origin of the house of Guisnes [42]. The first count of Guisnes is supposed to be the bastard-son of a Danish leader, Sifridus, a relative of the Danish king, who landed at the site of the present town of Guisnes in 928.

The names Harald and Turfrida (ON. Þorfríðr) are evidently of Scandinavian origin. How did they get into this story, which for the rest is based upon historical facts? There seems to be no plausible reason why Hereward, upon his arrival in Flanders, should conceal his identity from the count and why he should adopt the Scandinavian name Harald. We suppose that these names are remnants of a tale about viking activities in Flanders, which must have been current in the north-eastern districts of England in the 11th century. Hereward's fighting a rival for the hand of Turfrida may be compared to such bride-winning stories as, for instance, the one contained in the second chapter of the saga of Hrólfr Gautreksson. To this viking-tale must also have belonged the war in Scaldemariland, which contains descriptions that clearly point to a period previous to the 11th

century. The primitive character of the warfare and the weapons of the people of Scaldemariland is not in accordance with the art of war as it was practised at the time of the Norman Conquest. It looks more like a description of some of the tribes that the vikings must have encountered on their expeditions two centuries before Hereward ever came to Flanders. The fictitious story about the mare Swallow and its foal Lightfoot may also have belonged to this Scandinavian tale. The mare is also mentioned in some of Hereward's adventures in England, but the name may have been interpolated by Richard in his oral sources, as it does not occur in the other traditions which we possess about Hereward, viz. Gaimar's Lestorie des Engles.

On these grounds we assume Hereward's Flemish adventures to have been based upon historical tradition in the main, but with interpolations from an earlier tale of viking-origin.

The second part of the Gesta treats of Hereward's adventures in England during his struggle against the Norman Conqueror. It covers approximately two thirds of the whole work and contains mostly historical or pseudo-historical tradition. We may divide these exploits into the following three sections: 1. Hereward collects a band of followers and starts the insurrection against the king; 2. the defense of Ely; 3. Hereward's outlaw-career after Ely has surrendered and his submission to the king.

The contents are in short as follows:

1. Hereward returns home and finds the Normans in possession of his lands. His younger brother has been killed in an attempt to protect his mother and his estate against the invaders. Hereward steals up to the castle at night with his servant, Martin Lightfoot, and surprising the Normans at their revels, kills them all, while Martin takes care that

no one escapes at the door. When Hereward's return becomes known, the Normans fly from his estates, but the English flock to his standard. He forms a staunch band of forty valiant men. His forces increase day by day and to augment his authority, he asks abbot Brand of Peterborough to knight him, while a monk of Ely, Wilfumus, does the same for two of his followers, Winter and Gaenoch. This Wilfumus had been a great friend of Hereward's father and they had sworn oaths of brotherhood. The custom of persons being knighted by monks was continued at Ely, especially at the time when Hereward defended the island, though the Normans despised this way of conferring knighthood. When Hereward returns from Peterborough, he hears that Frederick, the brother of William, earl of Warren, is out to capture him. Hereward surprises him in Norfolk, however, and despatches him.

Next he leaves for Flanders to fetch his wife, after promising his companions to return within a year. In Flanders he fights for a certain Baldwin against the viscount of Picquigny. The ruler of Brabant is also present. Hereward distinguishes himself by valiantly defending himself against superior numbers, when he is surrounded by a large body of adversaries. They try to capture him alive, because it is held a crime to kill such a courageous warrior. One of his companions manages to rescue him, however.

Hereward returns to England in company of his wife, Turfrida, the two Siwards and another pair of brothers, Hugo Britannicus, Hereward's priest, and Wivhardus, both men of a military disposition. He discovers that the Normans have not dared to take his lands again and that everything has remained as he left it. Three signal-fires are lit on the heights of Bruneswald as a sign for his followers to assemble. Then follows a list of names, which has evidently been copied from two different sources without the author taking the

trouble to compare them, because many names occur twice.

2. The chief centre of active resistance against the king is the monastery of Ely and the abbot having heard of Hereward's success sends for him to aid them in the defense of the island. Hereward arrives at Ely notwithstanding an attempt of the earl of Warren to ambush him on his way from Lincolnshire.

The king lays siege to the island and builds a bridge across the marshes. His first attack is frustrated, however, because the bridge breaks down under the weight of his army, and half his forces are drowned in the fens. Even at this time, the author writes, rusty harnesses are sometimes found in the marshes. Only one soldier, called Deda, reaches Ely. He is treated with great courtesy by the besieged and is shown around the island to impress upon him its great natural resources and its impregnability. He is released upon condition that he shall relate everything that he has seen to the king. William listens to Deda's narrative and decides to raise the siege. Some of his generals persuade him to make one more attempt, this time with the aid of a witch, upon the advice of Ivo Taillebois. The final attack proves a failure, Hereward has hidden soldiers in the rushes everywhere and when the witch starts her incantations, the rushes are set on fire. The witch is burned alive and the Norman soldiers have the greatest difficulty in escaping the same fate. The king now raises the siege and only leaves a cordon of troops around the island to prevent the insurgents from pillaging the adjacent country. Several adventures are told of Hereward in connection with the siege. Once he enters the hostile camp in the disguise of a potter, he gets into difficulties with the servants of the king, who try to make him drunk and it is only the fleetness of his mare Swallow that saves him from certain death. Another time he and his companions disguise

themselves as fishermen and burn the wooden bulwarks that have been constructed by the enemy.

After the last attack of the Normans the three earls, Morkere, Eadwine and Tostig, who have aided in the defense of the island, leave Ely and join the successful rebellion of Ralph of Wader in Norfolk. Although the siege is raised, the end of the resistance at Ely is approaching. The king has confiscated all the estates of the monastery outside the island and the monks decide to make their peace with the Normans to get back their possessions. Negotiations are entered into, without the knowledge of Hereward, and the island is surrendered, the monks having to pay a big sum for the reconciliation of the king. Hereward barely escapes across the fens with only a few followers and takes refuge in the Bruneswald.

3. Hereward wages a sort of guerilla warfare in the fastnesses of the Bruneswald. The forces of seven shires are called into action against him and his faithful followers. Ivo Taillebois and Turold, the abbot of Peterborough are his principal opponents, but he evades being captured by all kind of stratagems. A favourite trick is the reversing of the shoes of his horses. Once he even captures Turold and only releases him at a ransom of 30.000 pounds (!). He burns and pillages Peterborough to punish Turold, but he returns the treasures at the command of St. Peter, who appears to him in a dream. On their journey back from Peterborough they lose their way in the forest. The appearance of a white wolf that acts as a guide saves them and candles that suddenly burn at the ends of their spears light their way. At dawn the wolf and the candles disappear, but they are on the right road to Stanford. He meets a former enemy of his in this town and scares the wits out of him, but does him no harm.

Hereward finally marries the widow of count Dolphin

and makes his peace with the king. His first wife, Turfrida, enters Croyland. According to the author Hereward's proverbial luck left him after this event. In the Bruneswald he comes upon a Saxon, named Lethold. The two parties fight, but Hereward finds his match in Lethold. He is unable to overcome him and the combat remains undecided. Hereward now travels to the court with a picked body of men. He is received with great honours, but his followers are not allowed entrance in order to avoid trouble with the other courtiers. He dismisses his bodyguard and stays at court with only two companions. The courtiers are envious of the favours bestowed upon Hereward by the king and they elect Oger as their champion to meet him in single combat. Hereward, who is drawn into this affair against his wish, wounds Oger in the arm. He is imprisoned by the king at the instigation of the courtiers. The warden, Robert de Horepol, is a friend of his, however, and when Hereward is to be removed to the castle of his former enemy, Ivo Taillebois, Robert warns two of Hereward's old comrades. The convoy, which is to take Hereward to Ivo's castle, is ambushed by Hereward's comrades and Hereward is liberated. Robert persuades the king to treat the outlaw mercifully and the latter is again reconciled with the Norman king, He dies in peace on his estate, which has been restored to him by king William.

These last three sections have been built up on a historical foundation, whereas the author has filled out his story with traditional matter, current in an oral form in the fenlands of East Anglia. The historical facts that have been handed down about Hereward are very scanty, as we have already seen at the beginning of this chapter. It is indeed possible that a great deal of the subject-matter of the latter part of the Gesta is

historical, though we have no other evidence to corroborate the statements of Richard.

On a few points he deviates from the historical facts, known to us. The sacking of Peterborough took place before Hereward came to Ely, as may be proved from the entries in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (cf. above). In the Gesta the reason for the sacking lies in the fact that abbot Turold, on being released by Hereward, breaks his promise. This story is clearly a variation of the entry in the A. S. Chronicle, in which the burning of Peterborough is attributed to the nomination of the Norman abbot Turold. This is proved, moreover, by the fact that in the so-called Chronicle of John of Peterborough, which is based either on the Gesta or on Ingulf, the capture and the ransoming of Turold are placed before the siege of Ely. This different order of events in the Gesta must have been a part of the oral traditions about Hereward, because Gaimar, writing independently, uses the same order as Richard. Another mistake, historically speaking, is the connection of earl Eadwine with the siege, because the two brothers Eadwine and Morkere parted company, after secretly escaping from the Conqueror's court [43]. Eadwine tried to reach Scotland, but was killed in the north of England. Morkere took refuge at Ely. The revolt of Ralph of Wader, which is mentioned in relation to the events at Ely, took place four years after the siege. This mixing up of history and tradition may safely be put down to the oral nature of Richard's sources. These are only a few cases, which we can verify from authentic accounts; how many more may there not be, which we are not able to compare with reliable sources? We shall leave this historical aspect of the question to more competent men and turn to the more literary aspect by attempting to detach from Richard's account the more general outlaw-features.

Hereward has been endowed by tradition with an invincible strength, but beside this quality he possesses another, namely

cunning. This is revealed in the numerous instances in which he, either alone or with only a few companions, fools his enemies. In these cases a certain humorous element is often present. This is especially the case with his adventure at Stanford, where he chases a former enemy all around the town and, when the latter in his fright takes refuge in the privy, Hereward magnanimously lets him be! Disguise is one of his favourite stratagems, as it is with later outlaws. The same disguise of a potter, in which he enters king William's camp at Ely, is also assumed by Robin Hood and Eustache the Monk. He proves himself to be a master of guerilla warfare by the way he continually evades and defeats the forces of Ivo Taillebois and abbot Turold in the Bruneswald, making the most of his advantageous position in the impenetrable woods.

Before proceeding to Gaimar we must point to the curious story of the white wolf, who guides Hereward and his followers through the forest at night, and the candles that are suddenly lit at their spear-heads, *quae vulgus appellant candelae nimpharum*, as Richard says. These are evidently remnants of old pagan tradition, probably of Scandinavian origin. The *candelae nimpharum* are the will o' the wisps, which occur largely in Norse folklore and with the wolf we may compare, for instance, Grettir's intercourse with supernatural beings during his outlaw-period. Supernatural occurrences are hardly ever featured in Anglo-Saxon literature in such a distinctly pagan shape. This traditional account evidently replaces the miracles of a more Christian nature that are related about the church-relics and their fate in the A.S. Chronicle version of the sacking of Peterborough.

Gaimar covers the same ground as Richard, but he begins at the siege of Ely. His narrative is somewhat shorter, the greater part being taken up by Hereward's deeds after the siege. The story of the fisherman has been combined with the

tale of the potter. Hereward escapes with only seven comrades from Ely, but at every town his company grows. His strength is said to be that of seven men. Most of the names of Herewards' comrades which are mentioned by Gaimar, also occur in the Gesta. The Saxon lady, who becomes Hereward's wife, is called Aelfthryth by Gaimar, but the latter is unacquainted with Hereward's first marriage. According to the author of the Estorie des Engles, Hereward after making his peace with the king, fights for the Conqueror in Maine. The chief difference between the story in the Gesta and in the Estorie is the way in which Hereward's death is recounted. According to Gaimar Hereward is surprised at his castle by a number of his Norman enemies. He is the victim of the carelessness of his chaplain, Ailward, who falls asleep instead of being on the look-out. Hereward is assaulted before he can arm himself properly, but he defends himself like a lion. Four of his opponents are killed by his sword before it goes to pieces on the helmet of the fifth. He then kills two with his shield, but not being able to protect himself, he is pierced through the back by four lances. He sinks to his knees and with his last strength he hurls the shield at one of his opponents and kills him. They both die at the same moment. Indeed, a death in keeping with Hereward's whole life! It reminds one of the last gallant struggles of Gísli and Grettir; Grettir is also the victim of his servant's carelessness and Gísli also ends his fight upon the rock by hurling his shield at one of his adversaries and killing him. Two other sources relate Hereward's violent death, but in a very different way. The Liber de Hyda tells us that:

> .... quadam die *cum omnibus sociis* ab hostibus circumventus miserabiliter occubuit.

In this version Hereward is evidently thought to have been killed during his outlaw-career together with his companions,

which is perhaps the most probable solution from a historical point of view. The 15th century rolls, mentioned above, has connected the fact that Hereward was killed by Norman noblemen with the name of Hugo de Evermouth, Hereward's son-in-law according to Ingulf. Hereward is killed in a brawl by Hugo. Except for the last case, which is obviously an invention, all these endings are historically possible, though the version of the Liber de Hyda seems to us the most probable. Nothing can be said with certainty, however, as we possess no reliable information on this point.

Returning to the Gesta once more as our chief source for the traditional matter about Hereward, we may conclude from internal evidence that Richard compiled his work from two distinct sources. The first part, adventures abroad, including his second trip to Flanders, consists of tales which are of too romantic and too general a nature to have ever existed as separate traditions about Hereward. This is particularly the case with the adventures in Northumbria, Cornwall and Ireland; the Flemish episode seems to be founded upon historical matter combined with an old viking-tale from those parts. The second part is based upon historical facts, probably taken from the chronicles, to which the author has added a great deal of oral tradition. This state of affairs is corroborated by Richard's assertion about his sources in the introductory section of the work. After telling his readers that he has found a mutilated copy of a book by Leofric the Deacon about Hereward's deeds in the English language, he continues:

> In quibus (i.e. Angliae literis) vero licet non satis periti aut potius exarare deleta incognitarum literatum, ad illum locum tamen de illo usque collegimus ubi in patriam et ad pristinam domum reversus fratrem occisum invenit. . . . .

An infinitive seems to have disappeared after *periti*, but for the rest the sentence is quite clear and proves, according to

our view, that Richard had a written source in the vernacular before him, which supplied him with subject-matter for Hereward's real and supposed adventures abroad.

In conclusion we may say that the Gesta is the most elaborate collection of romantic material about Hereward, whereas Lestorie des Engles contains mostly material in relation to the forest-outlaw, which we shall meet again in Robin Hood and Gamelyn. Both show a marked Scandinavian influence, Gaimar especially in his account of Hereward's death. This is only natural, if we bear in mind that Hereward was born in Lincolnshire and that most of his adventures take place in East Anglia, a district which had been settled by a large body of Scandinavians only a hundred years before and whose inhabitants must still have possessed a wealth of Scandinavian lore. Hereward's companions must partly have been Danes or men of Scandinavian descent, as is proved by names like Tostig, Thorkell and Osbjǫrn.

CHAPTER II

THE TALE OF GAMELYN

From the semi-historical figure of Hereward we turn to Gamelyn, the hero of an outlaw-poem of the beginning of the 14th century. This poem occupies a place by itself in Middle English poetry, as one of the few remnants of medieval popular story-telling in the vernacular. The subjects and style of the English gleemen, who told their stories to a company of country-folk at inns and taverns, were usually not thought fit for committing to parchment for the use of the more cultured classes of society.

The Tale of Gamelyn may be considered as a forerunner of the numerous Robin Hood ballads [1], which must have come into vogue in the middle of the 14th century, as the scene for the latter part of the poem is laid in the woods, where a *maister outlawe* rules with his seven score of young men, who is obviously the prototype of Robin.

The contents of this remarkable poem are in brief as follows:

> A knight, Sir Iohan of Boundys, on his deathbed divides his lands between his three sons, Iohan, Ote and Gamelyn. The second brother disappears from the scene till the end of the poem. The plot is mostly concerned with the elder brother, the wicked Iohan, and Gamelyn, the hero of the story. The former deprives Gamelyn of his inheritance and uses him as a servant. Gamelyn grows up and one day he

becomes conscious of his strength and of the mean way his brother has treated him. He upbraids his brother for his conduct and the neglected state his — Gamelyn's — lands are in. The elder brother becomes angry, but being afraid of Gamelyn's strength, he orders his servants to give his brother a sound beating. Gamelyn seeing the servants approaching picks up a pestle and easily holds his own against them. Iohan now pacifies Gamelyn with all kinds of promises. In the next episode of the story Gamelyn rides to a neighbouring fair and overcomes a wrestling-champion. On his return to the castle he finds the gate shut against him and his friends by his brother, who had secretly hoped that Gamelyn would have broken his neck in the wrestling-match. The gate is forced and Gamelyn and his friends stay in the castle and feast for a week. When the friends have gone home, Gamelyn is again cajoled into a good temper by his brother and he even allows himself to be bound on a very slight pretext. But now at last the perfidious ways of his brother become clear to him, for the latter has no intention of liberating him. Iohan exhibits him in his hall and tells his guests that he has turned mad. Gamelyn is, however, secretly aided by his father's old servant, Adam the spencer, and when Iohan has a company of clergy to dinner one Sunday, the spencer sees to it that Gamelyn's fetters are unlocked. Gamelyn first pleads with the guests to procure his release, but when they all abuse him, he throws off his fetters and breaks the arms and legs of his abusers with a staff, while Adam guards the door to let no one escape his punishment. The sheriff hears of the outrage, however, and Gamelyn and Adam fly to the woods. There they meet the king of outlaws and his seven score of young men and after a time Gamelyn becomes their chief, the former king having made

his peace at home. Gamelyn is visited by a number of his tenants, who inform him that his brother has become sheriff and that he has proclaimed him an outlaw. Gamelyn immediately returns home, but is captured and put in prison. At this point the second brother, Sir Ote, re-enters into the story. He bails Gamelyn out till the justice comes to try him. Gamelyn goes back to the woods for a while, but returns just in the nick of time to save Sir Ote from the gallows, to which he had been condemned in Gamelyn's place. Gamelyn and his fellows now hold a mock-trial and Iohan, the justice and the twelve assisors are all hanged. The poem ends with Gamelyn and Sir Ote making their peace with the king.

The preservation of the poem is due to its occurrence in several MSS of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. This accounts for the fact that some of Chaucer's editors published it as one of the Canterbury Tales, though most of them admitted the Tale to be spurious. Tyrwhitt in his edition of the Canterbury Tales (1775—78) is the first to omit the Tale as not belonging to Chaucer. The following reasons may be adduced for repudiating Chaucer's authorship, as Skeat [2] and Lindner [3] have already pointed out: 1. the Tale does not occur in all of the MSS of the Canterbury Tales and its omission in some of the best, viz. the Ellesmere MS, the Hengwrt MS and the Cambridge MS, marked Gg. 4.27., looks suspicious; 2. the Tale is inserted after the Cook's tale, though there is no reason for the Cook telling two tales. In the best MS of Gamelyn, Harleian 7334, a gap has wisely been left between the Cook's tale and the Tale of Gamelyn and at the end of the latter. In the other MSS the rubricators have added verses at the beginning of the present Tale to make it appear as if the Tale belonged there; 3. the structure of the verse is irregular, but mostly the line contains six stresses, a metre not

found elsewhere in Chaucer's poems; 4. the poet of the Tale has a strong aversion to the clergy in general, which he shows clearly in several parts of the poem. Chaucer, on the other hand, when he points out the evils of the time, is always careful to take a single instance and not to condemn a whole class for the excesses of some of its members.

After considering these points it will be clear that the poem is an interpolation in the Canterbury Tales, but from sub 3 it is also evident that the Tale, unlike other interpolations in Chaucer's works, was not written by a subsequent author with the intention of filling up a gap in the Canterbury Tales. If that had been the case, the interpolator would have used one of Chaucer's measures. Moreover, the poem makes an older impression than Chaucer. Skeat has conjectured that Chaucer procured a copy of our poem with the intention of remodelling it into a Canterbury Tale, probably the Yeoman's Tale [4]. This would be a way of accounting for the poem finding its way into the Canterbury Tales, though it can never be more than a conjecture.

As far as the authorship of the present poem is concerned, nothing can be said. There is no internal evidence nor is the poem mentioned anywhere in Middle English literature. The only place, where the name Gamelyn occurs, is in the Robin Hood ballads, in the form Gamwell and Gandeleyn. This connection will be treated presently in the chapter on these ballads. No clue is given as regards the author of our poem in this body of poetry.

About the origin and the date of the poem we have to rely solely on the internal evidence of the poem itself. We have not been able to find any distinct parallel to our story either in the Anglo-Norman or French stories or in Scandinavian sources. The story of the wicked elder brother, who oppresses his younger brother is, of course, very old, but we have

not found it elsewhere with any of the details occurring in the poem.

We propose to examine the internal evidence under the following headings:

1. the form and language of the poem
2. social and political indications
3. the proper names occurring in the poem.

Sub 1 has been thoroughly treated by Lindner[5] and Skeat[6]. As we agree on the main points of their investigations, we can do little more than summarize their work. The different MSS may be divided into two groups[7]. The fact that there is a close agreement between the two groups proves that they are both derived from one archetype. There are, moreover, distinct signs that this original written source was noted down from oral tradition. For instance, the poet makes a generous use of stock expressions; he has a habit of using the same words close together and the same vowels in successive pairs of rhyme-words. These peculiarities point exclusively to an underlying oral tradition. This is not the case with some of the other arguments which Lindner uses[8]. The fact that some lines found in one MS are missing in another, which Lindner accounts for by a lapse of memory, might be attributed with a greater degree of probability to the carelessness of copyists. The same may be said of such variants as: line 756, *forth fro you* (Sloane MS) — *for soth fro you* (other MSS); line 351, *selleer* instead of *soleer*, which is clearly meant; line 555, *to fette away* (Landsdowne MS) — *be way* (Corpus MS) — *by her fay* (other MSS). The exclusively oral features of these variants are not clear to us. We prefer to treat them as clerical errors. We may safely say, however, on the grounds which we have pointed out above, that the poem must have existed in popular oral tradition in a form closely akin to the texts in the various MSS.

Our next consideration will be the dialect in which the poem has come down to us. This clearly shows a North East Midland type with a comparatively small percentage of French words and some specifically northern words of Scandinavian origin. The word *awe* (ON. *agi*) occurs beside the southern form *eye*. The word *nyggoun* (ON. *hnøggr*) is only known from this poem and Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne, in which it is spelt *nygun*. *Lithe* (ON. *hlýða*), the noun *loft* (ON. *lopt*), *serk* (ON. *serkr*) and *skeet* (ON. *skjótr*) are the other words that only occur in northern dialects [9]. The rhyming of words with *i* and *y* is another northern and N.E. Midland feature. The use of *y* for *i* in all positions became general only in the middle of the 14th century in the south. Other northern and Midland peculiarities are: 1. the personal pronoun *I* or *Y*, never *ic* or *ich*; 2. the Scandinavian form *thei* and *thai* is mostly used instead of *hi* or *he* of the other dialects; 3. Scandinavian *them* is used in the dative and accusative plural with different vowels, beside *hem*; 4. the ending *-is*, *-ys*, beside *es* in the plural of nouns. All these facts point to a N.E. Midland dialect. The few southern forms may be explained as the work of later copyists.

Sub 2. We saw before that the poet has a strong aversion to the clergy in general. In one of the episodes he depicts with obvious glee the flogging of a body of religious personages, whereas of Gamelyn, the outlaw, it is said in line 780:

> There was no man that for him ferde the wors
> But abbotes and priours, monk and chanoun;
> On hem left he no-thing whan he mighte hem nom.

Here we meet with the same antipathy towards the church as is expressed in the Robin Hood ballads. The poet certainly did not belong to the clergy and the poem was probably recited in a time, when the clergy was also in disfavour with the audience, in this case the common people. From the mention of a grey

friar in line 529 it is evident that these were already established in England, when the present poem was made. At the end of the 13th century the influence of the mendicant orders began to diminish, but it is only in the 14th century that they become the special butt of satirical and political songs [10]. Now the poet of the Tale of Gamelyn shows an extreme dislike for abbots and priors, but the friar is only mentioned incidentally and does not come in for abuse. This gives us a hint for the approximate date of the poem, which is, moreover, corroborated by the judicial facts in the story.

The chief points connected with the judicial proceedings in the last episode of the Tale may be summarized as follows. Iohan, having become sheriff, gets up an *enditement* of outlawry against Gamelyn during the latter's absence in the woods. Gamelyn comes back to plead his cause, but is put in the King's prison without being heard. The second brother, Sir Ote, bails him out till the next *sitting of deliverance*. The institute of *gaol-delivery* may be traced to the beginning of the 13th century, according to Maitland [11]. The sheriff has bribed the twelve assisors on the *quest* into giving false judgment. From lines 862—63,

> .....who was on the quest
> For to deme his brother, Sir Ote, for to honge,

it is clear that the twelve assisors were already more than witnesses and that they functioned as a trying jury, which gave a verdict, as may be proved from line 840, in which Sir Ote says to Gamelyn,

> For the quest is oute on me that I schulde honge,

Quest means in this case verdict. Neither line 840 nor line 863 is to be interpreted in such a way that the assisors decided the punishment, because at no period in English history did the

assisors have the power to do this. The explanation is that the assisors returned a verdict of guilty and then the judge passed the sentence of death by hanging, this being the usual punishment in such cases. So a verdict of guilty was virtually equivalent to the sentence of hanging.

Opinions are divided as to the time when these *trying* assisors first appear in criminal cases. Maitland holds that all jurors in the reign of Edward I are as yet witnesses or sworn accusers, not yet judges of fact [12]. Forsyth, on the other hand, says [13]:

> In some such way as this I conceive that trial by jury in criminal cases may have originated, and it certainly was in operation at the time when Bracton wrote, in the reign of Henry III. But even then the jury sometimes discharged both functions of accusers and triers.

From the examples adduced by Forsyth we see that the trying jury began to function in the above mentioned reign, but that it was as yet far from common, the older method of trial by combat being favoured in that period. So for a time these two methods existed side by side till at the end of the 13th century the trial by jury ousted the older Norman mode of trial. No mention is made of an alternative way or of the accused having the choice between two modes in the present poem, however, so that we may assume that it originated at a period when the trial by combat had already fallen into disuse, i.e. about 1300.

Some minor points belonging to this heading, which bear witness to the popular character of the poem are the following. Though the poem consists for the greater part of fighting episodes, no weapon of chivalry is ever mentioned, the adversaries have to rely on their own bodily strength or on such rude arms as a pestle or staffs. In the outlaw-section the traditional bows appear, but of swords or spears never a word is said. Another contrasting point with the court-poetry of the Middle Ages is the total absence of women and of the subject of love. The

audience seemed to want only a story of strength and fighting and to have no use for the chivalrous ideas of the time.

Sub 3. The only proper names that occur in the poem are those of the old knight, Sir Iohan of Boundys and his three sons: Iohan, Ote and Gamelyn, and that of the servant, who aids Gamelyn, Adam the spencer. All these names are of French origin except Gamelyn. The name of the knight probably has no other significance than Sir John of the Marches (Old French *bonne* — a limit). *Ote* is an unusual form of Latin *Otho*, which became *Otto* in German and *Odo* in the more southern Frankish counties. A form that is more common in Anglo-Norman is *Otoun*, derived from the Latin accusative *Othonem*. Another possible derivation would be from ON. *óđi*, the weak form of the adjective *óđr* 'mad'. In both cases the *t* must be due to written sources. We prefer the derivation from Latin *Otho*, as the appellation *óđi* 'the mad' is not found anywhere in ON. or Norman sources. Only the name of the hero is of distinctly Scandinavian origin. The name *Gamel* or *Gamelo* occurs as a proper name in Anglo-Saxon and Latin sources from the end of the 10th century onwards, often in connection with other Scandinavian names, like *Ketel* and *Orm*. *Gamel* is derived from ON. *gamall* 'old', *Gamelo* is a Latinized form of the weak adjective *gamli* 'the old'. The word *gamel* or *gomol* is also found in Anglo-Saxon, but only in the poetical language, in prose *eald* is always used. The ending *-yn* is probably the Romance diminutive ending *-in*, as found in *Colin*, *Gerardin*, *Paulin* etc. Björkman prefers the derivation from the ON. adjective plus the article-suffix *-inn* [14]. The meaning of the suffix being lost the *i* subsequently became a long vowel. Personally we adhere to the former explanation of ON. *gamall* plus the Romance diminutive ending, because it is a simpler resolution of the problem. Skeat thinks that the name refers to Gamelyn being the son of his father's old age [15]. This explanation is a little far-fetched, as the meaning of names like *Gamel* and

Orm were no longer understood at the time when the poem was made [16]. Moreover, if the name is a remnant of the time, when the meaning was indeed understood, we should expect a Germanic diminutive and not a Romance one.

Recapitulating we arrive at the conclusion that the poem is evidently based on oral tradition and that it was originally intended to be recited to the common people. On examining the dialect of the poem we found that it was N.E. Midland of the end of the 13th century, with a strong influx of northern and Scandinavian forms. This conclusion is corroborated by the information that may be derived from the judicial facts, as these point to the same period. Other features that point to the north eastern districts are: the connection with Robin Hood, whose early exploits usually take place in south eastern Yorkshire, and a resemblance to certain features in the Lay of Havelok [17], which is connected with Lincolnshire. The wrestling-episode may be compared with Havelok's putting the stone farther than any of the champions at the fair. Similarly Havelok's dispersing of the forty robbers is reminiscent of Gamelyn's prodigious feats with the pestle and the cart-staff. It is evident then, that the poem originated in its present form in the north eastern counties about 1300. Lincolnshire with its extensive Scandinavian settlement, seems to be the most appropriate home for this remarkable poem. Like the Lay of Havelok the story of Gamelyn must have been of Scandinavian origin, which may be proved from the viking features which the tale contains, — the extraordinary strength of the hero, the episode with the pestle, the cudgelling of the guests. The Scandinavian origin has been a great deal obscured by the social background, which has become typically English. Compare, for instance, the relation to the king, the judical proceedings, the dislike of the clergy, all traits of medieval English life. The English matter has to such a large degree superseded the Scandinavian elements

of the story that it is practically impossible to eke out the original substance of the Tale. There is a slight resemblance to the Hereward-story in the following particular: Hereward, when he returns to Brunne, goes to his former castle and kills all the revelling Normans inside, while his servant guards the door to let no one escape. We may compare this to Adam the spencer guarding the door in the episode of the beating of the guests in Gamelyn. Such analogies as this one and those between the stories of Havelok and Gamelyn, only prove that such features were the common property of the popular viking-tales.

As Gamelyn's connection with the outlaws as their second-in-command is mentioned in the Robin Hood ballads as well, but without his other exploits, the outlaw-matter of the poem must be the primary fact around which the other adventures of Gamelyn were grouped to account for his becoming an outlaw. Gamelyn might have been the central figure of a whole cycle of adventures, just like Robin Hood, the other stories having been lost in the course of time. This cannot be determined, however, as long as we have no other remnants of this cycle than the Tale of Gamelyn. We shall have to content ourselves with the thought that in the Tale we have a link between the older outlaw-literature, represented by the Hereward-story, and the Robin Hood ballads. The Scandinavian element is still clearly perceptible, but the background and the sphere has already become distinctly English. This development has gone even farther in the outlaw-matter, which we propose to treat in the next chapter, viz. the Robin Hood ballads.

CHAPTER III

THE ROBIN HOOD BALLADS

Our last example of the medieval English outlaw is by far the most famous of all. A whole cycle of ballads, ranging from the 15th to the 19th century attests the popularity of this outlaw-figure. Robin Hood originally represents the type of the woodland-hero and it is only from the end of the 15th century and later that he came to be connected with the May-games in which he and his loyal companion Little John were added to the principal actors in the spring-festivals, the King and Queen of May, Maid Marian and Friar Tuck. Some of the later ballads treat this connection with Maid Marian and Friar Tuck, but it is entirely foreign to the older cycle of Robin Hood [1].

Of the older ballads, the *Gest of Robin Hood* is of the greatest importance, as it is based on a representative collection of ballads about Robin Hood, which must have been popular at an early date. The oldest MS preserved is of the end of the 15th century, but the language proves that the poem was probably written about a century before [2]. The compiler of this ballad-history of the great outlaw must have been a poet of some skill, as he has succeeded in building up a consecutive story by a clever adaptation of the different ballads at his disposal. The eight fits may be summarized as follows:

1*st fit.* After a short introduction, describing Robin Hood

and his boon-companions, Little John, Scarlok and Much in the forest of Barnesdale, we proceed to the first adventure. Robin Hood likes to have a guest at table and the three companions are despatched to fetch him one. They have instructions to harm no *husbonde, that tilleth with his ploughe* nor a good yeoman or a knight or squire, *that wol be a gode felawe*. The clergy, however, and especially the high sheriff of Nottingham, they are enjoined to beat and bind. The companions meet a knight of very sad appearance and Little John conveys Robin Hood's invitation to him. He accepts the invitation, though he intended to dine *at Blith or Dancaster*. The knight is courteously received by Robin Hood, but when the dinner is over, the guest is unable to pay for it according to the outlaw's custom, as he has only ten shillings. Little John is sent to inspect the knight's coffers and the latter's declaration is found to be correct. Robin Hood will not touch a penny and asks the knight after the cause of his misfortune. The knight now tells his story. How he needed money to save his son, who had slain *a knyght of Lancaster and a squyer bolde*, and how he had borrowed 400 pounds from the abbot of St. Mary's Abbey, his land being his security. As he has not got the money, his lands will be forfeited. Robin Hood lends him the money and the Virgin will be the knight's security. The outlaw, who is very religious and especially devoted to the Virgin, accepts the security. Beside the money to redeem his property, the knight is presented with a new suit, boots and spurs, a palfrey and Little John is to accompany him as a yeoman or squire.

2nd fit. Much to the surprise and annoyance of the abbot of St. Mary's Abbey, who had hoped to confiscate the knight's possessions, the latter turns up at the gates of the Abbey at the appointed time. The knight, who has come with a large retinue in fine apparel, orders his retainers to change into

simpler clothes. The knight enters the hall and feigns inability to pay his debt. The abbot refuses to grant any respite, however. The knight appeals in turn to the justice, the sheriff and the abbot, but no one will aid him. The knight takes on such a menacing attitude that the justice intervenes and an offer is made to the knight to give up his claims for an additional 100 pounds. The knight refuses, of course, and disdainfully counts out the 400 pounds and leaves the abbot and his company dumbfounded. The knight and his followers dress in their fine clothes again and go home. When the knight has collected the 400 pounds to pay his debt to Robin Hood, he sets out for Barnesdale to keep his appointment. A wrestling-match along the way causes delay, however, because the knight has to intervene on behalf of the champion, who is attacked by his jealous competitors.

3rd fit. Little John distinguishes himself at a shooting-match, at which the sheriff of Nottingham is also present. The sheriff is so impressed by John's skill that he hires him for a year from the knight. John takes the name of Reynold Greenleaf. One day the sheriff goes hunting and Little John is left behind, because he is still in bed. He gets into a fight with the butler and the cook, because he wants to have his dinner before the sheriff comes home. The fight between the cook and Little John remains undecided and they are so pleased with each other that they decide to go to the greenwood together, taking with them as much silver as they can find. Little John and the cook are graciously received by Robin Hood and Little John goes into the forest to find the sheriff. On meeting him he fools him by saying that he has seen a *ryght fayre harte* with a herd of seven score of deer and so he leads him to Robin Hood's hiding-place. The sheriff has to eat and drink out of his own silver vessels, much to his discomfiture. He is dressed in the Lincoln green of Robin

Hood's men and is forced to sleep on the ground like the rest. After these trials he is released on the following morning on the promise that he will never again do harm to Robin Hood or any of his men.

4th fit. The day of the knight's payment has arrived and Robin Hood will not take his meal before some guest is found to share his dinner. Again Little John, Much and Scarlok go out and now they meet a monk, who travels with seven pack-horses and fifty-two men. His followers are put to flight and he himself is taken to Robin Hood to have his dinner. The monk turns out to be the *high cellarer* of St. Mary's Abbey. Robin Hood tells him of the money that he has lent the knight and how the Virgin is his bond. Robin Hood and his men jocularly consider the monk as a messenger from Our Lady to pay the debt. The monk professes to have only twenty marks, but, when his coffers are emptied, a sum of more than 800 pounds is found. Robin Hood says that he could never have had a better bond than Our Lady and the monk has to continue his journey without his 800 pounds. Shortly afterwards the knight and his company arrive and he offers his excuses for not having kept his appointment, as the wrestling-match has delayed him. Robin Hood entertains him with good grace and tells him that the Virgin has already paid his debt. He will only accept a hundred goodly bows and arrows as a present and and in return he offers the knight the additional 400 pounds that Our Lady has paid him. The knight leaves, blessing Robin Hood and his men for their bounty.

5th fit. In the next adventure Robin Hood narrowly escapes being trapped by the sheriff and his men. The sheriff proclaims a shooting-match for the men of the north; the reward will be an arrow of gold and silver. Robin Hood, Little John, Scarlok, Gilbert of the White Hand, Much and Reynold go to the match,

while the rest of the outlaws stay at the border of the forest. Robin Hood wins the arrow, but after the shooting they are treacherously set upon by the sheriff and his men. Little John is sorely wounded, but they manage to resist the sheriff and retreat to the castle of Sir Richard at the Lee, who is identified with the knight to whom Robin Hood has formerly lent the money.

6*th fit.* The knight resists the sheriff's forces and tells him that he will not deliver his guests without an order from the king. Robin Hood and his men escape to the woods and the sheriff sends messengers to the king to tell him what has happened. The king is coming in person to punish the bold outlaws. The sheriff avenges himself on the knight by unexpectedly attacking him, while he is hawking, and imprisoning him in Nottingham. Robin Hood is apprised of this by the knight's wife and he goes to Nottingham and delivers the knight from prison. The sheriff is killed by Robin Hood himself.

7*th fit.* The king arrives at Nottingham and hears of the outrages that have been committed by Robin Hood and his followers and he is naturally greatly enraged. Robin is nowhere to be found, however. At last an old forester undertakes to show the king Robin Hood's abode. They dress up like monks and they meet with the outlaw indeed. The pseudo-abbot and his monks are invited to dinner and are courteously treated by Robin Hood. The abbot complains of the expensive life at the court of the king, he can only offer Robin forty pounds for his excellent meal. After dinner they play *pluck-buffet*, i.e. a shooting-match, with the restriction that everyone who fails of the mark is to receive a buffet from Robin Hood. But it so happens that Robin himself fails with his last shot, and now the abbot is to administer the buffet. He strikes Robin Hood so hard, that the latter falls down

and in this way the king is recognized by his strength. Robin Hood and his fellows and the knight, who also seems to have been present, kneel down and pay homage to the king. The king has enjoyed himself so much that he readily pardons them all.

8th fit. The king determines to play a joke upon the citizens of Nottingham. He dresses just like the outlaws in Lincoln green and the citizens are terribly scared, when they see the large band approaching. The general opinion is that the king has been killed. He is recognized at last and the whole town rejoices. Robin and his company follow the king to court, but after a year or more he cannot stand it any longer at court and he gets leave to pay a visit to the little chapel that he has built in Barnesdale in honour of Mary Magdalen. When he is in the greenwoods again, he blows his horn, the *sevenscore of wyght yonge men came redy on a rowe* and Robin decides to risk the king's wrath and stay in the forest, where he dwells for another twenty-two years, according to the story. He is treacherously killed by one of his relations, the prioress of Kyrkesly, who lets him bleed to death, when he comes to her to be let blood. The poem ends with the stanza:

> Cryst have mercy on his soule,
> That dyed on the rode!
> For he was a good outlawe,
> And dyde pore men moch god[3].

Clawson in his admirable treatise on the Gest [4], has elaborated the work of Child [5] and Fricke [6] about the original ballads on which the Gest must have been based. We agree with the results of his investigation in the main points.

The Gest may be divided into three principal parts. The first division comprises fits I, II and IV, the story of the knight and the payment of the debt. The second part consists of fits III, V and VI, and describes Robin Hood's quarrel with the

sheriff, whereas the last part, fits VII and VIII, may aptly be called the tale of Robin Hood and the King.

In the first division we have three principal features: 1. the story of the knight, who is entertained by Robin and who borrows 400 pounds on the surety of the Virgin; 2. the knight's visit to St. Mary's Abbey; 3. the story of the monk, who is entertained against his wish by Robin Hood and who is robbed of 800 pounds. It is clear that there is a connection between the story of the knight and that of the monk. Moreover, there are many verbal agreements and contrasts, which prove that the story of the monk has been used by the compiler as a foil to the main tale of Robin Hood and the unfortunate knight. The original ballad from which the story of the monk was taken seems to have been concerned with *two* monks, as is proved by certain discrepancies in stanza 213 ff.

stanza 213 lines 3—4	Than were they ware of *two* blacke monkes, Eche on a good palferay.
stanza 214 lines 3—4	I dare lay my lyfe to wedde That *these monkes* haue brought our pay.
stanza 216 line 1	*The monke* hath two and fifty men.
stanza 225	They brought *the monke* to the lodge-dore, Whether *he* were loth or lefe, For to speke with Robyn Hode, Maugre in *theyr* tethe.

Fricke asserts that the ballad about the two monks was the one underlying this entire division [7], the story of the knight having been modelled by the compiler himself after the example of the Robin Hood and the monk story. We are more inclined to accept Clawson's view that the two stories go back to separate ballads [8]. The chief argument in favour of this as-

sumption is the existence of two similar stories, but unrelated, in an earlier outlaw-tradition, viz. that of Eustache the Monk. A merchant, who makes a correct declaration of the amount of money he has with him, is allowed to keep it. An abbot, on the other hand, lies about the amount and is robbed. The existence of these stories separately in an older outlaw-tradition, makes it extremely probable that similar tales were also told of Robin Hood. The story of the knight's visit to St. Mary's Abbey in the second fit shows some inconsistencies with regard to the first fit, as Clawson has pointed out [9]. In the second fit the knight is said to return from foreign countries, which does not tally with the story in the first fit. Moreover, Little John goes with the knight as his squire at the end of the first fit, but in the second fit the knight has a large retinue and Little John is not mentioned at all. So here again the compiler has made use of an older ballad and skilfully inserted it in his plot.

The second division (fits III, V and VI) comprises: 1. the story of Little John as the sheriff's man; 2. the sheriff's treachery at the shooting-match; 3. the aid of Sir Richard at the Lee to the outlaws; 4. the capture of this knight by the sheriff and his deliverance by Robin Hood. The story of Little John as the sheriff's man contains many typical outlaw-features, which are also found in some of the extant ballads. The most important of these features are the theme of the hero meeting his match (the fight between Little John and the cook) and the capture of the enemy under false pretences (Little John pretends to have seen a fine stag and leads the sheriff to Robin Hood's haunt). The first theme occurs in a number of Robin Hood ballads and is one of the main features of later imitations. An earlier example is found in the Gesta Herwardi, in the fight between Hereward and Lethold the Saxon. This tradition has been combined with the story of how the outlaw or one of his followers takes service with the enemy. Whether Little John or Reynold Greenleaf

was the hero of the original ballad is of little importance. The second adventure, the tricking of the enemy into entering the outlaw's hiding-place, is found in two ballads, which are closely related, viz. Robin Hood and the Potter, and Robin Hood and the Butcher. In both poems Robin gets into a fight with a tradesman, who has the best of the fight. They are reconciled and Robin Hood disguises himself in the other's clothes. He goes to the sheriff and fools him by telling him, in the case of Robin Hood and the Potter, that he knows Robin Hood's hiding-place and, in the case of Robin and the Butcher, that he has a herd of *horned beasts* in the forest. In both cases the sheriff is allowed to depart unharmed. An earlier tradition, which is closely connected with this version of the story, is found in the story of Eustache the Monk. Here also the enemy is released without any promise. The tradition which shows the closest resemblance to the adventure in fit III of the Gest is the story of the capture of King John in the tale of Fulk Fitzwarin. Fulk disguised as a charcoal-burner meets his enemy, King John, in the forest. Fulk offers to show the king a large stag and leads him into an ambush. The king is released after promising to restore the outlaws to their possessions. In this case we also meet with the promise, which does not occur in the ballads mentioned above.

Robin Hood's next adventure with the sheriff, the latter's treachery at the shooting-match, is clearly based on a simple ballad, which probably ended in the outlaws' escape into the woods. The compiler has connected this ballad with another one about Robin Hood and a knight, Sir Richard at the Lee. For the sake of unity the compiler identified Sir Richard with the unnamed knight of the first section. That they are not one the same person is proved by the fact that the unnamed knight is said to live in Verysdale, at present Wyresdale to the south-east of Lancaster, whereas Sir Richard must have lived in the

neighbourhood of Nottingham. The underlying ballad probably treated of the capture and rescue of Sir Richard. This type of rescue-ballad has also been handed down with relation to Robin Hood in the ballad of Robin Hood rescuing Three Squires. It occurs, besides, in the northern ballad of Adam Bell and in the Tale of Gamelyn, — Gamelyn's rescue of Sir Ote. Some discrepancies between the connective stanza at the beginning of the sixth fit and the stanzas about the capture and rescue increase the probability of a separate underlying ballad for the latter part of this fit [10]. Fricke has attempted to prove that there are also signs of a second ballad in this part of the sixth fit [11]. He assumes quite correctly that stanza 333 does not fit in with the sequence of the story.

332 Toke he (i.e. the sheriff) there this gentyll knight
With men of armys stronge,
And led hym to Notyngham warde,
Bounde bothe fote and hande.

333 The sheref sware a full grete othe,
Bi hym that dyed on rode,
He had leuer than an hundred pound
That he had Robyn Hode.

334 This harde the knyghtes wyfe,
A fayr lady and a free;
She set hir on a gode palfrey,
To grene wode anone rode she.

Is is evident that stanza 333 is an interpolation, 332 and 334 making a perfect order. Fricke thinks, moreover, that Robin Hood's hatred, as expressed in the latter part of the sixth fit, could not have been caused only by such a secondary event as the capture of the knight. Therefore he assumes the influence of another ballad, which must have treated of Robin Hood's revenge on the sheriff, because the latter had put a

price on his head. Beside stanza 333, which must be a remnant of this ballad, stanza 329 must also have belonged to it. This is proved, according to Fricke, by a comparison with the three opening stanzas of the ballad of Robin Hood and the Butcher (version A), which are acknowledged by everyone to be an interpolation of some other ballad.

Robin Hood and the Butcher	*Gest*, fit VI
1. But Robin he walkes in the greene fforrest As merry as bird on boughe, But he that feitches good Robin's head Hee'le find him game enoughe	329. Robyn Hode walked in the forest, Under the leuys grene; Thereof he had grete tene.
2. But Robine he walkes in the greene fforrest, Under his trusty-tree; Sayes, Hearken, hearken, my merrymen all, What tydings is come to me.	
3. The sheriffe he hath made a cry, Hee'le have my head i-wis; But ere a tweluemonth come to an end I may chance to light on his.	333. The sheref sware a full grete othe, Bi hym that dyed on rode, He had leuer than an hundred pound That he had Robyn Hode.

We venture to raise the following objections against this hypothesis. Robin Hood's anger against the sheriff is not at all irrational in connection with the events described in the Gest. The sheriff has broken his promise by treacherously attacking Robin Hood at the shooting-match, which would seem a sufficiently logical cause for Robin's hatred [12]. Moreover, in the type of capture-and-rescue ballad, to which the underlying ballad of fit VI must have belonged, the sheriff is always killed (cf. Robin Hood and the Monk, Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne, Robin Hood and the Three Squires, Adam Bell and the Tale of Gamelyn). So the killing of the sheriff is a standing feature in this

type of ballad and Robin's anger is logically explained by the preceding events in the Gest. We agree with Fricke that the three opening stanzas of Robin Hood and the Butcher must have belonged to a ballad describing Robin Hood's revenge and ending with the death of the sheriff (cf. the last lines of stanza 3). We fail to see clearly, however, the distinct similarity between these stanzas and stanza 329 and 333 in the Gest. The first two lines of 329 are of too general a nature to be of any value for a comparison; similar lines are found over and over again in the Robin Hood ballads. The last two lines of 329 have no counterpart in the stanzas from Robin Hood and the Butcher, and are entirely in keeping with the story in the Gest. The meaning is that the sheriff is angry at Robin having escaped him again. It is clear then that 329 cannot be separated from the context of the sixth fit, as is the case with 333. The agreement between the third stanza in the ballad and stanza 333 of the Gest is also very slight. Besides, neither stanza speaks of the sheriff having put a price on Robin's head. The phrase: *He had leuer than an hundred pound That he had Robyn Hode,* is only used as a measure for the sheriff's hatred and desire to catch the obnoxious outlaw. In a similar manner the phrase is used in the ballad of Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne, when Guy says:

stanza 25 'I seeke an outlaw', quoth Sir Guy,
'Men call him Robin Hood
I had rather meet wit him upon a day
Then forty pound of golde.'

On these grounds we reject Fricke's hypothesis. The only conclusion to be drawn is that stanza 333 of the Gest is an interpolation from another ballad and that stanzas 1—3 of Robin Hood and the Butcher belong to a ballad describing Robin Hood's revenge on the sheriff. Stanza 333 may also have belonged to this ballad, but there is no reason whatever for assuming

that the compiler has used two ballads for the latter part of the sixth fit.

The last section (fit VII and VIII) narrates the meeting of Robin Hood and the King, Robin Hood's visit to court and his death. It is curious that no separate ballad has been handed down of Robin Hood's meeting with the King, as the theme of the King visiting his subjects in disguise has been celebrated in numerous ballads and in connection with different kings. Examples of the outlaw's pardon and his reception at court may be found in the Gesta Herwardi, the Tale of Gamelyn and the ballad of Adam Bell. The last stanzas of the Gest describing Robin Hood's death seem to have been based on an older version of the existing ballad of Robin Hood's Death.

From the above investigation, which is mainly based on the work of Clawson, Child and Fricke, we see that the author or compiler of the Gest took a number of ballads and ingeniously fitted them together into a ballad-history of Robin Hood, often changing his sources and inserting connective passages of his own to obtain a greater unity.

From the geographical indications it is evident that the underlying ballads belonged to different cycles. In the first section (fit I, II, IV) the scene is laid in Barnesdale, in southern Yorkshire, north of Doncaster. Verysdale, the home of the unknown knight, lies to the south of Lancaster. The second division (fit III, V, VI) evidently plays in the neighbourhood of Nottingham, which lies about fifty miles farther south than Barnesdale. The third division (fit VII, VIII) plays in the same district, only the last few stanzas describing Robin Hood's death belong to the Barnesdale cycle. Robin Hood's abode near Nottingham must have been the famous Sherwood forest, though the name is not mentioned in the Gest. This forest, which all of the later ballads and stories have connected with the name of Robin Hood, lies just to the north of Nottingham and is mentioned

as Robin's hiding-place in the early ballad of Robin Hood and the Monk. Wyntoun in his chronicle of Scotland [13], written about 1420, says about Robin Hood

> Lytill Ihon and Robyne Hude
> Waythmen ware commendyd gude;
> In Yngilwode and Barnysdale
> Thai oysyd all his tyme thare trawale.

Inglewood or Englishwood was a forest between Carlisle and Penrith in Cumberland, close to the Scottish border. It was the abode of the three outlaws mentioned in the northern outlaw-ballad of Adam Bell. The compiler of the Gest evidently made use of the Barnesdale cycle as well as the Sherwood cycle and mixed them indiscriminately.

Beside the Gest the following ballads are of importance to our investigation, either in representing the spirit of the old Robin Hood cycle or in containing subject-matter, which shows traces of an older stage of Robin Hood poetry:

1. Robin Hood and the Monk
2. Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne
3. Robin Hood and the Potter
4. Robin Hood and the Butcher
5. Robin Hood and the Curtal Friar
6. Robin Hood's Death
7. Robin Hood Newly Revived

1. *Robin Hood and the Monk.* This ballad is found in a MS of the middle of the 15th century and is one of the oldest that have been handed down. It is regarded by many critics as one of the finest ballads of the English language. Before entering into the peculiarities and merits of the poem, we shall give a short synopsis of the contents.

The ballad opens with the traditional description of the forest in the month of May. Little John enjoys the weather, but Robin Hood is sad, because he has not been to *mas nor matyn* for more than a fortnight. He decides to go to Nottingham with *þe myght of mylde Marye*. Much advises him to take twelve men with him, but Robin will not hear of it, and will only allow Little John to accompany him. On the way they shoot for pennies and Little John wins five shillings from his master. Robin denies the fact and after a short altercation Little John leaves him and goes back to Sherwood. Robin Hood continues his journey alone and arrives at St. Mary's church and says his prayers. He is recognized by a monk, who apprises the sheriff of the fact. All the gates of the town are shut and the sheriff attacks Robin Hood with a large body of men. Robin is sorry now that he has quarreled with Little John, whose aid would have stood him in good stead. He defends himself bravely, but at last he breaks his sword on the head of the sheriff. The next passage is obscure on account of a great number of stanzas having dropped out. Apparently Little John and the rest of Robin's followers have received the news that their master has been captured. They are in very low spirits and only Little John is not discouraged and trusts in Our Lady, saying that she will never let Robin Hood die in this miserable way. Somehow the outlaws have got word that the same monk, who has betrayed Robin, is on his way to the court as a messenger. Little John and Much waylay him and after killing the traitor, they take the sheriff's letters to the king. The latter greatly rejoices at the capture of the dangerous outlaw and sends them back to Nottingham with the message that Robin Hood is to be brought to court alive. The disappearance of the monk is explained to the sheriff by Little John by the fact that the king liked him so much that he made him abbot of Westminster! The two comrades rescue Robin at night, while the sheriff is heavy with wine. Robin Hood

and Little John are, of course, reconciled, and the latter stays with the outlaws. The king is angry, because he has been fooled by Little John, but he admires his staunch adherence to his master, Robin Hood.

The moral of the ballad lies in the unselfishness of Little John, who sets aside his personal grievances to save his master. The poem is written in a fine ballad-strain and Robin is again depicted as a thoroughly religious person, who puts his trust in the Virgin. We possess a similar story of the same period in Bower's interpolation of Fordun's Scotichronicon [14]. Robin has masses sung regularly at Barnesdale. One day the sheriff and his men are planning an attack. Robin is warned, but refuses to fly and with a few men he utterly defeats the sheriff's force. This event only strengthens his piety. The tale in the Scotichronicon is obviously based upon a lost ballad of the same nature as the one we are discussing.

There is a controversial point about the the first two lines of the thirtieth stanza, where the gap in the manuscript begins. Two readings have been suggested for the first line of this stanza, which seems to be almost illegible. Madden's reading runs:

Robyns men to the churche ran

whereas Skeat reads:

Robyn into the churche ran

The last reading is the more logical one, as there is no clue as to where Robin's men should come from all of a sudden. The preceding stanzas describe Robin's single-handed fight against the sheriff and his men, and the gap occurs just when he is on the point of being captured. The lost stanzas must have contained Robin Hood's capture and the delivery of a message to his followers, relating his imprisonment and the intended journey of the monk. The rest of the story is told quite consecutively.

Fricke has followed Madden's reading and in building another

hypothesis on this obscure line, has entered upon dangerous ground, in our opinion [15]. He asserts that Robin Hood and the Monk is an extended form of an older ballad of which the context must have been about as follows: Robin goes to Nottingham to say his prayers, he is recognized and betrayed by a monk. He fights single-handed against the sheriff and his men, but is finally rescued by his own men. How his followers came to the rescue is not clear, Fricke states that a stanza is probably lost, telling of Robin blowing his horn. We consider Fricke's explanation forced, to say the least of it, especially as it is based upon such a weak foundation as a questionable interpretation of a line. Another reason for his hypothesis is the last stanza, which runs:

> Thus endys the talkyng of the munke
> And Robyn Hode i-wysse;
> God þat is ever a crowned kyng,
> Bryng us all to his blisse.

Fricke asserts that this is the end of the ballad as reconstructed by him, since there is no reason for speaking especially of the monk, who is only one of the minor personages in the present story. We agree with Fricke that this stanza may have been taken from another ballad, but we do not think this sufficient reason for building up a hypothesis of the above kind. Moreover, the intrigue of the ballad runs on perfectly smoothly, if we accept Skeat's reading, so there is no need of such a far-fetched explanation.

The present ballad has a close affinity to the northern ballad of Adam Bell, Clim of the Clough and William of Cloudesley. These three outlaws lived in Inglewood near Carlisle in the same manner as Robin Hood and his fellows. William is married and against the advice of Adam Bell, he goes and visits his wife at Carlisle. He is betrayed by an old woman, who lives at his house. William is besieged by the justice and his men, who in the

end set fire to the house. William's wife and children escape through the window, but the outlaw himself keeps on shooting till his bow-string is burnt in two. He is at last overpowered and put in prison. All the gates are shut and a new pair of gallows is erected for his hanging. A little boy brings the news to Adam and Clim in the woods. They manage to get into the town by showing the porter a letter, which is supposed to bear the king's seal. They kill the porter and take his keys. William is rescued in the nick of time, and the justice and the sheriff are killed by the arrows of the two outlaws. After a great skirmish they get out of the town by the gate of which they have the keys, and escape to the greenwood. This is only a part of the ballad, the rest tells of their sojourn at court and their shooting-achievements. The outline of the above part of the ballad is the same as that of the ballad of Robin and the Monk. The hero goes to the town of his chief enemy, in the one case to pay his devotions, in the other to see his wife. He is betrayed and overpowered by his enemy. His fellows rescue him in the disguise of the king's messengers. It is evident that the two stories originally rely on the same tradition, which proves that the rescue of the hero by his comrades in the disguise of the king's messengers is an essential part of the story. According to our point of view this conclusion effectually establishes the unsoundness of Fricke's hypothesis.

The last point to be discussed is the stanza in which the monk betrays Robin Hood to the sheriff:

> Þis traytur name is Robyn Hode,
> Under þe grene-wode lynde;
> He robbyt me onys of a hundred pound,
> Hit shalle never out of my mynde.

Child[16] asserts in opposition to Fricke[17] that this stanza does not necessarily refer to the story of Robin Hood and the monk,

as it is narrated in the fourth fit of the Gest. He asserts that there were probably several tales about the outlaws robbing the clergy. Fricke considers this stanza to be a remnant of an older version of the story in the Gest, the sum of a hundred pound being changed to eight hundred on account of the amount of the knight's debt. We have seen already, however, that Fricke has quite correctly suggested that the tale in the Gest was probably based on a story containing *two* monks. We do not understand how Fricke intends to reconcile these two contrasting conclusions.

2. *Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne.* The opening stanzas of the poem again contain the usual spring-scenery. Robin seems to have had a dream of being bound and beaten by two young men, though the context is not entirely clear on account of a stanza having dropped out. Robin Hood and Little John go out to find the two yeomen of the dream. They meet a man, well-armed, leaning against a tree. Robin quarrels with Little John about the question of who is to accost the man and Little John goes back to Barnesdale. Great disaster has befallen the other outlaws in the meanwhile, for they have been routed by the sheriff and his men. Little John wants to take one shot at them, but his bow breaks and, though the arrow kills one of the sheriff's followers, Little John is taken prisoner. He is bound to a tree and the sheriff assures him that he will hang on a high hill.

In the meantime Robin has greeted the stranger and the latter tells him that he is looking for Robin Hood. They hold a shooting-match in which Robin shows his mastery. The stranger is astonished at the other's skill and asks his name. Robin tells him who he is, and the stranger turns out to be Guy of Gisborne. Swords are drawn and for a long time the fight is undecided, but in the end Guy is killed. Robin cuts off his enemy's head,

disfigures it with his sword, so that it cannot be recognized and sticks it on his bow. He then puts on Guy's clothes and throws his green coat over the body. The sheriff hearing the sound of Guy's horn, joyfully calls out that Robin Hood is slain. Robin goes to the sheriff and the latter thinking it is Guy, readily grants his request that he may also kill the knave, now that he has killed the master. Robin Hood releases his companion, gives him Guy's bow and together they put the sheriff's company to flight. Little John kills the flying sheriff.

This ballad seems to be a counterpart to the preceding one. Robin again quarrels with Little John, but now he is able to repay his companion by rescuing him from the sheriff. There are some inconsistencies in the poem, which point to the story being made up of different ballads. The most striking is the fact that Robin Hood disguises himself in Guy's clothes with the obvious intention of rescuing Little John, whereas there is no sign in the ballad that he knows anything about the misfortune that has befallen his comrade.

The most probable solution is that the present ballad is based upon two older ballads, which described: 1. the capture and the rescue of Little John; 2. Robin Hood's fight with Guy of Gisborne. The fact that Barnesdale is mentioned in the first part of the poem as Robin's haunt is an indication that the tradition about Robin Hood and Guy belongs to the Barnesdale-cycle, whereas the capture of Little John by the sheriff of Nottingham must have been a part of the Sherwood-cycle. An earlier example of the principal theme of this ballad is found in the tale of Fulk Fitzwarin. Fulk at one time kills his pursuers, except their chief, Sir James of Normandy, who is bound and gagged and put into Fulk's armour. They dress up in the armour of the vanquished knights and go to King John. The latter taking them to be Sir James and his knights, is very pleased and intends to hang the supposed Fulk. The real Fulk gets the king's horse to pursue

the rest of the outlaws. At the last moment the trick is discovered, when the helmet of the captured Fulk is taken off and Sir James is found in the armour.

The principal features of this episode are the same as those in the story of Robin Hood and Guy: 1. the fight with the enemies sent in pursuit; 2. the disguise in the clothes of the pursuers; 3. the chief-enemy, fooled by the disguise. This proves that the theme was evidently based on an old outlaw-tradition. The capture-and-rescue theme which forms the basis of the other part of the ballad is one of the stock incidents in outlaw-tradition (cf. the sixth fit of the Gest). A dramatic fragment, based upon Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne, preserved in a MS of 1475 or possibly a little earlier, is another proof of the antiquity of the ballad.

3. *Robin Hood and the Potter.* After the usual 'spring-opening' the poem describes Robin meeting a potter. He wagers for forty shillings with Little John that he will floor the fellow. Little John is not so sure, as he has already experienced the fellow's strength on a former occasion. The potter with his stick manages to overcome Robin, who fights with sword and buckler. Little John and his companions come to the rescue and Robin Hood admits that he has lost his wager. The potter makes friends with the outlaws and Robin changes clothes with him and goes to Nottingham with the potter's cart to play his pranks. As he sells the pots too cheap, he is sold out in a moment's time, except for five pieces of crockery which he presents to the sheriff's wife. On account of this present he is invited to dinner at the sheriff's. After dinner they go to a shooting-match and everybody is surprised at the potter's skill in archery. The potter tells the sheriff that he has often shot with Robin Hood in the forest and at the sheriff's request he promises to take him to Robin Hood's retreat next day. When they arrive in the

woods, Robin blows his horn and Little John and his fellows come running along at a brisk pace, when they hear the familiar sound. The sheriff realizes that he has been fooled by the supposed potter, but it is too late for escape. He is allowed to return to Nottingham, however, without his horse and his money. Robin gives him a white palfrey to present to his wife in return for her hospitality. The potter is paid for his pottery by Robin and invited to stay with the outlaws, whenever he comes their way.

Robin Hood and the Potter is the oldest ballad to describe the familiar story of Robin Hood meeting his match. Gradually a whole string of these ballads arose connecting Robin Hood with some locally famous man, and Robin Hood often cuts a very poor figure and is sometimes ignominously defeated in these poor imitations of the older cycle.

The poem, which is preserved in a MS of the end of the 15th century, presents the following features: 1. Robin Hood meets his match; 2. Robin Hood fools the sheriff in the disguise of a potter; 3. Robin magnanimously lets the sheriff off. Sub 1 has been connected with outlaw-traditions from the time of Hereward, as we have seen above, when speaking of Little John's fight with the cook in the third fit of the Gest. Sub 2 and 3 also occur in the same fit of the Gest, though the Gest in both cases presents a slightly different form of the traditions (cf. above).

4. *Robin Hood and the Butcher.* This ballad is based for the greater part upon the preceding ballad. The oldest version of the ballad tells of Robin meeting a butcher and getting into a fight again, because he has killed the latter's dog. Again it is battle between a sword and a staff, but we have to guess at the result, as some stanzas have dropped out, which must have described the fight and the change of clothes in a similar

fashion as in Robin Hood and the Potter. After the gap Robin appears to be in Nottingham, disguised as a butcher. He lodges again at the sheriff's house and sells his meat too cheap. A second gap occurs, which seems to have contained a conversation with the sheriff about cattle, which the latter wants to buy from Robin. Robin leads the sheriff and seven butchers to the forest and shows them a herd of deer. *These are my horned beasts*, he says, and at the same time he blows his horn. His companions come running along and the gap in the manuscript that follows probably contained a similar conversation as takes place in Robin and the Potter. The sheriff is saved by the hospitality his wife has shown Robin and allowed to return home with the loss of his money.

The resemblance between this ballad and the preceding one is obvious and it is clearly modelled along the same lines as the older ballad.

1. Robin fights with the butcher in the same way as he fights with the potter and he is probably overcome in the same manner, though the description of the fight is lacking in the present ballad.
2. He sells his meat too cheap, just as he did the pots in the preceding ballad.
3. He lodges at the sheriff's house in both cases.
4. The sheriff is beguiled into going into the forest with the supposed potter as well as with the supposed butcher.
5. The sheriff is suffered to go home with only the loss of his money on account of his wife's hospitality.

The only interesting point about this ballad is the fact that the three opening stanzas seem to belong to another ballad. These stanzas state the fact that the sheriff wants to kill Robin Hood, but that within a year's time Robin may take the sheriff's head. Fricke has taken these stanzas to be the beginning of a ballad on Robin Hood's revenge on the sheriff, the end of

which would be Robin's attack on the sheriff in the sixth fit of the Gest. As we have already discussed the merits of Fricke's hypothesis, there is no reason for entering upon this question once more.

5. *Robin Hood and the Curtal Friar.* The oldest version, preserved in the Percy MS, presents the same difficulties as the preceding ballad, viz. that gaps occur at regular intervals on account of the lower halves of the leaves having been cut off. There are later versions, which apparently did not differ appreciably from the older version and which supply us with a large part of the subject-matter of the lost stanzas.

Robin Hood hears of a curtal (cutted?) friar of Fountains Abbey who can shoot better than Little John and Robin together, according to Scarlok's report. Robin vows neither to eat nor to drink till he has met this man. They meet him on the banks of a stream and Robin goes to him, while the others remain concealed in a fern-brake. He accosts the friar and asks him to carry him across the stream. The friar does so, but on the opposite bank he threatens to kill Robin, if he does not carry him back. Robin in his turn carries the monk over and again Robin asks the monk to take him across. The friar does not say a word, takes him on his back and drops him in the middle of the river. Both of them swim to the shore, where Robin Hood draws his bow, but the friar wards off Robin's arrows with his buckler till they are all spent. They fight from ten o'clock in the morning till four in the afternoon without coming to a decision and then Robin asks for a favour, viz. to blow his horn. The friar tells him to blow till his eyes fall out. At the horn-signal fifty yeomen come running along; the friar now blows in his fist and fifty *bandogs* come *all on a rowe.* The friar wants to match a dog against each man, but Robin stays him

and makes his peace with the strong monk, inviting him to become one of his followers.

The story of the dogs is told differently in the later version, where they tear Robin's cloak from his back and catch the arrows aimed at them in their mouths. This is apparently a fantastical innovation of a later writer.

The ballad is another example of the hero meeting his match, as it is likewise described in Robin Hood and the Potter, Robin Hood and the Butcher and in the third fit of the Gest, where Little John meets his equal in the sheriff's cook. All of these ballads are of course apt to show similarity in some of the details.

The ballad was entitled in the Percy MS: Robin Hood and Friar Tuck. This title must be a later addition of a copyist, because there is no sign in the ballad itself that the friar of Fountains Abbey is identical with Friar Tuck. The title was inserted after Robin had been connected with Friar Tuck on account of the May-games. The unknown friar was replaced by the better-known Friar Tuck, a common procedure. It is uncertain whether the friar was a *cutted* friar, i.e. a Franciscan with a short frock, as he is called in the older version, or a *curtal* friar, as the name is in the later version. *Curtal* may mean the same as *cutted* or according to Child, may be derived from *curtilarius* meaning someone taking care of the *curtile* or kitchen-garden [18].

6. *Robin Hood's Death.* This ballad, preserved in the Percy MS, has the same defects as the other ballads of this collection, viz. that there are several gaps on account of the lower halves of the leaves having been cut off. The later version is of little use in this case, because the lost stanzas evidently contained features that are not preserved in the later version. The ballad describes Robin Hood's death in a similar manner as the account

handed down in the Gest, only with more detail. The present ballad and the latter part of the Gest are probably based upon the same original. The fact that the Red Roger of the ballad is called Roger of Doncaster in the Gest shows that the notice in the Gest is not directly derived from the present ballad. This conclusion is, moreover, corroborated by the way the name of the nunnery is spelled in the two stories. In the ballad the spelling is *Churchlees*, in the Gest *Kyrkesly*. The latter being the original place name and the other only a southern form of it, the more concise story of the Gest cannot be directly derived from the present poem.

Robin Hood feels ill and wants to go to Churchlees to be let blood. Scarlok warns him to be careful and take fifty bowmen with him, just as Robin is warned in other ballads before going on a dangerous expedition. Robin says he will take Little John with him to carry his bow. Exactly like in Robin Hood and the Monk, Little John tells him to carry his own bow and proposes to shoot for a penny. They arrive at a black water with a plank across it, on which an old woman is uttering imprecations against Robin Hood. Robin asks her why she does so, but the answer will never be known on account of a gap. The missing stanzas seem to have contained the conversation with the witch and possibly with another person. The ballad continues with an imperfect stanza:

. . . . . .
'To give to Robin Hoode;
Wee weepen for his deare body,
That this day must be lett bloode.'

Robin Hood is not afraid, however, because the prioress of Churchlees is his cousin and *nie unto his kinne*. He presents her with twenty pounds and promises more, if she needs it. The prioress prepares her irons and performs the operation, but Robin soon understands that he has been betrayed. He sees the

thin blood coming after the thick has stopped running. Little John asks:

'What cheere my master?' said Little John.
'In faith, John, litle goode;
. . . . . .

At this point the second gap in the MS occurs. In the missing stanzas Robin evidently meets Red Roger of Doncaster, the paramour of the prioress, who has probably had a hand in the plot. The story continues with Red Roger thrusting his sword through Robin's side, but the latter is still quite strong and cuts the traitor's head off. Little John asks leave to set fire to the nunnery, but Robin does not want to hurt any woman, even if she has betrayed him. Little John is enjoined to take him on his back and make *a full fayre grave, of gravell and of greete.* Robin's sword is to lie at his head, his bow at his side and his arrows at his feet.

It is a pity that the ballad is defective, because the meeting with the witch, for instance, is rather a curious point, which has no parallel in any of the other Robin Hood ballads. The situation after the second gap is not clear and the later version is of no avail here, because Red Roger and the witch are both missing in it. Little John is apprised of his master's plight by a faint blowing of the horn in the later ballad.

7. *Robin Hood Newly Revived.* This ballad is of a much later date and is only mentioned here, because it contains allusions to the Tale of Gamelyn. It treats again the story of Robin Hood meeting his match. In this case his antagonist turns out to be Young Gamwell, a cousin of his. The latter says:

For killing my father's steward,
I am forc'd to this Englishwood
And for to seek an uncle of mine
Some call him Robin Hood.

Robin greatly rejoices at this unexpected meeting and says to Little John:

> But he shall be a bold yeman of mine,
> *My chief man next to thee;*
> And I Robin and thou Little John
> And Scarlet he shall be.

Young Gamwell must be young Gamelyn of the Tale of Gamelyn. There are other similarities which point to the same conclusion, beside the coincidence of the names. Line 686 in Gamelyn:

He (the king of outlaws) made him master under him over hem alle

may be said to agree with the first two lines of the last quoted stanza. As Little John was already known to the author of the ballad as Robin Hood's chief man, Gamwell could only become Robin's second aide-de-camp. In the Tale of Gamelyn the hero and Adam Spencer fly to the woods, because they have killed the porter and broken the heads of several of the sheriff's men. In Robin Hood Newly Revived the reason for Young Gamwell's flight is the killing of his father's steward. There is a distinct agreement, but at the same time it is obvious that the ballad is not based on the Tale of Gamelyn, because then there would have been a closer adherence to the facts as given in the Tale. The author of the present 17th century ballad may have had access to an older tradition which treated of the relation between Gamelyn and Robin Hood, or he may have modelled his poem after the example of another 17th century ballad, viz. Robin Hood and Little John. This ballad describes how Little John became a member of Robin's outlaw-band. We also meet with the feature of the change of name, John Little being dubbed Little John. The evidence of the Tale of Gamelyn points to the fact that there must have been an old tradition about the relation

between Robin Hood and Gamelyn, of which no mention has been made in the ballads of the older Robin Hood cycle that have been handed down. It seems doubtful whether the present ballad is based on this tradition; we prefer the assumption that it was written as a parallel to the ballad of Robin Hood and Little John to account for the connection between Scarlok or Scarlet and the outlaws. That the story of Gamelyn was still known at the end of the 16th century is proved by the use Lodge and Shakespeare made of it for dramatic purposes. The belief that the outlaws lived under assumed names may be illustrated by the tendency in the 16th century and later to identify Robin Hood with some famous nobleman of the 14th century.

After this discussion of the contents of the older Robin Hood ballads and their internal relation, two questions remain to be decided: the origin and evolution of this cycle during the Middle Ages and the origin of Robin Hood as a person. As the former question is treated in the next chapter, we shall only concern ourselves with the second. The following are the theories that have been propounded on the subject:

1. Robin Hood is a mythical personage.
2. Robin Hood is a historical person.
3. Robin Hood is a fictitious character originating in the popular imagination.

Various German philologists have attempted to prove that Robin Hood is identical with Wodan. One of the chief exponents of this theory is Kuhn [19], who tried to trace the name of the ballad-hero to a sort of Kentish traditional masquerade during the winter-season, the principal feature being a hobby-horse, consisting of the wooden head of a horse nailed to a pole about four feet long. To this head a cover was attached, in which the

horseman concealed himself. This sport was called *hooding* or *hoodening*, which obviously means *covering*, as it does in old-fashioned English *hooding-cloth*, a curtain. Why this hobby-horse or its rider are to be identified with Robin Hood only on account of a slight and mistaken similarity in name, is as much a puzzle to us as it was to Child, who entirely refuted Kuhn's arguments in his preface to the Gest [20]. Moreover, it remains an open question whether this Kentish hobby-horse is really a relic of Wodan.

Thos. Wright has based his arguments for the mythical point of view on Robin Hood's connection with the May-games and on the fact that his name has been used for all kinds of trees, mounds and stones all over England [21]. But as we have already seen above, Robin Hood originally had no connection whatever with the May-games and his appearance together with Friar Tuck and Maid Marian in these festivals is of a later date. Of the geographical names containing the name Robin Hood, there is not one that is actually proved to be older than any of the older ballads about Robin Hood, so it is clear that these names were invented long after the period when the ballads originated.

The historical theory, which was for the first time expounded by Ritson [22], is also built on weak foundations. Ritson even affixed a life of Robin Hood to his edition of the ballads. He assembled his material for this biography from various historians from the 15th century onwards, without realising that these accounts had all been based upon ballads and been furnished with purely arbitrary dates (cf. Child) [23]. In this way Wyntoun in his chronicle of Scotland (about 1420) assigned the date 1283 to Robin, because he probably knew a ballad about Robin Hood and King Edward, whom he supposed to be Edward I. Bower takes Robin Hood to be one of the followers of Simon de Montfort, without giving any plausible reason. Major is somewhat

more careful in his utterances and places Robin Hood in the reign of Richard I, *circa haec tempora, ut auguror* [24]. The usual date assigned to Robin by the adherents of the historical theory, is the latter half of the 12th century. Grafton adds to these various pseudo-historical narratives the fact that Robin was of noble birth, a supposition that has entered in all subsequent accounts [25]. The most extensive of these older biographies occurs in the 16th century Sloane MS. We take the liberty of referring to Fricke [26], who has conclusively proved that the Sloane MS is entirely based upon the ballads and the older chronicles, thus having no value as an independent source. In Munday's tragedy, *The Downfall and the Deathe of Robert, Earle of Huntington, otherwise called Robin Hood* (1601), the author has gone still further, and from a man of noble birth, Robin has become Earl of Huntingdon [27].

The principal objection to the historical theory is that the earliest mention of Robin Hood in chronicles or other historical works dates of the beginning of the 15th century and that there is no trace of him in any of the histories contemporaneous with his supposed life-time, either during the reign of Richard I or under Edward I. So we may with fairly great certainty assume that all entries in the 15th century chronicles are based on ballads, some of which have been handed down and others which have presumably been lost. Moreover, we have attempted to show in the preceding pages that Robin Hood is not a political personage, but a traditional character, which has gradually been developed in the popular imagination from the time of the Conquest.

This brings us to the third theory, which is adhered to by Child, Kiessmann [28], Fricke and others. As Child puts it: *Robin Hood is absolutely a creation of the ballad muse.* From the discussion above it is evident that several standing features of the Robin Hood poetry were already popular in the 13th century.

They were even of such widespread interest that they were embodied in such literary works as the stories of Fulk Fitzwarin and Eustache the Monk. It is clear that the adventures of Robin Hood and his band are entirely traditional. The name may have belonged to a historical outlaw-figure, around whose name the traditional outlaw-matter was grouped. This outlaw must have lived in the 14th century, as the author of the Tale of Gamelyn does not mention the name yet, and because the notice about Robin Hood in Langland's Piers Ploughman cannot be earlier than 1377 [29]. On the other hand, the name may be entirely fictitious or the invention of some minstrel or gleeman, who may possibly have corrupted it from a name like Robin of the Wood or Robin of the Hood. The derivation of the name will always remain a hypothetical question, but Robin Hood's character as it is revealed to us in the ballads we may safely assume to have been developed by popular imagination and by tradition.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH OUTLAW-MATTER

Two outlaw-stories that have already been mentioned in connection with the Gest and that also offer an interesting comparison with the Robin Hood matter in other ways, are the tales of Fulk Fitzwarin[1] and Eustache the Monk[2], both of the beginning of the 13th century.

Fulk Fitzwarin was a nobleman of the reign of King John (1199—1216), who was outlawed by this tyrannical king for some futile reason. His adventures seem to have been recorded quite early in French and English verse, but only a paraphrase of the former version has been handed down in a MS of the end of the 13th century. The adventures of the baron and his band of loyal followers are partly of a romantic nature and partly of a popular character. Only the latter are of interest to us, as an illustration of the outlaw-stories, that circulated in the beginning of the 13th century. In Fulk's adventures as a forest-outlaw the following points are noteworthy:

1. Fulk never injured anyone but the king and his agents.
2. Fulk and his companions take refuge in an abbey. He goes out to meet his pursuers in the dress of an old monk and puts them on the wrong track.
3. Shortly afterwards Fulk is insulted by Sir Gyrard de Malfée

and ten knights; he strikes the knight with his monk's staff and with the aid of his companions he captures their horses and rides off on them.

4. He reverses his horse-shoes to mislead his pursuers.
5. One of Fulk's followers, John de Rampaigne, at various times puts on disguises to spy upon the enemy or to rescue companions. These adventures are mostly of a romantic nature.
6. Fulk in the disguise of a charcoal-burner, meets king John and three knights hunting in Windsor Forest. He pretends to lead them to a stag, but brings them to the spot, where his companions are lying in ambush. The king is released on the promise of pardoning Fulk and restoring his heritage, but the king breaks his promise.
7. The capture of Sir James of Normandy and the fooling of the king (cf. p. 63).

Sub 6 we have already met in a later form in the third fit of the Gest. Sub 7 is closely connected with the tradition underlying the ballad of Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne. The other features are not found in the Robin Hood ballads, but recur in the stories of Eustache the Monk and Hereward. This relation will be treated below.

That the Anglo-Norman prose-version of Fulk Fitzwarin was indebted to popular tradition of a similar character as the Robin Hood matter is shown by the fact that the story opens in very much the same manner as many of the older Robin Hood ballads:

> En le temps de Averyl e may, quant les prees e les herbes reverdissent, et chescune chose vivaunte recovre vertue, beaute e force, les mountz e les valeys retentissent des douce chauntz des oseylouns, e les cuers de chescune gent, pur la beaute du temps e la sesone, mountent en haut e s'enjolyvent.....

This similarity was already remarked upon by Child [3].

The first one to point out the existence of a body of English outlaw-tradition in Eustache the Monk was Jordan in his interesting article on the sources and composition of this story [4]. The story of Eustache the Monk, as it has been handed down in a French MS of the 13th century, contains a network of fiction woven around a historical figure, just as in the case of Hereward and Fulk Fitzwarin. This rather fantastical conglomeration of tales may be divided into three parts:

1. tales of magic, describing Eustache's study at Toledo.
2. adventures on land, describing Eustache's struggle against the Count of Boulogne and his life as a forest-outlaw.
3. his adventures as a pirate.

Jordan has quite conclusively proved that sub 3 contains the historical foundation of the story and that part 1 and 2 have been added later. We shall confine ourselves to 2, as it is the only part that is of importance in connection with the present discussion. By comparing the second part of Eustache with a typical French *compilation-novel* of the same period, the Trubert-story, Jordan has arrived at the conclusion that this part of Eustache is not of French origin, as the erotic element, which plays such an important part in the Trubert-tale, is entirely lacking in Eustache. As Eustache figured as a historical personage at the court of King John and as the reliable historical data about him are all found in English chronicles and statepapers, it is only natural to look to England for the source of the second part of the present story. It will be seen that Eustache's adventures have a great similarity to the forest-outlaw tradition current in England in the 13th century.

A further circumstance, which adds probability to this theory, is a political incongruity, which occurs in one of Eustache's adventures in the forests of Boulogne and which seems to be a relic from the English original. Eustache has at one time been

captured by his enemy, the count, but instead of passing judgment himself, the latter sends Eustache to the king at Paris to be tried and, of course, the outlaw escapes during the transport. It is difficult to understand why Eustache should be sent to the king, as the count in feudal France certainly had the power to pass judgment on him. Jordan's theory that this is a remnant of the English original, in which the sheriff was much more subordinate to the royal power than the count would have been, seems to us a plausible solution (cf. Robin Hood and the Monk and the sixth fit of the Gest). Jordan concludes from these facts that Eustache the Monk must have originated as an Anglo-Norman work, just like Fulk Fitzwarin, and that the present MS is only a later French version of the same. Jordan has made the following list of features in the second section of Eustache and compared them with corresponding ones in Fulk Fitzwarin and the Robin Hood ballads.

1. *Generosity as a robber*

   Eustache meets a merchant, but does not rob him of his possessions, because he has made a correct declaration of his money. Afterwards an abbot is captured, but he lies and is only allowed to keep as much as he has declared, the rest is confiscated.

   Robin Hood does exactly the same to the knight and the monk in the first and fourth fit of the Gest respectively.

The fact that in Eustache the two stories have no connection whatever with each other, proves that Fricke's hypothesis about the derivation of the knight's story from that of the monk is wrong. Clawson correctly asserts that, as the two stories are entirely separated in the older work, they must also have been derived from two separate ballads in the Gest and that it is the compiler who is responsible for the connection between the two (cf. p. 50).

2. *Generosity towards the arch-enemy*

Eustache beguiles the count of Boulogne into entering the wood and at another time he captures Hainfroy, his personal enemy. Both of them are released after the meal.

We have pointed above to similar stories in the third fit of the Gest and in the ballads of Robin Hood and the Potter, and Robin Hood and the Butcher as well as the adventure of Fulk in the disguise of a charcoal-burner. Jordan asserts that Eustache again represents the older form of the story, because the enemies are released according to the tradition that people who have been entertained at a meal are not to be injured, a remnant of the old Germanic inviolability of guests. Fulk and the Gest of Robin Hood both add the promise-feature to account for the release. A similar tradition occurs in the Hereward-story, in which Turold is captured and released after paying an enormous ransom and after promising to do no harm to Hereward and his band. The feature of the meal is absent. A curious point about the tradition which contains the promise-feature, is that the promise is always broken. This points to the conclusion that a revenge-theme is probably closely connected with this release-and-promise feature.

3. *The hero as revenger*

Eustache kills two of the enemy for every person that is killed on his side. This feature is found in none of the other traditions.

4. *Reversed horse-shoes and horse-stealing*

Both features occur in Eustache and Fulk and are also of frequent occurrence in the story of Hereward. They do not occur in the Robin Hood matter.

5. *Capture and rescue*

Eustache: cf. the adventure mentioned on page 78, where he escapes during the transport to Paris.
Compare the ballad of Robin and the Monk.

In the case of the ballad of Robin Hood and the Monk Jordan has based his conclusions upon Fricke's hypothesis, which we have already shown to be improbable (cf. p. 60). Just like Fricke, he supposes a mixture of two ballads: 1. church-going, capture and rescue; 2. capture and rescue. The contents of older traditions prove, however, that the various features of the ballad belong to one theme.

6. *Punishment of a treacherous priest*

Eustache punishes a priest who has betrayed him.

Jordan, accepting Fricke's hypothesis, sub 5, supposes that Robin Hood killed the priest in the original of Robin Hood and the Monk. We object to this theory on the same grounds as we object to Fricke's hypothesis. Moreover, the coincidence would be too slight to be of much importance.

7. *Disguise*

This theme has been so generally used in all periods of literature, that one has to be very careful in using it to prove a connection between different works. It occurs repeatedly in all three of the traditions under discussion. The similarity of the person in disguise to the real person is stressed in Eustache several times. It also occurs in Hereward's spying in King William's camp. Another similarity may be found in the cases where the hero assumes the disguise of a merchant (Eustache: potter; Robin Hood: potter and butcher) and proves to be a bad one (Eustache breaks his pots, Robin sells his stock too cheap).

These two Anglo-Norman tales complete our survey of the growth of English outlaw-tradition from the time of the Norman Conquest to the middle of the 14th century. As early as the 12th century the exploits of outlaws were celebrated in popular songs, as may be inferred from the following quotation from the Gesta Herwardi:

.... mulieres ac puellae de eo (i.e. Hereward) in choris canebant.

That the popularity of the subject was not confined to the common people during the Middle Ages, is further attested by the use of the traditional outlaw-matter in more literary works like the tales of Fulk Fitzwarin and Eustache the Monk.

We are now in a position to trace the development of the English outlaw-tradition. In the Hereward-story we have found the following leading features:

1. The outlaw lives in the forest with a band of followers (cf. the second part of Hereward's English adventures, after the siege of Ely).
2. The outwitting of the opponents.
3. The disguise as a potter and a fisherman.
4. Horse-stealing and the reversal of horse-shoes.
5. Capture and rescue during a transport (cf. Hereward's escape, when he is transferred from Sir Robert de Horepol's castle to that of Ivo Taillebois).
6. The impulse to show off one's strength. This element returns in the Robin Hood ballads in the shape of the various single combats, which gradually led to the development of the story of Robin Hood meeting his match. Even in Hereward we have an early example of this development, in his fight with Lethold the Saxon.

These elements, which were possibly based upon historical

facts originally, became standing features in the later traditions. Beside this traditional colouring, the story of the last of the Saxons has a distinctly historical and political background. This is also the case with the stories of Fulk and Eustache, who are closely connected with the history of the reign of King John. In these tales the features mentioned in connection with Hereward recur. Stress is laid on the disguise-element, a theme which is employed with numerous variations in the story of Eustache the Monk. The following features are added:

1. Hatred of the clergy, a typical medieval trait, due to political and social conditions.
2. Generosity towards the arch-enemy.
3. Generosity towards other victims, who make a correct declaration of their money.

Turning from these stories with a more or less historical basis to the Tale of Gamelyn and the Robin Hood ballads, we find that the background has essentially changed. This change may be accounted for as follows. As the contrast between Saxon and Norman gradually disappeared during the 12th century, the character of the traditional forest-outlaw also changed and he became identified with various *deer-stealers*. The severity of the forest-laws, as they were enacted from the time of the Conquest to the middle of the 13th century, was a source of continual complaint among the people. The Assize of the Forest of 1184 provided that the old Norman forest-laws were to be re-enacted and that punishment for forest-offences should be inflicted strictly upon the body of the culprit and no longer take the form of fines [5]. Large areas that had formerly been a common hunting-ground for nobleman and peasant alike, became part of the king's forest in Norman times, and anyone who dared to shoot deer, was regarded as a criminal by the king's officers. It is plain that these *deer-*

stealers were regarded as men defending their natural rights and were sympathized with by the common people. They became popular figures and took the place of the old Saxon outlaws.

Fortunately we have some examples among the ballads of how these kind of *deer-stealing* stories gradually developed. We meet with an early form in the ballads of Johnie Cock and of Robyn and Gandeleyn. These last names have no connection whatever with Robin Hood or Gamelyn. The heroes are really nothing more than individual poachers struggling against the foresters. They have nothing in common with the outlaws, they do not live in the forest, but leave their homes occasionally to shoot deer in the forest. In the above cited ballad of Adam Bell, Clim of the Clough and William of Cloudesley we find a later stage; the three men live in the forest, are regarded as outlaws, but the fundamental idea of the chief-outlaw and his seven score of followers is not yet in evidence. Though none of these ballads occur in MSS earlier than the 15th century, the traditions embodied in them must have been popular in an oral form at least two centuries before their committal to writing. The earliest mention of the outlaw-leader and his seven score of companions is in the Tale of Gamelyn. The chief is not yet called Robin Hood, but king of outlaws, and we look in vain for his principal companions, Little John, Much and Scarlock. In the latter part of the Tale of Gamelyn we see then the merging of the popular deer-stealing stories into the outlaw-tradition of the Conquest. For the notion of the outlaw-chief and his seven score of followers is evidently a continuation of the tradition, which is also found in the stories of Hereward and Fulk Fitzwarin, and which we shall meet again in some of the Scandinavian examples of outlaw-tradition. The three ballads mentioned, all originated in northern England. The scene of Johnie Cock is laid in Northumberland and in some versions in Dumfriesshire

in Scotland. Robyn and Gandeleyn is also of Scottish origin, whereas the ballad of Adam Bell plays in Inglewood or Englishwood, which is also mentioned as one of Robin's haunts in Wyntoun's Chronicle of Scotland. So there is a good reason for supposing that the area of these ballads gradually extended further south, from the Scottish border to Barnesdale and lastly to the famous Sherwood. These regions probably had their separate cycles of ballads, which merged into one great cycle of Robin Hood, as we have already seen in the case of Barnesdale and Sherwood.

In the Robin Hood ballads then the development of the outlaw-matter in England has reached its final and most elaborate stage. Most of the traditional features enumerated in connection with earlier outlaw-matter appear again in the Robin Hood poetry in a similar form. The only elements that have disappeared are those connected with horses, viz. horse-stealing and reversal of horse-shoes. Probably on account of the fact that horses were of no practical use to the merry archers of the forest. The three principal features of the Robin Hood ballads: the disguise-theme, the outwitting of the opponent and the hero meeting his match, all rest upon the older outlaw-tradition, which we have found in our various examples of medieval English outlaw-stories. The theme of the hero meeting his match was gradually developed out of the love of combat and the parading of bodily strength, which occurs repeatedly in the Hereward-story, and which, as a matter of fact, is a typical Germanic trait. These three themes comprise the essential elements of the make-up of the outlaw-hero, — bodily strength, cunning and courage. We shall meet this combination of strength and cunning again in the following chapters, when speaking of the Scandinavian outlaws.

CHAPTER V

THE ICELANDIC OUTLAW-SAGAS

It may be useful to say a few words about the origin and general features of the Icelandic family-sagas, before giving an exposition of the three outlaw-sagas to be discussed [1].

One of the major causes of the settlement of Iceland was the unification of Norway during the reign of Harald Fairhair in the latter half of the 9th century. Many Norwegian land-owners were dissatisfied with the stern rule of Harald and emigrated with their families and followers, either to Iceland or to the *Western Isles*, i.e. the Shetlands and the Orkneys, which were already partly colonized by Scandinavians. The colonization of Iceland took place between about 870 and 930. With great difficulty the settlers managed to eke out a meagre existence from the hitherto uncultivated soil. Some Irish monks seem to have lived on the island before the settlement of the Norwegians, but what happened to them on the arrival of their heathen successors, is uncertain. We adopt Liestøl's division of the period of the independence of Iceland [2]. After the settlement-period (870—930) follows the saga-time (930—1030), i.e. the time in which the events described in the family-sagas took place. The third period comprises the time of peace (1030—1130) and is succeeded by the writing-time (1130—1230), when the oral sagas were committed to parchment. In 1262 the Free State of Iceland became a part of the kingdom of Norway after a period of

internal dissensions, the stormy Sturlunga-time. It is clear from the above dates — which are only approximate — that several centuries passed between the actual occurrence of the facts described in the Icelandic family-sagas and the date of their committal to writing. During this interval the family-traditions were transmitted orally. In spite of the long period of oral transmission the sagas are remarkably accurate and correct. This is due to the fact that the independent land-owners were exceedingly proud of their traditions, so that the reciters did not get much chance of changing the facts or the characters of the chief personages, without being corrected by someone of the audience. The style of the sagas is simple and direct, without any outward ornamentation, in contrast with the strophes that occur in some of the sagas and which are often extremely involved. The use of dialogue as a means of portraying character is already highly developed and the conversations between the principal characters are often of great dramatic intensity and of importance for the development of the plot. Other features of this prose literature are epic objectivity, interest in the events of everyday-life and great psychological insight. The subject-matter that was accounted fit for a saga was limited and usually the plot evolves around feuds, arising from the clash of divergent characters and interests, and ending in the extinction of the principal characters. The tragic note is seldom absent and we may safely say that these *tragical biographies* are unsurpassed in medieval literature as works of art.

We must look for the causes of this admirable growth of literature in the quality of the settlers, the environment from which they were recruited and the environment surrounding them in Iceland. As we have noticed, a large proportion of the settlers were dissatisfied land-owners of the upper classes, too proud to bow their heads under the yoke of the overbearing Harald Fairhair. Their individualism was heightened by their

position of independent masters of Iceland, only loosely held together by the authority of the Thing. A large body of them came from regions, in which story-telling reached a considerable height in later times, so that the germ for this kind of oral, traditional literature was already present, when they left Norway. So, conditions being extremely favourable for the fostering of traditional family-matter, the family-sagas could attain a very high degree of perfection.

We shall now proceed to give an exposition of the three great outlaw-sagas: the Gísli-saga [3], the Hǫrðr-saga [4] and the Grettir-saga [5]. The events described in the first two sagas took place in the first half of the *saga-time*, whereas the Grettir-saga treats of the latter part of this period. Of the MSS of these sagas that have come down to us, that of the Gísli-saga is the oldest and is probably of about 1200. This saga is a masterpiece of its kind and much more concise than other sagas that have been handed down in later versions and which often contain later additions and interpolations from other oral or written sources. After a few introductory chapters about Gísli's ancestors and his youth in Norway, we enter upon his life in Iceland. The chief personages in the tragedy that is unfolded before our eyes, are introduced without the usual addition of numerous persons that take no actual part in the plot. There are, of course, various minor characters, but they are all of some importance. There are two distinct groups of personages, which centre around the two brothers, Gísli and Þorkell. On Gísli's side we have his friend and brother-in-law, Vésteinn, and his wife, Auðr, Véstein's sister. The other group is represented by Þorkell and his friend and brother-in-law, Þorgrímr, and Þórdís, the sister of Gísli and Þorkell and the wife of Þorgrímr. The two brothers possess very different characters: Gísli is a man of great strength of character, the honour of his family is of the utmost importance to him; he is a skilled artisan and a skald of

great gifts. He is brave and dauntless, when the occasion demands it, but he does not abuse his strength. He is loved and honoured by all that come into close contact with him. His wife is a wise and loyal woman, who stands by her husband in the hour of greatest need. The relation between Gísli and Auðr is one of the finest things in the story. Þorkel's loyalty is of another kind and he does not aid Gísli any more than is strictly necessary during the latter's outlaw-period. He is loyal to his family for the sake of decency and no more. He is, moreover, vindictive, unreliable and suspicious. A certain animosity exists between Þorkell and Vésteinn, because the latter is supposed to have had a relation with Þorkell's wife, Ásgerðr, before her marriage. This animosity turns into hatred when Þorkell overhears a conversation between Auðr and Ásgerðr on the subject, which seems to justify his suspicion. Þorkell leaves the farm on which he had been living with Gísli and takes up his abode with Þorgrímr. Notwithstanding Gísli's warning, Vésteinn comes to Gísli's farm and is murdered at night by Þorgrímr. Gísli draws the spear out of the body, which means that he must avenge Vésteinn. Gísli murders Þorgrímr, and Þorkell, who knows that Gísli is the murderer, does not betray his brother. Gísli does so himself, however, in a strophe, which he recites at the funeral-games. His sister Þórdís overhears it and tells Bǫrkr, Þorgrím's brother, whom she marries later on. Bǫrkr brings the matter up before the Thing and Gísli is declared an outlaw. Gísli is warned by Þorkell and takes up his abode in various places. Only the last seven years of his outlaw-life are described, because information is lacking to the saga-man about the first six. The outlaw is pursued by Eyjólfr enn grái and his helpers, who are paid by Bǫrkr. But Gísli manages to get away every time, although he often escapes only just in time. Once he is almost caught, when staying with a friend, whom he helps fishing and repairing boats; he passes himself off

as an idiot and escapes into the woods. He is closely beset, but has just time to take refuge in a house, where he is hidden under the straw of a bed, in which the lady of the house is lying. She uses such abusive language towards the pursuers, that they dare not investigate the room too closely. From time to time Gísli stays with his wife for a while and his pursuers being apprised of the fact, try to bribe Auðr into betraying her husband's hiding-place. The episode ends with Auðr throwing the bag of money into Eyjólf's face. Gísli is haunted by dreams, in which a good and a bad *dream-woman* figure. The good one shows him seven fires, which represent the years he has to live yet, and the beautiful dwelling-place, where he is going to live with her after his death. The bad dream-woman appears in bloody dreams and her appearance becomes more and more frequent as the end draws near. In the meanwhile Þorkell has been killed at the Thing by the sons of Vésteinn. They escape and are hidden by Auðr, because she is afraid of her husband's anger, when he hears of his brother's death. The bad dreams become more numerous and Gísli is afraid of being alone in the dark. When winter approaches, Gísli prepares to go to his winter-hiding-place with his wife and their fosterchild. Their cloaks leave a broad track on the dewy ground thus betraying their hiding-place to Eyjólfr and his men. Gísli knows that his time is up and that it is going to be his last fight. Together with the two women Gísli keeps the men at bay for a long time, fighting on the top of a rock, but at last he is so covered with wounds that he has to give up the unequal struggle. He hurls himself from the rock on one of his opponents and both die at the same moment. When Eyjólfr enn grái comes to Bǫrkr with the story of Gísli's death, Þórdís attempts to kill Eyjólfr during the meal, but she only wounds him in the leg. Þórdís leaves Bǫrkr, whereas Auðr goes to Norway and takes the veil. One of the sons of Vésteinn is killed in Norway by Ari, a

brother of Gísli and Þorkell, who did not emigrate to Iceland.

These are in short the contents of the Gísli-saga. It is generally recognized as one of the finest of the family-sagas from the modern point of view. It is concise in form and well-constructed and it lacks the abundance of minor personages pleasing to the realistic and historical sense of the Icelanders, but slightly bewildering to the modern mind. The interest is continually focussed on the development of the plot, which arises out of the divergence of the characters of the two groups. The centre of the scene is held by the noble figure of Gísli, who courageously meets the fate that is allotted to him. He knows that he cannot escape his destiny and wisely tries to make the best of his life. He is quite different in character from that other famous Icelandic outlaw, the overbearing and unbalanced Grettir. Circumstances are against the noble-minded poet, who might have been one of the leading chieftains of his district, if outward conditions had been more favourable. As the artistic merits and structure of the saga really lie outside the scope of the present discussion, we take the liberty of referring to M. Olsen's article on this aspect of the subject [6]. The strophes which occur in the saga are very old and were probably composed by the hero himself [7].

The Hǫrðr-saga in its present form is slightly longer than the Gísli-saga, but a fragment of another version has been handed down, which must have been appreciably shorter. Hǫrð's grandfather was the first of the family to settle in Iceland, on the south coast. His son Grímkell marries for the second time with Signý, the daughter of Valbrandr and the sister of Torfi. The latter has not been consulted by his father with regard to the marriage and does not approve of it. The marriage is not a happy one and it is only the presence of Grímr, Signý's foster-child, that keeps husband and wife together. Grímr does not like the situation and wants to set up for himself. At length Grímkell

lets him go and aids him in his marriage. Grímr soon attains prosperity. Signý has a dream about an enormous tree that grows in her husband's bed, but which produces but few flowers. The explanation given is that she will give birth to a boy, who will become a great and famous personage, but who will get little love or aid from his friends. The child is born and is beautiful and strong, but his mother does not love him and curses him, when he stumbles against her knees and breaks a necklace lying on her lap. Grímkell hearing her curse the boy, takes him away to be brought up at Grím's, who has a son called Geirr, a year older than Hǫrðr. The two boys grow up together and are great friends; both are strong, but Hǫrðr always surpasses his friend. Shortly afterwards Signý has a second dream of similar import as the first, but this time the tree has many flowers. Now it is a daughter she will give birth to and the flowers are a sign of a new and better faith, which her daughter's offspring will embrace. Signý goes for a short time to her brother Torfi and dies at his farm after bearing a daughter. Torfi is terribly angry about the course of things and orders the child to be killed. His plans miscarry, however, and after many hardships the child is taken up by Grímr and called Þorbjǫrg. She grows up with her brother and Geirr. Grímkell sues Torfi for damages at the Thing on account of his plotting against his daughter's life and to recover Signý's dowry. It is decided that Torfi shall pay a certain sum with interest to Hǫrðr after six years. Both men are dissatisfied with the decision, but nothing happens for the time being. Illugi marries Þúríðr, Grímkel's daughter of his first marriage. Illugi wants to be friends with Hǫrðr, but the latter does not trust him. Hǫrðr and Geirr go to Norway with merchants and Geirr gets into trouble with servants of the king's mother. They have to leave Norway and go to Gautland, where they are hospitably received by the jarl. A number of viking-adventures have been interpolated at

this point. Hǫrðr desecrates the gravemound of Sóti and rifles the treasure. He keeps a ring, a sword and a helmet. On a viking-trip they save Sigurðr Torfafóstri from the hands of other vikings and he becomes their loyal companion. Geirr is the first to return to Iceland. Hǫrðr comes back a few years later with his wife, Helga, the daughter of the Gautland-jarl, and Sigurðr. His sister, Þorbjǫrg, has married Indriði in the mean time and his father has died, after having cursed one of the old deities and burned her temple. Torfi is not inclined to give Hǫrðr the money that he owes him, according to the decision of the Thing, but he gives him land and cattle. After a few years Hǫrðr gets into trouble with his neighbour, a follower of Torfi's, about horses. Hǫrð's servant kills the neighbour's son and Hǫrðr, who wants to offer satisfaction, gets into a fit of anger, when he hears that his neighbour has put the matter into the hands of Torfi. He kills the man and burns his house. Hǫrðr is declared an outlaw and his friends and family make no attempt to prevent it. After staying with Geirr for a time, he goes to the island of Hólmr and establishes a kind of outlaw-community there. The outlaws plunder the coast opposite and carry off the cattle and sheep of the farmers. After a time Hǫrðr gets tired of this life of petty stealing and wants to capture some merchant-ships, that lie in a fjord close by. Before doing this they decide to burn some of their chief enemies in their houses. This plan is carried out at the instigation of Geirr, but against the advice of Hǫrðr, who presages trouble, if they start committing such outrages. Indriði is to be the first victim. Þorbjǫrg has had forebodings of what is going to happen in the form of a dream and she takes care that there shall be enough water in the house to extinguish the fire. When the outlaws arrive at the farm, Indriði is not at home and Þorbjǫrg receives her brother courteously. Hǫrðr proposes to her to leave Indriði and go with him to the island, but she declines. The house is set on fire, but on account of the water-

supply no harm is done and Þorbjǫrg manages to protect the farm till Indriði and his men come to the rescue. The farmers, thoroughly enraged, decide that the only way to get rid of the outlaw-nest is by stratagem. One of them, named Kárr, is willing to risk his life. Sóti's ring is promised to him, if he gets through safely and the outlaws are all killed. He takes the boat that is generally used as a kind of ferry by the outlaws and arrives safely on the island. He pretends to be an outlaw and swears the prescribed oaths. He says that he has heard that the farmers offer the outlaws a free retreat, if they will only leave the district. Hǫrðr does not trust the fellow, but Geirr and the rest of the company do and decide to leave the island. Two boat-loads are ferried across by Kárr and slaughtered by the farmers lying in ambush along the coast. Kárr returns a third time to persuade Hǫrðr to come with him, but Hǫrðr has no intention of leaving and it is only when Kárr calls him a coward, that Hǫrðr is persuaded to leave the island. His wife and children stay on the island. Close to the coast Hǫrðr perceives the treason, when he sees Geir's body floating on the sea, but it is too late. The odds are too great and after a heroic fight he is killed by someone with an axe on a large pole, because nobody dares to come close to him. Helga, Hǫrð's wife, swims across the bay at night with her two young children and takes refuge with her sister-in-law, Þorbjǫrg. The latter is planning revenge on the men who killed her brother. An attempt to kill her husband, Indriði, is foiled, but she is satisfied, when Indriði promises to receive Hǫrð's wife and children into his house and to murder the man who killed Hǫrðr. Many people are to lose their lives before the revenge for Hǫrðr is completed. Helga eventually goes back to her native country, Gautland, with her younger son, the other one having been killed. Bjǫrn, the younger son, returns to Iceland and takes up the work of revenge. Twenty-four persons, all told, lose their lives in the struggle to avenge

Hǫrðr and no damages are asked for any of them. According to Styrmir, the priest, Hǫrð's fame is due to his wisdom, his skill in fighting, and to the fact that he married the daughter of a foreign jarl and that so many people were killed in his revenge, without damages being required.

The general opinion is that the Hǫrðr-sage in its present form belongs to the romantic sagas, i.e. the sagas that were only imitations of the classical sagas and that were no longer based directly on oral tradition, but on written sources. The fragment (the *Brot*) is considered to represent an older version of the saga. Finnur Jónsson even asserts that the complete form — the present Hǫrðr-sage — is based on the version of which only the *Brot* has been handed down [8]. This view is contested by Miss V. Lachmann in her admirable dissertation: Das Alter der Harðar Saga [9]. According to our opinion Miss Lachmann has conclusively proved that the *Brot* and the saga represent two different versions, and that, in fact, the saga is the older of the two. The *Brot* is only a more prosaic and less artistic form of the story. The arguments for her second conclusion, that the *Brot* is an excerpt-form of the story, are not convincing. The chief argument in favour of the assertion that the Hǫrðr-saga belongs to the romantic sagas, is the presence of viking-themes, which are evidently borrowed from the *fornaldar-sǫgur*. The question to be decided in this respect may be formulated as follows: Are these viking-features interpolations of a scribe or did they belong to the oral tradition?

The chief theme on which the saga is built up is Torfi's objection against Signý's marriage with Grímkell and the resulting animosity between the two families. A repetition of this theme is furnished in the relation between Hǫrðr and Illugi, the husband of Hǫrð's half-sister Þúríðr. The plot gradually develops from a quarrel between Grímkell and Torfi into the tragic conclusion of Hǫrð's outlawry and death, in both of which Torfi plays an

important part. Beside this fateful thread, which runs through the whole saga, there is a second intrigue which originates in the viking-portion of the story, i.e. the curse which Sóti utters at the desecration of his grave-mound and which is especially connected with the ring, which Hǫrðr steals from the mound. This theme is not restricted to the viking-part of the saga, but continues running parallel to the feud-theme in the rest of the saga. The introduction of the curse-theme is, however, superfluous for the development of the main plot. The fact that the curse-theme is not restricted to the viking-interpolation, but is already firmly embedded in the latter part of the saga, points to the conclusion that the viking-interpolation is probably not the work of a writer, but existed already in a late oral version. The sagaman of this interpolated form of the saga had evidently lost touch with the old heathen times and does not know the meaning of the old religion. This is proved by the fact that Þorgerðr Hǫrgabrúðr, one of the old deities, is called the sister of Sóti! As the *fornaldar-sǫgur* must also have been recited orally, like the family-sagas, it is very probable that the interpolation was added to the saga as early as the oral transmission-period. That the viking-episodes are indeed interpolations and do not belong to the saga in its oldest form is proved by the stock-themes from the *fornaldar-sǫgur* that are embodied in this part of the saga, viz. the desecration of the grave-mound, the viking-battle, and the appearance of óðinn, who advises Hǫrðr as to the way to open the mound. So, outwardly the saga seems to form a connected whole, but on closer inspection it is clear that some seemingly integral features, such as the curse of Sóti, do not belong to the original saga.

Miss Lachmann has proved by a conscientious comparison of the Hǫrðr-saga with the other family-sagas that the facts and incidents recorded in this saga have their counterparts in the other sagas. The style and conception of the saga-teller,

moreover, tend to the conclusion that the body of the saga — excluding the viking-part — belongs to the classical and not to the later romantic sagas. The conclusions which may be drawn from this investigation are: 1. the saga must have existed without the interpolation during an early period of the oral transmission-time; 2. the viking-episodes are not a late interpolation of a scribe, but were inserted in the oral transmission-time; 3. the Hǫrðr-saga does not belong to the romantic sagas; 4. the *Brot* is not necessarily older than the Hǫrðr-saga, but represents a different and in many points inferior version.

Grettir is the most famous of all Icelandic outlaws; he was an outlaw for nineteen years, whereas Gísli and Hǫrðr were killed after respectively seven and three years. Nobody ever got the better of Grettir, while he was in sound health. Of course his figure of legendary strength stimulated the imagination of his countrymen tremendously and the tales about his adventures are numerous. It is a matter of small wonder then that the story of his life is the longest of the three sagas under discussion. The saga is much more episodic than the other two and it contains at least one lengthy interpolation, the Spés-story at the end of the saga, the contents of which are of a very romantic nature. The introduction of the Grettir-saga is quite a lengthy affair treating of the exploits of Grettir's viking-ancestors in Norway and the settlement of his great-grandfather in Iceland. The fact that Grettir lived at the end of the saga-time entails a large number of genealogical and other details about Grettir's ancestors in Iceland. Grettir's father, Ásmundr, goes to sea in his youth, marries in Norway and has a son, Þorsteinn drómundr, who is destined to avenge Grettir later on. Ásmundr goes back to Iceland and settles down on a farm. He marries for a second time and has three children, Atli, Grettir and Þórdís. The characters of the two brothers, Atli and Grettir, are very divergent, the former is always at work on the farm and is loved by everyone,

the latter is a lazy good-for-nothing, who is always getting into trouble. Grettir kills his first man at the age of fourteen and is outlawed for three years. He goes to Norway and has all kinds of adventures. He rifles the grave-mound of Kárr, he defends the farm of his host against twelve berserkers, when the latter is on a journey, and by stratagem he kills ten of them. On another occasion he is the guest of a certain Þorkell, and he quarrels with a great boaster, named Bjǫrn. Bjǫrn is chosen to kill a bear that is doing damage to the property of Þorkell, but he gets scared and Grettir is the one who kills the animal. Grettir gains great fame by these different exploits. At last Grettir gets fed up with Bjǫrn's boastful pestering and kills him. Bjǫrn's two brothers try to murder Grettir, but are both killed by the outlaw. Grettir is eventually forced to leave the country. He returns to Iceland and takes up his former habits again. He gets into all kinds of scrapes and makes himself a great number of enemies. An interlude follows in the shape of the Glámr-episode, which contains different allusions to fairy-tales and other supernatural stories. A farmer is troubled by a ghost, who breaks the bones of his cattle and annoys him in other ways. He is always short of servants on account of this. But one winter, when the apparitions are very troublesome indeed, he comes into contact with a certain Glámr, who promises to become his servant. This Glámr turns out to be a very uncouth fellow, who is disliked and feared by the rest of the household for his ungodly ways. When Yule-time comes, he goes out to look after the cattle and does not return. They find him afterwards as a black and swollen body. He has to be buried on the spot as his body is too heavy to be transported. The original ghost is now replaced by Glámr, whose apparitions are worse than the former ones. At last nobody dares to pass the haunted valley. Another servant is mauled by the spectre and the farmer's daughter falls ill and dies. The farmer is at the end of his wits, but now Grettir comes

to the rescue. He engages in a terrible struggle with the spectre and manages to overcome the gigantic being. The moonlight falls on its eyes and Grettir gets such a scare from this sight, that he is for ever afraid in the dark. The being prophesies that misfortune will pursue him from this very moment. The exploit adds to Grettir's growing fame. Like many of his compatriots, Grettir leaves for Norway at the accession of King Óláfr (1015). One of his enemies wants to go in the same ship, but is killed by Grettir, before the vessel leaves. The first misfortune that befalls Grettir is the burning of the sons of Þórir í Garði in a guest-house on the coast. Grettir is sent from the ship to fetch fire, but when he enters the house, the inmates take him for a troll and attack him. Grettir gets safely out of the house, but the rest are burned. The general opinion is that he burned the house on purpose and on his arrival in Norway Grettir wants to submit to the fire-ordeal to prove his innocence. King Óláfr grants the request, but on the way to church Grettir is insulted by a youth and commits manslaughter. He is not allowed to pass the ordeal and is ordered to leave Norway the next summer. During Grettir's absence the old Ásmundr has died and Atli inherits the farm. Þorbjǫrn øxnamegin is jealous of Atli's influence in the district and insidiously kills him. Þórir í Garði uses all the influence at his command in the Thing-meeting and Grettir is declared an outlaw for the burning of Þórir's sons, without being heard in the meeting. Unmoved Grettir listens to these bad tidings, when he returns to Iceland. This is the beginning of his outlaw-career, which is to last for 16 years and which will take him across the greater part of his native country. His first deed is the revenge for the death of his brother Atli; he kills Þorbjǫrn in the fields. He stays for short periods at the farms of friends, but gets into trouble everywhere on account of robbing the farmers in the district of their cattle. Once he is even captured by the farmers, who surprise him

in his sleep. He is released, however, by the wife of the chief of the district. For a long time he has his abode on the Arnarvatnsheiðr, a famous hiding-place of outlaws. Attempts are twice made by outlaws, who have been bribed by Þórir í Garði to kill Grettir, but he is not to be caught off his guard and both times the conspirators are killed. Grettir cannot stand the lonely life of the Arnarvatnsheiðr for long and he goes to his friend Bjǫrn hítdoelakappi, who shows him an almost impregnable hiding-place in a cave above the river Hvítá. He stays there for three winters in comparative quiet, but again he provokes the farmers by stealing their cattle and after a tremendous fight, he is forced to leave the district. The next year he passes in the mythical Þórisdale, which belongs to the giant Þórir and his daughter, but the quiet life soon bores Grettir and he goes to the Reykjaheiðr. At this point another ghost-story is put in, the Bárðardale-episode. Grettir arrives at the haunted farm and assumes the name of Gestr. When the farmer's widow and her daughter go to church at Yuletide, Grettir stays at the farm and fights with the giantess at midnight. She wants to hurl him down a precipice near a waterfall and Grettir has to exert all his strength to prevent it. After a hard struggle the giantess herself topples over the brink. According to another version the giantess turns to stone at dawn and is still to be seen standing on the bank of the river. After having restored his strength Grettir dives beneath the waterfall and after killing the other giant that lives there, he brings back a bag full of bones. These are the bones of all the people that have been killed by the two giants.

After this exploit Grettir is advised to go to the island of Drangey on the north coast. He goes for a last visit to his mother and tells her of his decision to go to Drangey. His younger brother Illugi goes with him to keep him company in his solitude. The parting of Âsdís and her sons is a touching moment in the

saga, because they feel that they will never see each other again. On the way to the island they are joined by a funny old man, called Glaumr, who eventually stays with them on the island. The cliffs of Drangey can only be ascended on one side by means of rope-ladders. The island is used by the farmers of the district as a pasture-ground for their sheep. The three men subsist on the flesh of the sheep. The farmers are very much perturbed, because they cannot protect their interests. At length they sell their shares in the pasture to the two principal farmers, Þorbjǫrn and Hjalti, on condition that they shall expel the outlaws from the island. Several attempts are made, but in vain and Þorbjǫrn's position is far from pleasant, as he is ridiculed by the whole district. He intends to make one last attempt and accepts the services of a witch. When Grettir sees the hag in Þorbjǫrn's boat, he feels that the end is drawing near. He throws a stone at the witch and breaks her hipbone. After recovering from the wound, she throws a big root into the sea with a curse carved on it in runes. The root is thrown ashore by the waves, but Grettir recognizes the danger and throws it back. This happens twice, but a third time it is brought up from the shore by Glaumr at night to keep the fire going. Grettir wants to cut it to pieces with an axe and wounds himself in the leg. The outlaw understands that it must have been the cursed root and that the seemingly insignificant wound will cause a lot of trouble. The cut festers and Grettir's condition becomes worse and worse. The witch goes to Þorbjǫrn and advises him to go to the island. Þorbjǫrn collects a few men and on arriving at the island, he sees that the rope-ladders have not been pulled up. They climb up the ladders and find Glaumr asleep at the top. He is awakened by the men and tells them that Grettir is very ill. Notwithstanding the odds Illugi is able to defend his sick brother for a long time. Grettir is just able to raise himself on his knees and he kills the first man, but he is

stabbed in the back by Þorbjǫrn, before he can do any more mischief. Illugi covers Grettir with his shield and fights on with only his sword to protect him. Þorbjǫrn admires the boy's heroic resistance and gives him a shield. The odds are too great, however, and Illugi is taken prisoner. As he refuses to abstain from revenging his brother, if they grant him his life, he is killed and buried together with Grettir. Þorbjǫrn cuts off Grettir's head and takes it with him as a proof of his supposed heroic deed. But when people hear about the witch and the fact that Grettir was dangerously ill, he is indignantly received everywhere. He is even forced to leave Iceland by decree of the Thing, on account of having used witchcraft in killing Grettir. The story ends with the above mentioned Spés-episode, an interpolation which contains Tristan-themes. Þorsteinn, Grettir's half-brother, takes revenge for Grettir's death by killing Þorbjǫrn in Byzantium.

Grettir's fame as the representative Icelandic outlaw is one of the main causes of the episodic nature of the Grettir-saga. The sagaman had such a mass of material at his disposal that it was a matter of extreme difficulty to make the saga into a unity like, for instance, the Gísli-saga. The sagaman had to choose between using most of the material and forming an episodic story or barring a great deal of the traditional matter and acquiring an artistic whole. He was evidently more of a collective than of an artistic turn of mind. On the other hand, there is at least one instance in the saga of a later interpolation, i.e. the Spés-episode, that has been tacked on at the end of the saga [10]. This episode is full of romantic matter and must be the work of some later scribe. Except for this obviously late interpolation, it is extremely difficult to decide whether the saga contains any other interpolations on account of the episodic character of the story. The tale of the famous outlaw was most probably continually enlarged upon by different sagamen,

which accounts for *fornaldar* and supernatural elements getting into the saga.

We spoke of the question of fate in connection with the Gísli- and the Hǫrðr-saga. It is again in evidence in the Grettir-saga, in which it is embodied in the Glámr-episode. Glám's curse produces the same effect as Sóti's curse in the Hǫrðr-saga and the cursed sword *grásíða* in the Gísli-saga. In the preceding sagas we saw that there were other, natural causes beside this idea of fate, which further the tragic course of events. Similarly it is brought out in the Grettir-saga that one of the causes of Grettir's misfortunes lies in his own character, in contrast to the other two sagas, which are really tragedies of circumstance. This point is especially clear in the case of the fire-ordeal, to which Grettir wants to submit in order to prove his innocence. On the way to the ordeal he is insulted by a youth, he kills the boy and loses his chance. It is not only his fate, which prevents him from passing the ordeal, but also his own impetuosity.

When we compare the contents of the three family-sagas, we find a similarity in some of the details of the Grettir-saga and the Hǫrðr-saga [11]. The sagaman of the Hǫrðr-saga must have been familiar with a form of the other story. A few examples may suffice to show this: 1. both sagas contain the desecration of a grave-mound; 2. both heroes are cursed by a ghost; 3. both sagas end with the judgment of a wellknown Icelandic author, Sturla in the case of the Grettir-saga, Styrmir in the case of the Hǫrðr-saga. So the sagaman of the Hǫrðr-saga in its present form evidently made use of a version of the greatest Icelandic outlaw-saga for some parts of his story, without strictly copying the latter. The similarity in the details of the gravemound-episode is due to the fact that this was a stock feature of the *fornaldar-sǫgur*, which had already reached a certain fixed form.

The three outlaws all go to Norway; in the Gísli-saga this travel-episode is short and gives the impression of being based

on actual fact, whereas in the other two sagas this part of the story has been enlarged by the addition of fictitious themes, which are of little or no importance for the development of the plot. Gísli and Grettir differ from Hǫrðr in representing the typical Icelandic *skógarmaðr*, the solitary outlaw, who is driven from place to place, till he is finally cornered and killed by his pursuers. Hǫrðr, on the other hand, is the head of an outlaw-community that subsists on the cattle and sheep of the farmers of the district. He resembles more the English outlaw-chieftains with their bands of followers.

The most marked analogies to the Icelandic outlaw-sagas may be found in the Hereward-story. The description of Hereward's youth reads like the beginning of an Icelandic saga; he is brave and strong and excels in games, but is continually getting into trouble at home, till he is at length outlawed at the instigation of his father. There is a distinct resemblance to the Grettir-saga. Grettir has similar troubles at home and is outlawed at an early age. Hereward goes on his travels and has all kinds of adventures, just like the Icelandic saga-heroes, who go to Norway and lead an adventurous viking-life in their youth. The bear-theme features in the Grettir-saga as well as the Hereward-story. As we saw above, these viking-adventures were often taken from the *fornaldar-sǫgur*. The feature of the loyal wife occurs in the Hereward-story (Turfrida) and in the Gísli-saga, in which Auðr is one of the principal personages and in which the relation between Gísli and Auðr is an important theme. The witch-theme is found in the Grettir-saga and in the Gesta Herwardi. In both cases the witch is fetched to make one last attempt to dislodge the outlaw and his companions from their stronghold. In the Hereward-story the witch is burned, while reciting her incantations and the attack is foiled. In the case of Grettir the witch is only wounded and afterwards throws the cursed root into the sea, which ultimately causes Grettir's

death. The strategical value of an island is prominent in several of the outlaw-stories: Ely in the Hereward-traditions, Drangey in the Grettir-saga and Hólmr in the Hǫrðr-saga. This feature clearly rests upon historical foundations. In the English outlaw-traditions the idea of a band of outlaws is an important feature, e.g. *Hereward and his genge* and Robin Hood and his companions. In the Icelandic sagas this feature occurs in the Hǫrðr-saga only. The disguise-theme which plays such an outstanding part in the English traditions, is very sparingly used in the sagas. It occurs in the Gísli-saga, when Gísli changes clothes with his servant and escapes. The servant is indeed mistaken for his master and killed. Gísli's passing for an idiot boy is another example. Grettir also dresses in the clothes of a servant, when he is closely pressed by his pursuers, and puts them on the wrong track. This may be compared to the incident in the story of Fulk Fitzwarin, in which Fulk goes out to meet his pursuers, disguised as a monk, and puts them on the wrong track. Other instances of this same feature are found in the story of Eustache the Monk. Grettir's appearance at the Hegraness-þing in disguise is also one of the few instances of the disguise-theme in the sagas.

Hǫrðr in his last heroic fight kills his servant rather than let him be captured by the enemy. Parallels to this feature may be found in the fifth fit of the Gest, in the story of Fulk Fitzwarin and in the traditions about the Scottish outlaw, William Wallace. In the episode in the Gest Little John is wounded in the fight and begs his companions to cut off his head, so as not to fall into the hands of the sheriff. They refuse to kill him and Much carries him on his back. Wallace actually kills an exhausted follower to prevent him from being captured by the enemy. On another occasion he carries a wounded companion on his back. William Fitzwarin, the brother of Fulk, makes the same request as Little John, but his companions refuse to kill him and he is captured [12].

An instance of close similarity between the English and the Icelandic matter may be pointed out in the description of Hereward's death in Gaimar's Lestorie des Engles. Gaimar's story contains details that are typically of Scandinavian origin and which are also found in the description of the deaths of Grettir and Gísli. The negligence of the guard, who falls asleep, is found in the Grettir-saga. The throwing of one's shield in order to kill the last man and the fact that both die at the same moment is a feature of the Gísli-saga. The detail that the hero dies at the same time as his last victim, occurs quite often in the Icelandic sagas. The Hǫrðr-saga contains an example in the fight between Þorvaldr bláskeggr and Sigurðr Torfafóstri. The fact that the details of the episode in Gaimar occur in different sagas, proves that the account is not based on a particular saga, but on a general Scandinavian tradition that must have been current in the eastern counties of England.

This tragic ending is the more remarkable as the English outlaw-stories are on the whole not of a tragical nature, which is characteristic of the Icelandic sagas. Their conception is entirely different from that of the sagas. The Icelandic sagaman built up his story around a conflict of characters, whereas adventures and outward circumstances were of secondary importance to him and were only used to stress the conflict. The belief in fate also heightens the tragic effect of the family-sagas. In the English outlaw-matter, on the contrary, the adventures are the primary factors, the persons involved are no more than types, even in the Robin Hood ballads, in which the delineation of character has been most developed. More like the English outlaw-stories in this reprect, are the *fornaldar-sǫgur*, of which we shall meet a fairly representative example in the following chapter. These are typical adventure-stories with little or no psychological character-delineation.

We return now to the question put in the Introduction whether we can prove the existence of a close relation between the English and Icelandic traditions. In the present chapter we have found a few striking resemblances, but these may after all be the result of similar outward circumstances. In the next chapter we hope to adduce evidence which will prove the existence of this relation conclusively.

CHAPTER VI

THE SAGA OF AN BOGSVEIGIR

The saga of Án bogsveigir [1] is the only outlaw-saga among the so-called *fornaldar-sǫgur* (abbreviated *Fas.*). We have included it in our investigation, because it constitutes the link between the English outlaw-matter and that of the Icelandic family-sagas, as will be shown below. The difficulty in making use of the *Fas.* as a proof of the connection between the two categories treated, lies in the largely fictitious character of this species of saga. The *Fas.* are a later form of the Icelandic saga, which attempts to portray life in Norway before the settlement of Iceland, in the time called the *fornǫld* (the olden time). These sagas are for the greater part a mixture of legendary and fictitious stories, with borrowings from the older heroic and family-matter. Though the scene is always laid outside Iceland, the written and probably also the oral form of these sagas are due to Icelandic sagamen. The moot point with regard to the *Fas.* is whether they are wholly fictitious or whether they contain a nucleus of tradition brought over to Iceland by the settlers. We shall only investigate this question as far as it is concerned with the present saga and with the outlaw-matter in general.

The contents of the saga of Án bogsveigir (the archer) are in short as follows:

> Þórir and Án are the sons of Bjǫrn, a *bóndi*, who lives at Hrafnista in Norway. Þórir, the elder son, is highly esteemed at the court of Óláfr, the king of the Naum-

dæla-district. Án is entirely different from his brother, the courtier. He is a strong, clumsy fellow with bad manners and he is always ridiculed on account of his ill-fitting clothes. When he is twelve years of age he stays away from home for three nights and returns with a bow and five arrows and a beautiful chair for his mother, who loves him better than does his father. These things have been made for him by a dwarf. When Án is eighteen, his brother Þórir goes to court again and Án wants to go with him. Þórir refuses and binds him to an oak-tree. Án runs after him with the tree on his back and, in the end, Þórir is forced to take his brother with him. When they arrive at court, they hear that king Óláfr is dead and that his son, Ingjaldr has succeeded him. Þórir does not like this piece of news; he is graciously received by the new king, however, and so is Án, though he behaves rudely. Án keeps aloof from the other warriors and hardly speaks to them. He does not appreciate the presents of the king and when the latter presents him with a ring, he plays with it and pretends to have lost it in the mud of the entrance-hall. All the other warriors crowd into the hall to look for it. After a time it turns out that Án still has the ring on his finger. The warriors are angry at being fooled in this way by the person, whom they have ridiculed. Án has to wrestle with Bjǫrn, the champion of the warriors. At Án's request a fire is lighted and in the first bout Án is thrown into it by Bjǫrn. He is not much the worse for it, because he has an old cape around his shoulders, which saves him from being burned. Án now steps up to Bjǫrn, clenches him in his strong grasp, holds him above the fire for a moment and drops him. Bjǫrn is pulled out of the fire half-roasted.

One day Þórir offers Án his sword Þegn, a present from

the late king Óláfr, if he kills two of the king's men. Án says that he would like to have the sword, but not at that price. King Ingjaldr now organizes an expedition against his two half-brothers, who are both called Ulfr. He pretends to visit them with peaceful intentions. During the voyage Án speaks *vísur*, in which he yearns for Þegn. Jokes are made about it, but Án explains that he does not mean the sword, but his brother, — who is called Þórir Þegn —, because he is afraid that the latter puts too much trust in the king, who is intending to kill him. Ingjaldr decides to attack his half-brothers under the pretext that they will not come to an agreement. Án refuses to fight, but secretly kills the half-brothers with his arrows. Ingjaldr has little difficulty in overcoming his opponents and annexes the district. Ingjaldr suspects Án of having killed the half-brothers and sends messengers to him. Án refuses to come, because he sees through the tricks of the king, who wants to kill him. Ketill, one of Ingjald's warriors has found one of Án's arrows and passes for the famous archer at a neighbouring farm. The real Án surprises him, however, and Ketill is sent back to the king badly mutilated and tarred and feathered into the bargain. The king banishes Ketill from the court and declares Án an outlaw; a price is set on his head. Án stays with the farmer for a while and helps him to rebuild the farm, which has been burned by the king's men. He leaves the farmer with the injunction that if the farmer's daughter, Drífa, gives birth to a son, the boy is to be sent to him. He leaves a ring as a sign of recognition. In the forest Án meets a robber, called Garan; they fight with each other, the robber is wounded and invites Án to his house, when he hears the name of his adversary. In the house are two stones of unequal height, which Garan uses to test the strength of his visitors' backs. They divide

the duties, Án is to light the fire and Garan is to fetch water. Garan treacherously attacks the other, when he is bent over the fire. They fight and either tries to push the other on the stone. Án finally succeeds in breaking Garan's backbone on the stone; he cuts off his head and lays it between his legs to prevent the robber from becoming troublesome as a ghost. He stays and hides in the house during the summer. The following winter Án takes up his abode at the house of a widow, called Jórunn, whom he marries. He turns farmer and is greatly honoured in the district and becomes the leader of the farmers. Þórir often visits him and wants him to make up his quarrel with the king; Án, on the other hand, warns him against the king and advises him to go back to Hrafnista and take over the farm, as their father has died in the meanwhile. Grímr, Án's nephew, comes to stay at his uncle's farm. Ívarr, a man from Upplǫnd, comes to the court of king Ingjaldr and falls in love with the king's sister Ása. The king agrees to the marriage, if Ívarr kills Án. Ívarr goes to Án's farm and stays there for some time as a guest. One day, coming from the smithy he remembers his quest and tries to cut Án down with his sword. He has mistimed his stroke, however, and the sword gets stuck in a root. Án puts him in irons to be judged by the Thing. At the Thing Án's proposal to maim Ívar's legs and to turn his feet the wrong way about, is accepted. When the wound is healed, the unfortunate Ívarr is sent back to king Ingjaldr, who is greatly annoyed and cancels the marriage.

The next attempt is made by twelve men, who are to try and bribe Án's servants. Again the plan miscarries, this time on account of Jórun's watchfulness. The king's men are hanged and the unfaithful servants are dismissed. The king treacherously kills Þórir with the sword Þegn.

Þórir's body is put aboard a ship and sent to Án, accompanied by sixty men, with the message that Þórir has come to visit him. Án is warned, however, by a bloody dream and takes his measures. He stations ships in a hidden creek and all the king's men are killed and put in the same ship, in which Þórir is buried.

The king now comes himself to make one last attempt. Grímr and Án fight gallantly, armed with cudgels only and many are killed. They are surrounded, while sitting in a rowing-vessel; Grímr rows himself to death, but Án escapes by jumping over board. The king, thinking that Án is dead, goes home. Án manages to reach an island and after recovering his strength he goes back to the farm. He is joyfully received, but perceives that this continual trouble with the king has drained his funds or rather his wife's funds. He goes back to Garan's dwelling in the forest and returns home with a great deal of treasure.

One evening, when returning from the smithy Án sees a fire burning on an island off the coast that belongs to him. He rows across and sees a young man sitting by the fire and eating meat from a silver plate. He only eats the choice morsels and throws the meat away, when it gets cold. Án's first arrow hits the piece of meat the boy is taking from the kettle. The youth goes on eating as if nothing has happened. Án's second arrow splits the silver dish and his third the handle of the boy's knife. The stranger rises and takes up his bow and curses the man who has broken his knife. Án retreats behind an oak-tree and the boy's arrows hit the oak on the exact spot where Án had been standing the moment before. Án leaves his hiding-place and they wrestle for a while. They inquire after each other's names and the boy proves to be Án's son, Þórir. They go home together and Þórir

tells Jórunn who he is. Jórunn dubs him *háleggr* on account of his long legs. Þórir tells how he was brought up as a girl, because the king was after him. Án says to the boy that he must gain renown and that his first task will be to kill king Ingjaldr. His reward will be the sword Þegn and the king's sister. Þórir goes with five ships and sets the hall on fire. When the king hears that it is Drífa's son, waiting for him, he knows that his end has come. Þórir kills him, when he leaves the burning building. Þórir sends Ása and all the treasure to his father and goes on a viking-voyage. When he comes home at last, he is well received by his father. Án entrusts his wife, Jórunn, Þórir's mother, Drífa and Erpr, the man who saved him on the island, to the care of his son and goes back to Hrafnista. He gets a daughter, Mjǫll, who becomes the grandmother of Ingimundr enn gamli of Vatnsdal. Án gains great fame by fighting giantesses. Þórir's son is called Qgmundr akraspillir, and the latter's son was Sigurðr bjóðaskalli, a man of great fame in Norway.

The saga of Án bogsveigir is loosely connected with a group of *Fas.* describing the adventures of the so-called Hrafnista-men, i.e. the sagas of Ketill hæingr, of Grímr loðinkinni and of Qrvar-Oddr. These three sagas really form a continuous story of Ketill hæingr and his race. Án's father, Bjǫrn, is married to Þorgerðr, a daughter of Bǫðmóðr and Hrafnhildr, Ketill hæing's daughter. This does not tally with the information given in the saga of Grímr loðinkinni [2] that Bǫðmóðr and Hrafnhildr had only one daughter, Þórný or Þórunn, whose son was Þorbjǫrn tálkni, one of the ancestors of Ingjaldr of Hergilsey. Bjǫrn's children are, according to the Án-saga: Þórir, Án and Þórdís. The descent of Ingjaldr of Hergilsey agrees in detail with Landnámabók [3], where Þorbjǫrn tálkni's father, Bǫðvar blǫðruskalli

is mentioned, but not his mother. There is no mention of Hrafnhild's marriage with Bǫðmóðr in Landnámabók; her second marriage with Þorkell, the jarl of the Naumdæla-district, however, is stated in Landnámabók [4] as well as in the saga of Grímr loðinkinni [5]. As there is no sign of Bǫðmóðr or his marriage with Hrafnhildr in Landnámabók, this marriage either belonged to tradition not known to Landnámabók or was invented. Bjǫrn's marriage with an unknown granddaughter of Ketill hæingr was evidently invented to connect the Án-saga with the sagas about the Hrafnista-men. Another secondary connection between the Án-saga and the saga of Ketill hæingr has been pointed out by Miss H. Reuschel in her book, Untersuchungen über Stoff und Stil der Fornaldarsaga [6], viz. the fact that the episode about the chair, which Án gives his mother, has been interpolated in the Ketill-saga. For the rest the Án-saga stands quite apart from the other three sagas mentioned.

The outward influences that are usually traceable in the *Fas.* may be grouped under the following heads:

a. The influence of legendary and fairy-tale themes.
b. The influence of the Icelandic family-sagas.
c. The influence of Landnámabók.

Under a. may be mentioned the following incidents of the Án-saga:

1. Án stays in the woods for three nights and forces a dwarf to make him a bow and arrows.
2. Impossible feats of strength: Án uproots an oaktree to wich he is bound.
3. Án fools the courtiers by letting them look in vain for a ring in the mud.
4. Án meets his unknown son and fights with him.

Under b. may be mentioned some similarities between the

Án-saga and the Grettir-saga [7]. In the Án-saga the following is said about Án's relation to his parents:

....lítit ástríki hafði hann af feðr sínum, en móðir hans unni honum mikit [8].

In the Grettir-saga the following words are used:

Ekki hafði hann ástríki mikit af Ásmundi fǫður sínum, en móðir hans unni honum mikit [9].

Both Grettir and Án belong to the type of hero, of which nothing is expected in their youth, but in contrast to other descriptions of this kind, it is expressly said of both that they do not lie *í eldaskála* [10].

There is also a slight similarity between the Án-saga and the Egill-saga in the relation between the two brothers, but not enough to warrant Miss Reuschel's conjecture that the irrelevant statement in the Án-saga about Ingjaldr declaring Án an outlaw *um allan Norig* is due to the influence of the Egill-saga [11]. We prefer the simpler explanation that this historically impossible statement is due to the Icelandic sagaman, who was thinking of the united Norwegian kingdom of his own time and not of Norway before the days of Háraldr hárfagri, a country of countless petty kings.

The Landnámabók has not been used by the sagaman, a conclusion which is based on the following fact: the genealogy of Mjǫll, the daughter of Án bogsveigir is the same in the Án-saga and the Landnámabók [12]: Mjǫll — Þorsteinn — Ingimundr enn gamli. But the genealogy of Þórir háleggr which follows immediately upon that of Mjǫll in the saga, does not agree with Landnámabók. In the saga we have: Þórir háleggr — Qgmundr akraspillir — Sigurðr bjóðaskalli; of these names only the last one is mentioned in Landnámabók [13], but he is called the son of Eiríkr, son of jarl Hunda-Steinarr and Álǫf, the daughter of the famous Ragnarr loðbrók. These two notices about Sigurðr

bjóðaskalli and Mjǫll are quite close together in Landnámabók — 19 lines apart in Finnur Jónsson's edition. So it is precluded that the sagaman took the notice about Mjǫll from Landnámabók and put in a genealogy of Sigurðr bjóðaskalli, which differs completely from Landnámabók.

The Án-saga holds a peculiar position among the *Fas.*, it portrays the relation between king and follower, the usual *comitatus*-theme of the viking-sagas, but from the point of view of the independent Icelandic land-owner [14]. The king is not depicted as the superior person of the viking-sagas, but really as an unfavourable counterpart to the hero, Án. Moreover, the family-ties, — in this case between the two brothers Þórir and Án —, are much stronger than the bond between king and subject. This predominance of the family-relation over the *comitatus*-relation in the Án-saga reminds one of the preponderating part the family-spirit plays in the Icelandic family-sagas. Towards the end the *comitatus*-spirit crops up again, when Án himself does not take vengeance on the king, but sends his son Þórir háleggr. Án evidently does not avenge his brother's death, because it would be improper for a former follower of the king to kill his lord, even though the latter is his greatest enemy.

The usual viking-features play only a small part in the story and are kept well in the background. They are mostly connected with Án's son, Þórir, who gains fame by burning Ingjald's hall and who goes on viking-voyages, but these facts are stated very briefly and without any details. Án himself, moreover, could hardly be characterized as a viking. After his sojourn at court he lives for a while the wandering life of the outlaw, but he soon settles down as an honoured *bóndi* after his marriage with Jórunn. He is now no longer the hunted outlaw, who hides in the woods and perpetrates all kinds of crimes, but a well-to-do farmer, who is harassed by a perfidious king.

The only other source that gives us some information about Án bogsveigir is Saxo Grammaticus [15]. Saxo has interpolated a short notice about Án in the story of king Fridlevus. It contains the following incidents: Ano sagittarius is a warrior of king Amundus, who is engaged in battle with another king, called Fridlevus. One of the latter's warriors, Bjǫrn, takes aim at Ano with his bow. Ano with his first shot splits Bjǫrn's bow-string; the second arrow hits the grip of Bjǫrn's bow. The third arrow, finally, knocks Bjǫrn's arrow from the bow-string. The latter is not put out at all and goes on fighting as if nothing has happened. The two are reconciled later on and Ano marries Iuritha, a paramour of king Fridlevus.

Attention must be drawn to the following facts:

1. The story is entirely in keeping with the *comitatus*-spirit; there is no sign of the family-spirit.
2. Ano has an opponent, called Bjǫrn.
3. Ano exhibits his mastery by three superlative shots with the intention of scaring his opponent. His adversary is not in the least daunted.
4. Ano's wife is called Iuritha.
5. Ano becomes a warrior of king Fridlevus, the enemy of king Amundus.

The three superlative shots recur in the Án-saga, in Án's meeting with his son, with the same restriction that they are only meant to scare the opponent; Án's son, like Bjǫrn, is not afraid of the uncanny mastery of his assailant. The name Bjǫrn is also the name of Án's opponent at court in the Án-saga. Moreover, the name of Ano's wife in Saxo has a distinct resemblance to Jórunn, Án's wife in the saga. From the fact that Ano becomes the follower of king Fridlevus we may infer that he deserted the family of his own king Amundus, who is killed in the battle. There is no sign of the family-spirit in Saxo's

notice, everything turns on the relation of king and follower.

The two stories differ so widely from each other in other respects, that we must assume that the sagaman had a much fuller and a greatly divergent tradition, either historical or legendary, at his disposal, which presumably contained at least the following factors, beside those in evidence in Saxo:

1. The contrasting characters of the two brothers.
2. The quarrel between the king and Án.
3. Án is declared an outlaw by the king.
4. The king attemps to kill Án in various ways.

The principal change then is that the central interest has been transferred from the episode of the three shots to the struggle between Án and the king. Saxo seems to have taken his notice from a *Fas.*, of which a younger and greatly modified version has been handed down in the Án-saga. Both versions mention Bjǫrn, as an adversary of Án, but the shooting-episode, which had been connected with Bjǫrn in Saxo's version, was combined in the Án-saga with the fairy-tale theme of the meeting of the father and the unknown son. Moreover, the germ of the enmity between Án and the king is already present in the fact that Án deserts his own royal house. These two themes, the shooting-theme and the enmity between king and subject, are outlaw-features that must then have been inherent in the older version which Saxo used. This does not prove, however, that these outlaw-features were of Norwegian origin, as Saxo also took his story from an Icelandic *Fas.*, only an older one than the present Án-saga. The question of the presence of Norwegian tradition in the Án-story we propose to settle by a comparison with the English outlaw-matter.

If we compare the Án-saga with the earliest example of outlaw-literature in England, the Hereward-story, we find the same contrast between the oppressive king and the strong

and cunning outlaw. But there are other similarities between the present saga and the English outlaw-matter.

1. Án's inferiority to his brother Þórir may be compared to the relation between Gamelyn and his brother, though the outward circumstances are different.
2. The performance of feats of strength at an early age recurs in the stories of Hereward and Gamelyn.
3. The fight between Án and Bjǫrn, the champion of the envious warriors at court, may be compared to the fight between Hereward and Oger at the court of William the Conqueror.
4. The punishment of Ketill, when he passes himself off as Án, is related to a similar episode in the story of Fulk Fitzwarin, when the outlaw surprises and kills a knight who abuses his name.
5. The attemps of Ingjaldr are all foiled by Án's cunning and a kind of rough humour is shown in the treatment of the king's agents. Both these details are leading features in the English outlaw-stories from Hereward to Robin Hood.
6. Án is faithfully assisted in his difficulties by his wife, Jórunn. Hereward's wife, Turfrida, follows her husband to England and we may assume that she shares his wanderings across his native country, because Turfrida's fidelity is one of the reasons, why the writer of the Gesta has moral objections to his hero's second marriage.
7. Án as well as the English outlaws have their trusted followers in the hour of greatest need. They even form a sort of outlaw-community. Compare, for instance, Án's position at the Thing, where Ívarr is condemned, and Robin Hood's position in Sherwood Forest.

8. Án never uses any other weapons but his bow and arrows, except in the last attack of the king, when Án expressly orders his followers to use only cudgels. Gamelyn, likewise, uses only clubs to defend himself, but when he becomes a member of the band of outlaws he takes to the bow and arrows.

It is clear from the above comparison that there exists a distinct connection between this *Fas.* and the English outlaw-stories. The similarity lies chiefly in the way of treatment of the outlaw-subject, in its general features; there are no grounds for assuming any direct connection with the English matter. The Án-saga contains an undercurrent of old Norse tradition about outlaw-life, but for the rest it is impossible to ascertain with any degree of certainty which other features originally belonged to this Norse story.

We do not agree with P. Herrmann's verdict: *Zwei Stränge laufen in ihr, mehr oder minder geschickt miteinander verbunden, beiden gemeinsam ist ein Meisterschuss* [16]. It is true that we may distinguish two periods in the story, e.g. Án's life at court and his outlaw-life, but they cannot be separated, as the Icelandic sagaman has welded his subject-matter into one continuous story about the struggle between Án and the king. Moreover, the Norwegian tradition which, as we have seen from the above comparison with the English matter, must have been at the sagaman's disposal does not essentially belong to one part, but occurs in both. The characterization has been worked out well and has been consistently carried through. On the whole the story is well told, but there are already signs that the saga-style is deteriorating. One of the chief assets of the Icelandic family-sagas is the artistic use and variation of indirect and direct speech to lay stress on the more important points in the story [17]. This variation has in many cases in the Án-saga become

a mere mannerism, many indirect speeches ending in direct speech, where there is no call for stress. Another instance of this deterioration may be found in the fact that Án in the fourth chapter makes a monologue — the longest piece of direct speech in the saga! — in which he awkwardly repeats the story of the origin of his bow and arrows, which has already been told in the first chapter. Such an unnatural turn of speech would be impossible in the objective and realistic family-sagas.

We agree with P. Herrmann's conclusion that the little intermezzo in Saxo's notice about Ano sagittarius has incorrectly been taken from the story of Ano and been mixed up with the story of king Fridlevus [18]. The sequence in Saxo's story about Fridlevus is broken first of all by the Ano-episode, which we treated above, then follows a short notice, in which Ano does not appear, with the following contents: the king on his way to fetch his bride, Frogertha, the daughter of the killed king Amundus, goes ashore to get victuals and is hospitably received by a farmer, called Grubbus. The king marries (!) the farmer's daughter, Iuritha, and begets a son by her, called Olavus. This Iuritha marries Ano later on, as we have already mentioned. Immediately after the line about Iuritha and her marriage with king Fridlevus, Saxo writes: *Interiecto quoque tempore Frogertham adeptus* . . . . . This sequence of love-stories is evidently due to Saxo having taken Án's affair with the farmer's daughter Drífa from the Án-saga and awkwardly transferring it to king Fridlevus. Iuritha has taken the place of Drífa and of Jórunn in the story. For P. Herrmann's further argumentation we beg to refer to his book: Dänische Geschichte des Saxo Grammaticus.

Recapitulating, we arrive at the following important conclusions:

1. The comparison between the Án-saga and Saxo proves

that there must have existed a *Fas.* of a more primitive character about Án, which already contained some of the principal features of the younger Án-saga, which has come down to us.

2. The English sources contain a number of features similar to those of the existing Án-saga. So these features must have been part of the older Án-saga and they must have formed a connected tradition in pre-Icelandic times. Whether this body of outlaw-tradition was already connected with the person of Án bogsveigir in Norway is a question that cannot be solved.
3. The obviously Scandinavian setting of the Án-saga precludes the idea that the saga originated with the vikings in England and was transferred to Iceland afterwards. On the contrary, it is clear that the English outlaw-literature contains a body of old Norse outlaw-themes, brought over to England by the vikings — notwithstanding the characteristically English development it went through in the course of time.
4. The Án-saga is an example of a *Fas.* which contains a connected body of Norse traditions, not wholly fictitious, brought over to Iceland by the settlers. This conclusion is in sharp contrast with Finnur Jónsson's assertion that the Án-saga is *wholly* fictitious and unhistorical [19]. That Án was a personage rooted in historical tradition, is proved, moreover, by the mention of his descendants in Landnámabók.
5. The fact that we have discovered the existence of a complex of features in Norway before the settlement of Iceland, evidently points to the existence of connected oral traditions (stories or sagas) in Norway in pre-Icelandic days. This may at least be proved for the outlaw-complex, to which the following features belonged: *a.* enmity be-

tween king and subject; *b*. the outlaw is strong as well as cunning and always outwits his opponents; *c*. the outlaw is the leader of a community or band of outlaws; *d*. the outlaw is ridiculous and clumsy in his youth; *e*. the test-fight; *f*. feats of strength at an early age; *g*. the trusted wife.

CONCLUSION

To fully realize the extent of the Scandinavian influence in England, we have to go back to the time of the invasions of the Norsemen at the end of the 8th century. These inroads bore at first only a depredatory character, the fierce heathens came to capture rich booty, not to conquer the land. Gradually, however, a part of the Norsemen, at least, came to conquer and settle. By the Peace of Wedmore (878) the Danish claims to the whole of the English territory north of Watling-street, — the old Roman road from London to Chester —, were recognized by king Alfred. For more than a century the English kings tried to expel the foreigners with varying success till in the beginning of the 11th century, the whole of England fell under the Danish rule of Cnut the Great. The two closely related nations were easily merged and the Anglo-Saxon language received a large influx of Scandinavian words, which immediately became part and parcel of the language. Beside a number of words belonging to the everyday language, the judicial terminology seems to have undergone a distinct Scandinavian influence [1]. These terms have for the greater part been superseded by French words during the Norman Conquest, but some have survived to the present day. The principal one is the word *law* itself (ON. *lǫg*) and its derivations *by-law* (ON. *býjar-lǫg*) and *outlaw* (ON. *útlagi*). The Anglo-Saxon language did not possess a specific word for the idea of *outlaw*; AS. *fliema — fugitive*, had the secondary meaning of *outlaw*, but it was not till the acceptance

of the ON. word *útlagi* that the idea was clearly expressed. In a similar way AS. *friðeleas — without grace* did not acquire its secondary meaning, corresponding to German *friedlos*, till the days of Cnut. There is, moreover, hardly any mention of banishment or exile in the AS. law-codes before the Scandinavian settlement. All these facts tend to the conclusion that the outlaw-institution as a social and judicial measure, was either a Scandinavian innovation or, at least, only practised on a large scale after England had come into contact with similar Scandinavian institutions [2].

The leading families that settled in Iceland were mostly of Norwegian descent. Beside the language, they also brought over the laws and customs of their native country. That the settlers felt the need of judicial measures [3], is clear from the fact that before the settlement-period had ended, two *things* were already established: the Kjalarnes-thing by Þorsteinn, the son of Ingólfr, one of the first settlers [4], and the Þórsnes-thing by Þórólfr mostrarskegg [5]. Ingólfr as well as Þórólfr came from the Gula-thing-district in Norway, so this Norwegian thing to all intents and purposes served as their example. The earliest mention of the outlaw-institution in Iceland, is met with in connection with the Kjalarnes-thing. Ari writes in his Íslendingabók [6], after mentioning the existence of the Kjalarnes-thing prior to the Althing:

> . . . . en maþr hafþe secr orþet of þræls morþ eþa laysings, sá es land átte in Bláscógum.

The second notice is in the Grettir-saga [7], after the killing of Ófeigr grettir (about the year 910):

> . . . . . Var á talat um málin, ok váru lǫgð til Kjalarnesspings, þvíat þá var enn eigi sett alþingi. Síðan váru málin lǫgð í gǫrð, ok kómu miklar boetr fyrir vígin: en Þorbjǫrn jarlakappi var sekr gǫrr.

Shortly after the year 920 the Icelanders sent a man of Norwegian origin, Ulfjótr, to Norway to study the Norwegian laws and arrange a common law-system for the whole of Iceland [8]. After three years he returned to Iceland and the outcome of his voyage was that the common law of Iceland was based upon the laws and proceedings of the Norwegian Gula-thing, with some alterations to meet Icelandic conditions.

Beside their language and their laws the settlers must have taken their customs and traditions to their new homesteads. In Iceland, where the leading group of the population was of Norwegian descent, these traditions stood a much better chance of being preserved than in England, where the settlers were rapidly absorbed by the native population. But the preservation of Norwegian tradition in Iceland experienced one great drawback: on account of the settlers having to build up their lives anew in this strange and inhospitable country, they had a much livelier interest in the present than in the past. The struggles of every-day life and the events in the lives of the great *bóndi's* were of much more importance and attraction to them than the traditions of their ancestors. So the older Norwegian traditions were pushed into the background and had to give way to the mass of current family-tradition. This state of things is reflected in the family-sagas, the greater part of which is taken up by the description of Icelandic conditions and people, and only a small section is usually devoted to the exploits of the Norwegian ancestors. These episodes are, moreover, of a vague and stereotype nature. If we turn to the outlaw-sagas, we find that the solitary figure of the outlaw had a peculiar attraction for the Icelandic mind. It represented the acme of individualism to a people, which had always lived along individualistic lines, partly on account of their independent position as free farmers and partly on account of their viking-inheritance. The outlaw is depicted as a hunted

down hero, gloomy and tragic, not only pursued and menaced by his enemies, but also by his fate and the reactions of his own nature. It is the individual character that stands out clear-cut from the saga, not the type.

We have now arrived at the basic difference between the development of the outlaw-tradition in Iceland and in England. In Iceland the main interest centred around the individual and his fate, and in England the outlaw represented to the people the champion of freedom or of their jealously guarded liberties. In other words, he became a social type. Hereward, for instance, is turned from the historical opponent of William the Conqueror into the last defender of the native Saxon race. The historical facts about him are enlarged and expanded with the aid of Scandinavian outlaw-tradition still strong in the districts where his principal exploits took place. At the end of the 12th century the contrast between Norman and Saxon had gradually been obliterated and the outlaw-tradition took on a different shape, the Saxon defender of liberty was replaced by the typical forest-outlaw, Robin Hood, the idealized poacher. The severe forestlaws had raised discontent among the masses and the nobility alike, and the English people felt their liberties encroached upon. From an ordinary poacher, a tresspasser on the king's domains, Robin Hood gradually became the popular hero, the defender of the weak and the poor, but the terror of the king's game-keepers and of rich travellers. The popular character of the hero also involved a change in the nature of the tales and the whole was transported into a lighter and more humorous sphere. In the later ballads this led to a deterioration of the species to a more vulgar and farcical plane. In spite of this change some of the older features may still be detected. As the English outlaw is more or less a type against a distinctly social background, it becomes clear, why the English tradition has generally preserved the old Scandinavian features better than

the Icelandic sagas, in which the individual and his character were of primary importance.

We have so far assumed that the English outlaw-matter has been chiefly, if not entirely, founded on Norwegian tradition, without considering the possibility of the English and Icelandic stories having mutually influenced each other. In several sagas mention is made of Icelanders visiting England [9]. Vésteinn, for instance, Gísli's brother-in-law, goes on a voyage to England [10], and Gunnlaugr ormstunga, the principal character of the Gunnlaugr-saga, visits the court of king Aethelræd II in the beginning of the 11th century [11]. Egill, the famous skald, was a friend of king Aethelstan, who ruled in the second quarter of the 10th century [12]. We seldom hear, however, of English persons visiting Iceland. The usual route taken by the Icelanders, was by way of the Norwegian ports, which kept up a lively trade with England. After the Conquest the extensive trade-connections between England and Norway remained unimpaired and it is known that Icelanders took part in this trade. In the Sturlunga-saga an Icelander is said to have imported the wood for the building of a church from Norway, but the bells were fetched from England [13]. English merchants were welcome guests in the Norwegian trading-centers of Bergen and Nidarós, which were also frequented by travelling Icelanders. So the two nations came into contact with each other quite often, but the influence of England and, as a matter of fact, of the other countries of western Europe seems to have left few traces in the contents and artistic form of the Icelandic family-sagas. Ireland is the only country for which perhaps an exception should be made. The resemblance of the Irish story-telling to the Icelandic family-matter is, however, of an external and general nature. There is hardly any trace of Irish themes or influence, barring the description of the battle of Clontarf in the Njáll-saga, which is really an Icelandic story about a historical Irish event [14].

The external resemblance, the mixture of prose and verse, may be due to the intercourse between the Icelanders and the vikings in Ireland and the Western Isles or it may have had its origin in the existence in Iceland of a large body of slaves of Irish descent. But Irish literary influence of so general a character has never yet been proved conclusively. The family-sagas seem to have been so closely and indissolubly bound to the soil and the people of Iceland that foreign influences had no chance of creeping in. It is only after the period of the family-sagas had passed away that the Icelanders began to adopt the romantic themes of feudal Europe, in the so-called *riddara-sǫgur*. The English matter yields only one episode, on closer inspection, which by its detailed similarity resembles the Icelandic outlaw-sagas, viz. Gaimar's description of Hereward's death. This description has a distinct resemblance to similar episodes in the outlaw-sagas. The fact, however, that it agrees in details with different sagas and not with one saga especially, would point to the conclusion that Gaimar's episode contains old Norse tradition rather than Icelandic features.

We have found that one source indeed contains remnants of the old Norse outlaw-tradition, which must have flourished on the ancestral soil of the Norsemen that settled in England as well as of those that colonized Iceland. This source is the saga of Án bogsveigir; it offers the solution to the problem of the relation between the English and Icelandic outlaw-traditions. A comparison of the Án-saga with the English matter has shown that there are distinct analogies, which prove that the Án-saga contains a body of old Norse outlaw-traditions which may have been of much older date than the original story about Án and which belonged to a period previous to the settlement of Iceland. Several features of this Norse tradition return not only in the English outlaw-matter, but also in the Icelandic outlaw-sagas.

1. *The outlaw is clumsy and sometimes ridiculous in his childhood.* Grettir cannot properly carry out the tasks which his father imposes upon him. Hǫrðr learns to walk very late and breaks his mother's necklace by stumbling against her lap, in his first attempt to walk.
2. *Feats of strength at an early age.* Gísli fights for the honour of his sister, Þórdís, against Hólmgǫngu-Skeggi, when he is a lad in Norway. Compare also Grettir's fight against the twelve berserkers and his fight with the bear during his first sojourn in Norway.
3. *The trusted wife.* Compare the figure of Auðr in the Gísli-saga.
4. *The outlaw is the leader of a community or band of outlaws.* Compare Hǫrðr and the outlaw-community on the island of Hólmr.
5. *The outlaw is cunning as well as strong.* This is a very common feature in the outlaw-sagas. A few instances may suffice: Gísli's escape as an idiot boy and his hiding in the bed of his hostess. Grettir fools his treacherous companion on the Arnarvatnsheiðr, when the latter tries to kill him, by feigning death.
6. *The disguise-feature.* This feature, of which only one instance is found in the Án-saga, occurs somewhat more frequently in the Grettir- and in the Gísli-saga, but it does not attain in any way the proportions, it has reached in the English matter. Grettir as well as Gísli disguise themselves in the clothes of their servants to escape impending danger. Grettir, moreover, goes to the Hegranessþing in disguise.

Our ultimate conclusion is then that we must assume the old Norse outlaw-tradition, as embodied in the Án-saga, to represent the trunk of which the Icelandic and the English outlaw-matter are the branches. Each branch has developed in its own way

and has been strongly influenced by social and national conditions, without ever losing altogether the inherent Scandinavian impress of the original tradition. Our investigation of the Án-saga permits us, furthermore, to draw the following important, general conclusions:

1. There existed a complex of oral outlaw-traditions in Norway even in pre-Icelandic time.
2. The *fornaldar-sǫgur* may in some cases contain genuine traditional matter and are not to be *a priori* considered as pure fiction.

As an investigation of the whole group of *fornaldar-sǫgur*, in order to test these general conclusions more conclusively, would take us beyond the scope of the present treatise, we shall leave this side of the question to other, more competent hands.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1] H. G. Leach: Angevin Britain and Scandinavia (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, vol. VI). Cambridge (U.S.A.) 1921.
[2] Leach, op. cit. p. 355.

CHAPTER I

[1] Domesdaybook. London 1783—1806.
[2] MS (E) in J. Earle's Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel. Oxford 1865.
[3] MS (D) in Earle, op. cit.
[4] Domesdaybook, 364*b*, 376*b* and 377.
[5] Earle, op. cit. p. 207.
[6] Ibid. p. 210.
[7] Liber Monasterii de Hyda (Rolls Series). London 1866. p. 295.
[8] F. Liebermann: Ueber ostenglische Geschichtsquellen (in Neues Archiv, XVIII). Hannover and Leipzig 1893. p. 239.
[9] Gesta Herwardi (in vol. II of Gaimar's Lestorie des Engles. Rolls Series). London 1888—89. p. 339.
[10] Geoffrey Gaimar: Lestorie des Engles (Rolls Series). London 1888—89.
[11] Liber Eliensis, ed. Stewart. London 1848.
[12] Ingulf: Historia Croylandensis, ed. Riley. London 1854 (an extract containing the Hereward-matter in Ingulf is printed in vol. II of F. Michel's Chroniques Anglo-Normandes. Rouen 1836).
[13] A Genealogical Roll of the Lords of Brunne and Deeping (in Michel's Chroniques, vol. II, p. xii).
[14] in Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores Varii, ed. Sparke. London 1727 (the entries pertaining to Hereward are reproduced in Michel's Chroniques vol. II, p. x).

[15] Liebermann, op. cit. p. 241.
Martin: Preface to the Rolls edition of Gaimar, vol. II, p. xxxv.
[16] Liebermann, op cit. p. 249 ff.
[17] E. A. Freeman: History of the Norman Conquest. Oxford 1871. Vol. IV, Appendix OO, p. 809.
[18] Michel's Chroniques, vol. II, p. vi.
[19] Liebermann, op. cit. p. 235 ff.
[20] Ibid. p. 262.
[21] Michel, op. cit. p. x.
[22] Ibid. p. ix.
[23] Gesta Antecessorum Comitis Waldevi (in Michel's Chroniques, vol. II, p. 104).
[24] M. Deutschbein: Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands. Cöthen 1906. vol. I, p. 249 ff.
[25] Saxo Grammaticus: Gesta Danorum, ed. A. Holder. Strassburg 1886. p. 56.
[26] Bjarkarímur (in Finnur Jónsson's edition of the Hrólfs Saga Kraka. Copenhagen 1904), p. 140.
[27] Hrólfs Saga Kraka, ed. Finnur Jónsson. Copenhagen 1904. p. 69 ff.
[28] D. A. Stracke: Iets over de Bronnen van Reinaert (Tijdschrift voor Ned. Taal en Letterkunde XLIV, 1925). p. 216.
[29] Ibid. p. 216.
[30] Deutschbein, op. cit. p. 251 ff.
[31] Bjarkarímur, p. 160 ff.
[32] Saxo, op. cit. p. 55 ff.
[33] A. Olrik: Danmarks Heltedigtning. Copenhagen 1908—10. vol. I, p. 124.
[34] Hrólfssaga Gautrekssonar, ed. Detter. Halle 1891. Chapter 38.
[35] Deutschbein, op. cit. p. 26 ff.
[36] J. H. Todd: The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill (Rolls Series). London 1867. p. 197 ff.
[37] Brennu-Njáls Saga, ed. Finnur Jónsson (Altn. Saga-Bibliothek, 13). Halle 1908. p. 411.
Þorsteins Saga Síðuhalssonar (in Austfirdinga Sǫgur, ed. Jacobsen). Copenhagen 1902—3. p. 217.
[38] The Annals of Loch Cé (cf. Todd, op. cit. Introduction, p. clxx note).
[39] Lamberti Ardensis Historia Comitum Ghisnensum, ed. Heller (Mon. Germ. Hist. abt. Scriptores XXIV). p. 584.
[40] Ibid. p. 578.
[41] Liebermann, op. cit. p. 241.
[42] Lambertus, op. cit. p. 566 ff.
[43] Freeman, op. cit. p. 810.

CHAPTER II

[1] The Tale of Gamelyn, ed. Skeat. Oxford 1893.
[2] Ibid. p. xiii ff.
[3] F. Lindner: The Tale of Gamelyn (in Englische Studien, vol. II). Heilbron 1879. p. 94 ff.
[4] Tale, p. xv.
[5] Lindner, op. cit. p. 109.
[6] Tale, p. xvi ff.
[7] J. Zupitza: Die Mittelenglische Vorstufe zu Shakespeare's As You Like It (in Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, vol. XXI). Weimar 1886. p. 109 ff.
[8] Lindner, op. cit. p. 109, p. 326.
[9] Tale, p. xii.
[10] Thos. Wright: Political Poems and Songs (Rolls Series). London 1859—61.
[11] F. W. Maitland: Constitutional History of England. Cambridge 1919. p. 140.
[12] Ibid. p. 131.
[13] W. Forsyth: History of Trial by Jury. London 1852. p. 200.
[14] E. Björkman: Die Namen Orrmin, Gamelyn (in Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen, vol. 119). Braunschweig 1907. p. 33.
[15] Tale, p. viii.
[16] Zupitza, op. cit. p. 140 ff.
[17] The Lay of Havelok the Dane, ed. Skeat (Early English Text Society, extra-series IV). London 1903.

CHAPTER III

[1] F. J. Child: The English and Scottish Popular Ballads. Boston 1888. vol. V, p. 44.
[2] W. H. Clawson: The Gest of Robin Hood (University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series 1909). p. 6.
[3] All quotations from the Robin Hood Ballads are taken from Child, op. cit. vol. V.
[4] Clawson, op. cit.
[5] Child, op. cit. vol. V, p. 49.
[6] R. Fricke: Die Robin Hood-Balladen (Diss. Strassburg). Braunschweig 1883. p. 9.
[7] Ibid. p. 13 ff.
[8] Clawson, op. cit. p. 24.
[9] Ibid. p. 42.
[10] Ibid. p. 89 ff.

[11] Fricke, op. cit. p. 20 ff.
[12] Clawson, op. cit. p. 94 ff.
[13] A. Wyntoun: The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland, ed. Laing. Edinburgh 1872—79.
[14] Fordun-Bower: Scotichronicon, ed. Goodall. Edinburgh 1759.
[15] Fricke, op. cit. p. 24 ff.
[16] Child, op. cit. vol. V, p. 96.
[17] Fricke, op. cit. p. 22.
[18] Child, op. cit. vol. V, p. 121.
[19] A. Kuhn: Wodan (Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum, V). Leipzig 1845.
[20] Child, op. cit. vol. V, p. 47 ff.
[21] Thos. Wright: Essays on Subjects Concerned with the Literature, Popular Superstitions and History of England, in the Middle Ages. London 1846. vol. II, p. 204 ff.
[22] J. Ritson: Robin Hood. London 1832.
[23] Child, op. cit. vol. V, p. 43.
[24] J. Mair: Historia Maioris Britanniae. Paris 1521.
[25] R. Grafton: History of England. London 1809.
[26] Fricke, op. cit. p. 43 ff.
[27] A. Ruckdeschel: Die Quellen des Dramas 'The Downfall and the Death of Robert, Earle of Huntington, otherwise called Robin Hood' (Diss. Erlangen). Erlangen 1897.
[28] R. Kiesmann: Untersuchungen über die Motive der Robin Hood-balladen (Diss. Halle-Wittenberg). Halle 1895.
[29] The earliest mention of Robin Hood is in Langland's Piers Ploughman, as was already pointed out by Percy in the 18th century. The earliest possible date to be assigned to Langland's work, according to Skeat, is 1377. The following is the quotation:
I can nougte perfitly my paternoster as the prest it singeth,
But I can rymes of Robyn and Randolf, erle of Chester.

Randolf, earl of Chester, must have been either Randolf II (1128—1153) or more likely Randolf III (1181—1231), who is also mentioned in the story of Fulk Fitzwarin.

CHAPTER IV

[1] The Legend of Fulk Fitzwarin (De Coggeshall volume of the Rolls Series). Ed. Stevenson. London 1875.
On the connection of Fulk Fitzwarin and Robin Hood see: W. F. Prideaux: Who was Robin Hood? (in Notes and Queries, vol. II, 7th series) London 1886. The author contends that Fulk was the original Robin Hood. His reasons are the following:

1. Fulk uses the pseudonym '*Amys del Boys*' at the court of the king of France.
2. Robin is connected with Randolf, earl of Chester in the famous quotation from Langland. This Randolf occurs in the story of Fulk Fitzwarin, as a personal friend of Fulk, though he is a partisan of King John.
3. In the ballad of Robyn and Gandeleyn, the former is killed by Wrennok of Doune and his death is avenged by Gandeleyn, *goode Robyn's knave*. The author assumes that this ballad expressed in a figurative way the struggle between Fulk and his enemy Morice of Powys, as the latter's son is called Wrennok. One of the families that were already attached to the Fitzwarins at an early date, were the Fitzcandelou's. In Leland's English prose-paraphrase of an English poem on Fulk Fitzwarin, Candelou is spelled Gaudeline.
4. The names of the two women that are mentioned in the Robin Hood ballads, are Maid Marian and Clorinda, the wife of Robin. A lady, named Marian de la Bruyière, occurs in the early history of the Fitzwarins.
5. Among the names of Fulk's companions, found in the Patent Rolls, are: *Ricardus de Wakefelda* and Johannes filius Toke. Perhaps these are the Pinder of Wakefield and the *curtall fryer*.
6. The *master outlaw* of the Tale of Gamelyn must have been Fulk.
7. The name of Gamelyn is to be derived from Norman Candelou or Gandelyne instead of Scandinavian Gamel-ing. Especially as the two other sons of Sir Johan de Boundys (Boundys — Welsh marshes?) have French names, Johan and Ote.

We think the author's conclusions too hastily drawn and based on too vague grounds and similarities. Our principal objections are directed against sub 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

1 is too little concerned with facts to be of any value, because it is to be proved yet that the name Robin Hood is to be derived from Robin of the Wood.

3. Robyn and Gandeleyn does not belong to the Robin Hood cycle and the Robyn of this ballad cannot be indentified with Robin Hood. Moreover, the ballad does not sound like an allegorical poem.

4. The two feminine characters mentioned do not belong to the original Robin Hood poetry.

5. We have not been able to find any reason for identifying *Johannes filius Toke* with the *curtall fryer*.

6. No reasons are offered by the author, why the *master outlaw* of the Tale of Gamelyn should be the same as Fulk.

[2] W. Förster-J. Trost: Wistasse le Moine (Rom. Bibliothek IV) Halle 1891.

[3] Child, op. cit. p. 95.
[4] L. Jordan: Quellen und Komposition von Eustache le Moine (in Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen, 113). Braunschweig 1904.
[5] G. B. Adams: From Norman Conquest to the Death of John (Political History of England, vol. II). London 1906—11. p. 340.

CHAPTER V

[1] A. Heusler: Die Anfänge der Isländischen Saga (Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften 1913, No. 9). Berlin 1914.
[2] K. Liestøl: The Origin of the Icelandic Family-Sagas. Oslo 1930. p. 25 ff.
[3] Gísla Saga Súrssonar, ed. Finnur Jónsson (Altn. Saga-Bibliothek, X). Halle 1903.
[4] Harðar Saga ok Hólmverja, ed. Jón Sigurðsson (Íslendinga Sǫgur II), Copenhagen 1847.
[5] Grettis Saga Ásmundarsonar, ed. Boer (Altn. Saga-Bibliothek, VIII). Halle 1900.
[6] M. Olsen: Om Gísla Saga's Opbygning (in Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi, 46). Lund 1930.
[7] Finnur Jónsson, preface to Gísla-Saga, p. xxi.
[8] Finnur Jónsson: Den Oldnorske og Oldislandske Litteraturs historie Copenhagen 1923. vol. II, p. 421 ff.
[9] V. Lachmann: Das Alter der Harðarsaga (Palaestra 183). Leipzig 1932.
[10] R. C. Boer, preface to Grettis Saga, p. xii. Ibid. p. xix ff.
R. C. Boer: Zur Grettis Saga (Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie, 30). Halle 1898.
Finnur Jónsson, Litt. Hist. p. 744 ff.
[11] Lachmann, op. cit. p. 233 ff.
[12] W. H. Clawson, op. cit. p. 81 ff.

CHAPTER VI

[1] Áns Saga Bogsveigis (in Fornaldar Sǫgur Norðrlanda, ed. Rafn. vol. II). Copenhagen 1829.
[2] Gríms Saga Loðinkinna (in Fas. Norðrlanda, ed. Rafn. vol. II).
[3] Landnámabók Islands. Copenhagen 1925. p. 32.
[4] Ibid. p. 10.
[5] Gríms Saga Loðinkinna, p. 156.
[6] H. Reuschel: Untersuchungen über Stoff und Still der Fornaldarsaga. Bühl-Baden 1933. p. 108.

[7] Ibid. p. 57.
[8] Áns Saga, p. 326.
[9] Grettis Saga, ed. Boer. p. 38.
[10] Áns Saga, p. 327.
Grettis Saga, p. 46.
[11] Reuschel, op. cit. p. 58.
[12] Landnámabók, p. 96.
[13] Ibid. p. 95.
[14] Reuschel, op. cit. p. 56.
[15] Saxo Grammaticus, ed. Holder. p. 180 ff.
[16] P. Herrmann: Erläuterungen zu den Ersten Neun Büchern der Dänischen Geschichte des Saxo Grammaticus. Leipzig 1922. vol. II, p. 408.
[17] W. Ludwig: Untersuchungen über den Entwickelungsgang und die Funktion des Dialogs in der Isländischen Saga (Rheinisch Beiträge, vol. 23). Halle 1934.
[18] Herrmann, op. cit. p. 406.
[19] Finnur Jónsson, Litt. Hist. vol. II, p. 809.

CONCLUSION

[1] O. Jespersen: Growth and Structure of the English Language. Leipzig 1912. Chapter IV.
E. Björkman: Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English. Halle 1900—1902.
[2] F. Liebermann: Friedlosigkeit bei den Angelsaksen (in Festschrift H. Brunner). Weimar 1910.
[3] Finnur Jónsson, Litt. Hist. vol. II, Chapter III.
[4] Landnámabók, p. 28.
[5] Ibid. p. 58.
[6] Ares Isländerbuch, ed. Golther (Altn. Saga-Bibliothek, I). Halle 1892. p. 6.
[7] Grettis Saga, ed. Boer. p. 25.
[8] Ares Isländerbuch, p. 5 ff.
[9] Leach, op. cit. p. 36 ff.
[10] Gísla Saga, ed. Finnur Jónsson. p. 17.
[11] Gunnlaugs Saga, ed. Mogk (Altn. Text-Bibliothek, I). Halle 1926. p. 11.
[12] Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar, ed. Finnur Jónsson (Altn. Saga-Bibliothek, III). Halle 1894. p. 144 ff.
[13] Sturlunga Saga, ed. Vigfusson. II, p. 280.
[14] Liestøl, op. cit. p. 154 ff.
Heusler, Anfänge. p. 42 ff.

k 336

STELLINGEN

I

De samensteller van den stamboom van de heeren van Brunne en Deeping is nog verder gegaan in het combineeren van de gegevens omtrent Hereward's afstamming in de Gesta Herwardi en Ingulf's Historia Croylandensis, dan Freeman aanneemt.

(E. A. Freeman, History of the Norman Conquest, deel IV, bl. 809.)

II

Ten onrechte citeeren Freeman en Liebermann de Gesta Herwardi als bron voor de meening dat Brant, de abt van Peterborough, Hereward's oom is.

(E. A. Freeman, History of the Norman Conquest, deel IV, bl. 459. F. Liebermann, Neues Archiv XVIII, bl. 240, 1893.)

III

Zupitza maakt terecht bezwaren tegen Lindner's bewering dat er regels weggevallen zijn tusschen regel 617 en 618 in de Tale of Gamelyn.

(J. Zupitza, Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XXI, bl. 144, 1886.)

IV

De vergelijkingen, die W. de Hoog gemaakt heeft tusschen Engelsche en Nederlandsche woorden, berusten in sommige gevallen op onjuiste gronden en zijn veelal niet voldoende uitgewerkt.

(W. de Hoog, Studiën over de Nederlandsche en Engelsche Taal en Letterkunde en haar wederzijdschen invloed, deel II, 1909.)

V

Ten onrechte neemt Kemp Malone aan dat *the other* in Beowulf, regel 2061, een Bard en niet een Deen is.

(Kemp Malone, Anglia LVII, bl. 218, 1933.)

VI

Tolstoi's veroordeeling van Shakespeare, in het bijzonder van diens drama King Lear, is voornamelijk te wijten aan onvoldoende kennis van Shakespeare's tijd.

(L. N. Tolstoi, Shakespeare, 1906.)

VII

De pogingen van de uitgevers der Egilssaga (F. Jónsson, bl. 222, S. Nordal, bl. 212) om in cap. 67,2 den meervoudsvorm *konunga* te verklaren, zijn gewrongen en waardeloos.

VIII

De stof der Skáldhelgarímur moet reeds aan den samensteller van Landnámabók in den vorm eener proza-saga bekend geweest zijn.

IX

Het geleerde beroep, waartoe de gymnasiast wordt opgeleid, eischt het vermogen om levende moderne talen mondeling gemakkelijk te gebruiken. Niet minder dan op de H.B.S. is dan ook op het Gymnasium de directe methode van onderwijs, althans van Engelsch, de meest verkieslijke.