Saxo and his younger cousin

a study in the principles used to make *Gesta Danorum* into *Compendium Saxonis*

Marko Vitas

Abstract

Saxo and his younger cousin

a study in the principles used to make *Gesta Danorum* into *Compendium Saxonis*

The aim of this study is to offer as detailed analysis as possible of the *Compendium Saxonis*, a late medieval abridgement of the famous historical work *Gesta Danorum*, written towards the end of the XII century by Saxo Grammaticus. Books I–IV and XVI have been used for this purpose. The study contains an introduction, two chapters and a conclusion.

In the introduction, scarce information known about life of Saxo Grammaticus, author of the original work, is summarized and briefly discussed. Further on, general information about *Compendium* and its dating are referred to. Second part of the introduction deals with the theoretical background concerning ancient and medieval abridged version. In this discussion, we rely on Paul Grice's Theory of Communication and its reinterpretation by Markus Dubischar.

In the First chapter, called *Treatment of the content of Gesta Danorum in the Compendium Saxonis* we analyse the way the author of the shorter version dealt with the content of the original. Particular attention is payed to the abridgment's treatment of four distinct episode types frequent in the original. These are episodes pertaining to the supernatural, episodes pertaining to the moral and didactical issues, episodes pertaining to the upbringing, legal activity and death of a Danish king and episodes pertaining to war and destruction.

In the Second Chapter, called *Treatment of style and language of Gesta Danorum in the Compendium Saxonis* we analyse the way the author of the shorter version dealt with the style of the original. This chapter is divided into three parts. In the first part, we meticulously analyse the account of the kingship of Frotho (book II) in both works and compare stylistic features to be found in each. In the second part, we compare concordances of the vocabulary concerned with death and killing made for both the original and the abridged version in order to establish whether the shorter version lacks variety of the longer one. In the third part, we turn towards grammar and analyse the absolute ablatives in both works.

In the conclusion, summary of all the conclusions reached throughout the paper is offered. Additionally, the contents of the shorter version are compared to the schema (compiled by Ilona Opelt) of typical contents to be found in medieval abbreviations.

Keywords: abridged texts, Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, *Compendium Saxonis*

Magna cum gratia

Arnoni magistro universitatis Lundensis qui opusculum meum diligentissime legerat et emendaverat, Elisabethae magistrae seminarioque latino universitatis dictae parentibusque meis familiaribusque qui me studiosissime adiuverant.

Table of contents

Tables and abbreviations

List of tables

Abbreviations (further clarifications in the text)

GD – Gesta Danorum (all quotations referring to the edition by Holder 1886).

CS – Compendium Saxonis (all quotations referring to the edition by Gertz 1917–1918).

1. Introduction

1. 1. Saxo Grammaticus and his *Gesta Danorum*

Gesta Danorum (Deeds of the Danes) bursts out from Danish Middle Ages unprecedented and incomparable to anything else. It is not an overstatement to say that *Gesta* were the very first masterpiece of Danish literature in Latin. It has been noted that at the time when it was written, although literature had already been flourishing on Iceland, only annals produced by the monks, runic epigraphical monuments and the History written by Sven Ågesen existed in the corpus of Danish literature and, interesting as these might be, they were no match for the great masterpiece that was going to come from the quill of Saxo Grammaticus (Elton 1894).

Next to nothing certain is known about the life of Saxo, writer of *Gesta Danorum*. His title *grammaticus* comes from an introductory notice from the *Compendium Saxonis*, an abbreviated version of *Gesta* (*quidam egregius grammaticus*: *CS* 216/1), to which we shall return shortly. The nature of his work offers evidence that he was a Dane, most likely a Sealander, since he praises Sealand more than any other part of Danmark (Elton 1894). One might want to add that it is in that vein that Saxo offers information that Sealand was the very heart and the center of Denmark. Additionally, he uses an opportunity in his introduction to express very warm feelings about this particular county:

> *Quae insula [Sialandia] amoenitate cunctas nostrae regionis provincias antecedens medium Daniae locum obtinere putatur, ab extimae remotionis limite pari spatiorum inter capedine disparata.* (*GD* 5/10–14)

Apart from that, also the *Compendium* claims that Saxo came from Sealand (*CS* 1/1–2. *origine Syalandicus*).

Saxo might have lived from around 1150 until after 1208. He himself tells us that his grandfather fought for the king Valdemar the Great. As Elton (1894) rightly remarks, since Valdemar came to power in the year 1157 Saxo's grandfather can hardly be expected to have been born before the year 1100, which places the birth of Saxo himself around the middle of the century. Concerning his death, a date after the year 1208 has been assumed because of the following passage:

> *Albiaeque reciprocos fluctus propagatae dominationis labore complexus* (*GD* 4/1)

This supposedly refers to the military campaign Valdemar II led that year. It is, however, easy to see that even this conclusion must remain highly speculative.

It is regrettable that a clearer portrait of Saxo the man and his life cannot be established. There has been a lot of discussion on what to make from his claim that he was "the last of all Absalon's followers" (*comitum suorum extremus*, *GD* 1/8), but I think that in any case it should not be taken at face value, but as a reflection of the literary cliché of expressing modesty (Weibull 1978, 87.

comes to the same conclusion). His forefathers having been in service of a great king, and himself being in the entourage of the famous bishop Absalon and an impeccable Latinist, it is certain that our Saxo was not a nobody. That said, it must remain purely speculative whether he received his education, which was undoubtedly very good, in France (perhaps Orléans) or at home, in Scandinavia. While Friis-Jensen (1987, 13–18) defends Saxo's French connections with good arguments, the problem will probably remain controversial.[1]

Yet another hot issue is whether Saxo, the author of *Gesta Danorum*, belonged to the Church or not. It has usually been assumed or suspected that he was in fact a churchman (cf. Elton 1894). Curt Weibull has, however, put forward a series of strong arguments against such an identification. Among other things, he reminds us that Saxo's language bears only scarse resemblance to the language of the Bible, and that the contents of his historiographical work show only the mildest of interests for the development of the Church in Denmark. Furthermore, Weibul's argument goes, two Danish national saints: St. Canute and Canute Lavard are not represented in a very holy manner, but as warring and cunning worldly gentlemen. Furthermore, some of the verses Saxo included in his narrative have been causing scandals by their obscenity many centuries after his time and it is highly unlikely that they would be so freely uttered by a medieval clergymen.[2] Finally, Weibull comes to a different portrait of Saxo than what was the usual one – for him, our Saxo was „en lärd, krigsglad aristokrat" (a learned and warring aristocrat; cf. Weibull, 1978).

Let us now turn from the man to the work itself. *Gesta Danorum* is an ambitious attempt to prepare a complete Danish history, from its very beginnings and its first kings all the way to the king Kanutus and the year 1285. It is divided into 16 books of unequal length, as some books are rather concise, while the book 14 is enormously huge, spans two hundred pages of the printed edition, and represents almost one third of the whole work. The first nine books are often described as "mythological", while the rest is rather "historical". One will do well to remember that, although there is a clear cut in the way Saxo narrates in the first and in the second half of his vast work, there is no evidence that he considered the first part to be less of a history than the other, and the stories of Frotho and Amlethus were no less true and important than the account on the glories of Valdemar the Great in Books 14 and 15. This attitude is not something typical for Saxo or curious, but rather a general tendency to be noticed in old historiography. According to Marianne Wifstrand Schiebe, for ancient people, no matter how educated they were, Hercules and Theseus were no less historical than, say, Alexander and Augustus.[3] (cf. Wifstrand Schiebe

---

[1] There is, namely, no gurantee that Saxo was not able to receive excellent education home in Danmark.

[2] If our reader is doubtful when it comes to this last argument, we might suggest that he takes a look at the verses that are to be found in *GD* 139/36–140/7. and which seem to have been translated to English only in 2015 for the first time due to their Catullian obscenity.

[3] "Till skillnad från hur vi ser på saken idag, var för antikens människor Herakles, Theseus, Helena, Aeneas, Romulus och Remus och alla de andra gestalterna i sagorna i samma mån historiska personer som

2008, 704). One can also recall that in antiquity even such serious historiographers as Thucydides never doubted that the Trojan War took place. Mythological books are usually considered to be the height of Saxo's charm, not only because they contain many stories and legends which are a great source for Old Norse mythology, and because they present a valuable source for the reconstructions of the Indo-European myths (see West 2007), but also because they are written in prosimetrium – that is, prose is intertwined with verse – and the songs, his Latin translations of Old Norse and Icelandic compositions, are widely regarded as a world-class masterpiece of medieval literature.[4]

Saxo was very aware of the importance of his task as pioneer of Latin literature in Denmark. This is obvious not only from his preface (where he notes that even ancient people of Scandinavia had a great need to write their histories, cf. *GD* 3/11–16), but also from a bitter outburst in the book 4 where he is forced to interrupt his account on the good king Uffo due to the lack of information that survived from the past. If the records of the yore were kept in Latin, he says, there is no doubt that testimonies about the glorious deeds from the past would have been preserved:

> *Cuius [Uffonis] sequentes actus vetustatis vitio sollemnem fefellere notitiam. Sed credi potest gloriosos eorum processus exstitisse, quorum tam plena laudis principia fuerint. Tam brevi factorum eius prosecutione animadverto, quod illustrium gentis nostrae virorum splendorem scriptorum penuria laudi memoriaeque subtraxerit. Quod si patriam hanc fortuna Latino quondam sermone donasset, innumera Danicorum operum volumina tererentur.* (*GD* 117/9–15)

1. 2. *Compendium Saxonis* in the context of the ancient abridging practice

When it comes to the *Compendium Saxonis*, an anonymous abridgment of Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*, a detailed account of it is to be provided in the pages that follow. Here it will suffice to note that a consensus about the its dating is yet to be reached: Elton places it around 1430 (Elton 1894), while Gertz and Friis-Jensen seem to opt for around one-hundred-year earlier date (Gertz 1917, 201–203; Friis-Jensen 1987, 11; Friis-Jensen & Fisher 2015, lviii–lix). The fact that little can be deduced about the date of the *Compendium* on its internal evidence is due to the fact that it could really have been made at any time, since it follows an extraordinarily long tradition of abridging great texts coming all the way down from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and beyond. These ancient abridgments varied in range and scope (see, for example, *Ilias latina*, a one thousand verse rendering of Homer's grand poem, or short epitomes to Livy's Histories, which unfortunately offer the only evidence we have for most of the books of the great Augustan historiographer), but their purpose seems always to have been the same: to present an already great and well-loved work in a more accessible language and format (one must remember that copying books before

---

Alexander och Augustus, och i det här fallet gällde detta människor oavsett bildningsgrad." (Wifstrand Schiebe 2008, 704)

[4] One in want of a summary of all the books of Saxo's text may find a concise and well arranged one on this internet link: https://wikihost.uib.no/medieval/index.php/Saxo_Grammaticus

the age of the printing press was both hard work and extremely costly, which is why many of the large-scale works from the past have been regrettably lost or preserved only in epitomes). Sometimes the abridged versions were prepared by the very authors of the original ones, as in the case of the Bower's "Scotichronicon". It is interesting to note, as a remainder of the popularity the abridged originals usually enjoyed, that even the abridged version of "Scotichronicon" has been further abridged for the convenience of its readers no less than three times. (cf. Drexler 1982)

When it comes to the theory regarding abridgments, little has been done so far. Researchers have rather concentrated on specific examples of epitomes and abridgments and only rarely tried to draw general conclusions on the aims and principles relevant for all or most of the cases. While the purpose of this study too is to describe and explain one specific case – the case of *Compendium Saxonis* – we deemed it beneficial to put our chosen text in the wider theoretical context. In this endeavour, we are helped by the newly developed reapplication to text and literature of Paul Grice's Theory of Communication.

This is not place to delve deep into intricacies of the theory we just mentioned. However, it would be beneficial to relate some of its basic principles and its core idea. For Grice, an ideal conversational contribution is characterized by four features. Here, only a very brief summary is appropriate: *quantity* (it is neither too long nor too short); *quality* (it is essentially truthful); *relation* (it is relevant for the listener); *manner* (among other things, that the contribution is perspicuous and expressed in a clear way) (Grice 1975, 47). These are called by name of the conversational categories or rather the four Gricean categories (they are further subdived into maxims). If any one of them is breached, it is obvious that the conversation is jeopardized and prone to deteriorate. We shall, however, do well to remember that the conversation as such is something of a joint effort and that the role of the listener is not a passive one. He is required to make necessary amends for himself to the categories breached by the other conversant in order to be able to understand the message (cf. Dubischar 2010, 52).

It is a novel application of this theory to the relationship between the text and the reader (instead of the relationship between the two conversants), developed by Markus Dubischar, that we are interested in here. As Dubischar points out, the four Gricean categoriess are equally important and relevant for a text as they are for a conversation. A text is, however, faced with some additional difficulties (ones that conversations are spared from) – since a text can transgress time and space, it is likely that it will have a chance to be read in a completely different context and by completely different audiences than such that it has initially been prepared for (a phenomenon called *decontextualisation* by Dubischar), which is in turn likely to lead to a breach of any of the categories, even though the text in its original setting fulfilled all criteria. Apart from that, it is worth noting that at any given time there has been many more texts than a person can read in a lifetime – not all of the texts can end up being read, and this is why the texts compete between themselves, in a way, for the favour of reader's attention. According to Dubischar, it is the level of their complaisance to the four Gricean categories that is likely to influence their odds at being noticed, read and, ultimately, conserved. (Dubishchar 2010, 53–56)

This is where the abridgments, or the *auxiliary texts*,[5] as Dubischar calls them, have their relevance. Old texts (and sometimes, of course, even the texts that are not that old) can be too long, thus breaching the first Gricean category. This is the most usual case, but not the only one possible. Old literary texts can make use of archaic and complex vocabulary and grammar, which might result in the violation of the fourth category. If one takes a careful look, it will become obvious that all categories are prone to be compromised in the course of time. Auxiliary texts try to resuscitate these texts by tackling those problems they were subject to. If the problem were the excessive length, an abridgment might be the solution required. If it were the relevance, the auxiliary text might attempt to select only those parts of the original which would be deemed relevant by the target audience – and so on. It is, of course, possible to combine two or more category violations as well, in which case the auxiliary text would have to tackle more than one problem (Dubischar 2010, 57–59). This is, in my opinion, an excellent theoretical clarification of the origins, relevance and importance of the auxiliary texts and abridgments.

Dubischar has pointed out that a good general overview of the problems the abbreviator is looking to solve (in Gricean terms, the category violations of which is looking to appease) can be found in their prefaces, which generally consist of three parts: first, the author of the original text is praised (if it were not the text worth praising, it would be hard to account for the relevance of the abridgment itself); then, the problem of its reception is tackled (which category has been breached? why do readers fail to enjoy the text they used to enjoy in the past?); finally, the author of the auxiliary text explains (usually in a brief statement) what are his plans, i.e. how he intends to resolve the problems the original text had been experiencing (cf. Dubischar 2010, 44–50). Although his analysis is based on ancient evidence of auxiliary texts, it is very relevant for the *Compendium* as well. We can take a look at its brief preface (*CS* 216/1–217/9):

1) First, Saxo is introduced as *egregius grammaticus* ("a distinguished erudite") and his topic is explained, which establishes the relevance of the text. If we want to parallel this to a preface of an ancient abridgment, we can take a look at the preface of Justin's epitome of the histories of Pompey Trogue. He spends more than half of his preface praising this historiographer from the age of Augustus (cf. 1. 2. *nonne nobis Pompeius Herculea audacia orbem terrarum adgressus videri debet, cuius libris omnium saeculorum, regionum, nationum, populorumque res gestae continentur*).

2) Then, the author of the *Compendium* explains what are the deficiencies of Saxo's text. He claims that Saxo's *Gesta* are: *diffusum in pluribus locis* (diffuse, i.e. too long, the breach of the first Gricean category), *magis propter ornatum quam propter veritatem hystorie* (interested more in the textual adornments than in historical veracity, i.e. the breach of the second category), *stilus suus nimium obscurus est propter plurima vocabula et poemata diuersa moderno tempore inconsueta* (his style is too obscure and he makes use of vocabulary and songs that our modern times are not accustomed

---

[5] Dubischar has introduced the term *auxiliary text* for both abridgments and other texts which serve to enhance understanding of another text (commentaries, glossaries etc.). Since in this research we are interested in an abridgment, these two terms are to be used indiscriminately.

with, i.e. the fourth category has been breached). In our conclusion, after having discussed the ways of the *Compendium* in detail, we will be able to show our reader whether the author of the *Compendium* stayed true to his professed goals and in what way.

3) Finally, a short statement issued by the author of the *Compendium* reveals his plans regarding the correction of Saxo's original. He aims to depict those same noble deeds but in simpler language (*planis vocabulis*), and to add some more that Saxo failed to mention. A similar statement is issued by other authors of abridgments (one might want to take a look at the already mentioned epitome by Justin: 1. 4.).

We have thus become acquainted with the general motivation for the existence of the auxiliary texts and abridgments, as well as with general principles used in these kinds of texts in order to mend the original. When it comes to the more specific means employed by such authors throughout their abridgments, a schema of structural elements recurring in all (or most) of the auxiliary texts, judiciously made by a classical philologist Ilona Opelt (as quoted in Reitz 2007, 336–337) retains its relevance. I deemed that it would be beneficial to present the reader with the list and to retain it in the German original for the sake of clarity and precision:

1) Selbstaussagen über die Methode 2) Wörtlichkeit 3) Auslassungen von Reden 4) Auslassung beweisender, erläuternder und psychologischer Details 5) Auslassung von Wiederholungen 6) Zusatze 7) Änderungen 8) Missgriffe 9) Zusammenziehungen

After we have discussed the *Compendium* in detail, we shall return to this list in the Conclusion and, based on our discussion, examine whether the *Compendium* fits in the general tradition of the auxiliary texts and epitomes, on the general level (in terms of the theory of communication as proposed by Grice and interpreted by Dubischar) and on the specific and structural level (in terms of the list of elements compiled by Ilona Opelt). Our purpose with this paper will be to see how *Compendium Saxonis* fits into this tradition. We will examine how it treated both the content and the language and style of the original text and try to establish which principles the abbreviator could have used.

We will conduct our research on the sample of the first four books and the sixteenth book of Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*. This will be large enough a sample, and it will include both mythological and historical parts of Saxo's text in order to ensure that a hypothetical change that might have been introduced by the author as he passed from the first to the second part of Saxo's narrative is detected. We are going to use the following editions and to refer to them in the following way:

GD – Gesta Danorum (all quotations referring to the edition by Holder 1886). Saxo's text in this edition is 675 pages long, with pages usually containing around 40 lines.

CS – Compendium Saxonis (all quotations referring to the edition by Gertz 1917–1918). The text of *Compendium* in this edition is 224 pages long, with pages usually containing between 20 and 30 lines.

It may come as a surprise that we are using the old Holder's edition of Saxo, when there is a new and excellent one, made by Karsten Friis-Jensen, and published in 2015. Although I have only the words of praise for the latter edition, and for its accompanying translation, introduction and commentary, since the textual tradition of Saxo's *Gesta Danorum* relies only on the first printed edition and no complete manuscripts at all are known, only a small number of differences between different editions should be expected. Inspection of the two editions offered no evidence that the differences between them could be substantial. Holder's edition was, furthermore, more convenient for our purpose since it notes numbers of lines on each page (contrary to the 2015 edition), and this type of reference would be most useful for us in the minute discussion which is to follow, since it will make it easier for the reader to find the right spot in the text, should he find it necessary to acquaint himself with the context.

We should perhaps mention in passing a theory which radically questions the nature of the *Compendium* we are dealing with. This theory seems to have been around for quite some time and has recently been revitalized in an article by Ivan Boserup (2007). According to this view, the *Compendium* would be dependent not on the vulgate of Saxo's text, as represented by the Paris *editio princeps*, but on an earlier version of Saxo's text, scarce remains of which we have in the famous Angers manuscript fragment. It is our attitude that the relevant materials available are far too few to allow the question to be settled, and that Boserup's argument, although, ingenious, is not convincing. We will therefore, for the purposes of this paper, regard the *Compendium* as dependent of the standard Saxo's vulgate, as represented by the Paris edition.

2. Treatment of the content of *Gesta Danorum* in the *Compendium Saxonis*

2. 1. Introduction

In this chapter, we will observe how the text of *Gesta Danorum* was received in *Compendium Saxonis*. One can, of course, see already at the first glance that *CS* is shorter than *GD*. This may thus be easily established, but our task will rather be to explain what principles the author of *CS* used in shortening the text of Saxo. We want to see whether all parts of the text have been shortened in equal measure or rather some episodes were severely trimmed, while others stayed virtually undisturbed. It has already been noted by Friis-Jensen and Fisher in their new edition that the author of the *Compendium* excludes the episodes "that do not interest him", but they do not elaborate this statement (Friis-Jensen & Fisher 2015, lix). The main goal of this chapter will be to see whether there is a pattern or a system the abbreviator used in order to decide which episodes can be sacrificed and which are to be retained. My impression, which I now put forward as a preliminary hypothesis, is that the author of the shorter text had such a system, and that he did not simply cast out such episodes that did not appeal to him – or even if he did, that there must be a traceable conscious motive for this disaffection.

2. 2. A Comparative Table of the Contents of *GD* and *CS*

For the analysis, we will use all the five books (I–IV, XVI) we have taken as a sample from *GD*. For the purpose of this research we have created a large table, which is central to our research. In the following lines, I will explain why this table was construed and how it is to be consulted. All the five book we chose from *GD* are systematically divided into sections according to their contents – that is, there is a cut between two sections only when there is a clear cut in the narrative of *GD* as well. I must stress that these sections do not correspond to the sections in which *GD* is usually divided – as, for instance, in the newest edition with translation published in the Oxford Medieval Texts series. I had to create a new division since the old one does not always reflect cuts in the narrative and is therefore unsuitable for the research on the content. Now, each section can have its own subsections, and these subsections can be further divided (sections are therefore named 1; 1.1.; 1.1.1. and so on). This serves well to show the complexity of the text of *GD*, which is full of digressions and excurses.

In the second column, I have given a short explanation of the contents of each section. It is needless to say that in such a narrow space only a resumé of the original content could be attempted. A reader who wishes to check our account or learn more about certain episodes will have to consult the texts themselves. In this (s)he will be helped by references we have given for each of the episodes and sections, also in the second column.

The third and the fourth columns are dedicated to the way *CS* reacts to *GD*. In the third column, I have expressed the way *CS* treated each episode with a number (I will return to these numbers

shortly) and in the fourth column I have explained (if I deemed necessary) why a particular judgment has been made in the previous column. I came to the conclusion that there are exactly four ways in which each of the episodes of *GD* can be treated in *CS*, and each of these four options received a number – this made our results more systematic and transparent. The numbers in question with their meanings are the following ones:

1a – an episode present in *GD* is present in *CS*, but abridged. (cf. *1. 1. 1.*)

1b – an episode present in *GD* is present in *CS*, without any substantial abridgments (cf. *1. 1. 2.*)

2 – an episode present in *GD* has been fully removed from *CS* (cf. *1. 3. 2. 2.*)

3 – an episode present in *GD* has been changed / updated in a certain way in the text of *CS* (cf. *1. 2. 2.*)

Several further clarifications seem to be needed at this point. First, it must be clear that virtually all the episodes are somewhat shortened, since even the same episode could be expressed in a much shorter way in the stern, rigid and unornamented style of *CS*, contrary to the flowery richness of the style of the original. Therefore, number **1b** was noted when the main points of the narrative were conserved, even if they were expressed in a far more concise manner, while number **1a** was reserved only for those episodes where some more or less important points of the narrative were left out of the *CS*. In the latter case the material excluded by the abbreviator has been mentioned in the fourth column. The meaning of numbers **2** and **3** is more straightforward: the former relates to the total deletion of an episode, while the latter means that an information has been either changed or added to the text of *GD* in the *CS*. Cases of this last type are somewhat rare and they will, as a rule, appear only in combination with some of the previous types.

As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, we are not only interested in finding out how much of the text has been abridged (it has already been calculated that *CS* is roughly four times shorter than *GD*: Friis-Jensen & Fisher 2015, lix), but also which episodes were abridged and how. That is why we chose several important motives and narrative patterns that are often to be found in *GD*, marked each of these motives with a symbol and added the appropriate symbols to the first column of each of the sections where any of these motives occurs. In the third column, under the number which shows how the whole section generally has been adapted, we also relate how each of the chosen motives present in the given section of *GD* was treated in *CS* with the help of the same letters and numbers we have already mentioned. Number **1b** still means that the motive has been preserved, **1a** that it has been abridged (with possibility of its importance to be downsized), and **2**, finally, that it has been lost. Number 3 never appears in this context. It may seem an unnecessary confusion to add these letters and numbers to those numbers already explaining how the given section was treated in *CS*. One, however, has to take into consideration that these two often do not overlap. To take just one example, in *1. 4. 1.* the treatment of the whole section has been marked as **1a** – however, both of the motives detected in this section were marked with **1b**. This means that whatever caused the whole section not to be fully treated in *CS*,

it does not pertain to the motives and patterns we are chiefly interested in. Now, I will offer brief explanations of each of the motives we chose to analyse in the table:

Episodes pertaining to the supernatural

ME – episode containing miraculous events

P – episode containing prophesies (as a subsection of the former, in a way)

Episodes pertaining to the moral and didactical issues

LE – episode containing learned and didactic excurses

M – episode containing moralizing

Episodes pertaining to the upbringing, legal activity and death of a Danish king

YA – episode containing descriptions of the young age and upbringing of an important character

L – episode containing elements relevant to the legal history of Danmark

D – episode containing the death of a Danish king

CH – characterization (primarily of a Danish king, but of other characters too)

Episodes pertaining to war and destruction

WB – episode containing war battles

K – episode containing killing of a person (other than a Danish king)

C – episode containing descriptions of cunning devices used by the protagonists (these are often – although not exclusively – employed during war campaigns. Hence, *C* is adjoined to this category)

Highly stylized episodes (treated only summarily in the scope of this chapter)

R – episode containing elaborate orations

S – episode containing songs (*i. e.* metrical texts)

Each of these five categories is discussed after the table. Here I would just like to briefly explain in response to possible criticism why I do not think that it is a problem that the table is larger and takes far more place than any discussion on it ever could in the scope of this paper. Namely, I would like to encourage the reader not to take this table simply as a material or corpus for the discussion afterwards. The table is a result in itself. While almost all of the sections and subsections contain at least one letter – that is, one of the motives we chose to analyse (we have at the first place chosen such motives that occur very often), there are some sections which do not have a letter and which will, therefore, not be included in the discussion later on. Furthermore, any number of other motives could be added to the ones already noted. I have limited myself to

the ones outlined above simply because this paper had to come to an end at one point, but I could think of many more that would be interesting to add: marriages and marriage ceremonies, envoys and embassies, examples of cruelty etc. However, the motives we do discuss may be the most interesting ones to consider when discussing an adaptation. This table and the method it represents is ready to take on another research with another number of variables. It is therefore important not only because the following discussion would be opaque, confused and pointless if it did not have a firm grounding in the table, but also because it presents a solid groundwork for any future student of *CS* who would like either to check our results or to make his own research in a different direction.

Table 1. *A Comparative Table of the Contents of GD and CS*

BOOK I				
		The earliest kings		
		GD 10/4–11/18		*CS* 220/21–221/7
1.1	*1, 1, 1.* *LE*	**Name origins of Danmark and England**	*1a* *LE 1a*	References to Dudo (the author of *History of Aquitania*) and to Beda (the author of *History of the church*) are nevertheless lacking.
		GD 10/4–24 CS 220/21–221/3		
	1, 1, 2.	**Kingship of Dan** GD 10/25–29 CS 220/23 – 221/1	*1b*	
	1. 1. 3. *M, D, CH*	**Grim story of Humblus and Lotherus**	*1a* *M 2* *D 1b* *CH 1b*	All of Saxo's Stoic moralizing is out (rich life in court bears many dangers, life of a poor fellow is more relaxed).
		GD 10/30 – 11/18 CS 221/2 - 7		
1. 2.		The kingship of Scioldus		
		GD 11/19–12/25		*CS* 221/8–22
	1. 2. 1. *YA, LE, ME, M*	**The young age of Scioldus and his upbringing.** The young man shows outstanding qualities, as he singlehandedly defeats a bear in the forest.	*1a* *YA 1b* *LE 1b* *ME 1b* *M 2*	The author of the Compendium does not comment upon the fact that Scioldus was much more honourable than his father (which is important since Lother was a cruel usurper). The names of fighters defeated by Scioldus are also lacking (*Attalus, Scatus*)
		GD 11/19–40 CS 221/8 – 17		
	1. 2. 2. *WB, K*	**Scioldus fights for the hand of the fair Aluilda.** He defeats his opponent, German prince Scatus, and wins over the bride.	*1b,* *3* *WB 1b*	All the major points of the story are present in the *CS*, but a curious detail, absent from *GD* is added – namely, that he had a

			K 1b	son with Aluilda *ex quo Gramhæræth nuncupatur* ("whence he was called *Gramhæræth*").
		GD 12/1–10 *CS* 221/17–22		
	1. 2. 3. L, CH	**Scioldus reigns over Denmark with a firm, but just hand.** His legal and social initiatives are explained in some detail. *GD* 12/10–25 *CS* 221/17–22	*1a* L 1a CH 1a	*GD* makes an important point in Scioldus' just treatment of soldiers – this is, however, not at all mentioned in *CS*.

Exploits of king Gram			
GD **12/26–19/26**		*CS* **221/1–222/11**	
1. 3. 1. YA	**Gram's youth and his first marriage.** Gram was a strong and intelligent young man. There is a curious story of his conceding his first wife to his friend and commander-in-chief *Bessus* as a reward for the exploits of the latter. *GD* 12/26–13/4 *CS* 222/1–4	*1a* YA 1a	This part is very abridged. No mention is made of Gram's exceptional physical strength and of his first marriage (and the bizarre way it abruptly ended).

1. 3.		*Gram and Gro*			
			GD **13/5 – 18/4**		*GD* **222/4–7**
	1. 3. 2. WB, CH, S, K, M, C	1. 3. 2. 1. WB, CH	**Gram and Bessus set to rescue Gro from the ignominious marriage with giant (*Sigtrugus*).** This episode includes a metrical conversation between Bessus and Gro. *GD* 13/5–16/6 *CS* Ø	*2* WB 2 S 2 K 2 C 2	
		1. 3. 2. 2. WB, S	**Gram converses with Gro.** She falls in love with him as a result. *GD* 16/6–17/5 *CS* Ø	*2* WB 2 S 2	
		1. 3. 2. 3. K, M	**Gram destroys some highwaymen in Sweden.** *GD* 17/5–15 *CS* Ø	*2* K 2 M 2	

		1. 3. 2. 4. *K, S, C*	**Gram kills the giant in a duel.** He uses a golden sword since that appears to be the only way to stop *Sigtrugus*. *GD* 17/15–18/4 *CS* 222/4–7	*1a* *K 1a* *S 2* *C 2*	Even this last part of this once famous episode in *GD* is heavily abridged, although not completely removed. No mention is made of Gram's cunning use of gold.
		1. 3. 3. *K*	**Gram successfully fights Suarinus the Goth**, and kills his sixteen brothers along the way. *GD* 18/11 – 12 *CS* 222/7–11	*1b* *K 1b*	
		1. 3. 4. *K, M*	**Gram becomes a co-ruler with his father.** He repels Ringo, the master of Själland. *GD* 18/11–22 *CS* 222/11 – 13	*1a* *K 2* *M 2*	Ringo of Själland is not mentioned at all (Saxo's moral lessons that every age of life is able to give shelter to virtue, included in this section, is also mising as a result).
		1. 3. 5. *WB, K, M, S*	**Gram engages with the daughter of king Sumblus of Finnland.** Sumblus is, however, not true to his words and plans to wed his daughter to king Henry of Saxony. Gram shows up at the wedding and kills everyone. *GD* 18/23–19/21 *CS* 222/13–21	*1a* *WB 1b* *K 1b* *M 2* *S 2*	Missing is the song Gram sings at the twisted wedding, elaborating his anger on broken vows (*filia Sumbli fera Signe, vetus execrata / fedus...*). Missing is also Saxo´s moralizing (one should not seek the wife of another).
		1. 3. 6. *D, ME, WB*	**Gram´s death in hands of Swabdigerus, the king of Norway.** The fate of Gram´s two sons: *Guthormus* chooses to collaborate with the victor, while *Hadingus* is sent to Sweden, to be taken care of by the giants and to avenge his father in due time. *GD* 19/21–31 *CS* 222/21–26, 223/12–18	*1a,* *3* *D 1b* *ME 1b* *WB 1a*	*GD* makes a point of the fact that Saxons came to help Swibdagerus, king of Norway, since they wanted to avenge the death of Henry. *CS* does not mention the crucial help Norway received from Saxony. On the other hand, we get additional information about the victorious Swabdigerus (*ex patre Dacus fuit et ex matre Noricus, qui patrem proprium, in Norwegia regnantem, de regno expulit et pro ipso regnavit*).
1. 4.	**Exploits of Hadingus as a young man**				

			GD 19/32–25/5		CS 222/26–224/28
	1. 4. 1. LE, ME		**Saxo divides magical beings that lived in days of yore to three distinct groups.** He thinks these classifications are necessary, to make his narrative trustworthy (the giantess *Harthgrepa* will soon play an important role in the text). *GD* 19/32–20/22 *CS* 222/26–223/11	*1a* LE 1b ME 1b	The classification is preserved, but since *CS* does not explain why the classification is made, it ends up as an awkward and uncalled-for addition.
			Youth and upbringing of Hadingus		
			GD 20/23–22/10		**CS 223/13–224/28**
	1. 4. 2. YA, ME, S	1. 4. 2. 1. YA, S	**Hadingus is dedicated to war and physical exercise and has no time for love.** The giantess *Harthgrepa* tries to mend his ways. *GD* 20/23–21/18 *CS* 223/18–19	*2/1a* YA 1a S 2	*CS* does mention that in his youth Hadingus *omisso voluptatum studio exercicium armorum amabat*, but he does not make a point out of it. Harthgrepa's attempts to bring him to enjoy love, which find their most convincing expression in the metrical form, are completely surpressed.
		1. 4. 2. 2. ME, S	**The giantess makes a case for her love.** Her prodigiousness is not a problem, since she can freely change from small to big and back. *GD* 21/19–22/10 *CS* 223/19–23	*1a* ME 1a S 2	Harthgrepa's convincing song which drives the point home in *GD* is completely cut off. Her long argument is summarized in one sentence.
			Dead man talking		
			GD 22/11–23/25		**CS 223/23 – 224/11**
	1. 4. 3. ME, P, S, K	1. 4. 3. 1. ME	**Harthgrepa and Hadingus enter the house of a lately deceased men.** The Giantess plans to use magic to make the dead man reveal their future. *GD* 22/11–21 *CS* 223/23 – 224/2	*1b* ME 1b	

1. 4. 3. 2. P, S	**The dead man tells the future.** Aggrieved at being awakened, the deceased predicts a violent death to Harthgrepa. *GD* 22/22–23/14 *CS* 224/3–4	**2** *P 2* *S 2*	The whole song by means of which the dead man has told the future has been cut off. *CS* is likely to have been reluctant to repeat the same storyline as in *1. 4. 3. 3.*, so only the latter instance is conserved. We do not learn from *CS* about the anger of the resurrected dead man.
1. 4. 3. 3. ME, K	**The prophesy ful-filled.** Harthgrepa is killed by monsters in an attempt to save Hadingus. *GD* 23/15–25 *CS* 224/4–11	**1b** *ME 1b* *K 1b*	Therefore, the point of the professy fulfilled is laid bare in *CS*, since *CS* kept this passage.

One-eyed wizard

	GD 23/26–24/23		*CS* 224/11–18
1. 4. 4. ME, S	*1. 4. 4. 1. ME* **The wizard pushes Hadingus into alliance with the pirate** *Liserus***.** Their attempt to fight king *Lokerus* ends in failure. *GD* 23/26–33 *CS* 224/11–16	**1b** *ME 1b*	
	1. 4. 4. 2. ME, S, P **The wizard heals Hadingus's wounds** and teaches him how to fight the lion he will face in the future. *GD* 23/33–24/16 *CS* 224/16–18	**1a, 2** *ME 2* *S 2* *P 2*	The only information that has been conveyed in *CS* is that the old man healed Hadingus. His elaborate prophesy about his capture and details about his miraculous escape are fully missing.
	1. 4. 4. 3. ME **The wizard trans-ports Hadingus on a flying horse.** *GD* 24/17–23 *CS* Ø	**2** *ME 2*	
1. 4. 5. WB, C	**Hadingus defeats Lokerus.** Although Lokerus' city was invincible, Hadingus overcame these difficulties by a cunning device.	**1b** *WB 1b* *C 1b*	

		GD 24/24–38 *CS* 224/18–24			
		1. 4. 6. *WB, K*	**The Norwegian king Swabdigerus is destroyed.** Hadingus assumes power over Denmark. *GD* 24/39–25/5 *CS* 224/24–28	*1b* *WB 1b* *K 1b*	

First appearance of Odin		
GD 25/6–26/20		*CS* 224/29 – 225/23

1. 5.	*1. 5. 1.* *M*	**Odin pushed from his supreme position** due to controversy produced by his wife's adultery. *GD* 25/6–34 *CS* 224/29–225/15	*1b* *M 1b*	It is interesting that even Saxo's misogynistic exclamation (*tale numen hac coniuge dignum extitisse!*) is rendered in *CS* (*talis deus tali coniuge dignus erat!*).
	1. 5. 2. *ME, K*	**Mithotyn assumes power after Odin's abdication.** His cruel reign comes to an abrupt end when Odin returns. Mithotyn is killed in Finland. *GD* 25/35–26/20 *CS* 225/15–23	*1a* *ME 1b* *K 1b*	In *CS* Mithotyn is never named. His reign is only summarily treated. Odin's return is represented in less spectacular terms than it is the case in Saxo (cf. *GD* 26/16–17. *veluti tenebras quasdam superveniente numinis sui fulgore discussit*).

The kingship of Hadingus		
GD 26/21–37/5		*CS* 225/24–229/18

Hadingus's war against Asmundus of Norway		
GD 26/21 – 27/31		*CS* 225/24 – 226/3

1. 6.	*1. 6. 1.* *K, S,* *M*	*1. 6. 1. 1.* *K, S*	**Death of Asmundus.** He was the son of Swibdagerus. His wife Gunnilda follows him in death. *GD* 26/21–27/31 *CS* 225/24–226/3	*1a* *K 1b* *S 2*	Asmundus does not speak in *CS* while in *GD* he authors several highly rhetorical metrical speeches: in the first, he encourages his soldiers to fight; in the other, he curiously blames Hadingus for using a curved blade.
		1. 6. 1. 2. *M, C*	**Asmundus' son Uffo** attacks Danmark and thus forces Hadingus to leave Sweden. *GD* 27/32–40 *CS* 226/3–5	*1a* *M 2* *C 1b*	Saxo's moralizing is excluded, in which the Danes are praised for preferring to save their own households rather than to pillage the foreign ones.

1. 6. 2. C, K	**Hadingus finds his treasury empty.** He employs cunningness to regain the money, track down the culprits and kill them. *GD* 28/1–17 *CS* 226/5–13		*1b* C 1b K 1b	
1. 6. 3. ME, S	**Hadingus is cursed and his military campaigns end in series of failures.** The first failure is due to the fact that the wizard supporting his army was weaker than the one supporting the enemy. The second failure is due to the fact that he accidentally killed an undercover god. *GD* 28/18–30/25 *CS* 226/13–227/4		*1a* ME 1a S 1a	Theentire story of the clash between the two wizards who support different armies is missing. The story of Hadingus's curse also lost in substance, since in *CS* we never learn why Hadingus incurred the wrath of Gods (*i. e.* we know he killed a *inauditi generis beluam*, but not that in fact this beast was a divinity). Note, however, that some of the verses are preserved.
1. 6. 4. ME	**Hadingus marries to a woman he had earlier saved from a giant.** She picks him from all the other suitors as she recognizes it was him who saved her from the giant thanks to a mark she left on him back then. *GD* 30/26–31/4 *CS* 227/5–7		*1a* ME 1a	The story is severely abridged. The whole intrigue with the mark on Hadingus's leg, which helped her identify him on a later point, is lost.
1. 6. 5. ME	**Hadingus's excursion to the underworld.** *GD* 31/5–31 *CS* Ø		*2* ME 2	
1. 6. 6. WB	**Hadingus fights the pirates.** *GD* 31/32–36 *CS* Ø		*2* WB 2	

	The Fall of Uffo			
	GD 31/37–32/38		*CS* 227/7–16	
1. 6. 7. ME, WB, P, K	1. 6. 7. 1. ME, WB, P	**Uffo promises the hand of his beautiful daughter to anyone who slays Hadingus.** *Thuningus* accepts the task, but is routed in a naval battle	*1a* ME 1a WB 1a P 2	The role of the old man (yet another wizard) is considerably lessened. No mention is made of the way Hadingus's crew protests, of the way the old man reorganized the forces of

		against Hadingus, who is helped by an old man. *GD* 31/37–32/24 *CS* 227/7–16		Hadingus, and of his prophesy suggesting that Hadingus would die by his own hand and will, and not in war.
		1. 6. 7. 2. WB, K	**Uffo ambushes Hadingus in Uppsala.** Uffo manages to slay many of the Danish nobles by deceit, but is ultimately killed by Hadingus in a battle. *GD* 32/25 –38 *CS* 227/16–23	*1b* *WB 1b* *K 1b*	
	1. 6. 8. S	**Hadingus is unhappy living in too much peace.** His wife is not thrilled that he plans to embark on new adventures. *GD* 32/30–33/38 *CS* Ø	*2* *S2*	

<div>

War against Tosto				
		GD 34/1 – 35/4		**CS 228/1–19**
1. 6. 9. WB, K, CH, C	*1. 6. 9. 1. WB, CH*	**Tosto is a cruel tyrant.** He forces the king of Saxony to help him assault Hadingus. *GD* 34/1–9 *CS* 228/1–5	*1b* *WB 1b* *CH 1b*	
	1. 6. 9. 2. WB, C	**Tosto routs Hadingus.** Victory is, however, reversed by Hadingus's cunningness. *GD* 34/10–29 *CS* 228/5–19	*1b* *WB 1b* *C 1b*	
	1. 6. 9. 3. C, K	**Tosto attempts to assemble his army once again.** He collects money for it by manipulating an incident which occured during gambling. He is however slayed. *GD* 34/30–35/4 *CS* 228/19–20	*1a, 2* *C 2* *K 1a*	This episode is almost completely suppressed. No mention is made of Tosto's elaborate plans for his return and the way he consolidated his financial situation. Only the result is referred to in *CS*: Tosto has been killed.

</div>

				Ulvilda's conspiracy	
				GD 35/5–37/5	**CS 228/20–229/18**
		1. 6. 10. P, D, S, R	*1. 6. 10. 1. P, S*	**Hadingus receives a grim prophesy in a dream.** It is revealed that his daughter means to dethrone him. GD 35/5–22 CS 228/20–229/1	*1b* *P 1b* *S 1b*	It is interesting that the dream prophecy (delivered by Hadingus's late wife) is conserved, even though it was metrical.
			1. 6. 10. 2. R	**Hadingus's daughter Ulvilda tries to convince her husband to kill her father.** She was unhappy that she was married to a private person and prompted by a wish for glory. GD 35/23–36/22 CS 229/1–4	*1a* *R 2*	Ulvilda's very elaborate speech to her husband is almost completely cut off. Only one reason for her conspiracy is given: she was unhappy because she was married to a private person (*CS 229/2 cuidam privato denupta, humilitati corpore permota*).
			1. 6. 10. 3.	**The rout of Ulvilda's conspiracy.** GD 35/23–32 CS 229/4–10	*1b*	
			1. 6. 10. 4. D	**Hundingo, the king of Sweden, receives the false news that Hadingus has fallen as a victim of a conspiracy.** He dies in an attempt to honour him. Out of respect for a friend, Hadingus hangs himself. GD 36/33–37/5 CS 229/11–18	*1b* *D 1b*	

BOOK II

				The Dragon from the distant island	
				GD 38/1–39/10	**CS 229/20–230/5**
		2. 1.	*2. 1. 1. YA*	**Frotho´s youth.** He is in desperate need for financial resources for his war campaigns. GD 38/1–11 CS 229/20–25	*1b* *YA 1b*	All main points have been preserved, although there might be a difference in context due to the faulty understanding of an ablative absolute (consult our ablative absolute table, #115).

	2. 1. 2. S, C	**Frotho gets welcome advice on how to defeat the Dragon guarding the treasure.** GD 38/11–32 CS 229/4 (possibly)	2 S 2 C 2	CS 229/4 includes the verb *audivit* which is a reference to Frotho listening to the friendly advice, but the pieces of advice themselves are suppressed.
	2. 1. 3. WB, ME	**Frotho fights the Dragon.** He follows the advice, kills the Dragon and collects the treasure. GD 39/1–10 CS 229/25–230/5	1a WB 1a ME 1b	Details of the battle between the hero and Dragon are left out, as, for example, Dragon's curious and unsuccessful attempt to avenge himself after receiving the blow.
	King Dornus attempts to reject Frotho using the scorched-earth strategy			
	GD **39/11 – 40/13**		*CS* **230/4 – 230/12**	
	2. 2. 1.	**Frotho decides to attack Curets, and their king** *Dornus.* GD 39/11–14 CS 230/4–5	1b	
2. 2.	2. 2. 2. R	**The speech of king Dornus to his people.** He tries to convince them to retreat and destroy everything, so that Frotho and his army will be destroyed by hunger. GD 39/14–37 CS Ø	2 R 2	Obviously, the resulting havoc of Dornus' decision is mentioned even in *CS*, but the speech itself, a very elaborate product of Saxo's rhetorical Muse, is nowhere to be found.
	2. 2. 3. C, WB, K	**The siege of Dornus' invincible city.** Frotho comes up with a cunning plan which eventually brings Dornus to his ruin. GD 39/38–40/13 CS 230/6–12	1a C 1b WB 1a K 1b	In *CS* it is never mentioned how strong the fortifications of Dornus' stronghold were, which makes Frotho's cunning plan seem rather unnecessary.
	Frotho engages in war with Russia			
	GD **40/14–41/17**		*CS* **230/12–26**	
2. 3.	2. 3. 1. C	**Frotho sabotages the Russian fleet.** He makes holes in the hulls of the ships.	1b C 1b	

		GD 40/14–23 *CS* 230/12–17		
	2. 3. 2. *WB*	**The Russian fleet is destroyed by simultaneous danger from the water and the enemy's attack.** *GD* 40/23–35 *CSS* 230/18–19	*1b* WB 1a	It is, however, to be mentioned that *CS* does not make it clear (not nearly as much as *GD* does) how difficult the situation was for the Russian soldiers.
	2. 3. 3. *WB*, *C*	**The siege of the city of Rotalus.** Frotho diverts the river which surrounds the city, thus leaving it without natural protection and an easy prey. *GD* 40/36–41/7 *CS* 230/19–23	*1b* WB 1b C 1b	
	2. 3. 4. *WB*, *C*	**The siege of the city of Paltisca.** Frotho feigns death and the disarray in his army, to trick the enemy into relaxing the guards. *GD* 41/7–17 *CS* 230/23–26	*1a* WB 1b C 1a	*CS* does not make it clear, as *GD* does (*GD* 41/13 *milites conscio fraudis merore*), that the soldiers were privy to the conspiracy.
2. 4.		The Fall of Handwanus		
		GD 41/18–42/7		*CS* 230/26–231/6
	2. 4. 1. *WB*, *M*, *C*	**Frotho takes over another city by using a cunning device.** It was not helpful that *Handwanus* took measures to prevent the city from being taken the same way as Hadingus took it (cf. episode *1. 4. 5.*) *GD* 41/18–32 *CS* 230/26–231/5	*1a, 3* WB 1b M 2 C 1b	Saxo's moralizing on how dangerous it is to be relaxed and unprepared in warfare is cut off. On the other hand, while *GD* purports only that Handwanus removed all the birds from the city, (*GD* 41/20–21. *domesticis avibus vacuefecit*) weary of the cunning device employed by Hadingus, *CS* claims that the birds have all been killed. (*CS* 230/28. *omnes aves domesticas interfici iussit*)

	2. 4. 2. M	**In utter desperation, Handwanus throws all the city's treasure in the city.** *GD* 41/32–37 CS 231/5–6	*1a* *M 2*	Again Saxo's moralizing (that Handwanus had better used the treasure to bribe his enemy) has been removed.
	2. 4. 3. M	**Frotho asks for the hand of Handwanus' daughter.** In return Handwanus gives him a lesson in how a victor should behave. *GD* 41/37–42/7 CS Ø	*2* *M 2*	
		Suanhuita fights the army of ghosts		
		GD **42/8–45/9**	*CS* **231/7–8**	
2. 5.	*2. 5. 1. S, ME*	*Suanhuita* **arrives to the field of ghost.** Unlike the maids in her escort, she can see that the field is full of unholy creatures. *GD* 42/8–42/37 CSS Ø	*2, 3* *S 2* *ME 2*	Not only has almost the whole episode been removed, but the one detail which is present is not to be found in *GD*, namely that Suanhuita left without her brother's permission. (231/7–8. *sine voluntate Frothonis*)
	2. 5. 2. S	*Regnerus* **introduces himself.** He and his brother have been sent to take cattle to pasture, but lost them, and are now on the run, fearful of the punishment awaiting them if they return to their home. *GD* 42/38–43/20 CS Ø	*2* *S 2*	
	2. 5. 3. M, R	**Suanhuita assures Regnerus that he is of royal descent.** Regnerus is ashamed because of his modest appearance and bids Suanhuita not to judge a man by his clothing.	*2* *M 2* *R 2*	

	2. 5. 4. ME, S	**Suanhuita presents Regnerus with a sword.** She bids him to be worthy of the gift. Toghether the two of them destroy many ghosts. GD 44/15–45/5 CS Ø	*2* ME 2 S 2	
		GD 43/21–44/14 CS Ø		
	2. 5. 5.	**Suanhuita forces Regnerus to marry her.** GD 44/6–9 CS 231/7 – 8	*1a*	Many details of the exciting relationship of *Suanhuita* and *Regnerus* are lacking in *CS*: that he was reluctant to marry because of his inexperience, and that she helped him regain the crown of Sweden.
	The conspiracy of Ubbo and Uluilda			
	GD 45/10–46/19		*CS 231/19–232/5*	
2. 6.	2. 6. 1. WB	**The war against Ubbo.** He was prompted to war by his deranged wife, Uluilda, Frotho's sister. Frotho prevails. GD 45/10–31 CS 231/9–20	*1b* WB 1b	
	2. 6. 2. M	**Uluilda continues her scheming.** She tries to prompt her new husband, *Scottus*, to rebel against Frotho and when this fails, she tries to murder him too. GD 45/31–46/19 CS 231/20–232/5	*1a* M 2	This episode in *GD* has two moralizing and reflective parts lacking in *CS*: the first one proposing that *Uluilda*'s shrewdness could not be tamed by a change of husband since what is learned in young age is hard to remove at a later point; the second taking *Uluilda* as a welcome warning for all men not to trust their wives.
2. 7. WB, C	**The war against the pirates of Frisia.** Danish army prevails thanks to a cunning device.		*1b, 3* WB 2	The reason why Frotho declared war on Frisia is changed: in *GD* it is glory (*GD* 46/21 *claritatem*), while in *CS* it is territorial

		GD 46/20–36 CS 232/6–14		C 2	expansion (CS 233/7–8 *suum dominium dilataret*).
	Wars in Britain				
	GD 46/36–50/22			*CS 232/11–233/9*	
2. 8.	2. 8. 1. R, M	**The Danish king advises his soldiers.** He bids them leave all their treasures behind in order not to be burdened with them during their quest. GD 46/36–47/9 CS 232/14–20	*1b* R 2 M 1a		The Danish king's bid is of course much shorter in the version of CS, but the main point, that can be reduced to *non ad avariciam, sed ad pugnam* is still there, whence the section belongs to *1b*.
	2. 8. 2. R	**A greedy Danish soldier *Torkillus* opposes the king.** "Have we worked so hard for those goods only to leave them behind?" GD 47/10–48/2 CS Ø	*2* R 2		
	2. 8. 3. R, M	**The British king advises his soldiers.** "The treasure they left behind is a trap. Ignore it! Let us defeat them, and then you can have all the treasure you wish." GD 48/3–48/36 CS 232/20–24	*1b* R 2 M 1a		The speech has been seriously shortened, but the main points are still there.
	2. 8. 4. R	**A greedy British soldier opposes the king.** "Why should we venture a dangerous war, if we can have the treasure right away?" GD 48/37–41/31 CS Ø	*2* R 2		
	2. 8. 5. M	**The British army listens to the soldier and frantically goes after the treasure.**	*1a* M 2		Just a short information is given in CS about the British army being totally out of control.

		GD 32–38 *CS* 232/24–25		
	2. 8. 6. WB	**Frotho achieves victory over the Brits and the Scots.** Later, in the battle, he is helped by *Scottus*, the husband of the infamous *Uluilda*. *GD* 49/39–50/13 *CS* 232/25–233/2	*1b, 3* *WB 1b*	The main results of the story are given in *CS* as well, but with one curious change. In *GD* Scottus convinces Frotho to let the Scots be (*GD* 50/7. *per hunc Scottorum insectatione relicta*), while in *CS* Scottus is ordered by Frotho to finish off the Scots (*CS* 232/30. *quo contra Scotos relicto*).
	2. 8. 7. C, WB	**The siege of London.** Frotho wins by feigning his death again. *GD* 50/14–22 *CS* 233/2–9	*1a* *C 1b* *WB 1b*	The main storyline is faithfully retold in *CS*, but for the name of the governor of London (*Dalemannus*) who is left nameless in *CS*.
2. 9. D		**Death of king Frotho.** One of the most important kings in the early books of *GD* dies in a rather bizarre sequence of events: he suffocates in his heavy armour. On this occasion, we learn several anecdotes about him. *GD* 50/23–51/3 *CS* 233/10–18	*1a* *D 1b*	The curious case of Frotho' death is related in *CS*, as well as account on his successful fight against certain wrestlers. *CS*, however, leaves out several other anecdotes: the one concerning the unpiercable armour (given to him by none other than the infamous *Uluilda*) and the one relating that his meals were covered with gold to prevent poisoning.
2. 10. M, D, CH		**The kingship of Haldanus.** Saxo relates that he was a cruel despot, who nevertheless died of old age. *GD* 51/4–51/15 *CS* 233/19–24	*1a* *M 2* *D 1b* *CH 1b*	*CS* cuts off the moralizing present in *GD*, where the time of *Haldanus* is criticized as lacking in virtue.
2. 11.		**The kingship of Roe and Helgo**		
		GD 51/16–53/15	*CS* 233/25 – 235/9	
	2. 11. 1.	**Roe and Helgo share the Danish territory between themselves.** Helgo achieves many military exploits, but they are over-shadowed by his	*1a, 3*	The main points of the narrative are conserved in *CS*, but the account lacks names: of Hundingo's father (*GD* 51/29 *Syrici filium*) and of the three governors he appointed in

		rape of a virgin he met on an island.		Göttland (*GD* 51/33 *Hesce, Eyr et Ler*). Some information has been added: a rather long (in terms of *CS*) account (*CS* 123/1–5) of the town king Roe moved to another location, very briefly mentioned in *GD* (51/16–18). It is also added that the raped girl was a daughter of a peasant (*CS* 234/8–9. *filiam cuiusdam rustici*), and that the island was later named after her (*GD* 234/9–10. *a que inslula Thorø nuncupata est*).
		GD 51/16–51/38 *CS* 233/25–234/13		
	2. 11. 2. M, YA	**Thora's revenge.** After Helgo arrives at the island of the raped girl again, she decides to punish him by prompting him to an intercourse with her daughter, whom he fathered. This incest produces Rolphus.	1a, 3 M 2 YA 2	No moralizing elements of *GD* survive in *CS*, where the mother would be criticized for excessive cruelty (*GD* 52/6–7. *o stolidam matrem!*), and *Rolphus* praised (*GD* 52/26. *ita felix patris error extitit*). Author of *CS* seems to be under the impression that the father was aware that Odin was having a sexual intercourse with his daughter (*CS* 234/16. *qui, nesciens filiam, eam cognovit*). Could *cognovit* be an euphemism for an abominable intercourse?
		GD 51/39–52/27 *CS* 234/13–17		
	2. 11. 3. WB, D	**Helgo wages war on Sweden** and imposes humiliating conditions in the wake of victory. Meanwhile, king *Regnerus* dies, and his wife *Suanhuita* kills herself. (see episode *2. 5. 5*) At last, Helgo takes his own life out of remorse for his crimes.	1a, 3 WB 1b D 1b	In *CS* the information that at the height of war against Sweden Helgo has hidden his son to the *Letrica arx* (*GD* 52/40) is left out. No mention is made of *Suanhita*'s death (even earlier her episodes were seriously shortened). *CS* is, on the other hand, about much more specific when speculating on reasons for Helgo's suicide, taking incest as a possible reason for his

				breakdown (*CS* 235/2. *quod propriam filiam cognovisset*). *CS* also makes a stronger point than *GD* that Sweden was during that time subject to Denmark.
		GD 52/28–53/15 *CS 34/17–235/9*		

Ursa's plan to derobe her greedy and detestable husband of his money				
		GD 53/16–55/39		**CS 235/10–236/26**
2. 12.	2. 12. 1. C, CH	**The greedy *Atislus* marries *Ursa***, mother of *Rolphus* (and daughter of the wicked *Thora*) in order to avoid paying taxes. *GD* 15/16–25 *CS* 235/10–15	*1b* C 1b CH 2	
	2. 12. 2. C, M	**Ursa makes an elaborate plan to get rid of Atislus.** She prompts him to rebel against Rolphus, and secretly asks her son to come over. Atislus is blissfully ignorant of the plot. *GD* 53/25–54/6 *CS* 235/15–20	*1a* C 1a M 2	*CS* cuts off the information from *GD* that Ursa was prompting Atislus to mutiny (*GD* 53/29–30. *novarum rerum exhortacione*). Lacking is also the moralizing part where Saxo laments the foolishness of Atislus who was delusional enough to think that a mother would support him over her own son.
	2. 12. 3. C	**Rolphus meets his mother.** She does not recognize him at first and refuses to grant him food and help. It is only when he complains that it is difficult to find a real friend in a world where mother denies food to her son, and a sister[*] sewing service to her brother, that she realizes her mistake. *GD* 54/6–20 *CS* 235/20–26	*1a* C 1a	Their first meeting is rendered in *CS* as well. However, later Atislus find Rolphus and Ursa laying on the same bed and accuses them of being too intimate for a brother and sister.[*] Rolphus makes an arcane defense (*GD* 54/20. *ab arctisssimo nature vinculo*). [*]*sister* – we must not forget that *Ursa* is both a sister and a mother to *Rolphus*. Mother, since she gave him birth, and a sister, since they have the same father.
	2. 12. 4.	**Rolphus and Atislus respond to their challenges.** Rolphus has	*1b*	

33

		to give evidence of courage, and Atislus of generosity. *GD* 54/20–55/2 *CS* 235/26–236/13		
	2. 12. 5. C, L, CH	**Ursa and Rolphus escape Atislus' court with his treasure.** They, however, leave it along the road to delay his pursuit. *GD* 55/3–55/39 *CS* 236/13–26	*1a* C 1a L 1b CH 1b	*CS* does not relate the alternative version of Ursa's escape present in *GD*: namely, that she painted common copper to look like gold and left that along the road instead in order to trick Atislus.

		The wedding turns into combat		
		GD 55/40–57/5	*CS* 236/27–237/23	
2. 13.	2. 13. 1. K	**Agnerus marries Ruta.** Due to savage wedding customs, a hero *Biarco* gets hurt and the ceremony turns into a bloodbath. *GD* 55/40–56/10 *CS* 236/27 – 237/7	*1a* K 1b	In *CS* we never learn whose son *Agnerus* is (cf. *GD* 55/40. *Ignelli filius*).
	2. 13. 2. K	**Agnerus and Biarcus engage in a duel**, since Agnerus considers Biarcus to be responsible for the ruin of his wedding. He is, however, defeated and killed. *GD* 56/10–27 *CS* 237/8–12	*1a* K 1a	*CS* shortens the account on the duel. No mention is made of the way duels were arranged in those days (*GD* 56/14–19), or of *Agnerus* laughing at his deathbed (*GD* 56/25–27). The latter fact is important since we later learn that *Biarcus* takes it as a proof that the opponent he vanquished was a tough one (64/31 *ridendo excepit letum*).
	2. 13. 3. K	**Biarcus rises to prominence.** Among other things, he marries Agnerus' widow *Ruta*, sister of the king. Atislus is routed and killed. *GD* 56/27–57/5 *CS* 237/12–23	*1b, 3* K 1b	*CS* places the last part of this episode (*GD* 57/1–5), where *Hiarthwarus* is named the governor of Sweden after the episode *2. 14.*, probably in order to join this first mention of Hiarthwarus with the prominent and maleficent role he plays in the last chapters of the Second Book.

2. 14. C	**Resourceful Wiggo.** By a series of witty jokes, he gains the king's respect and many gifts, but is in turn obliged to avenge him, should he die a victim of treason. *GD* 57/6–34 *CS* 237/24–238/9	*1b* *C 1b*		

Hiarthwarus kills Rolphus and gains a short-lived power over Danmark				
	GD 57/35–58/19		*CS* 238/13–25	
2. 15.	2. 15. 1.	*Sculda*, **Rolphus' sister and wife to Hiarthwarus, prompts him to attack Denmark.** The surprise attack leaves Danish forces in disarray. *GD* 57/35–58/19 *CS* 238/13–25	*1a*	In *CS* it is not mentioned how confused the Danish forces were in the wake of the assault. *GD* claims that the Swedes abstained from sleep in order to carry out their plan (*GD* 58/12 *quietis usum adimerat*), while *CS* claims that they abstained from drinking the previous evening as well (*CS* 238/23. *se a potu abstinuerunt*).
	2. 15. 2.	*Hialtus* **leaves his mistress to join the battle.** As she asks him whom she is to marry, if he falls in battle, he mutilates her face. *GD* 58/19–40 *CS* 238/25–239/3	*1b*	The excessive praises Saxo piles up on Hialtus in *GD* are moderated in *CS*.
	2. 15. 3. S, R, WB	**War songs.** *Hialtus* calls Danes to fight and protect their king, and criticizes *Biarcus'* inactivity. The latter defends himself and lists his glorious exploits. *Ruta* and *Biarcus* plan to kill Odin "the war god". *GD* 59/1–66/35 *CS* Ø	*2* *S 2* *R 2* *WB 2*	This long and highly praised episode, featuring the longest sequence of metrical replicas in the whole body of *GD*, is cut off from *CS* to the last word.
	2. 15. 4. D	**Hiarthwarus pulls off a surprise victory.** All Danes have been killed, but one.	*1b, 3* *D 1b*	*CS* adds that *Wiggo*, the one who survived, "has already been mentioned" (*CS* 239/5. *Viggone, de quo supra mencio facta est*).

		GD 67/1–13 *CS* 239/3–8		
	2. 15. 5. D, K, LE	**Wiggo kills Hiarthawarus in the very wake of his victory.** Swedish forces are thereby driven off from Denmark.	**1a** D 1b K 1b LE 2	The whole episode is rather faithfully rendered in *CS*, and in detail, except for the detail that in the days of yore soldiers took an oath to the king by receiving from him a sword by the hilt. This tradition is, however, very important for the storyline since it allows *Wiggo* an occasion to surprise Hiarthwarus and kill him.
		GD 67/13–68/5 *CS* 239/8–22		

BOOK III

		Hotherus' upbringing at Gevarus' court		
		GD **69/3–70/2**	*CS* **230/24–240/7**	
3. 1.	3. 1. 1. YA	*Hotherus* **as a young man at Gevarus' court.** He is a fine youth indeed, with a special talent for music.	**1a,** **3** YA 1a	*CS* excludes all other Hotherus' talents (strength, swimming etc.), except for his musical skills. *CS* also does not mention Saxo's reasons to discuss Hotherus' youth first (*GD* 69/7–8., namely in order for the discussion on his mature age to be clearer). It is an addition of *CS* that *Gevarus* was king "according to Saxo" (*CS* 239/25) and that Hotherus was a grandson of Suanhuita (*CS* 240/2–3). Finally, *CS* says that Hotherus was *Atislus' filius* (239/24), while *GD* claims they were brothers (69/4).
		GD 69/3–22 *CS* 239/24–240/7		
	3. 1. 2. M	*Nanna,* **daughter of Gevarus, falls in love with Hotherus.**	**1a** M 2	Saxo's reflections on the nature of falling in love are taken out (for example, *GD* 69/26. *multiplices enim amor aditus habet*).
		GD 69/22–70/2		
		CS 240/6–8		
3. 2.		Odin's son Balderus and a way to defeat him		
		GD **70/3–72/14**	*CS* **240/8 – 241/5**	

	3. 2. 1.	***Balderus* falls in love with Nanna**, after having seen her bathing. *GD* 70/3–10 *CS* 240/8–11	*1b*	
	3. 2. 2. *ME, P*	**Hotherus visits the forest nymphs.** They reveal to him that Balderus too is in love with Nanna, and that he should not attack him, as he is a son of god, and invincible as such. *GD* 70/11–29 *CS* 240/11–21	*1b, 3* *ME 1b* *P 1b*	Although the main points of the episode are preserved, by the end, where Saxo says that *Hotherus* did not know that the whole scene with the forest nymphs "was only an illusion" (*GD* 70/27. *ignorabat enim… ludibrium tantum inaneque prestigiarum arcium extitisse commentum*), *CS* claims that *Hotherus* in fact understood that (*CS* 240/21. *credens igitur se ludificatum*).
	3. 2. 3. *C, ME*	**Gevarus gives Hotherus advice on how he can defeat Balderus.** He should find a special sword. *GD* 70/30–71/26 *CS* 240/21–241/2	*1a* *C 1a* *ME 1a*	This episode is considerably shortened. It is only reported that Hotherus gained the miraculous sword and other important weapons, but not how he achieved it.
	3. 2. 4. *WB, C*	**The king of Saxony Gelderus wants to take the magical sword from Hotherus.** He is defeated, as Hotherus first concentrates on defence, and when enemies have spent all their arrows, he easily subdues them. *GD* 71/27 – 72/26 *CS* 241/3–6	*1a* *WB 1a* *C 1a*	In the resume of the Gelderus episode, *CS* relates only that Hotherus was victorious, but not how it came to his victory.
3. 3.		**Hotherus helps his friend *Helgo*.** Suffering from serious stutter, Helgo is uncappable of proposing to a girl he likes, so his friend Hotherus takes care of that.	*2*	Not only the episode, but Helgo as a character of *GD* has been omitted.

		GD 72/15–38 *CS* Ø		
		**Hotherus and Balderus engage in several battles with varying success**		
		GD **72/39–75/30**		*CS* **241/6–242/8**
3. 4.	3. 4. 1. C	**Nanna cunningly rejects Balderus' love.** She claims that it is inappropriate for a god to marry a mortal. *GD* 72/39–73/16 *CS* 241/6–12	*1b* C 1b	
	3. 4. 2. WB, LE	**First battle between the man and the gods.** *Thorus* causes a lot of damage, before Hotherus destroys his hammer. After that, gods are defeated and run away in disarray. *GD* 73/17–74/19 *CS* 241/12–23	*1a* WB 1a LE 2	Many elements of this important episode are cut off. *CS* does not discuss the real nature of the gods in question, as *GD* does (*GD* 73/40–74/2: they are not gods by nature, but *gencium more*). *CS* does not elaborate on the humiliation Balderus experienced due to his defeat (*GD* 74/3–8). Finally, there is no mention of the funeral of *Gelderus*, who participated in the war on the side of the humans.
	3. 4. 3. WB, M, ME	**Balderus defeats Hotherus in the next battle.** He produces a source to quench the thirst of his soldiers. But unrequited love for Nanna drives him mad. In meantime, the god Frø establishes a grim sanctuary in Uppsala. *GD* 74/20–75/3 *CS* 241/24–28	*1a* WB 1a M 2 ME 2	*CS* does not include neither the account on the source, nor the one on Frø's sanctuary. The account on Balderus' obsession with Nanna is described in a much smaller scale. Finally, Saxo's moralizing on whims of luck (*GD* 74/22 *fallax fortune lenocinium* – because Hotherus was sometimes a victor, and sometimes a loser) is not present in *CS*.
	3. 4. 4. WB	**Hotherus takes hold of Denmark**, after hearing that both *Rolphus* and *Hiart-warus* are dead (see episodes 2.14.4–5). He is, however, driven out of Denmark by Balderus.	*1a,* *3* WB 1a	The author of *CS* does not mention that Hotherus was glad to hear about Rolphus' death, since the latter was responsible for the death of his father (that would be *Hothbrodus*).

			GD 75/4–30 CS 241/28–242/8		The details of Atislus' death are not mentioned here (cf. *GD* 75/16–22), but much earlier in the narrative. Finally, *CS* explains independently from *GD* that Hotherus hoped he could be king of Danmark *propter Swanhuitam, aviam suam* (for the predilection for Suanhuita in the narrative of *CS* on Hotherus, cf. also episode *3. 1. 1.*
		The final battle between Hotherus and Balderus			
		GD 75/30–78/14		*CS 242/8–243/20*	
		3. 5. 1. M	**Hotherus isolates himself in the Swedish wilderness.** He is now a defeated man, uncapable of resisting the all-powerful Balderus. *GD 75/30–76/7* *CS 242/8–13*	*1a* *M 2*	*CS* never mentions that Hotherus' people were angry with him for leaving them without leadership. *CS* does not reflect, like *GD* does, on the fact that, while mourning, people seek solitude.
3. 5.		*3. 5. 2. ME*	**Hotherus meets forest nymphs again.** He accuses them of deceiving him, but they maintain that he was not only unsuccessful in his wars with Balderus. They relate to him the way to take down Balderus once and for all. *GD 76/8–23* *CS 242/14–23*	*1b* *ME 1b*	
		3. 5. 3. ME, C	**Hotherus visits forest ladies who supply Balderus with a strength potion.** He deceives them into giving him a sip. *GD 76/34–77/19* *CS 242/23–243/9*	*1a* *ME 1a* *C 1b*	The author of *CS* does not relate how the strength potion is produced. The main ingredient is, namely, snake venom.

		Hotherus engages in a duel with Balderus. The latter is mortally wounded and dies several days later. *GD* 77/20–33 *CS* 243/9–17	*1b* K 1b ME 1b	Even the visit payed to Balderus by Proserpina, goddess of the Underworld, in the wake of his death, is retained in *CS*.	
		The marvellous grave of Balderus. Some brigands tried to pillage it, but were driven away by horrible hallucinations. *GD* 77/34–78/14 *CS* 243/17–20	*1a* ME 1a	*CS* does not relate, as *GD* does, what hallucinations actually consisted of, but briefly describes them as *dyabolicas illusiones* (*CS* 243/18–19)	

3. 5. 4. K, ME (for first row)

3. 5. 5. ME (for second row)

Odin seeks revenge		
GD **78/15–82/37**		*CS* 243/21–245/25

3. 6. 1. P, M	**Odin learn from a prophet how his son Balderus can be avenged.** He has to impregnate a certain girl, and the resulting offspring will be the avenger of Balderus. *GD* 78/15–22 *CS* 243/21–25	*1b* P 1b M 2	After relating that Odinus seeked advice from a prophet, Saxo sharply remarks: *Plerunque enim humane opis indiga est imperfecta divinitas.* (*GD* 78, 18–19). This witty reproach is absent from *CS*.	

3. 6.

Odin laboriously tries to approach the girl mentioned by the prophet			
GD 78/23–80/39		**CS 243/21–244/28**	

3. 6. 2.	3.6.2.1. C, WB	**Odin as a soldier.** GD 78/23–36 CS 243/26–244/5	*1b* C 1b WB 1b	
	3.6.2.2. C, M, ME	**Odin as a jeweler.** The girl is, however, smart and still resists him. GD 78/37–79/22 CS 244/6–13	*1a* C 1b ME 1a M 1a	In the version of *CS* we do not learn of various habits Odin had in masking his real appearance (*GD* 78/40–79/1). As well as that, *CS* does not dwell on the smartness of the girl (*GD* 79/13–22, *pervicacis animi puella*).
	3.6.2.3. C, ME	**Odin as a tactician. the** Girl pushes him away. He then drives her	*1a* C 1b ME 2	Odin's motivation is not fully explained in *CS*. Neither it is mentioned that, as a god or sorcerer, he could change his age

			GD 80/40–82/3		CS245/1–25
			to madness by magic. *GD* 79/23–40 *CS* 244/13–19		and appearance at will (cf. *GD* 79/30–32. *preter naturalem corporis speciem cuiuslibet etatis statum simulare callebant*).
		3.6.2.4. C	**Odin as a midwife.** He uses the girl's illness to rape her. Her father might have been involved in the plot. *GD* 80/1–39 *CS* 244/19–28	*1a* C 1b	Odin's duties as a midwife (that he washed the girl's legs, cf. *GD* 80/10–12) are not mentioned. Apart from that, the alternative version of the narrative of the girl's rape, according to which the father was involved in an abhorrent way is not preserved in *CS*.
			Political games in the Assembly of Gods		
	3. 6. 3. M, ME, K	3.6.3.1. ME	**Odin is banished from the Assembly of Gods,** on grounds of his latest embar-rassment. God Olevus will act as his replacement. *GD* 80/4–81/22 *CS* 245/1–9	*1b* ME 1b	
		3.6.3.2. M	**After 10 years in exile Odin returns.** Saxo speculates some gods in the Assembly might have been bribed into voting for his return. *GD* 81/22–36 *CS* 245/9–11	*1a* M 2	In *CS* all speculations regarding the bribing and corruption in the Divine Assembly have been deleted.
		3.6.3.3. ME, K	**Olevus is now banished.** He is killed by the Danes as soon as	*1a* ME 2 K 1b	*CS* lacks a curious information that *Olevus* was such a powerful mage that he could go across the sea on a piece of magical wood,

		he tries to restore his power. GD 81/36–82/3 CS 245/11–13		which Saxo emphases as a miraculous event.
		Odin finally succeeds in eliminating Hotherus		
		GD 82/4–14		**CS 13–15**
3. 6. 4.	3.6.4.1. CH	**Odin is again on the height of his power.** He instructs his son Bous to kill Hotherus. GD 82/4–14 CS 245/13–15	*1a* CH 2	*CS* is less enthusiastic than *GD* in describing how the whole world rejoiced in Odin's return to the supreme power. In *GD* Odinus presents his son with a curious piece of moral teaching that war is even better when one can offer decent grounds for waging it. This is removed from *CS*.
	3.6.4.2. K	**Hotherus kills Gunno**, who is responsible for murdering Gevarus. GD 82/15–21 CS 245/16–19	*1b* K 1b	
	3.6.4.3. D, K	**Final battle.** Both Hotherus and Bous are killed. GD 82/22–27 CS 245/19–25	*1b* D 1b K 1b	
		Danmark fights the rebels		
		GD 82/38–85/34		**CS 245/26 – 247/6**
3. 7.	3. 7. 1. C, WB	**After Hotherus' death many of the vassal states rebel in an attempt to be released from taxing.** *Roricus*, new Danish king, at first wins some tactical victories. GD 82/38–83/22 CS 245/26–246/4	*1a* C 1a WB 1a	*CS* does not reveal details of Roricus' tactical victories against the "barbarians", that they tried to ambush the Danes, but Roricus saw through their plot and turned the tables, *ut in auctorum caput proprie fraudis eventus recideret*.
	3. 7. 2.	**A mage from barbarian army provokes the Danes**	*1a*	The whole account is very simplified. *CS* essentially only

	ME	**to settle the issue with a duel.** *GD* 83/23–34 *CS* 246/4–246/46	*ME 1b*	relates the fact that there was a challenger.
	3. 7. 3. R, K	**A Dane volunteers to fight the contender.** He refuses to receive the gift from the king, making a moral point by explaining that gifts should only be received after victory. He is promptly killed by the barbarian contender. *GD* 83/34–84/24 *CS* 246/7–8	*1a* *R 2* *K 1a*	*CS* does not relate nearly anything from this episode. It is only mentioned that one of the Danes accepted the challenge, but was instantly defeated. His elaborate speech does not exist in *CS*.
	3. 7. 4.	**Mage calls for another challenger from Danmark** and mocks the Danes when no one shows up. *GD* 84/24–85/2 *CS* 246/9–10	*1a*	*CS* does not elaborate on the greatness of embarrassment that was threatening the Danes if noone was found who was willing to accept the challenge.
	3. 7. 5. K	**One Dane accepts the challenge.** He mocks the need to award him a gift merely for being a contender. Both he and the barbarous mage are killed in the duel. *GD* 85/3–34 *CS* 246/11–13	*1a* *K 1a*	The whole plot with the gift is excluded in *CS*, although it occupies a considerable portion of *GD*. The outcome of the duel is somewhat altered as well, since no mention is made of the fact that the grandiosity of the duel made the barbarians love and respect Roricus again (*GD* 85/33–34. *que res Rorico rebellium animos conciliavit*).
3. 8. K, R	*Horwendillus*, governor of Jutland, engages in piratical activities.** The Norwegian king *Collerus*, who attempts to challenge his supremacy on the sea, is killed in a duel. Later on, Horwendillus hunts down and		*1a* *K 1b* *R 2*	A great deal of information is left out of *CS*: it is not mentioned that before becoming a pirate, Horwendillus was ruling the lend for three years (*GD* 85/37–38. *triennio tyrannide gesta*); the long and elaborated speach of

	kills Collerus' sister, who is also a pirate. *GD* 85/35–87/8 *CS* 246/14–247/6			the Norwegian king is considerably shortened; the beauty of the island where the duel took place is not mentioned; finally, the name of Collerus' sister (*Sela*) is excluded.

	The Crime of Fengo			
	GD 87/21–88/5		*CS* 247/4–9	
3. 9.	*3. 9. 1.*	**Horwendillus is very successful in his kingdom.** He also receives a son, *Amlethus*. *GD* 87/21–25 *CS* 247/4–6	*1b*	
	3. 9. 2. *D, M*	**Fengo, jealous of his brother's happiness, murders him.** He tries to justify his crime by portraying Horwend-illus as a cruel tyrant. *GD* 87/26–88/5 *CS* 247/6–9	*1a* *D 1b* *M 2*	*CS* does not retain Fengo's justifications and excludes also Saxo's moralizing that the court has always been the place where lawyers and traitors were welcome.

	Horwendillus' son *Amlethus* pleads insanity to save his life from Fengo			
	GD 88/6–90/37		*CS* 247/10 – 249/11	
3. 10.	*3. 10. 1.* *C, M*	**Amlethus pretends he is a raving lunatic.** The claim he is making spikes in order to avenge his father is thus not taken seriously by any of Fengo's associates. *GD* 88/6–24 *CS* 247/10–18	*1a* *C 1b* *M 2*	In principle, *CS* has treated this episode rather faithfully, but Saxo's statement that Amlethus was always telling the truth (although his words did not sound realistic): cf. *GD* 88/22–24. *nec parvo responsum ludibrio fuit... quanquam ea res proposito eius post modum opitulata fuerit*. This is important since Amlethus' actual truthfulness in spite of feigned madness is the core feature of his character. Truthfulness is also one of the most important points in Saxo's codex of knightly honour.

	3. 10. 2. C	**Some of Fengo's associates start to doubt if Amlethus was not sane after all.** They attempt to make the matter clear by luring him into having sex with a pretty girl (apparently, sexual appetite was deemed a sign of mental health). *GD* 88/24–40 *CS* 247/19–23	*1a* *C 1b*	*CS* does not include a long section in which Saxo explains why the conspirators thought that matching Amlethus with the girl would show them if he was insane or not (*GD* 88/35–36. *nature siquidem tam preceps in venerem esse ingenium*). From our perspective, especially explanation of this bizarre experiment is rather necessary.
	3. 10. 3. C, M	**Amlethus sets out on a journey.** He does not know that during this journey he would be tempted by the girl. Before it happens, on several instances he succeeds in presenting himself as insane. *GD* 88/40–89/36 *CS* 247/23–248/12	*1a* *C 1b* *M 2*	Several important points are left out from *CS*: namely, already in the beginning it is said that Amlethus has an insider among Fengo's men, his friend from childhood who attempts to save him from the temptation; again, as in *3. 10. 1.* an important moral message that in spite of his apparent ludicrousness Amlethus kept telling the truth, is deleted from *CS*.
	3. 10. 4. C	**An incident with the girl.** Amlethus engages in sexual intercourse with the girl. His friend warns him in a curious way that it is a trap. Amlethus convinces the girl to lie about the act. *GD* 89/36–90/17 *CS* 248/12–22	*1b* *C 1b*	
	3. 10. 5. C, M	**Cover-up of the intercourse.**	*1a* *C 1b* *M 1a*	Again, *CS* is very faithful in rendering the corresponding passage of the *GD*. It is even stated how Amlethus tricked the conspirators without lying, *but* it is not explicitly stated that it was important not to lie, as in

		GD 90/18–37 CS 249/1–11		GD (90/23. *vitandi mendacii gracia*).
	Conspirators try to spy on Amlethus			
	GD 90/38–92/24		*CS 249/12–250/10*	
3. 11.	3. 11. 1. C	**Fengo's associates plan to spy on Amlethus while he converses with his mother.** It is thought that he would feign nothing in front of her. GD 90/38–91/16 CS 249/12–17	*1a* C 1b	*CS* does not retain the description of the man who proposed to spy on Hamlet, for whom Saxo has no kind words (*GD* 90/40. *presumpcione quam solercia abundancior*).
	3. 11. 2. C, K	**Amlethus detects the spy.** He then kills him, cuts his body into pieces, cooks it and feeds the pigs. GD 91/16–31 CS 249/18–23	*1b* C 1b K 1b	Here *CS* retains even the gory details.
	3. 11. 3. R	**Amlethus scolds his mother** for falling into embraces of her husband's killer and reveals the truth of his sanity to her. GD 91/31–92/15 CS 249/23–250/6	*1b* R 1b	
	3. 11. 4.	**Fengo tries to find out where his spy is**, but is obviously unsuccessful. GD 92/16–24 CS 250/6–10	*1b*	
	Amlethus is sent to the British king			
	GD 92/25–95/5		*CS 250/11–251/25*	
3. 12.	3. 12. 1. C, M	**Amlethus is sent to the British king.** He instructs the mother on what she is to do in his absence. Fengo asks in a letter that the British king should kill Amlethus. Amlethus intercepts the letter.	*1a* C 1b M 2	*GD* makes it clear that Fengo is reluctant to eliminate Amlethus himself not only due to his fear of Roricus (as stated in *CS*), but also because he fears the reaction of his wife (Amlethus' mother). As well as that, *CS* does not moralize, as *GD* does, on the fact that Amlethus transposed the

			GD 92/25–93/5 CS 250/11–16		danger from the letters from himself to his traveling companions, Fengo's associates.
			Amlethus' contempt for the court of the British king.		
			GD 93/6 – 95/5		**CS 250/22–251/20**
	3. 12. 2.	3.12.2.1. C	**Amlethus despises the feast offered by the British king.** He reveals why to his "companions". *GD 93/6–31* *CS 250/22–251/4*	*1a* C 1b	Several descriptive moments from *GD* are lacking in *CS*, which emphasise the point of Amlethus' contempt: that all the other guest were taken aback by his behaviour, and that everyone else thought that the feast was no less than splendid.
		3.12.2.2. CH	**The King makes further inquiries about Amlethus' claims** and finds that the latter was correct in all of his assumptions. *GD 93/32–94/36* *CS 251/4–20*	*1a* CH 1b	The episode is relatively faithfully rendered in *CS*, but the king's shepherd, who provides the king with most of the information in *GD*, disappears as the character from *CS*.
	3. 12. 3. K		**The British king gives his daughter to Amlethus** and kills his companions, even awarding him damages upon the deed. *GD 94/37–95/5* *CS 251/20–25*	*1b* K 1b	
3. 13.			**A massacre on Fengo's court: Fengo is finally killed**		
			GD 95/6–96/21		**CS 251/26–252/19**
	3. 13. 1. C		**Amlethus prepares for his return to the court of Fengo.** He assumes again the outfit of a sorry lunatic. *GD 95/6–11* *CS 251/26–252/2*	*1b* C 1b	
	3. 13. 2. C, M		**Amlethus intoxicates all the guests at the royal banquet** by making them drink excessively.	*1a* C 1b M 2	When asked about his companions, Amlethus shows two sticks in which he poured in the gold he received as a recompense for their murder. Although the answer seems

		GD 95/11–32 *CS* 252/2–11		ridiculous, it is, of course, nevertheless truthful. While *GD* makes a point out of that, *CS* does not.
	3. 13. 3. *C, K*	**Amlethus sets the whole palace on fire** and makes sure that every living creature in it dies.	*1a* C 1b K 1a	*CS* excludes the fact that Amlethus' mother helped him with the carnage by making the tapestries which were used to cover the drunken guests and prevent them from escaping. *CS* also omits the information that Amlethus wrapped the guests so tight that it was impossible for anyone to escape.
		GD 95/32–96/5 *CS* 252/11–15		
	3. 13. 4. *D*	**Amlethus finally enters Fengo's chambers and kills his wicked uncle.** *GD* 96/6–21 *CS* 252/16–19	*1b* D 1b	

BOOK IV

	Amlethus' rise to power			
		GD 97/1–22		*CS* 252/21–23
4. 1.	*4. 1. 1.* *C*	**Amlethus inspects the reactions** of the general populace to the bloodshed. *GD* 97/1–22 *CS* 252/21–23	*1a* C 1b	It is not mentioned in the *CS* that the fire destroyed everything, including the possible evidence on the perpetrator, which is why Amlethus, the obvious culprit, was not blamed.
	4. 1. 2. *R*	**Amlethus gathers his father's friends** and tells them of his merits in a long oration. *GD* 97/22–100/4 *CS* 252/23–253/1	*1a* R 2	The speech is rendered in one sentence only.
	4. 1. 3.	**Amlethus assumes power** as a king. *GD* 100/5–11 *CS* 253/1–7	*1a*	There is no mention of the dramatic change in Amlethus' appearance (from a vile vest to the luxury one).
4. 2.		**In the best heroic tradition, Amlethus has a shield made for**	*1a*	It is only stated that the shield of Amlethus depicted all the past

		him. All his adventures and achievements are illustrated on it. *GD* 100/19–101/14 *CS* 253/7–11		events from Amlethus' life. There is no full recapitulation as in the *GD*.
4. 3.		*British king plots to kill Amlethus*		
		GD 101/15–105/18		*CS* 253/12 – 255/5
	4. 3. 1. C, M	**British king learns that Amlethus killed Fengo.** Subject to an old promise he must now kill Amlethus. He therefore sends him to a murderous Scottish Queen. *GD* 101/15–102/3 *CS* 253/12–22	*1a* *C 1b* *M 2*	*CS* makes no mention about how the King was nervously contemplating his options. Neither is it mentioned that his final plan was to have Amlethus killed, but not to make his own hands dirty.
	4. 3. 2. C	**Amlethus in Scotland.** The Queen learns about his arrival through sentinels. *GD* 102/4–103/5 *CS* 253/22–254/2	*1a* *C 2*	*CS* does not mention that the Queen changed the contents of the letter Amlethus was carrying for her (a basic element of the plot in *GD*). Less importantly, the description of *locus amoenus* where Amlethus was overcame by sleep is also excluded.
	4. 3. 3. R	**The Queen insists that she should marry Amlethus and not the British king.** Amlethus is easily persuaded. Marriage takes place. *GD* 103/5–104/4 *CS* 254/2–12	*1a* *R 1a*	The Queen's speech to Amlethus is considerably shortened. The important point the Queen makes in *GD* is excluded from *CS*: namely, that in a potential match Amlethus should not look for a pretty face, but for a good lineage.
	4. 3. 4. R	**Amlethus' former wife,** although she is not particularly happy about him remarrying, informs him of the plot against his life. *GD* 104/5–20 *CS* 254/13–16	*1a* *R 1a*	Differently than in *GD*, the wife does not bring up her love for Amlethus in her speech, nor does she pathetically claim that she will love him even if their mutual son will one day hate him for leaving the family. The wife in *CS* also does not mention what reasons her father has to plot against Amlethus.

	4. 3. 5.	**The British king unsuccessfully tries to assassinate Amlethus.** *GD* 104/20–37 *CS* 254/16–22	*1a,* *2*	No mention is made of a light wound Amlethus did receive in the hands of the King. Apart from that, the whole sub-episode in which Amlethus tries to offer the Queen's sentinel as a real culprit is deleted.
	4. 3. 6. C, WB, K	**In the decisive battle, Amlethus manages to desfeat the British king by a cunning mechanism.** The King dies. *GD* 104/37 – 105/18 *CS* 254/23 – 255/5	*1b* *C 1b* *WB 1b* *K 1b*	
	Amlethus' death			
		GD **105/19–106/24**	*CS* **255/6–20**	
4. 4.	4. 4. 1. CH	**Vigletus bothers Amlethus' mother.** Amlethus reacts in a benevolent way. *GD* 105/19–26 *CS* 255/6–9	*1a* *CH 1a*	*CS* does not mention that Amlethus' mother was the one who was disturbed.
	4. 4. 2. WB	**Amlethus attacks Vilgetus and defeats him in a battle.** *GD* 105/26–30 *CS* 155/9–11	*1a* *WB 1b*	*CS* does not reveal the faith of the governor of Skåne, banished by Amlethus.
	4. 4. 3. M	**Vigletus gathers a huge army against Amlethus.** Amlethus is aware that he will die in the battle which ensues, but chooses not to flee. *GD* 105/30–106/2 *CS* 255/11–13	*1a* *M 2*	*CS* does not include Amlethus' reflections on the incompatibility of long life and honourable death.
	4. 4. 4. M	**The Scottish Queen (Amlethus' wife) first offers to fight besides Amlethus.** However, she abandons him, and supports the victor.	*1b* *M 1b*	

		GD 106/2–19 *CS* 255/13–20		
	4. 4. 5. *M,* *CH,* *D*	**Saxo vigorously praises Amlethus**. Vigletus becomes the King of Denmark.	*1a* *M 2* *CH 2* *D 1b*	*CS* does not offer abundant praises of Amlethus, as *GD* does.
		GD 106/19–24 *CS* 255/18–20		
4. 5 .		**Danmark threatened by the Swedish king Athislus**		
		GD **106/25–113/2**	*CS* **255/21–257/14**	
	4. 5. 1. *YA*	**King Virmundus assumes that his son is mentally challenged,** since he does not talk at all.	*1b* *YA 1b*	
		GD 106/25–107/7 *CS* 255/21–256/8		
	4. 5. 2. *CH*	**Days and ways of the king Athislus.**	*2* *CH 2*	The whole episode is deleted insomuch that its main features have been removed: nothing is said about marshal activities of Athislus.
		GD 107/8–19 *CS* 256/9–10		
	4. 5. 3. *WB, K, M*	**Athislus attacks Denmark**. He kills a reputable Dane, Frovinus, in a duel.	*1a* *WB 1b* *K 1b* *M 2*	*GD*'s moralizes: too much bragging destroys the valour of the actual deed. This is not to be found in *CS*. The same goes for Saxo's moralizing on virtuousness of the duel, which brings peril to few instead of many.
		GD 107/19–35 *CS* 256/10–15		
	4. 5. 4. *R*	**The currier Falconus informs the king Vermundus on the new attack by Athislus.** He is generously rewarded for his account.	*2* *R 2*	The whole character of Falconus is removed, although he plays no insignificant role in this part of *GD*.
		GD 107/19–35 *CS* 256/10–15		
	4. 5. 5. *WB*	**The battle against Athislus.** Falconus wounds the Swedish king in a rough duel.	*1a* *WB 1a*	The battle description is summarily dealt with, since no mention of Falconus (a major star of the battle in *GD*) is made.

		GD 107/33–109/6 *CS* 256/17–24		
	4. 5. 6. M, LE, R	**Vermundus engages in military banter** and develops a curious theory on four types of warriors in battles. *GD* 10977–110/17 Ø	*2* *M 2* *LE 2* *R 2*	
	4. 5. 7. C, M	**Ceto and Vigo, sons of Frovinus,** set out to kill Athislus in order to avenge the death of their father. Upon finding him, they conceal their real identity at first. *GD* 110/18–111/15 *CS* 256/24–25	*1a/2* *C 2* *M 2*	Only the general information is retained in *CS*. No trace is left of the cunning ways Ceto and Vigo employed in order not to reveal the truth, but at the same time, not to tell lies either, since that was against the Danish code of honour (compare this to Amlethus' exploits).
	4. 5. 8. K, M	**Vigo and Ceto kill Athislus in a duel.** It is generally thought that it was not fair for the two of them to challenge Athislus who fought alone. *GD* 111/16–113/2 *CS* 256/25–257/14	*1a* *K 1a* *M 1a*	In *GD* Athislus is trying to persuade the young men not to engage him in a duel, since he is reluctant to kill them in their prime. *CS* makes no mention of this. *GD* also offers a lot of moralizing about the unfair duel, which is in *CS* reduced to the last sentence only.
4. 6.		**Uffo defends the dignity of Denmark**		
		GD 113/3–117/15	*CS* 257/15–260/7	
	4. 6. 1.	**An envoy from Saxony insults Vermundus.** The Saxon ruler assumes that he is not fit to rule the country because he is old and blind. *GD* 113/3–30 *CS* 257/15–22	*1a*	*CS* excludes Vermundus' sharp replies to the Saxon mission („my state calls for compassion, not for insults!"), present in *GD*.
	4. 6. 2.	**Uffo, Vermundus' son, talks for the first time in his life** and accepts to challenge in a duel both	*1b*	

		the Saxon prince and any other warrior who would chance to accompany him. *GD* 113/30–114/11 *CS* 257/23–29		
	4. 6. 3.	**Vermundus talks to his son for the first time.** *GD* 114/12–35 *CS* 258/1–14	*1b, 3*	At first, the blind Veremundus does not believe that it was his son who talked. In *GD* he expresses his doubts twice before starting to believe. In *GD* only the father praises Vermundus' answer to the envoys, while in *CS* the whole court does that (*cunctis laudantibus*).
	4. 6. 4. C	**Vermundus and other Danes** try to find an appropriate weapon for the giant and violent hands of Uffo. *GD* 114/35–115/31 *CS* 258/14–259/7	*1b* C 1b	
	4. 6. 5. C, K	**The duel.** *GD* 115/32–117/2 *CS* 259/8–260/7	*1a* C 2 K 1b	*CS* does not mention the cunning ways in which Uffo tricked his opponents into their deaths.
	4. 6. 6. LE	Saxo laments that nothing further is known about Uffo. **If Danes had acquired competence in the Latin language earlier, more of their history would have been known.** *GD* 117/3–15 *CS* Ø	*2* LE 2	
4. 7. WB, CH		**The horrible king Dan.** *GD* 117/16–25 *CS* 260/8–11	*1b* WB 1b CH 1b	
4. 8. K, WB		**King Hugletus.**	*1b*	*CS* does not mention that it was in the course of a naval battle

	GD 117/26–28 CS 260/12–13		K 1b WB 2	that king Hugletus killed the Swedish tyrants.
4. 9. C, K	**King Frotho** and his cunning fight against the Norwegian king. GD 117/29–118/23 CS 260/14–261/18		*1b* C 1b K 1b	
4. 10. C, K, YA	**The boy king Dan.** GD 118/24–34 CS 261/9–14		*1b* C 1b K 1b YA 1b	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">King Fridlavus</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2" align="center"><i>GD</i> 118/34 – 120/9</td><td colspan="2" align="center">CS 261/15 – 262/16</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">4. 11.</td><td><i>4. 11.
1.
M, C</i></td><td>King Fridlevus fights the traitors.

GD 118/34–35
CS 261/15–262/7</td><td><i>1a</i>
M 2
C 2</td><td>There is no mention in <i>CS</i> about the cunning ways the traitors used in order to safeguard against being betrayed by each other. Also, no moralizing about the nature of treason, abundant in <i>GD</i>, is present.</td></tr>
<tr><td><i>4. 11.
2.
C,
WB</i></td><td>Fridlevus uses the methods of previous Danish kings in his own battles.
GD 119/36–120/9
CS 262/7–16</td><td><i>1a</i>
C 1b
WB 1b</td><td><i>CS</i> does not remind us that the cunning method of invading a city by setting birds on fire can be traced to Hadingus. (cf. 1. 4. 5.)</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">BOOK XVI</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2" align="center"><i>GD</i> 657/4–674/15</td><td colspan="2" align="center"><i>CS</i> 436/9–439/4</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. 1.</td><td colspan="2">After Waldemar´s death, king Kanutus assumes power without opposition.
GD 657/4–12
CS 436/9–12</td><td><i>1b</i></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">The rebellion of Skåne</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2" align="center"><i>GD</i> 657/17–660/23</td><td colspan="2" align="center"><i>CS</i> 436/12–26</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. 2.</td><td><i>16. 2.
1.</i></td><td>Skanians rebel. Absalon leaves their assembly in agitation. Rebels commit acts of violence against the provincial nobility.</td><td><i>1a</i></td><td><i>CS</i> does not mention all the serious instances of violence committed against the nobility (houses burnt, goods confiscated etc.).</td></tr>
</table>

	GD 657/17 – 658/9 CS 436/12–14			*CS* gives no account of Absalon's presence at the Assembly (instead we are only informed that he fled: *CS* 436. 13. *Absolone fugato*).
16. 2. 2.	**The Skanian nobility finds refuge in Zealand.** The advice they give to Absalon is contradictory. GD 658.9–27 CS Ø	*2*		
16. 2. 3. M	**Haroldus the Pretender.** GD 658/27–32 CS 436/14–16	*1a* M 2		In *CS* Haroldus is only described as *nullius valoris homo* (*CS* 436/15), while *GD* moralizes quite a bit more to assure of the latter's inaptness.
16. 2. 4. WB, M, C	**A small number of nobles opposes the mob and pulls off a surprise victory.** The citizens of Lund have, meanwhile, waited to see the result of the battle before choosing side. GD 658/32–619/17 CS 436/16–19	*1a* WB 1a M 2 C 2		While *GD* talks a lot about the heroic audacity of the nobles, in *CS* this is not particularly emphasised. In *GD* a point is made of the fact that the strong wind was a fiercer opponent to the nobles than the rebels – again, this is not mentioned in *CS*. The behaviour of the citizens of Lund is passed over in silence in *CS*.
16. 2. 5.	**The Scanians attempt rebellion again**, but it is checked by Absalon before it could take a swing. GD 659/17–660.3 CS 439/19–22	*1a*		While *GD* devotes a lot of attention to explaining this last rebellion of Skåne, *CS* reduces it to the basic information only.
16. 2. 6. CH	**Kanutus' mildness.** In order to retaliate for the rebellion, the king first plans to devastate whole regions, but is swayed by Absalon, and only charges a fiscal penalty instead.	*1b* CH 1b		

		GD 660/4–23 *CS* 436/22–26		
	Diplomatic incidents			
	GD 660/24–662/1		*CS* 437/24–25	
16. 3.	*16. 3. 1.*	**Kanutus exchanges letters with the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire** on less than friendly terms. *GD* 660/38–661/31 *CS* 437/1–23	*1b, 3*	When the Roman Emperor threatens to invade Denmark, Kanutus replies that he would first have to find someone else willing to take that duty (*GD* 660/35–36. *priusquam sibi regnum adimat, qui Daniam in eiu beneficio recipere cupiat*). In *CS* he rather replies by saying "Come and claim it, if you dare" (*CS* 437/6–7. *Non prius alicui Daciam daret, quam ipse obtineret*).
	16. 3. 2.	**The Roman Emperor sends an envoy to Denmark.** Absalon, however, checks any attempt to reconciliation. *GD* 660/38–661/31 *CS* 437/1–23	*1b*	
	16. 3. 3.	**Unable to attack Denmark himself, the Emperor sucessfully enrolls the Wendish king Bogiszlavus**. *GD* 661/31–662/1 *CS* 437/24–25	*1a*	In *CS* it is not explained what stopped the Emperor from conducting the attack himself.
	The War against Bogiszlavus			
	GD 662/1–668/10		*CS* 437/26–438/11	
16. 4.	*16. 4. 1.*	**Bogiszlavus first attempts an assault against Jarimarus, the ruler of Rügen.** *GD* 662/1–36 Ø	*2*	
	16. 4. 2.	**Absalon learns that Bogiszlavus attempts a military attack on Rügen.** With extreme agitation, he	*1a/2*	As it is readily observable from the references (almost two full pages in *GD* are reduced to less

		sets off towards the island of Strela. *GD* 662/36–664/38 *CS* 437/26–438/1		than 10 lines) only a summary information is given.
	16. 4. 3. *WB, CH*	**Decisive battle between Absalon and Bogiszlavus.** As soon as Absalon's war signs become visible, the Wendish army takes flight. *GD* 664/39–668/10 *CS* 438/1–11	*1a/2* *WB 2* *CH 2*	As in the previous section, the episode has been severely trimmed in the hands of the *CS* abridger (four pages of *GD* are reduced to barely ten lines). Only the results of a dramatic battle are accounted for.
		**The War against Bogiszlavus after the naval battle**		
		***GD* 668/11–672/39**		***CS* 438/12–15**
16. 5.	*16. 5. 1.* *WB, C, CH*	**The siege of the *Walogastenses.*** *GD* 668/11–669/24 *CS* Ø	*1a/2* *WB 2* *C 2* *P 2* *ME 2* *(these symbols are valid for all the four sections examined here)*	This whole long section has been treated in only four lines by the author of *CS*. None of the notable episodes described in *GD* are present – *CS* rather sums up the campaign as difficult, without revealing any concrete details: *Hoc facto, ne Slavi iterum cito ad resistenciam pararentur, rex Kanutus iterum cum excercitu Slaviam intravit, multisque <cum> periculis ac difficultatibus utbes et terram incendiis ac spoliis devastabat.* (*CS* 438/12–15) The first two sections of the part **16** are also covered by this statement.
	16. 5. 2. *C, P, ME*	Bogiszlavus makes an unsuccessful **attempt on Absalon's life**. *GD* 669/24–670/4 *CS* Ø		
	16. 5. 3. *WB, C*	Danish army achieves the tactical **victory against *Walogastenses***. *GD* 670/4–24 *CS* Ø		
	16. 5. 4. *WB*	Other details of the **campaign against Bogiszlavus**, most notably the unsuccessful expedition against Pomerania. *GD* 670/24–672/39 *CS* Ø		
16. 6.		**Bogiszlavus surrenders**		
		***GD* 672/39–673/24**		***CS* 673/24–674/15**
	16. 6. 1.	**The siege of Camynus**	*1a/2*	

	WB, C	GD 672/39–673/24 CS Ø	WB 2 C 2 R 2	See the last section for more details on *CS'* treatment on these sections as well.
	16. 6. 2. R	**Negotiations with the priests of Camynus** and with Bogiszlavus		
		GD 673/24–674/15 CS Ø		
	16. 6. 3. CH	**Bogiszlavus accepts all the conditions** imposed on him by the Danes. The ormer rebel becomes an ardent admirer of Denmark, its people and their king.	*1a* CH 2	The curious moment where Bogiszlavus gets obscenely drunk and Absalon in his kindness makes sure that he arrives to his tent safely – an episode used by Saxo to further develop the portrait of the bishop – is left out from *CS*.
		GD 673/24–674/15 CS 438/15–439/4		

2. 3. Results and discussion

Now it is time to summarize the results obtained through the table. We will discuss each of the categories we introduced at the beginning of the chapter individually.

2. 3. 1. Episodes pertaining to the supernatural

We begin with the discussion on the way miraculous events present in *GD* were treated in *CS*. Anyone who recalls the preface written by the author of *CS* will remember that he was somewhat critical towards Saxo and that he actually accused Saxo of neglecting the *veritas* of his historical narrative in favour of the *ornatum* (*CS* 216/1–217/9).

If one were today to decide in which episodes Saxo departed from the truth the most, it is probable that primarily the sections containing the miraculous events would come to mind first: dragons, fairies, giants, magical swords and potions all pertain to the world of myth and have nothing to do with historical veracity. It is also very probable that it is precisely to miraculous and rather unbelievable episodes that the author of *CS* was referring, when issuing his criticism in the preface. There is, however, a big *caveat* to this assumption: what the author of *CS* would perceive as believable, and what he perceived as less so can have very little to do with the beliefs of our own day.

From the ancient times, throughout the middle ages and all the way to the early modern times, people – and the most educated among them – believed in existence of phenomena that most of our contemporaries would find exceedingly hard to accept. I will offer several examples to illustrate this point. When it comes to the Ancient authors, it will suffice to mention that Pliny the

Younger, who was certainly a very well educated man, as an imperial magistrate and an intimate friend of the great historian Tacitus (not to mention his being a nephew to the erudite Pliny the Elder, whose *Naturalis historia* was one of the pillars of medieval science, and a pupil to the great and rigorous teacher Quintilian) seriously contemplated the possibility of existence of ghosts. In one of his letters he begs his friend Sura to help him to decide since if they exist or not (VII 27. 1. *velim scire, esse phantasmata et habere propriam figuram numenque aliquod putes an inania et vana ex metu nostro imaginem accipere*). After this introduction, he relates three stories, all coming from confirmed sources: one from the Roman context, one from the Greek one, and one from his own household.

If we jump over many centuries to Saxo himself and to his introduction to *Gesta Danorum*, we will learn that he was no less serious in his belief in giants than Pliny was when it comes to ghosts. Saxo even tries to provide us with compelling evidence (that is at least how he saw them) that giants existed (cf. *GD* 8/29–9/8): namely, he found that in the distant past huge rocks were transported to the very tops of some high mountain peaks. He asks his readers, in a somewhat irritated fashion, if they refuse to believe that it was a doing of giants, *quis eorum verticibus cautes tante granditatis invexerit*. Since this means beyond reasonable doubt that Saxo truly believed in giants, there is no telling what else he might have believed. And even if not all of the miraculous episodes present in *GD* gained his fullest trust it seems very probable that the contrast between the "mythical" first half of *GD* and the "historical" latter one (as we nowadays like to tag them) was much less sharp than it is for us today. It was all one continuous history.

It is also unlikely that prophecies, which are abundantly present in *GD*, were taken less seriously than other miraculous events by Saxo. A good proof of this is that they do not appear only in the "mythological" part of the narrative, but also in the book XVI (see *16. 5. 2.*) when Absalon is saved from a plot against his life, construed by Bogiszlavus, thanks to a warning one of his associates received in a dream, the whole situation being not very dissimilar to *1. 6. 10. 1.* when Hadingus is informed, also in a dream, about a plot to kill him.

Finally, if we move even further on in history, since the author of *CS* had to have been at least a century younger than Saxo, we will not be at pains to find later examples too. For instance, there is a letter from a tax enforcer (*landbofogde*) Ubbe Jönsson, dated 26 June 1654, where he informs the Lord High Chancellor of Sweden Axel Oxenstierna, again a person who was not only of the utmost social standing, but also extremely well educated, that a certain Anders Persson from Rastbaksmåla would not be able to contribute to taxes in his full capacity, since he was bothered by Satan – an incident confirmed even by a church certificate (Reg. nr. 4273. *... ett intyg från kyrkoherden Olaus Eberi i Mortorp, enligt vilket satan alltsedan 1648 plågat AO:s bonde Andes Persson i Råstbaksmåla...*). To make the matter even more odd from the modern perspective, the Chancellor showed fullest the compassion and awarded a substantial tax reduction to the unfortunate farmer.

The fact that different times drew the line between possible and impossible events and between the believable and unbelievable quite differently could be confirmed with any number of examples, but we deem the ones already given to be enough for the purposes of the present research. If, therefore, the author of *CS* had the intention to draw Saxo's text closer to reality and release it from the burden of unconvincing phantasies, one is not to expect that he has done it in a way a modern scholar would. We should therefore not be discouraged by the fact that of all the 30 instances of what we call miraculous events in *GD* 13 has been conserved in *CS*, while 9 have been abridged, and 8 removed. This might mean that while only a small portion of episodes was indeed deemed miraculous by the abbreviator, the rest was classified as history. I believe that there are two main reasons for some of the episodes having been removed. It is interesting to see which episodes were eliminated from the shorter version and see if any system or pattern can be discerned. In relation to that I would particularly like to draw attention to the episodes *1. 6. 5.*, *2. 5. 1.* and *2. 5. 4.* which are among the rare episodes dealing with the ghosts and the Underworld, since they have been removed. It is perhaps conceivable that the author of *CS* rejected the belief in ghosts and evil spirits as too irrational. Further evidence might be seen in the fact that the prophecy of the dead man to Hadignus and Hargrepa, which gives rise to one of the more powerful songs in *GD*, although it was not excluded, was downsized in importance and trimmed to a level of one sentence (cf. *1. 4. 3. 2.*). On the other hand, many episodes describing giants, both good ones like Hargrepa (*1. 3. 6.*, *1. 4. 2. 2.*) and the bad ones attempting to marry unfortunate princesses (*1. 6. 4.*) have been kept. Perhaps the author of *CS* was convinced of the existence of giants by Saxo's arguments we discussed earlier, if he was ever in doubt in the first place.

There is, however, another reason for the deletion of certain episodes. I will elaborate it here, since we are discussing the treatment of miraculous events first, but it is applicable to all episodes belonging to any category. Another accusation directed against Saxo in the preface to the *CS* was that his narration was too amplified (*CS* 217/2. *opus suum diffusum est in pluribus locis*). This is why I think that the abbreviator also excluded certain episodes, independently from their content, which were only loosely connected to the main narrative, and attributed more to its general *decorum*, than to the development of the narrative. Quite a few of excluded instances could be explained in this way. For example, the section *1. 4. 4. 3.*, interesting as it may be with its description of Hadingus's journey on the flying horse, does not advance the plot one inch, and was duly removed. Even the episode *1. 6. 5.*, with its description of Hadingus's visit to various parts of the Underworld, could have suffered expulsion on the same grounds, since it is really very loosely connected to any other part of the narrative, although from the standpoint of the modern literary theory it could be interpreted as an important step towards defining Handingus as an epic hero of the first class and in the same category as Odysseus, Aeneas, Scipio (and, indeed, Dante) and the others who have visited "the Great beyond" before their due time has come. This is, however, a modern view which can have little or nothing to do with the way a XV century author approached the episode. He might have seen only an accessory, incidental anecdote in it, and could have duly removed it. Note also that this fits perfectly to our previous discussion on the importance of relevance for the author of the *Compendium* specifically, and for

a stereotypical medieval abridger generally, as relevance is one of the four Gricean categories, taken on by Dubischar and discussed in our introduction.

At this point I must be allowed to respond to the question or criticism that might arise from this last principle of abridgment we have introduced. Namely, someone could ask whether all the reductions could, at the end of the day, be reduced to the sheer avoidance of anecdotal and incidental, and whether the division we made of miraculous events, moralizing etc. can have any bearing on the issue. The answer can probably be found already in the case of the previously mentioned excluded episodes *2. 5. 1.* and *2. 5. 4.* which contain Suanhuita's battle against ghosts. I maintain that their content is the primary reason for the deletion, since the episode cannot be interpreted as marginal for several reasons. In the first place (although, perhaps, not most importantly), its imposing size (two full pages of *GD*) already prevents it from being a pure anecdote. Furthermore, the episode presents us with the character of the warring lady Suanhuita, who is important not only because of her relentless struggle against demons, but also as an ancestor to the whole league of important characters, most notably Hotherus, who is the main protagonist throughout the whole first half of the Third Book. Finally, the episode is also essential because it explains how it came to be that Suanhuita was married to Regnerus, and, furthermore, that Regnerus became the king of Sweden. We can perhaps even notice that the abbreviator was aware of the downside of reducing the role of Suanhuita so considerably in the previous book, since in the section *3. 1. 1.* (see our comment upon it) he mentions her as an ancestor to Hotherus (although Saxo does not). He was thus aware that it was important to introduce the reader to this curious and important character, but he nevertheless excluded the episode where she had the most prominent role. His motives therefore should not (and cannot) be reduced to mere removal of anecdotal material. One legitimate explanation for this (although I concede that it is not the only one and welcome any other suggestions) would be that he wanted to reduce the untrustworthiness of Saxo's account by excluding ghosts.

2. 3. 2. Episodes pertaining to moral and didactical issues

I now move on to the second category we mentioned in the introduction to this chapter – the one concerned, first and foremost, with moralizing. We must be aware that writing of history was always aimed at presenting the readers with a set of examples, either of glorious deeds or of hideous crimes, which would primarily serve to guide them through their own present lives and only then to augment their knowledge on the past (indeed, even today many perceive history as an epic factory of heroes and villains, rather than a cold and precise research on the past events). This moralistic approach to the writing of history was already familiar in Antiquity – we should recall that, for example, Sallust devotes whole passages to moral preaching (cf. *Bellum Catilinae* 5–9), while it hardly needs to be stressed that Livy's histories had a strong moral grounding in the set of values of Augustan Rome (cf. Conte 1994, 371. for a good discussion on the issue: "These images [of the past] act as models of social and individual behavior, positive and negative; they are invitations to virtue and warnings against wickedness.")

This moralistic approach to history was not abandoned during the Middle Ages. It is an important element of Saxo's literary technique. Before attempting a discussion on the way Saxo's moralizing was reflected in *CS*, we must make clear what all the instances that we have taken to be examples of Saxo's moralistic stance were. First, there are proverbs. The technique Saxo employs in his work is aptly defined as the "proverbial discourse" (cf. Pfeffer 1997, 3), since he usually relates an event and rounds up his narrative with a witty remark. For example, when he relates how Nana, daughter of the king Gevarus, fell in love of Hotherus, not because of his beauty or fame, but because of his musical talents, he concludes that "love has many doors" (*GD* 69/26. *multiplices enim amor aditus habet*), and when Hotherus finds solace in conversation with his friend in the wake of a war he is about to wage against gods, Saxo wisely remarks that "conversation with a friend in the times of peril, even if it does not eliminate danger, relieves the inquietude of the soul" (*GD* 73/20–21. *Amica siquidem in adversis collocucio, tametsi periculum non tollit, egritudinem minuit*). It is easy to notice the simple beauty of these proverbs, which certainly contributed to Saxo's overarching success. Even the great Erasmus of Rotterdam in his surprisingly warm eulogy on Saxo's *Gesta Danorum* in his famous treatise *De optimo dicendi genere sive Ciceronianus* (1528. ph.1575-6), is praising them: "*In Daniam malo, quae nobis dedit Saxonem Grammaticum, qui suae gentis historiam splendide magnificeque contexuit... Probo vividum et ardens ingenium, orationem nusquam remissam aut dormitantem, tum miram verborum copiam, **sententias crebras** et figurarum admirabilem varietatem, ut satis admirari non queam, unde illa aetate homini Dano tanta vis eloquendi suppetierit, sed vix ulla in illo Ciceronis lineamenta reperias.*" As we can see, in this trully enthusiastic review of *Gesta Danorum* from the quill of one of the foremost European intellectuals of the day, the proverbs receive a place of honour.

Saxo's moralizing is, however, not limited to proverbs. Often witty and clever remarks come not from the narrator, but from the protagonists in Saxo's history. It seems that Saxo urges the reader to accept their advice if the character who produced them is otherwise described as a commendable one. Fine examples can be found in the stylish book two with its quick succession of persuasive speeches (e.g. *GD* 48/35–36. *armis, non auro certandum fore*), but also in the book sixteen, originating from the warring bishop Absalon (most notably, *GD* 4–5. *armis, non precibus deo libamenta daturus*). Furthermore, some instances do not provide us with any proverbs strictly speaking, but rather offer Saxo's moral reflections, lectures and protests on a larger scale. These often occur in violent outbursts when Saxo is describing an event which is particularly problematic from the moral standpoint. A good example is to be found in the episode where he decries the crime committed by Thora, who exacted her revenge upon the king Helgo who had once raped her by tricking him into having sex with his own daughter (*GD* 52/6–18. *O stolidam matrem!* etc. in a similar vein).

Finally, we have to consider how these moralizing instances of Saxo, the tremendeous importance of which we have shown for both Saxo's style and his thought, were treated in the hands of the *CS* abbreviator. Of the total of forty episodes (notice the vast number), in as many as thirty-four occasions every trace of Saxo's preaching has been removed, while in four occasions

the moral element has been only abridged. On two occasions, it has been kept as it stands. The numbers are very telling and the tendency to remove Saxo's moralizing is perfectly clear. These results may be accounted for by the explanation we had already introduced – namely, moral outbursts, no matter how witty and elaborated, do nothing for the continuation of the narrative. Indeed, while the narrator thunders against the evils of the world, the plot is at a standstill. We have already shared our impression that the author of *CS* was mostly interested in advancing the main tread of the plot, and this impression can now be powerfully confirmed.

We need, however, to take a look at those few occasions in *CS* where moral lessons were not completely suppressed and try to explain their survival. Of the five instances of the *1a* type, four are quite specific: *2.8.1.* and *2,8,3,* belong to the wise speeches of two kings, a Dane and a Brit, who advise their soldiers on the best course of action. As a result of the first of these speeches, the Danes leave their treasures in order to lure the British army, while the second speech is meant to stop the British from committing such a mistake. It is clear that both of these speeches, although heavily moralizing, are deeply rooted in the narrative. Without them, not only the refinement of style and the depth of the story (two matters *CS* seems to take no interest in), but also the flow of the story, would suffer. Further on, in *3. 6. 2. 2.* Saxo is praising the wit of the girl who would not succumb of her own accord to Odin's aggressive courting. We can argue also in this occasion that the narrative would suffer: if the audience were not familiar with the girl's wit, her persistent and admirable (although ultimately futile) opposition to the chieftain of the gods would be hard to accept.

One final occasion of *1a* is equally interesting and might prompt us to further discussion: namely, the episode *4. 5. 8*. Saxo offers an exciting story of two young men on a quest to avenge their father. When they finally face the men whom they set out to kill (who happens to be the king of Sweden), he prompts them to attack him together, since that is the only way they could defeat an experienced warrior such as him. At first, they refuse, but when one of them is nearly killed, the other cannot bear the suspense any longer, joins the duel and slays the Swedish king. Saxo makes it clear that in this way only duels are won, but not glory. This is the subject of some moralizing in *GD* 112/26–113/2. This is, for a change, retained in *CS*, albeit in a much shorter form: *CS* 257/12–14. *versum est igitur in proverbium apud extraneos, quod duo Dani pugnando contra unum leges dimicandi turpiter infregissent.* At the first sight, it could seem that the narrative did not demand this remark. However, the next episode shows that it really did. An arrogant Saxon envoy comes to Denmark, bearing the message from his king, who expresses the wish to adjoin Denmark to his territory, and proposes a duel between the sons of the kings of Denmark and Saxony. The Dane, however, accepts not only to fight the Saxon prince, but any one of his companions he chooses to bring with him to the duel as well. Later on, when he is asked why he insisted on having two instead of one opponent, he replies – and this reply is preserved in *CS* 258/12–14. *respondit, quod hoc fecit propter regis Atisli necem, quem duo Dani contra legem duelli non sine opprobrio occiderunt*. It is therefore clear that the moralizing from the episode *4.5.8.* had to be

conserved for the sake of the narrative – namely, to offer a valid motive to the Danish prince, Uffo, for doing something that would in other circumstance be interpreted as arrogant folly.

Now we have touched upon the problem of the Danish code of honour. Since this is closely related to the morality and moral messages of *GD*, I have to briefly account for how these instances are treated in *CS*. One of the most important rules for an honourable Danish medieval gentleman was never to lie. This is expressed on several occasions in the famous tale about Amlethus. For example, in the episode *3. 10. 5.* Amlethus tries to hide the fact that he has had sex with the girl who was sent in order to tempt him – a confession to the intercourse would lead to his prompt execution. However, Amlethus does not lie, but says that he did sleep with her, albeit on *ungule iumenti, cristeque galli, laquearibus quoque tecti* (*GD* 90/21–22). This is of course absurd and his listeners lose all confidence in his account after hearing it. He has, however, taken care to bring with him the three objects he mentions when he was leaving the house on the morning of the temptation, in order to be able to hide the truth by absurdity and without lying. Further instances of this stratagem in the Amlethus story are *3. 10. 1.* and *3. 13. 2.* and in the story of the murder of Atislus *4. 5. 8.* None of these occasions is, however, retained by the author of *CS* – while he does mention that Amlethus did take all those ridiculous objects with him in episode *3. 10. 5.* he does not make a point out of it, and an uninformed reader could have thought that Amlethus was making things way more complicated than they had to be, since it would have been much easier to simply lie. I suppose that the *CS* abbreviator thought that these remarks do not add anything to the narrative – he might have thought that his readers knew enough about Danish customs and that no further explanations were needed. One might suggest, however, that Saxo would not approve of this. If readers of *CS* knew what was at play, the targeted audience of *GD* would have known it even better. The reason why Saxo nevertheless explained it was in order to offer a more vivid portrait of some of the important protagonists – most notably Amlethus – and to present them in the fullest light of Danish knightly manners. *CS* failed to take this into account.

I would finally like to briefly mention two episodes which contain moral remarks which were fully conserved (*1b*) by *CS*: *1. 5. 1.* and *4. 4. 4.* It is interesting and possibly important that the moralizing in both of these episodes is directed against women. In *1. 5. 1.* Saxo comments upon the scandalous behaviour of Odin's wife Frigga and says bitterly *tale numen hac coniuge dignum extitisse!* (*GD* 25/27–28), which is rendered in *CS* as *talis deus tali coniuge dignus erat!* (*CS* 225/12–13). In the latter episode, the target of the attack is Amlethus' second wife, the Scottish Queen, who promised to be with Amlethus in his final battle, but betrayed him in the last moment. Now, Saxo is known for his curious comments about women – and one should not draw premature conclusions from the fact that the only two moral remarks that were preserved are directed against women, since there are many more in *GD*, which have no reflection whatsoever in *CS* (e.g. *2. 6. 2.*). However, the coincidence is curious and we might not be wrong to suppose that the author of *CS* shared in the general medieval attitude towards women and thought that he could give vent to his frustration in at least some of the many opportunities given to him by Saxo, even if they have indeed nothing to do with the narrative which was his primary concern.

2. 3. 3. Episodes pertaining to war and destruction

We now quickly move on to our next topic which is concerned with episodes depicting war and destruction. This is the foremost topic of the *GD*. Saxo describes endless wars, duels, feuds and murders. It has already been argued by some scholars (Gertz 1917–1918, 198) that the author of *CS* was far less enthusiastic about the military lore. If we, however, take a look at our episode count, we will see that out of the total of 39 episodes containing descriptions of war battles, there are 19 instances *1b*, 10 of *1a* and 10 of *2*. These results are surprising, but they do not have to necessarily call into question those previous assumptions. First of all, great many of the battle descriptions which have been fully preserved in *CS* are very short – indeed so short that if they were not fully preserved, they would have had to be completely removed. Some telling examples of this are *1. 2. 2.* or *1. 4. 6.* On the other hand, the huge war episode in the Book XVI which deals with the war the bishop Absalon and the Danes led against the Wendish Prince Bogiszlavus and which painstakingly drags through several sections of *GD*, has been reduced to one sentence only in *CS*. This is one of the most drastic removals we have detected. Another example is the huge episode *2. 15. 13.*, which is mostly preoccupied with heroic battles, although its deletion might partly be due to the fact that the whole episode is contained in metre, which is, as a rule, removed from *CS*. All this, however, sends a clear signal that the author of *CS* was not particularly fond of describing battles. He felt it was enough to reveal the results to the reader. Indeed, one should not forget that the battle descriptions are precisely that – descriptions. Since descriptions by definition slow down the narrative and in light of our previous discussion on the abbreviator's attitudes on the narrative, this could be one valid explanation for his treatment of the war battles. Another good argument in favour of this interpretation is that a good number of episodes which originally did not give only summary information about battles, but rather full descriptions, were cut down to the level of summary information – see, for instance, episodes *3. 2. 4.* and *3. 7. 1.*, and many more. As we stated above, the summary information is all that he needed. I would therefore argue that he did not cut down battle descriptions due to the fact that they were *battles*, but due to the fact that they were *descriptions* (and thus easy to cut down without consequences for the narrative). The reduction of content ensued not as a result of an agenda we could imagine that he might have followed, but rather as a result of his choice of narrative style.

We must, however, offer a counter-argument as well. Some battle descriptions which do not lack details at all – for instance, *3. 4. 2.* – have been conserved in *CS* in large measure. I have given the treatment of *WB* in this episode the number *1a*, since some information is lacking. However, many important details regarding the battle remained: for example, that the god Thor provoked havoc with his hammer, and that the battle would have been lost for the humans, had Hotherus not run against Thor and cut his hammer in half. Nevertheless, even if this episode and the similar ones might be problematic for the interpretation we proposed above, I still do not think that the difficulty is insurmountable. All things considered, the *CS* abbreviator was human and humans, even when they try to follow a neatly delineated system (as his might have), seldom succeed in doing justice to their plans in each and every occasion, as machines would. One will do well to

remember that humans are neither capable nor willing to subject themselves to any strict laws when engaged in creative production.

Let us mention yet another alternative explanation for the problem of the peculiar way the *WB* instances were reduced. One could imagine that the author of *CS* wanted to make his own rendering of Danish history less gruesome and cruel than Saxo's. If one were willing to follow this hypothesis, one could cite *3. 6. 2. 4.* and *3. 13. 3.* in its favour, since in these cases indeed two particularly nauseating moments of Saxo's narrative were removed. However, the fact that *CS* relates all the gory details of the episode *3. 11. 12*, which is perhaps even more extreme than the two cited previously, is quite enough to damage this hypothesis beyond repair. If one should need any further evidence against it, it would be enough to look at the rate of *K* that was kept in *CS*: 25 out of 35 instances are marked with *1b*.

2. 3. 4. Episodes pertaining to the upbringing, legal activity and death of a Danish king

We have one final category to deal with and this one is concerned with the characterization of the protagonists in general, and of the Danish kings in particular. They were obviously of utmost importance to an author dealing with Danish history and among these we do not necessarily refer only to Saxo, but to the author of *CS* as well. Some scholars have argued that in the hands of the abbreviator *GD* was reduced in such a way as to create some sort of "royal chronicle". (cf. Sawyer 1999, 1056).

We must turn to our letters and categories to check these assumptions on real data. With respect to the category *YA*, which refers to the young age and upbringing of a Danish monarch, of 7 instances 4 have been completely preserved: *1. 2. 1.* (Skiold); *2. 1. 1.* (Frotho), *4. 5. 1.* (Uffo), *4. 10.* (Dan), while three have been reduced: *1. 3. 1.* (Gram), *1. 4. 2. 1.* (Hadingus), *3. 1. 1.* (Hotherus). It is striking that none of the *YA* instances has been fully removed, not even the Hotherus passage, although he was not a Danish monarch, but tried to occupy Denmark at one point. He is, nonetheless, such a dominant figure in the first part of the book III of *GD* that a casual reader might easily get an impression that it is yet another Danish king. The results are even more compelling if we turn to the category *D*. This category, as we explained in our introduction to this chapter, encompasses the information about the deaths of Danish kings (and is separated from *K*, discussed earlier, which is concerned with deaths of anyone but Danish kings). All the 13 instances of *D* have been preserved as *1b* in *CS*. One can also remember that the descriptions of the government of some of the kings mentioned in *GD* are not longer than two lines. The fact that they too were preserved by an author who was obviously very fond of abbreviating is certainly telling. And if someone might object that it would anyway be very difficult indeed to escape mentioning the death of a Danish king in a chronicle dealing with the history of Denmark, I would answer that we then have all the more reasons for believing that the author of *CS* preserved these sections consciously and wittingly.

The same trend may be noticed when it comes to the treatment of Saxo's characterizations. We have noted 15 instances of *CH* in our sample of *GD*. One has to bear in mind, of course, that any

action of any one person, be it a king or a commoner, provides material for his or her further characterization. The instances we have chosen to take as *CH* in the narrow sense are those where the author discusses the character and the ways of certain figures in immediate way, without use of examples. The results seem to support the hypothesis we proposed after analysis of the categories *YA* and *D*. Out of 15 instances of *CH*, 8 have been preserved as instances of *1b*. All but one of these 8 instances concern various Danish monarchs: *1. 1. 3.* (Hadingus); *2. 10.* (Haldanus), *2. 12. 5.* (Rolphus), *3. 12. 2. 2.* (Amlethus), *4. 4. 1.* (Amlethus), *4. 7.* (Dan), *16. 2. 6.* (Kanutus). One instance which does not refer to a Danish king is *1. 6. 9. 1.* regarding the cruelty of Tosto, a tyrant who challenges Hadingus (upon deeper considerations, I am in fact at a loss as to whether this last instance should at all be considered characterization, and not an instance of moralizing). One of the 15 instance has been only reduced, but not removed: *1. 2. 3.* (Scioldus). Out of six remaining instances which have all been deleted in *CS*, all but one concern various persons other than Danish monarchs: *2. 12. 1.* (Athislus the Elder, king of Sweden), *3. 6. 4. 1.* (Odin, a god), *4. 4. 5.* (Amlethus), *4. 5. 2.* (Athislus the Younger, king of Sweden), *16. 4. 3.* (Absalon, a bishop), *16. 6. 3.* (again Absalon). Furthermore, that one instance of total surpression of a characterization of a Danish king should not be taken as a grave issue since, as we have just mentioned, Amlethus had been awarded a *1b* characterization not once, but twice previously. I do not think that this is likely to be a coincidence and I cannot come up with an alternative explanation. It seems to me almost inevitable that in this particular instance the abbreviator actually was guided by the wish to create, as we cited above, a "royal chronicle".

2. 3. 5. Changes and additions

Finally, some remarks should be made regarding the category *3* – that is, those rare occasions when the *CS* abbreviator expanded or changed the text of *GD*. First of all, I do not think that all instances of *3* deserve to be treated as changes consciously planned and executed by the abbreviator. Some may be just a product of his misunderstanding of the original's text or, more probably (since he seems nevertheless to have been a good Latinist), of sheer negligence. Take for example *2. 4. 1*, a section which describes Frotho's siege of the city of Duna: while *GD* claims only that Handwanus removed all the birds from the city, (*GD* 41/20–21. *domesticis avibus vacuefecit*) weary of the cunning device that had been employed by Hadingus during an earlier siege, *CS* claims that the birds have all been killed (*CS* 230/28. *omnes aves domesticas interfici iussit*). I cannot imagine any possible reason for such a banal change except for the negligence of the person who changed it and that is the *CS* abbreviator. The same goes for the section *2. 7.* where Frotho's motives for engaging in a war against Frisia is disputed: in *GD* his motive is glory (*GD* 46/21 *claritatem*), while in *CS* it is territorial expansion (*CS* 233/7–8 *suum dominium dilataret*). Check also the instance *3. 2. 2.* which in fact may rather be an example of misunderstanding. Cf. *2. 15. 1.*

On other occasions, however, the additions and changes seem to have been introduced for didactical reasons – that is, to make it easier for the reader to follow the plot. It is to be expected that the *CS* abbreviator should have done so after having called Saxo's stile "obscure" in the preface. Sometimes these "intentional changes", as we might call them, relate to the composition

of the work. Thus, Saxo mentions Hiarthwarus for the first time in the episode *2. 13. 3.* when he is awarded an office. However, Hiarthwarus is going to play an important – however abysmal – role by the end of the Book Two. However, between his first appearance in *GD* and his wicked rebellion, Saxo has interposed the whole section *2. 14.* The abbreviator has probably thought that the reader would more easily grasp all the various characters relentlessly appearing and disappearing from the narrative if their stories were more concentrated. This is how and why Hiarthwarus' first appereance in *CS* was relocated after the episode *2. 14.* For the similar reasons, in *2. 15. 4.* the author of *CS* reintroduces the character of Wiggo, who had appeared for the first time in the episode *2. 14.*, by saying *Viggone, de quo supra mencio facta est* ("the above mentioned Wiggo"). Namely, he could have thought that the reader would benefit from a remainder that Wiggo is an old character, and not another new one.

Some changes cannot be explained in this way and should probably be regarded as deliberate additions made by the abbreviator. He might have learnt, for example (see the instance *1. 2. 2.*), from another source that *Scioldus* got to be called *Gramhæræth* since he fathered the famous Gram, and thought that the text of *GD* would benefit from the addition of such an information. For further examples, you may take a look at instances *1.3.6.* and *2. 11. 1.*

2. 4. Summary of the results

At the end of the whole paper we will try to sum up our discussions and conclusions in a brief and coherent account on the technique of the *CS* abbreviator. Here it will suffice to repeat some of the main points we arrived at in the scope of this chapter. First of all, the abbreviator's main concern seems to have been the flow of the narrative, and not for the various details surrounding the narrative. In cases where, for example, instances of *ME* or of *WB* are deleted, one should therefore first try to see if the reason for their removal perhaps was that the narrative did not necessarily need them. Only if there are serious objections to this first approach should one try to explain the removals by the virtue of the sense and message of the episodes removed. Secondly, there seems to be a clear tendency in placing kings and their characterizations at the first place. This may have been present already in Saxo's original, but his *lactea ubertas*, if we can use this description once employed for another writer, covered it up and made it less obvious and conspicuous. Finally, the author of the *CS* was actively thinking about making Saxo's text more accessible to his audience, as was his stated purpose in the preface.

3. Treatment of style and language of *Gesta Danorum* in the *Compendium Saxonis*

3. 1. Introduction

In the previous section, we tried to explain in as many details as possible how the content of *GD* was rendered in *CS*. In this section, we will devote some attention to the other of two main features that characterize any literary work: apart from content, there are style and language. To compare the style of two authors is a challenging task since there are too many stylistic features any given author uses for a researcher even to think of taking them all into account.

Comparing the style of the two authors is a particularly vexed issue in translation studies where many strong opinions have been voiced on how accurately the style of a certain author can or should be rendered. Dorothea Woodworth claimed that the translators only rarely translate syntactic and phonetic patterns, through which the original attains a stronger effect; she vigorously opposes this practice and insists that the translators must find a pattern that resembles the phonetic structure of the original, in order to be able to present their readers with the real style of the writer they are translating (Woodworth 1938, 195). She analyzed several different translations of a single poem of Catullus (XI *Furi et Aureli*). From her discussion, it becomes clear that it is her opinion that all the stylistic features of the original must be translated. While discussing Catullus XI she requests from the translator in the scope of one and the same verse to not only render the alliteration, but also the syllabic assonance and two times repeated trail of vowels (e – o – a). And while doing all this, he must not damage the meaning of verses in any way (ibid, 208–209). To her rigorous demands, we can also add some advanced by others, not less rigorous scholars (see Hill 1978, 65). Postgate, on the other hand, sees how difficult it is to grasp and reproduce that fine connection between style and meaning of a poetic or literary text. Even when the language of the translation has words with the corresponding vocal content, these words will never be able to produce the same effect as is the one in the original (Postgate 1922, 31–32).

The case of adaptations in general and of the abridgment of *GD* into *CS* in particular is, however, a very different one. While in translation studies the main objective of a translator is to preserve the style and the spirit of the original if at all possible and to the fullest extent possible while rendering it to the other language, the *CS* abbreviator seems to have aimed at changing the style of the original while rewriting it in the same language. That said, we may also emphasize what is, in our opinion, the most striking and, in a way, defining difference between translations and adaptations, among which *CS* would be included: the former aims at being as similar to the original as much as it goes and at conveying its spirit and identity, and the latter, while it cannot be said that it necessarily needs to aim at being as dissimilar to the original as at all possible,

needs to oppose and challenge at least one aspect of the original. If this minimum is not met, the rewriting of the original in question cannot be rightfully called an adaptation. There necessarily needs to be a difference in intentions or goals or means. This in turn leads to accepting *CS* as an adaptation: we have already seen how it has challenged the content of *GD*, and in this section we will see how it altered its style.

Our approach to comparing the style of *GD* to the one of *CS* will be the following. First a general discussion is to be made on a sample from both texts in order to show which general tendencies can be detected. We will then focus on several particular points – variance of vocabulary in both texts will be exemplified with a discussion on the words expressing death and killing, while the relationship to grammar is to be represented by a full-scale overview of both author's usage of the ablative absolute construction in Latin. Lastly, the treatment of some stylistic and linguistic features more or less typical for *GD* will conclude the discussion in this chapter.

3. 2. General discussion on the stylistic features of *Gesta Danorum* and *Compendium Saxonis*: the account of the kingship of king Frotho

For the general discussion on the stylistic features of the two texts I have chosen the first part of the Second book which describes the government of the Danish king Frotho (*GD* 38/1–51/3, *CS* 229/20–18). This particular section was chosen since it is there that Saxo offers his most remarkable feats of style. Therefore, I will be able to show both the breadth and strength of Saxo's stylistic capacities and the way the author of the *Compendium* coped with the passage in which style is one of the imposing and defining characteristics. First the passage from *GD* is to be treated, and the discussion on the passage from *CS* will follow next, since it would be methodologically problematic to discuss the style of the abridgment before we examined the style of the original.

For the details of the content of this part of *GD*, please see the sections *2. 1.* to *2. 9.* in our table of contents in the First chapter. (see pp. 25–31)

3. 2. 1. Saxo's style

3. 2. 1. 1. Contrast

Let us begin with one of Saxo's most loved stylistical features – *the contrast* – which is well represented in this part of *GD*, both in its narrative parts and – especially – in many orations delivered by various characters. Good examples of the contrasts in the narrative parts are, for instance, *GD* 41/2–3. *ex **ignotae profunditatis alveo meabilia vada** perfecit.* or *GD* 46/27–28. *que **tanto** a Fresis avidius **emissa, quanto** a Danis tolerabilius **excepta**.* However, the contrast remains one of the most popular rhetorical stratagems for Saxo's characters whenever they engage in a protreptic speech. In order to give a more precise account of the sheer amount of contrasts that are piled up one onto the other in these speeches, I will cite one of these speeches here and note the contrasts. The speech is given by a British soldier who does not share the view of his king that the gold scattered by the Danes as a bait should be ignored. Note that all the elements involved in the same contrast have been marked by the same number. This was necessary since sometimes

elements of two contrasts overlap (for instance, **9** and **10**). Also, sometimes one contrast has more than to elements – that is, there is more than one element on one of the sides (for example, **4**).

'Colliguntur,' inquit, 'rex, ex oratione tua gemini rerum affectus, unus timoris, alter malevolentiae testis, cum et opibus propter hostem uti prohibeas, nosque **egenos(1)** tibi quam **locupletes(1)** militare satius ducas. Quid hac deformius voluntate? Quid exhortatione stolidius? **Domesticas(2)** hic gazas **agnoscimus(3)**, **agnitas(2)** tollere **dubitabimus(3)**? Quod armis repetere **pergebamus(4)**, quod sanguine recuperare **contendimus(4)**, ultro restitutum **vitabimus(4)**? Propria vindicare cunctabimur? Uter timidior est, qui parta **fundit(5)**, an qui **fusa(5)** legere pertimescit? En, quod necessitas **ademit(6)**, casus **reddidit(6)**. Non **hostium(7)**, sed **nostra(7)** haec spolia sunt; non **attulit(8)** aurum Britanniae Danus, sed **abstulit(8)**. Quae subacti invitique perdidimus, gratis redeuntia fugiemus? Nefas est tantum fortunae beneficium indignanter excipere. Quid enim vesanius quam opes **in propatulo constitutas(9) despicere(10)**, **conclusas ac vetitas(9) affectare(10)**? **Ante oculos collocata(11)** fastidio **dabimus(12)**, **fugientia(11) captaturi(12)**? **In medio positis(13) abstinebimus(14)**, **longinqua atque extera(13) petituri(14)**? Quando **peregrina(15) praedabimur(16)**, si **propria(15) refutamus(16)**? Numquam deos tam infestos experiar, ut sinum paterna avitaque pecunia refertum tam iusto onere vacuefacere compellar. Novi Danorum luxum; numquam plena meri vasa liquissent, ni timor aufugere compulisset. Facilius **vitam(17)** deseruissent quam **vinum(17)**. Communis hic nobis affectio est, hac illis imagine respondemus. Esto, fugam finxerint; ante tamen in Scottos incident, quam regredi queant. Numquam porcis proculcandum aut **beluis(18)** hoc aurum rure squalebit, **humano(18)** melius usui serviturum. Praeterea si exercitus, a quo **victi(19)** sumus, spolia rapimus, fortunam in nosmet **victoris(19)** transferimus. Quod enim certius victoriae praesagium accipi possit, quam pugnam praeda praecurrere castraque ab hostibus deserta ante proelium capere? Satius est **metu(20)** vicisse quam **ferro(20)**.'

This example serves well to show the incessant use of contrast in the speeches of Saxo's characters. Aggressively and almost epigrammatically pointed contrasts add to the forcefulness of the speech and make it more convincing.

3. 2. 1. 2. Repetitions

A natural sequence of this discussion after we have cited the speech of the British soldier would be to turn to Saxo's *repetitions*. We do not have to look further than this speech for examples. The reader has probably noticed that it is almost one and the same point that is repeated over and over throughout the oration. Take for example the image of the king suggesting that they should desperately seek for the treasures that are far away, and abandon the ones that are ready at hand: (1) *in propatulo constitutas* : *conclusas ac vetitas*; (2) *ante oculos collocata* : *fugientia*; (3) *in medio positis* : *longinqua atque extera*.

This is, however, not only a feature of Saxo's speeches, but is present in the narrative and descriptive parts as well. Take, for example, the song in which an anonymous compatriot informs king Frotho of the Serpent that holds vast treasures on a deserted island (*GD* 38/15–17):

Hic tenet eximium montis possessor acervum
implicitus gyris(1) serpens **crebris**que **reflexus**
orbibus(2) et caudae **sinuosa volumina(3)** ducens
multiplicesque agitans **spiras(4)** virusque profundens.

In the matter of three verses, it has been stated that the Snake has winding members in as many as four different ways. That this is not only an extravagant medieval *tour de force*, but rather a sophisticated imitation of an ancient practice is shown by a similar description of a Snake (this

time it is a constellation) in the hands of a Roman poet Avienus in his translation of Aratus (v. 138–143). I do not, of course, suggest that Saxo was familiar with Avienus and that this is a direct imitation, but it helps us to make an evaluation of this stylistic feature. The exaggerated description of the Snake offered by Saxo is in no way unprecedented and, even more importantly, it does not lack good taste and worthy predecessors.

> Inter utrumque dehinc praeclari nominis Arcton,
> ceu **circumflexo(1) sinuantur(2) flumina lapsu(1)**,
> squameus **agmen agens(3)** Draco **volvitur(4)**, atque obit
> ambas **spirarum curvis anfractibus(5)**. Hunc quoque, ut **artus**
> longius **effusum(6) spatiosa volumina(7)** tendunt,
> compta Lycaoniis includunt Plaustra choreis.

Note, however, also that there are striking verbal parallels between two descriptions. Both authors use *spira* and *volumina*, and while Avienus uses *circumflexus* Saxo uses *reflexus*, both being compounds of the veb *flectere*. Furtheremore, Saxo's *volumina ducens* does recall Avienus' *agmen agens*. This all serves well to prove that the repetitions of *GD* were a well-established tool for embellishing the narrative and reinforcing its point.

3. 2. 1. 3. Other stylistic features of Saxo's text

Although it may not be nearly as popular as the previous two devices, *metaphor* also plays a role in Saxo's text. Here I only refer to those metaphors consciously added by Saxo to embellish his text and not to those which are already part of the language and are unconsciously used in vast amounts. One good example can perhaps be found in *GD* 46/26. *iaculorum imbrem*, where the huge number of spears cast by the enemy is metaphorically parallelled with rain.

There are various other tropes that can be found in the scope of this section, although it is not particularly long. There are several examples of *zeugma* (or *semantic syllepsis*) – for instance, in *GD* 48/27., *ferro caedeque*, where *ferro* is the material, concrete element and *caede* the general, abstract one.

When it comes to emphasizing the scope and the breadth of things being described, it should be noted that Saxo is also very fond of the two devices that are best suited for that purpose: *litotes* and *hyperbola*. A good example for the former can be found in *GD* 41/22. *Nec nova Frothoni calliditas defuit*; and for the latter in the already mentioned *GD* 46/26. *iaculorum imbrem* (since despite the best efforts, the array of the enemy's spears in reality could not have been as dense as the rain drops are) or even in *GD* 42/9–10. *infinito odio*.

Saxo makes ample use of *metonymy* as well, and especially of its subtype *synecdoche*, as in the following examples: *GD* 43/12. *soncia corda* where the "guilty hearts" refer to the guilty persons themselves; *GD* 43/16. *focis* where the "hearth" refers to the whole house; *GD* 45/7. *Regneri thoro* where the "bed of Regnerus" refers in fact to the whole marriage.

Finally, this section of Saxo's text does not lack *personifications* either. Many of them come from the speech Suanhuita delivers to Regnerus before they should engage in a battle against the demons. For that purpose, she awards him with a special sword and urges him to show himself worthy of such a weapon (cf. section *2. 5. 4.* in our table of contents). It is in this context that the following personifications should be interpreted: *GD* 44/23. *manus emula feri*; *GD* 44/25. *animus*

dextre... comes; *GD* 44/31. *ferrum animo coeat*. Personification is, however, richly employed even beyond the scope of Suanhuita's highly stylized speech. Let us take just some of the representative examples: *GD* 39/22. *illa [fames/esuria], quiescentibus nobis, tela contorqueat, illa pugne ius officiumque suscipiat*; *GD* 43/24. *luminum vibratus eloquitur*; *GD* 43/28. *papillarum alacritas confitetur*; *GD* 43/33. *condicio nativa resultat*; *GD* 48/25. *opibus... que raptorem captivant*.

The reader might have noticed already just how rich in orations Saxo's text is. Therefore, it will not come as a surprise that many *rhetorical questions* are also to be found in almost each of them. Several examples will suffice: *GD* 39/26. *Quis damnose quam tuto demicare maluerit*? (the speech of the king Dornus); *GD* 47/22–24. *An, qui hosti formidolosi fuimus, ridiculi erimus, claritatemque contemptu mutabimus?* (the speech of the Danish soldier Torkillus) ; *GD* 47/30–31. *Quid enim colligere prodesset, que protinus erogare cogantur?* (the speech of the British king); *GD* 49/13–14. *Quid enim vesanius, quam opes in propatulo constitutas despicere, conclusas ac vetitas captaturi?* (the speech of the British soldier). I have intentionally chosen examples from different speeches in order to show that rhetorical questions are not limited to only one or two, but that they are rather a general phenomenon in Saxo's speeches.

Apart from all these various tropes we have enumerated and exemplified, this part of Saxo's text even has some other refined stylistic features to offer in addition. One should note Saxo's clever use of ancient, pagan terminology. It is in no way impossible that he used it intentionally in order to draw reader's attention to the fact that he is speaking of the events set in the distant past, long before Danmark accepted Christianity. If this interpretation is correct, it must be admitted that Saxo used very sophisticated stylistic methods to achieve intertextuality. Among the references to pagan antiquity he makes is also *penates* (*GD* 41/20). Most of the references to the pagan antiquity come from the account on the various demons Suanhuita and Regnerus engaged in a battle. It has already been established that the main source for all these names was the Second Book of Marcianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (cf. Elton 1894, note 2). The following passage offers some remarkable examples (*GD* 30–35):

Trux **Lemurum** chorus advehitur, praecepsque per auras
cursitat et vastos edit ad astra sonos.
Accedunt **Fauni Satyris**, **Panum**que caterva
Manibus admixta militat ore fero;
Silvanis coeunt **Aquili**, **Larvae**que nocentes
cum **Lamiis** callem participare student.
Saltu librantur **Furiae**, glomerantur iisdem
Fanae, quas **Simis Fantua** iuncta premit.[6]

Note, however, that even if ancient references are overrepresented in this particular part of *GD*, they are, at any rate, not rare in its other mythological parts.

---

[6] Since this passage can arguable be hard to understand, I attach Elton's (1894) translation: "scowling horde of ghosts draws near, and scurries furiously through the wind, bellowing drearily to the stars. Fauns join Satyrs, and the throng of Pans mingles with the Spectres and battles with fierce visage. The Swart ones meet the Woodland Spirits, and the pestilent phantoms strive to share the path with the Witches. Furies poise themselves on the leap, and on them huddle the Phantoms, whom Foreboder (Fantua) joined to the Flatnoses (Satyrs), jostles."

Finally, Saxo's style also benefits from the fact that he often tries to bulge in his text and give it a more intimate tone by adding his own views. Examples of such excursion into the narrative are, of course, scattered all around the *Gesta Danorum*, and there are some instances in our sample as well: *GD* 41/33–35. *regias opes... in altum demersit,* **quamquam satius fuerat adversariorum favorem pecunie largicionibus occupare.**

3. 2. 2. Style of *Compendium Saxonis*

Now that we have given a detailed overview of various stylistic devices employed by Saxo and hopefully conveyed to the reader the idea of rhetorical abundance and refined richness of his text, we would like to explore how *Compendium* reacted to this and if any attempts were made in order to conserve the sophisticated taste of Saxo's Muse. Although one might wish to offer a discussion of comparable length to the one we just prepared for Saxo, so that the two texts relevant for this research would thus be paired, this is not possible, since the only dominant stylistic characteristic to be detected in *CS* is *reduction*. The vast majority of Saxo's tropes and figures has been deleted without any compensation. This is partly the result of the fact that Saxo's speeches have been either deleted or radically shortened. Our reader might have noticed this tendency in *CS* towards speeches upon consulting our table of contents in the first chapter (2 speeches have been shortened, and 16 completely deleted). This shoud also be placed in a wider context of the general ancient and medieval abridging practice – one will do well to remember that omission of speeches is included in Ilona Opelt's list (brought up in the introduction) of typical features of abridgements.

Some tropes and figures have, however, been preserved in the text of *CS*. There is a slight case of repetition in *CS* 231/16. *rogavit petivitque*. Several contrasts can be detected although they are obviously much fewer than in the original text: *CS* 231/22. *magis... uxoris impulsu quam propria temeritate* (= *GD* 45/34. *pocius uxoris impulsu, quam propria cupiditate*); *CS* 232/7. *tam in occidente quam in oriente* (= *GD* 46/21. *claritatem Orientis diviccione quesitam Occidentis oculi infundere*); *CS* 232/20. *magis ad avariciam quam ad pugnam*; (= *GD* 48/19. *abstractumque avaritia animum belli studiis impendant*); *CS* 233/1–2. *thesaurum, quem reiecerat, recuperavit.* (= *GD* 50/8–9. *predam, quam vafre reiecerat, acriter recuperavit*). We see, however, that the abbreviator of *CS* rarely adds something off his own, but rather simplifies and then uses Saxo's original tropes. Those few that have been preserved can in most of the cases be motivated by the fact that the narrative needed them (see our first chapter for the importance of the narrative in *CS*). For example, the contrast we have noted in *CS* 232/20 is all that is kept from the speech of the British king. His speech needed at least to be mentioned, since the plot needed it, because it showed how greedy and licentious British people were in spite of the warnings issued by their monarch – and there was no better way to sum up the oration than by offering a pointy and clear contrast. Therefore, even these scarce remains of Saxo's stylistical thesaurus are not there because the abbreviator allowed some ornamentation to his stern text, but simply because the plot needed them.

On the other hand, it can be interesting to observe how various stylistical features disappear from *GD* in the hands of the *CS* abbreviator. For example, the litotes we mentioned earlier (*GD* 41/22. *Nec nova Frothoni calliditas defuit*) is resolved into a simpler structure with a simpler meaning: *CS* 231/1. *quod intelligens Frotho*. A great example can be found in the treatment of a

metonymy from *GD* 46/9. *cum vacuas aures mariti haberet*, which is aptly transformed into much simpler *CS* 231/25–26. *qui dum non acquiesceret*.

3. 3. The richness of the vocabulary in *Gesta Danorum* and *Compendium Saxonis*

In this first part of our discussion on the fate of Saxo's style in the hands of the author of *CS* I hope to have shown on the general level that *GD* suffered serious reduction. In the latter part of the chapter we will take more specific examples in order to check and further develop our primary hypothesis.

One of the main interests one has when trying to analyse the style of a specific author is in the richness of the author's vocabulary. A casual reader of any two texts operating with thesauruses of very different richness will probably be able to decide which text uses the more complex vocabulary early on in his reading, even without doing any counting, but relying solely on his personal impression – and he will probably be correct in his assumptions. The case of *Gesta Danorum* and *Compendium Saxonis* is no exception to this rule. However, since we want to establish just in what measure did the vocabulary of *GD* shrink in the hands of the *CS* abbreviator and since we are, moreover, particularly interesting in getting a fuller picture on how both authors used their thesauruses, the large one and the reduced one respectively, we will have to undertake a more comprehensive investigation than the general reader from our previous hypothetical example did.

Since it is far beyond the scope of this paper to make a detailed quantitative analysis of the whole vocabulary used by *Gesta Danorum* and its young cousin, we had to choose a representative sample that would satisfy the needs of this research. Thus, we have decided to analyse the vocabulary of death and killing. Depressive in itself as this choice may be, it is certain that it will offer us valid results, simply for the reason that the storyline of *GD* (and, consequently, of *CS* as well) is a violent one, with a quick succession of cruel wars and kings, who rarely die of natural causes. Therefore, we may be sure that our research is based on the vocabulary closely related to the topic very relevant for the texts in question.

What method would be the best for handling this issue? I have made concordances of all the words concerning death and killing in the First, Second and Sixteenth Book of both *GD* and *CS*. We have chosen to disregard Third and Fourth Book which because three books will offer quite enough material for sound conclusion on general tendencies in the whole *GD*. As we stated in the introduction, in this paper we tend always to use just so much material as it is needed, and not more: in this particular case, three books will suffice.

How are the concordances organized? Words are listed in their alphabetical order. In case an entry is not a single word but a word cluster, the word which is placed first (then it is according to the first letter of this word that the cluster would be positioned on the list) is the verb (as in

dare orco); if there is no verb in the cluster, the noun is placed first (as in *dies suprema*); if there are two nouns, the one which was is in the nominative case is placed first (as in *finis vite*). It should be noted that all the different words have been listed separately and that no effort was made to organize them according to their similar roots (cf. *perimere* and *interimere*) or in cases where they partly employ same words (cf. *spoliare vita* and *finis vite*). Finally, all words concerned with the relevant subjects have been listed – both the ones referring to a specific object (death of someone) or the ones that are more open (death generally), both the ones referring to the agent (the person killing, the person dying) and to the object (the person being killed) There are also rare examples of words which do not have to mean death/killing in themselves, although they do in the examples we found. These rules apply to both of the concordances – the ones for *Gesta Danorum* and the ones for *Compendium Saxonis*.

The results of our concordances would probably be easily interpreted even if no additional comment had been made. We have, however, engaged in a brief discussion of the results that follows the two lists, especially concerning those issues contained in them that do not meet the eye instantly.

Table 2. *Concordances of the death vocabulary – Gesta Danorum*

1. **absumere**: 18/10.
2. **addere manibus**: 15/10.
3. **adimere vitam**: 62/26.
4. **agere in necem**: 27/1–2, 31/23.
5. **agere spicula mortis**: 19/1.
6. **cadere**: 65/11, 66/25.
7. **cedere**: 63/5, 659/10.
8. **cedes**: 19/6, 29/5, 35/19, 36/16, 46/12, 46/35, 53/7, 61/19, 67/9.
9. **clades**: 27/22, 31/23, 52/35, 58/17, 59/22, 66/25, 657/14, 667/33, 667/11.
10. **claudere lumina**: 15/13.
11. **complere Phlegethonta**: 65/14.
12. **conficere**: 56/33.
13. **confodere iugula**: 46/10–11.
14. **consumere --- morte**: 26/6, 32/23, 40/38, 53/15.
15. **consumere se**: 666/21.
16. **consumere suspendio**: 25/19, 28/4, 37/4–5, 51/12.
17. **contundere**: 17/28.
18. **corripere**: 19/2.
19. **cruentare prelium**: 61/29.
20. **dare orco**: 15/10.
21. **dare penas sanguine**: 50/11.
22. **decedere**: 11/2, 52/30, 53/13, 661/39.
23. **defungi**: 22/16, 22/19, 35/5, 52/28, 63/26.
24. **defungi morte**: 25/36.

25. **delere**: 53/24.
26. **demetere caput**: 32/30.
27. **deserere a vita**: 47/37.
28. **dies suprema**: 61/13.
29. **domare**: 17/34.
30. **efflare vitam**: 39/10.
31. **eripere spiritum**: 11/17.
32. **esse cinis**: 23/11.
33. **exanimare**: 17/7, 19/3, 22/26.
34. **exanimis**: 29/13.
35. **excedere vita**: 52/33.
36. **exicium**: 28/16, 62/20, 659/21, 666/18, 667/16, 669/23, 670/23.
37. **extinguere**: 37/3, 41/11.
38. **fata**: 17/11, 22/26, 26/7, 26/24, 27/27, 52/30, 62/37, 65/13, 670/24.
39. **ferire**: 44/21, 60/27.
40. **finire cede**: 34/35.
41. **finire vitam**: 51/14–15, 666/10–11.
42. **finis**: 59/6.
43. **finis vite**: 27/24.
44. **fundere**: 64/22.
45. **fungi**: 22/26.
46. **fungi funere**: 62/36.
47. **funus**: 15/21, 22/16, 65/12, 65/20, 66/27, 66/35, 67/32.
48. **generare necem**: 27/8.
49. **implicare leto**: 62/5.
50. **incidere**: 45/1.
51. **interfector**: 57/31, 67/37.
52. **interficere**: 12/8, 51/9, 670/11.
53. **interimere**: 17/13, 26/29.
54. **interire**: 51/2, 64/8.
55. **interitus**: 12/9, 41/29.
56. **intertemptor**: 51/31.
57. **ire in Stygias aquas**: 23/9.
58. **letum**: 63/15, 63/21, 64/31, 64/35, 65/20.
59. **madere cedibus ac cruore**: 21/5.
60. **mittere pavenda in Tartara**: 15/15–16.
61. **morior**: 26/30, 31/12, 56/25, 66/27, 66/28, 66/29.
62. **mors**: 26/8, 27/20, 40/30. 50/16, 64/31, 67/10, 67/33, 657/13.
63. **mulctare ferro cedeque**: 218/27.
64. **necare**: 11/30, 30/9, 41/17, 666/22.

65. **necator**: 34/17.

66. **nex**: 17/27, 18/10, 19/5, 26/8, 50/31, 51/34, 67/30.

67. **obire**: 65/10.

68. **obitus**: 50/18.

69. **obruere**: 40/10.

70. **obterere**: 18/20, 26/36.

71. **obtruncare**: 19/16–17, 46/33.

72. **occassus**: 36/33.

73. **occidere**: 18/5, 20/23, 26/4, 26/24, 34/16, 35/2, 46/3, 52/39, 58/3, 67/35.

74. **occumbere**: 66/34, 67/6.

75. **opprimere**: 14/34, 18/8, 19/24, 25/1, 29/34, 30/31, 32/31, 50/22, 51/22.

76. **parricidium**: 51/10.

77. **peragere sanguine cladem**: 60/40.

78. **perimere**: 11/17, 62/28.

79. **perire**: 61/12, 667/25.

80. **perire ferro**: 57/30.

81. **premere**: 23/10.

82. **prosternere**: 19/18–19, 34/27, 51/31, 57/1, 58/38, 66/24.

83. **punire suppliciis**: 28/13.

84. **rapere inferna regna**: 23/8.

85. **reddere spiritum**: 36/40.

86. **refundere sanguine dextram**: 14/6–9.

87. **sentire ferum applicare visceribus**: 36/19.

88. **siciare iugulum**: 21/1.

89. **sors ultima**: 61/12.

90. **spoliare vita**: 11/13, 31/38.

91. **sternere**: 62/4.

92. **strages**: 53/27, 61/28.

93. **subagere cede**: 53/3.

94. **subire gladios**: 64/14–15.

95. **succedere in orbem Elisium**: 64/32.

96. **sufferre**: 32/39.

97. **surripere spiritum**: 27/26–27.

98. **tollere**: 24/37.

99. **trucidare**: 40/13.

100. **trudare edaci funera corvo**: 15/6–7.

101. **vita preterita**: 31/25.

Table 3. *Concordances of the death vocabulary – Compendium Saxonis*

1. **amputare caput**: 227/19
2. **caedere**: 438/7, 438/8.
3. **confodire**: 225/28.
4. **consumere suspendio**: 233/22.
5. **defungi**: 224/2.
6. **dividere per mediam**: 237/17.
7. **finire vitam**: 233/24, 235/9.
8. **interficere**: 221/25, 222/6, 222/20, 224/26, 226/2, 226/21, 227/7, 227/9, 229/8, 229/10, 230/26, 230/28, 231/25, 231/26, 232/5, 233/15, 233/18, 233/21, 234/24, 237/8.
9. **interimere**: 221/7, 222/11, 229/18, 230/8.
10. **mors**: 225/18, 225/16, 229/2, 230/24, 233/4, 235/9, 237/12, 239/21, 436/12, 438/21.
11. **mortuus**: 221/3, 222/25, 223/26, 224/11, 230/25, 234/18, 239/7, 438/7.
12. **necare**: 238/25.
13. **nex**: 223/17, 229/3, 224/25.
14. **obitum**: 233/5.
15. **occidere**: 221/7, 222/9, 222/22, 225/18, 227/21, 228/8, 228/19, 230/20, 233/9, 234/12, 234/23, 237/14, 238/7, 238/10, 239/20, 436/18.
16. **occumbere**: 238/30, 239/4.
17. **opprimere**: 234/7.
18. **peremere**: 232/11, 235/5, 237/16.
19. **perire**: 230/19.
20. **privare vita**: 221/7, 436/25.
21. **punire suppliciis**: 226/12–13.
22. **strages**: 438/9.
23. **submergere**: 228/16.
24. **suffocare**: 229/16, 235/9.
25. **suspendere**: 225/7, 226/7.
26. **transfodire**: 230/3, 239/18.
27. **trucidare**: 238/18.

The first thing that meets the eye is the considerable difference between the number of various ways to express death and killing in the two texts. While *Gesta Danorum* offers more than hundred possibilities (101), in *Compendium* a bare quarter of this number (27) is to be found. One could object that this is only natural, since the *Compendium* is, after all, a shorter version of *Gesta*. That fact has, however, long been established – we wanted to research not *if* it is the shorter version, but, first and foremost, *how* the shortening was conducted. It was equally possible for the abbreviator – should this have been his intention – to employ the same variety in his version, by remanaging the distribution of the expressions.

This brings us to our second point, which was less obvious and less conspicuous from the very start of our research. The word Saxo uses most frequently is *occidere* (10 times), followed by *cedes*, *clades, opprimere, fata* (9 times each). 65 of the expressions Saxo used are used only once (nearly 65 percent), while 17 of them have been used only twice. This means that more than 80 percent or four fifths of expressions used by Saxo occurred either very rarely or only once, which had to have been a conscious choice with intention of enforcing variety to his vocabulary. It does not fail to astonish that the author succeeded in using no word on more than ten occasions in roughly hundred pages of densely printed texts swelling with battles and bloodshed.

On the other hand, we find a completely different situation in the *Compendium*. The word which is used the most is *interficere* (20 occasions) and is followed by *occidere* (16 occasions) and *mors* (10 occasions). Now, even if there is a considerable number of examples met only once or twice (once: 12 examples or roughly 45 percent; twice: 7 examples or 26 percent – in total, it is about 70 percent which is still less than the percentage attained by *Gesta*), there is a clear preference for using one set of common words on most of the occasions. The total number of expressions of death used in our sample from the *Compendium* is 91, which means that the three most popular words (*interficere, occidere* and *mors*) represent more than a half of all the examples. If we add two more words which are rather popular (*mortuus* with eight examples and *interimere* with four), almost two thirds of all examples will be taken. In opposition to that, as this section in *Gesta* contains 218 expressions of death, the top five (the same amount of the most popular words we used in the case of the *Compendium*) most popular words (*occidere, cedes, clades, opprimere, fata*) comprise little over one fifth of all the expressions used. The difference is extremely telling.

We should not, however, concentrate only on the statistics, but also take a look at how the expressions are used. In Saxo's original one very rarely finds two same expressions of death employed immediately one after the other – that is, with no other expression of the same type intervening in between. Some few examples can be found in the concluding songs of the Book Two, where, however, it is possible and even probable that the repetition was intentionally made to convey the picture of a warrior engaged in a deathly battle who does not fear death. Examples are to be found in *GD* 63/15, 21 and in *GD* 64/31, 35. always with the word *letum*. In the *Compendium*, on the other hand, chains of two (*CS* 221/25, 222/6: *interficere*; *CS* 227/21, 228/8. *occidere*; *CS* 229/8, 10. *interficere*; *CS* 238/30, 239/4: *occumbere*;), three (*CS* 226/21, 227/7, 227/9. *interficere*; *CS* 233/15, 18, 21: *interficere*) and even, exceptionally, four (*CS* 230/ 26, 28, 231/25, 27. *interficere*) same words in a row, are common. The abbreviator of *CS* does not stop there, however. Sometimes two sentences in a row follow the same structure and contain in large measure the same vocabulary. We can take a look at the following example:

per Hundingum quendam ad dimicandum provocatus ipsum duello superavit. In quo gravissimo vulnere susceptu iterum per Haquinum pugilem provocatus ipsum duello interfecit. (*CS* 233/12–15)

If we try to present these sentences schematically it will immediatly become obvious why they would be problematic in a work pertaining to high and variegated style:

per Hundingum quendam ad dimicandum provocatus ipsum duello superavit

in quo gravissimo vulnere susceptu iterum

per Haquinum pugilem   provocatus ipsum duello interfecit.

Just in order to give an impression to a totally different approach employed by Saxo, we may attach here his description of the same situation:

per Hundingum quendam ad dimicandum provocatus, quamquam convivalibus mentem gaudiis impendisset, plus pugnae propinquitate quam epularum praesentia delectatus duello cenam, victoria duellum absolvit. [3] In quo dubiae salutis vulnere suscepto, rursum Haquini pugilis adhortatione perstrictus provocantis nece ultionem irritatae quietis exegit. (*GD* 50/26–32)

It should be mentioned, nevertheless, that on rare occasions even the *CS* abbreviator shows some eagerness to add variety to his text. One may wish to consider the following example:

... mortem simulavit. Audiens autem prefectus oppidi de eius obitu nuncium falsum... (*CS* 233/4–5)

Although it would be in vein of *CS* to use either *mors* or *obitus* on both occasions, the author has preferred to use different expressions in the two closely related statement which is a clear sign of an attempt to add variety. This is, however, an isolated case and even if a couple more could be found, they would still be exceptions to the general rule that the variety in general does not particularly matter to the author of *CS*.

Finally, as we have described the attitude the author of *CS* has in practice towards the richness of the vocabulary and variety of style, we may ask ourselves why this is so. I believe that the answer is to be sought in the same direction as in the previous occasions of this chapter (where we, for example, discussed omission of various figures and tropes in the shorter version). The abbreviator was not only looking to shorten the text of *CS* and make it more concentrated and compact, but also to make it simpler and easier to read. This matter is crucially connected with his targeted audience, of which we know nothing certain, since the conception of the *Compendium* itself is under the veil of mystery. But if we imagine that people without perfect knowledge of Latin and not particularly well professed in literature and classics were not outside the abbreviator's field of vision, that would explain why he himself felt forced to simplify often complex and obscure periods employed by Saxo, the fact we have already witnessed and we will witness still in what remains of this chapter.

3. 4. Absolute ablatives in *Gesta Danorum* and *Compendium Saxonis*

3. 4. 1. Absolute ablatives in the two texts: a systematization

We would finally like to pass over to some of the language characteristics and peculiarities of *GD* and the discussion on the way they were rendered in *CS*. As we promised back in the introduction to this chapter, attention will be payed to the treatment of the ablative absolute in the two texts first. This should give yet another contribution to the question of the relationship of

language and simplicity in the two texts. Ablative absolute may not be an immensely complex construction in itself, but it is certain that its use has often perplexed the readers whose first language was not Latin. In the medieval Latinity, it sometimes happened that the rules regarding this construction were neglected – for example, the one prohibiting the subject of the ablative absolute to be the same as the subject of the main clause. We may take a look at an example from the histories of Gregory from Tours: *confligentibus vero pueris, pars Wandalorum victa sucubuit* (II 2; *pueris = pars*).

Again, we prepared a large table to show the treatment of the ablative absolute in both texts. The entries were taken from the preface, all the first four books and the sixteenth book of the texts. We characterized each of the examples with a number specifying the relationship between the original and the abridgment in that particular case. We first offer a resolution of this code before the table and then an explanation of the patterns that have been detected and that will be discussed. After the table, as usual, we will offer an account on what the results thus obtained could mean for this research.

This is the legenda necessary for understanding of the numeric symbols pointing to each of the instances:

1 – The same form and the same wording of the ablative absolute of *GD* are conserved in the *CS*

eg. *GD* 78/23 = *CS* 243/27 *recepto exercitu*

1a – An ablative absolute from *GD* is conserved, albeit with different wording

   eg. *GD* 82/22 *vocatis... majoribus* = *CS* 245/19 *convocatis optimatibus*

1b – An ablative absolute from *GD* is surpressed and replaced with a different grammatical structure

   eg. *GD* 81/22–23 *quo gerente* = *CS* 245/9 *qui cum... gessisset*

2 – An ablative absolute from *GD* is faultly understood in the *CS* (rare)

   eg. *GD* 38/8 *thezauro... absumpto* = *CS* 229/22–23 *qui cum... thesaurum expendisset*

3a – A part of the text where *GD* employed a certain ablative absolute is wholy missing from *CS*

   eg. *GD* 109/1 *quo facto* = *CS* Ø (episode on *Folcon* almost completely absent from *CS*)

3b – A minor part of the text (a sentence) where *GD* employed a certain ablative absolute is missing from *CS*

   eg. *GD* 111/18–19 *quibus visis* = *CS* Ø

4 – Ablatives absolutes added in the *CS* and absent from *GD* (but the part of the text to which they were included is not absent in *GD* although it originally did not contain the construction)

   eg. *GD* 56/13 *in cuius ingressu* = *CS* 237/9–10 *quibus congressis*

Table 4. *Table of the treatment of the absolute ablatives*

no.	*GD* ref.	*GD* text	*CS* ref.	*CS* text	symbol
PREFACE					
1.	1/8	*ceteris... abnuentibus*	Ø		3a
2.	1/18–19	*finitimis... gaudentibus*	Ø		3a
3.	1/26	*factis... praecurrentibus*	Ø		3a
4.	2/40	*operibus editis*	Ø		3a
5.	5/3–4	*perruptis estuariis*	Ø		3a
6.	6/1	*obtrito calle*	Ø		3a
7.	6/29	*forma duntaxat superstite*	Ø		3a
8.	7/23–24	*nulla...rimula superstante*	219/10	*subito evanescit*	1b
9.	8/11–12	*congressis pene fluctibus*	Ø		3a
BOOK I					
10.	10/10	*assentientibus civium sufragiis*	Ø		3a
11.	11/2	*decedente patre*	221/3 (1)	*mortuo Dan*	1a
12.	Ø		221/5 (1)	*conspiracione facta de regno*	4
13.	11/17	*eadem spiritum eripiente*	221/7 (1)	*a populo interemptus est*	1b
14.	12/7	*exercitu inspectante*	221/24 (2)	*presente... exercitu*	1a
15.	12/8	*interfectoque eo*	221/25 (2)	*ipsumque interfecit*	1b
16.	13/8	*virtutibus nisibus*	Ø		3b
17.	13/9	*inita Gothia*	222/6 (3)	*Sweciam intravit*	1b
18.	13/15–16	*succussis frenis*	Ø		3a
19.	14/12	*quo duce*	Ø		3a
20.	14/27	*hoc duce*	Ø		3a
21.	17/1	*quo dicto*	Ø		3a
22.	17/1	*discussis larvis*	Ø		3a
23.	17/7	*quo facto*	Ø		3a
24.	17/9	*subiectis... stipibus*	Ø		3a
25.	18/5	*occiso Suetie rege*	222/6 (3)	*regemque... ipsum interfecit*	1b

26.	18/25	*depositis armis*	222/ 14–15 (3)	*cum eo amiciciam fecit*	1b
27.	18/26	*promisso coniugis sue repudio*	222/15 (3)	*promisso uxoris sue repudio*	1
28.	18/31	*relicto exercitu*	222/19 (3)	*relicto exercitu*	1
29.	18/33	*extreme vilitatis veste sumpta*	222/19 (3)	*vili veste sumpta*	1
30.	18/35–36	*omnibus ebrietate madentibus*	Ø		3b
31.	19/2	*gladio... reducto*	Ø		3a
32.	19/18–19	*parte prostrata*	Ø		3b
33.	19/19–20	*nuptis in exequias versis*	Ø		3b
34.	19/22	*his gestis*	222/21 (3)	*postea*	1b
35.	19/28–29	*Swibdagero Daniam obtinente*	222/25	*tria regna habuit*	1b
36.	20/21	*his praetermissis*	Ø		3b
37.	20/23	*occiso Gram*	Ø		3b
38.	20/24	*eadem sepius flagitante*	223/15–16	*ad magnam coniugis instanciam*	1b
39.	20/26	*Hadingus... ulcionem hostis beneficio preferente*	223/16	*Hadingus... ulcionem necis paterne cogitans*	1b
40.	20/29	*omisso voluptatis studio*	223/18	*omisso voluptatum studio*	1
41.	20/31	*spectatis milicie operibus*	Ø		3b
42.	21/19–20	*quo... referente*	223/20–21	*qui cum diceret*	1b
43.	21/27	*hesitante eo... cunctante*	Ø		3b
44.	22/11	*his assertis*	223/23	*tandem*	1b
45.	22/15	*quo comite*	223/25	*sequeretur*	1b
46.	22/18–19	*carminibus ligno insculptis*	224/1–2	*in quo protraxit caracteres*	1b
47.	22/19–20	*iisdemque... suppositis*	224/2	*ut sub lingua poneret defuncti*	1b
48.	23/15–16	*compacto ramalibus tecto*	224/4–5	*cum sibi tectum de ramis arborum... facerent*	1b
49.	Ø		224/9 (5)	*Hadingus evadente*	4

50.	23/31	*quo pacto*	224/14–15	*at illi sic coniuncti*	1b
51.	23/33	*quibus superatis*	224/15–16	*quibus superatis*	1
52.	24/10	*admissa… cape*	Ø		3a
53.	24/28–29	*fastigio oppugnacionis aditum prohibente*	224/20	*altitudine oppugnacionem prohibente*	1a
54.	24/39	*robore debellato*	224/25	*robore debellato*	1
55.	25/1	*sique*	224/27	*mortuo hoste*	4
56.	25/18	*adcitis fabris*	225/6	*fabris misit*	1b
57.	25/19–20	*quibus… suspendio consumptis*	225/7 (7)	*suspensis fabris*	1a
58.	25/40	*confusis permixtisque sacrificiis*	Ø		3b
59.	26/3	*Othino redeunte*	225/17 (7)	*redeunte Othen*	1
60.	26/3	*relicta prestigiarum ope*	Ø		3b
61.	26/13	*opinione recuperata*	Ø		3b
62.	26/17	*superveniente numinis sui fulgore*	Ø		3b
63.	26/29	*interrempto filio*	Ø		3a
64.	26/39	*quo dicto*	Ø		3a
65.	27/1	*reflexo in tergum clypeo*	225/26–27 (8)	*clipeo in tergum reflexo*	1
66.	27/2–3	*Hadingus… postulante*	226/3 (8)	*in Swecia maneret*	1b
67.	28/6–7	*quo promissso*	226/9 (8)	*quo promisso*	1
68.	28/11	*relatis pecuniis*	226/11(8)	*ipsi pecunia reportabant*	1b
69.	28/18	*his gestis*	226/14(9)	*postea*	1b
70.	28/19	*frigoribus liquatis*	Ø		3b
71.	28/21	*consumptis alimentis*	226/16(9)	*incidente autem fame*	1a
72.	28/26–27	*Danis in… desperacionis augustias compulsis*	Ø		3b
73.	29/26	*congressis exercitibus*	226/18–19(9)	*congressi sunt exercitus*	1b
74.	29/34–35	*quem facto*	226/22	*quo facto*	4
75.	30/18	*navigante eo*	227/1–2 (9)	*eo navigante*	1
76.	30/36–37	*annulo vulneri incluso*	Ø		3a
77.	30/38	*libertate donata*	Ø		3a
78.	31/1	*spretis omnibus*	Ø		3a
79.	31/6	*cenante eo*	Ø		3a

80.	31/11–12	*diis infernalibus ita destinantibus*	Ø		3a
81.	31/16	*quibus preteritis*	Ø		3a
82.	31/22	*percunctante Hadingus*	Ø		3a
83.	31/39	*quo pacto*	227/9(10)	*ac*	1b
84.	31/39–40	*adcita Byarmensium manu*	227/10	*receptis secum Warmensibus*	1a
85.	32/3–4	*repugnantibus sociis... affirmantibus*	Ø		3b
86.	32/12	*digestis in cuneum catervis*	Ø		3b
87.	32/22	*victorem Hadingum dimissus senex*	227/16	*victoria igitur habita ac dimisso sene*	1a
	32/25	*quo relicto*			
88.	32/26	*amissis per insidias sociis*	227/20	*per fraudem amissis sociis*	1
89.	32/31	*deposito odio*	Ø		3b
90.	32/39	*sublato iam emulo*	228/1	*postea*	1b
91.	34/2–3	*plebe... lacessita*	Ø		3b
92.	34/7	*laborantibus prelio sociis*	Ø		3b
93.	34/7	*duce Syfrido... pacem petente*	Ø		3b
94.	34/14–15	*perfossis lateribus*	228/6–7	*navibus igitur per latera perforatis*	1a
95.	34/22	*correptis integris [navibus]*	228/12	*reparatis navibus*	1a, 2
96.	34/24	*neganteque eo*	228/14	*quo negante*	1
97.	34/27–28	*prostrato exercitu*	228/18	*Tostonem in fugam egit*	1b
98.	34/38–39	*correptis interfectorum pecuniis*	Ø		3a
99.	34/40	*quo comite*	Ø		3a
100.	35/5	*his gestis*	228/20 (12)	*hiis gestis*	1
101.	35/12	*sopore discusso*	228/27	*mane facto*	1b
102.	36/23	*insistente Vluilda*	229/2–3 (12)	*Vluilda... sollicitat*	1b
103.	36/25	*petito convivio*	229/4(12)	*ad convivium... invitatus*	1b

104.	36/28	*quo cibum capiente*	229/6–7 (12)	*qui dum cibum caperet*	1b
105.	36/29	*occultato sub veste ferro*	229/7–8	*gladium sub veste habuit*	1b
106.	36/30	*quo... animadverso*	229/9	*armatos advocavit*	1b
107.	36/31	*quibus... opem ferentibus*	Ø		3b
108.	36/34	*falso acceptum nuncio*	229/11–12 (13)	*habitis falsis rumoribus*	4
109.	36/34	*optimatibus contractis*	229/12	*convocavit optimates*	1b
110.	36/37	*partibus assumptis*	229/14–15 (13)	*personaliter aliis propinavit*	1b
111.	37/2–3	*quo cognito*	229/16–17 (13)	*quo cognito*	1
112.	37/4	*vulgo inspectante*	229/17–18 (13)	*toto populo inspectante*	1a
BOOK II					
113.	38/8	*paterno thezauro... absumpto*	229/22–23 (1)	*qui cum... thesaurum paternum expendisset*	2
114.	38/30	*pressoque ligone*	Ø		3a
115.	39/5–6	*eluso mittentis conatu*	Ø		3b
116.	39/22	*quiescentibus nobis*	Ø		3a
117.	39/38	*his dictis*	230/6	*habito consilio*	1a
118.	40/7	*crebro cespite fossis superadito*	230/8	*foveas factas fraudulenter texisset*	1b
119.	40/10	*simulato metu*	230/10	*simulata fuga*	1a
120.	40/12	*elusis vestigiis in foveas provolutos*	230/11	*in foveas deciderunt*	1b
121.	40/19	*provisis antea clavis*	230/14	*clavis ligneis scapham implevit*	1b
122.	40/21–22	*demptis obstaculis*	230/17	*clavos omnes abstraxit*	1b
123.	40/36	*victis itaque Rutenis*	Ø		3b
124.	40/40–41/1	*fluvii intersticio prohibente*	Ø		3b
125.	41/6	*amne domito*	230/22	*averso... fluvio*	1a
126.	41/9–10	*paucis ad modum consciis*	Ø		3b
127.	41/16–17	*potestate facta*	Ø		3b

128.	41/17	*necaretur*	230/26	*rege ejus interfecto*	4
129.	41/18	*urbe capta*	230/26	*quo facto*	1a
130.	41/23	*permutata cum ancillulis veste*	231/2	*sumpsit vestem muliebrem*	1b
131.	41/24	*depositoque virili cultu*	Ø		3b
132.	41/25–26	*omnibus curiosius exploratis*	231/3	*explorata igitur urbe*	1a
133.	41/26	*emisso comite*	231/3	*emisit socium*	1b
134.	41/28	*elusis vigilibus*	Ø		3b
135.	41/31–32	*solutis neglectisque rebus*	Ø		3a
136.	41/37–38	*Frothone... poscentem*	Ø		3a
137.	41/12	*sororibus in famulicium sumptis*	Ø		3a
138.	43/2	*desperata recuperacione*	Ø		3a
139.	44/5–6	*Thor deo excepto*	Ø		3a
140.	44/15–16	*ablegato nubile inumbracionis uapore*	Ø		3a
141.	44/38	*demissis comitibus*	Ø		3a
142.	44/40	*luce reddita*	Ø		3a
143.	45/3	*pyra accensa*	Ø		3a
144.	45/6	*quo facto*	Ø		3a
145.	45/15	*quo afflictus*	231/14	*mutlis sociis amissis*	4
146.	45/15	*conscensa cymba*	Ø		3b
147.	45/25	*assumpto coniuge*	Ø		3b
148.	45/30	*deforme vulnus specioso beneficio pensatum*	231/19–20 (2)	*ab eo auxilio habito*	4
149.	46/13	*rogatus ab Vluilda*	232/2	*querente Vluilda*	4
150.	46/28–29	*Vitthone... existimante*	Ø		3b
151.	46/23	*adversum Vitthonem*	232/8	*occurente sibi Witone*	4
152.	46/26	*imbrem exhaustum*	232/10	*telis eorum exhaustis*	4
153.	46/34	*repetito Oceano*	232/13	*rediens vero ad oceanum*	1b

154.	46/37	*cuius rege devicto*	232/15	*cum regem devicisset*	1b
155.	47/11	*capite galea nudato*	Ø		3a
156.	48/7	*vacuefactis crumenis*	232/20–21 (3)	*quod dum factum fuisset*	1b
157.	48/7–8	*quibus progressis*	232/21	*insequentes Britones*	1b
158.	48/12	*auro spreto*	Ø		3b
159.	48/37	*finiente rege*	Ø		3b
160.	49/39–40	*silvam... permensus*	232/25	*pertransita silva*	4
161.	50/15–16	*firmitate expugnacionis facultatem negante*	233/3	*propter firmitatem murorum*	1b
162.	50/16	*mortis simulacione facta*	233/4	*mortem simulavit*	1b
163.	50/18–19	*receptis in dedicionem Danis*	233/5–6	*receptis in dedicionem Danis*	1
164.	50/20–21	*quibus eleccionis diligenciam simulantibus*	233/8	*quibus electionis diligenciam simulantibus*	1
165.	50/23	*his gestis*	233/10	*his gestis*	1
166.	50/30	*vulnere suscepto*	233/13–14 (3)	*vulnere suscepto*	1
167.	51/8	*Roe et Scato fratribus interfectis*	233/21	*reliquis duobus interfectis*	1
168.	51/20	*diviso cum fratre regno*	233/26–27 (4)	*sic inter se regnum deviserunt*	1b
169.	51/27	*virgine Thora stuprum pati coacta*	234/9	*filiam... Thoram nomine compressit*	1b
170.	51/40	*merore deposito*	234/14	*dolore deposito*	1
171.	52/28	*Regnero... defuncto*	234/17–18 (5)	*Regnerus... moritur*	1b
172.	52/39	*his cognitis*	234/23	*quo cognito*	1
173.	53/2–3	*missis... satellitibus*	Ø		3b
174.	53/11	*his gestis*	235/1	*hiis gestis*	1
175.	53/13	*repetito Oriente*	235/3	*in oriente*	1b
176.	53/21–22	*intercedente conubii affinitate*	235/14	*propter affinitatem*	1b
177.	53/30–31	*categoryis muneribus promissis*	235/16–17 (6)	*multis muneribus promissis*	1

178.	53/32–33	*filio... nacto*	∅		3b
179.	54/9–10	*qua... hortante*	235/21–22 (6)	*qua hortante*	1
180.	54/14	*matris errore mulctato*	∅		3b
181.	54/21	*percunctantibus convivis*	236/1	*interrogaretur a convivantibus*	1b
182.	54/28	*alteroque... defenso*	∅		3b
183.	54/36	*egesta clepsedra*	236/9–10	*extracta de dolio clepsedra ac effuso humore*	1b, 2
184.	55/4	*suspicato nil tale coniuge*	∅		3b
185.	55/4–5	*pecunia vehiculis imposita*	236/13–14 (6)	*opibus super vehicula positis*	1a
186.	55/19	*retentis pecuniis*	∅		3a
187.	55/27	*affixis humo genibus*	236/20–21 (6)	*affixis humo genibus*	1
188.	55/30	*contentis preda Suetis*	∅		3b
189.	56/6–7	*osse... remisso*	237/5 (7)	*os reiecit*	1b
190.	56/13	*in cuius ingressu*	237/9–10	*quibus congressis*	4
191.	56/19	*prelato... Agnero*	237/10	*primo Agnerus*	1b
192.	56/20–21	*casidis parte conscissa*	237/10–11 (7)	*cassidem... percussit*	1b
193.	56/26	*soluto in risum ore*	∅		3b
194.	56/34	*applicato ore egestum belue cruorem haurire iussit*	237/17–18 (7)	*cruorem bestie potare coegit*	1b
195.	57/1	*tunc*	238/10	*occiso autem Atislo*	4
196.	57/2–3	*sorore... data*	237/20	*sororem... dedit*	1b
197.	57/3	*vectigali imposito*	238/11–12 (8)	*imposito... tributo*	1a
198.	57/19–20	*leva... reflexa*	238/3–4	*sinistram... reflexit*	1b
199.	57/36–37	*exprobrata condicionis deformitate*	238/14	*permota, quod vir suus tributarius esset*	1b
200.	58/3–4	*refertis... navigiis*	238/18	*naves... replens*	1b
201.	58/9–10	*hospitibus... formidantibus*	∅		3b

202.	58/10–11	*cateris... carpentibus*	238/24	*ut alij dormire ceperunt*	1b
203.	58/19	*errore... reddente*	Ø		3b
204.	58/29	*pellex percunctari cepit*	238/29	*querente autem meretrice*	4
205.	58/32	*preciso naso*	238/30	*naso mutilavit*	1b
206.	58/35	*quo facto*	Ø		3b
207.	58/36–37	*repetito ocius oppido*	239/1	*citus... oppidum intravit*	1b
208.	59/34	*admota... flamma*	Ø		3a
209.	61/28	*strage edita*	Ø		3a
210.	63/5–6	*rapiente... profluvio toto*	Ø		3a
211.	63/11	*venis... spumantibus*	Ø		3a
212.	63/25	*stricto... ferro*	Ø		3a
213.	65/19	*cumulato fenore*	Ø		3a
214.	67/5	*potitis victoria Gothis*	Ø		3a
215.	67/6	*excepto Wiggone*	239/5	*excepto solo Viggone*	1
216.	67/11	*positis mensis*	Ø		3b
217.	67/20	*oblato Wiggone*	239/12–13 (9)	*cumque offerretur sibi Viggo*	1b
218.	67/21–22	*annuenti*	239/14	*quo respondente*	4
219.	67/25	*tacto gladii capulo*	Ø		3b
220.	67/26	*quo pacto*	Ø		3b
221.	67/28	*quo facto*	239/20	*factum est*	1b
222.	67/31	*convivio in exequias verso*	Ø		3b
223.	67/33	*voto fortiter expleto*	Ø		3b
224.	68/1	*quo evenit*	239/21	*quo mortuo*	4
BOOK III					
225.	69/9–10	*interfecto ab Helgone Hodbroddo*	Ø		3b
226.	70/22–23	*his acceptis*	240/19	*his dictis*	1a
227.	70/12–13	*que ab ipso dedicerat, executas*	241/1	*informacione recepta*	4

228.	71/13	*tabernaculo... locato*	Ø		3b
229.	71/30–32	*Gevarus... iubet*	241/5	*direccione habita per Gewarum*	4
230.	71/31–32	*vocato Høthero*	Ø		3b
231.	71/40–72/1	*missilibus cohibitis, iisdem... effusis*	Ø		3a
232.	72/24	*legacione spreta*	Ø		3a
233.	73/15	*elusis Balderi precibus*	241/11–12 (2)	*sic... Balderi preces illudebat*	1b
234.	73/22	*fortitudinis studio preponderante*	Ø		3a
235.	73/36	*inclinata suorum acie*	Ø		3b
236.	73/37	*preciso manubrio*	241/20	*clava destructa*	1a
237.	74/14	*post hec*	241/22	*habita igitur victoria*	4
238.	74/15	*repetito Gevaro*	Ø		3b
239.	75/4–6	*Høtherus... cognoscens*	242/1	*quo audito Hotherus*	4
240.	75/16	*excessu cognito*	Ø		3a
241.	75/19	*pocione avidius sumpta*	Ø		3a
242.	75/24–25	*Høthero Sueciam tenente*	242/4–5	*cum autem in Sweciam rediret*	1b
243.	75/32	*hybernis peractis*	242/10	*hyeme autem peracta*	1a
244.	75/33	*magnatibus accersitis*	242/10–11 (3)	*magnatibus convocatis*	1a
245.	75/35–36	*consalutatis omnibus*	242/12	*ipsis salutatis*	1a
246.	76/13	*fide earum damnata*	242/17–18 (4)	*fidem illarum dampnavit*	1b
247.	76/34	*Danis contractis*	242/24–25 (4)	*auxilium habens Danorum*	1b
248.	76/35	*clade gesta*	Ø		3b
249.	76/36	*strage edita*	242/25–26 (4)	*strage... facta*	1a
250.	77/7	*oblatam namque chelim*	243/3	*allatoque sibi musico instrumento*	4
251.	77/7–8	*inflexis ad musam nervis*	Ø		3b

252.	77/8	*compositisque plectro fidibus*	Ø		3b
253.	77/22	*quo militibus nunciato*	Ø		3b
254.	77/23–24	*Danis... prosequentibus*	Ø		3b
255.	77/26	*quo fervente*	Ø		3b
256.	77/31	*elapso triduo*	243/15	*post tres dies*	1b
257.	77/32	*facto colle*	243/16	*facto magno colle*	1
258.	77/35	*vigente... fama*	Ø		3b
259.	78/1	*abiectis ligonibus*	Ø		3b
260.	78/5–6	*neglectoque cupiditis proposito*	Ø		3b
261.	78/13–14	*obstante periculi metu*	243/19	*adeo territi fuerunt*	1b
262.	78/23	*hoc audito*	243/25–26 (5)	*quo audito*	1
263.	78/25	*recepto exercitu*	243/27	*recepto exercitu*	1
264.	78/38	*peregrina veste sumpta*	244/6	*peregrina veste sumpta*	1
265.	79/5	*recepto... auro*	244/9	*recepto... auro*	1
266.	80/2	*puellari veste sumpta*	244/20	*puellari veste sumpta*	1
267.	80/5–6	*a plerisque... credebatur*	244/20–21 (5)	*omnibus credentibus*	4
268.	80/14	*puellam corporis firmitate defectam*	244/22–23 (5)	*puella autem infirmata*	4
269.	80/15	*circumspectis morbi remediis*	244/23–24 (5)	*quis sibi remedio posset esse*	1b
270.	80/23	*quo pater audito*	244/25	*quo audito pater*	1
271.	80/28	*veneris occasione sumpta*	244/27	*occasione habita*	1a
272.	80/29	*mutato curacionis officio*	Ø		3a
273.	80/39	*edito filie partu*	Ø		3a
274.	81/9	*vulgato majoris dei ludibrio*	245/6	*quando major inter eos deus tam turpia peregisset*	1b
275.	81/14–15	*hunc... exilio mulctantes*	245/7	*ipso igitur proscripto*	4
276.	81/22–23	*quo... gerente*	245/9	*qui cum... gessisset*	1b
277.	81/24	*diis... miserantibus*	245/9	*miserantes dij*	1b

278.	Ø		245/11–12 (6)	*quo reverso*	4
279.	82/4	*recuperatis divinitatis insignibus*	245/14	*ad gloriam pristinam restitutus*	1b
280.	82/16	*cuius cladem*	245/17	*quo audito*	4
281.	82/22	*vocatis... maioribus*	245/19	*convocatis optimatibus*	1a
282.	82/29	*quo ocius impertrato*	245/22	*quo statim impetrato*	1
283.	82/35	*insignem extruens collem*	245/25	*facto magno cole*	4
284.	83/3–4	*contractam in arma patriam*	246/1	*congregato exercitu*	4
285.	83/4	*recensitis maiorum operibus*	Ø		3b
286.	83/7	*creato sibi rege*	Ø		3b
287.	83/7–8	*ceteris milicie viribus ostentis*	246/2	*insidias posuerant*	1b
288.	83/19	*ignorata sociorum strage*	Ø		3b
289.	83/24	*prospectis Danorum turmis*	246/5	*videntibus... turmas Danorum*	1b
290.	83/39	*serie coherente*	Ø		3a
291.	84/24–25	*quo... dante*	Ø		3b
292.	84/25–26	*Sclavi ingenti... pompa...*	246/8–9	*gaudentibus igitur Slavis*	4
293.	85/24	*petito certamine*	Ø		3b
294.	85/32	*procurante fortuna*	Ø		3b
295.	85/38	*tyrannide gesta*	Ø		3a
296.	86/4	*collatis... navigiis*	Ø		3b
297.	86/29	*rigore deposito*	Ø		3b
298.	87/9	*data acceptaque fide*	Ø		3b
299.	87/13–14	*neglecta clypei cura*	246/26	*clipeum priprium neglexit*	1b
300.	87/16	*desecto tandem pede*	246/27–247/1	*pede eius absciso*	1a
301.	87/16	*occidere*	247/1	*quo mortuo*	4
302.	87/28	*ubi datus parricidio locus*	247/8	*occasione habita*	4
303.	88/40	*igitur*	247/20	*facto... consilio*	4

304.	88/39	*occasione suscepta*	247/23	*statim*	1b
305.	89/16–17	*regente caudam sessore*	Ø		3b
306.	89/19–20	*comitibus... dicentibus*	248/5	*sociique dicerent*	1b
307.	89/28–29	*invento periclitate navis gubernaculo*	248/7	*invento navis gubernaculo*	1
308.	89/32–33	*preteritis clivis*	Ø		3b
309.	89/35	*laudato a comitibus responso*	Ø		3b
310.	89/37	*immissam a patruo feminam*	248/13	*inventaque femina*	4
311.	90/8	*viso oestro*	248/19	*videns oestrum*	1b
312.	90/12–13	*peracto concubitu*	248/21	*factoque concubitu*	1a
313.	90/18–19	*cunctis... interrogantibus*	249/1	*eum interrogaretur*	1b
314.	90/38	*superatisque omnibus... nequeuntibus*	Ø		3b
315.	91/7–9	*Fengone... absenciam prestante*	249/13	*Fengo se absentavit*	1b
316.	91/10	*procurato antea viro*	249/16	*unus cum eis occulte latuit*	1b
317.	91/10	*ambobus insciis*	249/15	*ambobus insciis*	1
318.	91/16–17	*facta... simulatione*	Ø		3b
319.	Ø		249/18–19 (10)	*complosis manibus*	4
320.	91/23–24	*brachiis... concussis*	249/19	*concussis brachiis*	1
321.	91/24	*conscenso stramento*	249/20	*stramenta conscenderet*	1b
322.	91/30–31	*elusis insidiis*	Ø		3b
323.	92/18	*nemine... dicente*	250/7	*nusquam reperiret*	1b
324.	92/32	*post annum*	250/14	*anno revoluto*	4
325.	92/37–38	*quorum... quietem capiencium*	250/18–19 (11)	*quibus dormientibus*	4
326.	92/38–39	*perlectis mandatis*	250/19–20 (11)	*litteras... quibus lectis*	1a
327.	92/40	*novisque figurarum apicibus substitutis*	250/20	*aliasque imposuit*	1b
328.	93/1	*mutato mandati tenore*	Ø		3b

329.	93/8	*quo dissimulato*	Ø		3b
330.	93/16	*soluto convivio*	Ø		3b
331.	93/27	*socii... exprobrantes*	251/3	*exprobrantibus sociis*	4
332.	93/32	*quibus rex ex satellite cognotis*	251/5	*regi omnia enarravit*	1b
333.	94/4	*quo audito*	Ø		3b
334.	94/20–21	*conventa matre*	251/13	*cum a matre... extorsisset*	1b
335.	94/21–22	*qua... dicente*	Ø		3b
336.	94/24	*extorto confessionis indicio*	Ø		3b
337.	95/2–3	*simulata animi molestia*	251/22–23 (11)	*contra regem conquerens*	1b
338.	95/6	*apud quem annum emensus*	251/26	*anno... revoluto*	4
339.	95/6–7	*impetrata... licencia*	251/26	*de licencia*	1b
340.	95/10–11	*quibus... conversis*	Ø		3b
341.	95/15	*exprobrantibus... convivis*	Ø		3b
342.	95/17–18	*ostensis... baculis*	252/4–5	*ostendit baculos*	1b
343.	95/20	*a plerique vana existimata fuerit*	252/6	*ridentibus conviviis*	4
344.	95/27–28	*gladius cum... clavo traiiceretur*	252/9	*clavo perforante*	4
345.	95/35	*fusis humi corporibus*	Ø		3b
346.	95/38	*rescissis tenaculis*	252/12	*cortinas... soluit*	1b
347.	95/39	*adhibitis stipitum curvaminibus*	252/14–15 (12)	*hamis ligneis... colligavit*	1b
348.	96/2–3	*crebrescentibus flammis*	252/15	*ignem imposuit*	1b
349.	96/6	*petito Fengonis cubiculo*	252/16	*accedens... ad cubiculum Fengonis*	1b
350.	96/8–9	*excitato deinde patruo*	252/18	*patruum excitans*	1b
351.	96/18–19	*eadem... prebente*	Ø		3a
BOOK IV					
352.	97/4	*peracta uitrici strage*	252/21	*occiso Fengone*	1a

353.	97/20	*accersitis, quibus... cognoverant*	252/23–24 (1)	*vocatis ad se, qui amici patris fuerant*	1a
354.	100/7	*at ubi quievit meror*	253/2	*finito merore*	4
355.	100/13	*his apud Daniam gestis*	253/5	*hiis gestis*	1
356.	100/13–14	*ternis navigiis impensius adornatis*	253/6	*cum tribus navibus adornatis*	1b
357.	100/15	*in clientelam... adsciverat*	253/6	*assumpta... societate*	4
358.	100/30	*elusis comitibus*	Ø		3a
359.	100/37–38	*obliteratis apicibus*	Ø		3a
360.	101/3	*districto... ferro*	Ø		3a
361.	101/21	*quo audito*	253/14	*quo audito*	1
362.	101/33	*igitur insidias... texit*	253/17–18	*excogitato... consilio*	4
363.	101/34	*adumbratis... studiis*	Ø		3b
364.	102/10–11	*strepitu... provocante*	Ø		3b
365.	102/12	*quo audito*	253/24	*audito... adventu*	1a
366.	102/14	*elusis vigilibus*	Ø		3b
367.	102/20–21	*quibus... perlatis*	253/ 28–29 (2)	*litteras considerans*	1b
368.	102/38	*occlusis de industria oculis*	Ø		3b
369.	103/5	*excitatis comitibus*	254/1	*sociisque excitatis*	1
370.	103/37	*astrictis... complexibus*	254/8	*ipsum amplexata est*	1b
371.	104/2	*quibus expletis*	254/11	*quibus expletis*	1
372.	104/3	*manu... iussa*	154/11	*manu... sumpta*	1a
373.	104/18	*eluso mittentis voto*	Ø		3b
374.	104/21	*loquente ea*	Ø		3b
375.	104/24	*cognita fraude*	254/18–19 (3)	*licet sciret fraudem subessse*	1b
376.	104/25	*equitibus in comitatem receptis*	254/19	*receptis secum... equitibus*	1
377.	104/31	*recepto vulnere*	Ø		3b

378.	104/ 33–34	*captivo... remisso*	Ø		3a
379.	104/ 39–40	*desperatis... viribus*	254/25	*pro salute sua preliari deberet*	1b
380.	105/3	*nullo armorum detracto*	Ø		3b
381.	105/17	*preda acta*	255/4	*cum ingenti preda*	1b
382.	105/17	*convulsisque Britannie spoliis*	Ø		3b
383.	105/19	*defuncto Rorico*	255/6	*defuncto Rorico*	1
384.	105/21	*fraudato Lethrarum rege*	255/8	*fraudulenter rengum Jucie usurpasset*	1b
385.	105/ 24–25	*Vigleto... donato*	255/9–10	*dona... transmisit*	1b
386.	105/ 26–27	*occasione suscepta*	Ø		3b
387.	105/31	*Vigleto... recreato*	255/11	*iterum congregans exercitum*	1b
388.	106/ 10–11	*cum Amlethus... interemptus fuisset*	255/18	*interfecto Ambleto*	1b
389.	106/26	*ociis... decursis*	255/22	*tranquille... regnavit*	1b
390.	107/27	*crebrescentibus... plagis*	Ø		3b
391.	107/28	*prostrato Frowino*	256/13	*interfecto Frowino*	1a
392.	107/ 39–40	*superioris pugne fiducia concitatus*	256/15	*audaciaque sumpta*	4
393.	108/4	*nunciandum curavit*	256/17	*misso sibi nuncio*	4
394.	108/21	*quo prebito*	Ø		3a
395.	108/22	*affirmante Wermundo*	Ø		3a
396.	108/ 25–26	*quo... prosequente*	Ø		3a
397.	108/33	*commisso.. bello*	256/18	*Wermundo igitur cum Danis occurente*	1a
398.	108/34	*concurrentibus Folcone et Athislo... conserentibus*	256/19	*Atislus Folkoni dicto occurrens*	1b
399.	109/1	*quo facto*	Ø		3a
400.	109/7	*depositis armis*	Ø		3a
401.	109/10	*crebris obstantibus causis*	Ø		3a

402.	110/1	*quesitis... subterfugiis*	Ø		3a
403.	110/25	*sumpto... paratu*	Ø		3a
404.	111/4–5	*Ketone... dicente*	Ø		3a
405.	111/10	*interrogante... eo*	Ø		3a
406.	111/14	*quo dicto*	Ø		3a
407.	111/17	*receptis armis*	256/ 26–27	*in armis*	1b
408.	111/ 18–19	*quibus... visis*	Ø		3b
409.	111/ 20–21	*illis... dicentibus*	256/28	*fatentur*	1b
410.	111/38	*remoto fratris adminiculo*	Ø		3b
411.	112/13	*adacto... mucrone*	Ø		3b
412.	112/14	*quo... gesto*	Ø		3b
413.	112/ 19–20	*diffissa casside*	257/5	*divisa casside*	1b
414.	112/25	*invasoque Athislo*	257/8	*venit*	1b
415.	112/26	*quo facto*	Ø		3b
416.	112/32	*abscisso capite*	257/9	*capite absciso*	1
417.	113/3	*etatis vicio*	257/15	*procedente tempore*	4
418.	113/ 25–26	*legati scire se inquiunt*	257/21	*quibus respondentibus*	4
419.	113/30	*obstupefactis animo Danis... perculsis*	257/ 22–23	*cunctis Danis nescientibus*	1a
420.	113/ 35–36	*perhibuit*	258/2	*quo respondente*	4
421.	113/ 38–39	*satellitibus... testantibus*	258/1–2	*ministri dicebat*	1b
422.	114/5	*fortissimis... adsciverit*	257/28	*fortissimo... assumpto*	4
423.	114/6	*quo audito*	Ø		3b
424.	114/12	*abeuntibus legatis*	Ø		3b
425.	114/13	*auctore laudato*	Ø		3b
426.	114/ 15–16	*universis... testantibus*	258/3	*illis... affirmantibus*	1a

427.	114/ 18–19	*corpore... contrectato*	258/7	*contrectatoque corpore*	1
428.	114/ 35–36	*quem Wermundus... testatus*	258/14	*laudantibus cunctis*	4
429.	114/38	*quibus... oblatis*	258/16	*dum... eum armarent*	1b
430.	115/6–7	*oblatis compluribus*	258/ 21–22	*de plurimis gladiis... oblatis*	1b
431.	115/ 19–20	*recognito... habitu*	Ø		3b
432.	115/22	*interrogatis per omnia comitibus*	Ø		3b
433.	115/ 22–23	*acceptis... indiciis*	259/4	*per signa denotata*	1b
434.	115/ 33–34	*intersticio repugnante*	Ø		3b
435.	115/35	*Uffone... petente*	259/10	*intravit Uffo solus*	1b
436.	115/ 36–37	*turbis... complentibus*	259/ 12–13	*erant... intuentes*	1b
437.	115/ 37–38	*cunctis... inserentibus*	259/13	*spectaculum intuentes*	1b
438.	116/19	*congredi rubore compulsum*	259/19	*occasione habita*	4
439.	116/ 22–23	*referentibus... ministris*	259/22	*referentibus ministris*	1
440.	116/ 30–31	*loco... denotato*	Ø		3b
441.	116/ 31–32	*gladio... verso*	Ø		3b
442.	116/33	*quo audito*	259/ 24–25	*cumque Wermundus diceret se... audivisse*	1b
443.	116/35	*affirmantibus... arbitris*	259/25	*responderunt*	1b
444.	116/37	*ita*	260/1	*quo audito*	4
445.	116/ 38–39	*Saxonibus... ducentibus*	260/2–3	*recedentibus... Saxonibus*	1a
446.	117/ 16–17	*transfusis... preliis*	260/9	*propter crebras victorias*	1b
447.	117/31	*denis... ducibus bello consumptis*	260/ 14–15	*x duces... bello consumpsit*	1b
448.	118/12	*quibus descriptis*	261/2	*quibus descriptis*	1

449.	118/19	*pulvere correpto*	261/6–7	*pulverem mane colligens*	1b
450.	118/28–29	*itaque prelata pugnandi sorte*	261/11	*igitur*	1b
451.	118/29	*Danorum iuventus… complevit*	261/11	*congregata Danorum iuventate*	4
452.	118/35	*quo regnante*	261/15–16	*quo regnante*	1
453.	118/35–36	*icto cum Danis federe*	261/16–17	*facto cum Danis federe*	1a
454.	119/12–13	*perpaucis… vitantibus*	261/21	*occurentibus Danis tam fortiter*	1a
455.	119/19–20	*rescissis… funiculis*	Ø		3b
456.	119/22	*luce reddita*	262/2	*die sequenti*	1a
457.	119/31	*Huyrwillo, Bugone et Fanningo oppressis*	262/5	*interfecitque in duello Hwiruillum, Bugonem et Famingum*	1b
458.	119/39–40	*quibus… receptis*	262/11–12	*que dum nidos appeterent*	1b
459.	120/1	*oppidanis… concurrentibus… praestantibus*	Ø		3b
460.	120/3	*post hec*	262/12	*habita urbe*	4
461.	120/3	*amissis bello militibus*	262/13	*sociis amissis*	1a
462.	120/5	*cadaveribus erectis et… collocatis*	262/14–15	*cadaveribus erectis et… collocatis*	1
463.	120/7	*quo facto*	262/16	*quo viso*	1a
BOOK XVI					
464.	657/4	*peractis inferiis*	Ø		3b
465.	657/4	*corpore funerato*	Ø		3b
466.	657/5	*monentibus arbitris*	Ø		3b
467.	657/10–11	*simultate compressa*	Ø		3b
468.	657/13	*laxata frena*	Ø		3b
469.	657/21–22	*oratione… habita*	Ø		3b
470.	657/25	*spacio exacto*	Ø		3b

471.	657/27	*que res Absaloni Sialandiam repetendi causam prebuit*	436/13	*Absolone fugato*	4
472.	659/10	*hac cesa, [partim] capta*	436/18	*multos occiderunt*	1b
473.	659/13	*suspensis... animis*	Ø		3a
474.	659/15	*successu conspecto*	Ø		3a
475.	659/18–19	*collecta concione*	Ø		3b
476.	659/27	*preproperus Absalonis... adventus*	436/20	*Absolone superveniente*	4
477.	659/28	*sublatis vexilliis*	Ø		3b
478.	659/38	*armis depositis*	Ø		3b
479.	660/8	*herente animo*	Ø		3a
480.	660/27	*intracedente... consilio*	436/23–24	*Absalone agente*	1a
481.	660/28	*verbis... quesitis*	Ø		3b
482.	661/2–4	*ubi... quanta... quantis... exposito*	Ø		3b
483.	661/6	*Absalonem, Sunonem et Esbernum, qui... admittebantur*	437/9–10	*presentibus Absalone, Sunone et Esberno*	4
484.	661/23–24	*indignante Syfrido... fundente*	437/18–19	*superbe et cum minis respondisset*	1b
485.	661/31	*his auditis*	437/22	*hiis auditis*	1
486.	661/33–34	*spe... non omissa*	Ø		3b
487.	662/4	*quesitis... causis*	Ø		3b
488.	662/10–11	*armis... depositis*	Ø		3a
489.	662/14	*rege... metuente*	Ø		3a
490.	662/18–19	*altercatione... audita*	Ø		3a
491.	662/25–26	*promissis... estimatis*	Ø		3a
492.	662/26–27	*consilio... dimisso*	Ø		3a

493.	662/28	*fortissimis... causantibus... querentibus*	Ø		3a
494.	662/36	*hortente Cesare*	Ø		3b
495.	662/ 38–40	*quingentarum navium classem... contraxerat*	437/29	*congregata classe quingentarum navum*	4
496.	663/5–6	*laudato Bogiszlavo*	Ø		3b
497.	Ø		437/33	*congregata magna classe*	4
498.	663/40	*his regressis*	Ø		3a
499.	664/2–3	*correpto... signo*	Ø		3a
500.	664/4	*collegio... vocato*	Ø		3a
501.	664/15	*anchora... insidente*	Ø		3a
502.	664/29– 30	*cessata cura*	Ø		3a
503.	664/31	*nunciis... deceptis*	Ø		3a
504.	664/31	*nostris... iussis*	Ø		3a
505.	664/34	*quo... adnavigato*	Ø		3a
506.	664/39	*quo abeunte*	Ø		3a
507.	664/40	*nuncio... recepto*	Ø		3a
508.	665/12– 13	*nubilo... non paciente*	Ø		3a
509.	665/16– 17	*speculatoribus... gerentibus*	Ø		3a
510.	665/25	*rarescente nebula*	Ø		3a
511.	666/27– 28	*sociis... firmatis*	Ø		3a
512.	666/31	*temperato remigio*	Ø		3a
513.	666/35	*eo... iterante*	Ø		3a
514.	666/37	*parte... continuante*	Ø		3a
515.	667/40	*sublatis vexillis*	Ø		3a
516.	666/6	*sublatis anchoris*	Ø		3a
517.	666/24– 25	*quibus... preteritis mortuisque*	Ø		3a

518.	666/34–35	*navigiis... concitatis*	Ø		3a
519.	667/1	*cessato... remigio*	Ø		3a
520.	667/3	*quo cognito*	Ø		3a
521.	667/7	*converberato pelago*	Ø		3a
522.	667/34	*laudata... benevolencia*	Ø		3a
523.	668/6	*lutis... contractis*	Ø		3a
524.	668/9	*quo facto*	Ø		3a
525.	668/11	*nuncio... recepto*	438/8–9	*audiens... Caesar*	1b
526.	668/19	*labentibus... alimentis*	Ø		3a
527.	668/19–21	*hisdem... sumentibus*	Ø		3a
528.	668/31	*transitu vacuefacto*	Ø		3a
529.	668/32	*obsidione cepta*	Ø		3a
530.	669/1	*saxis... cadentibus*	Ø		3a
531.	669/15	*expugnacione non procedente*	Ø		3a
532.	669/16	*auctore Esberno*	Ø		3a
533.	669/25–26	*simulata affectacione*	Ø		3a
534.	670/12–13	*quo viso*	Ø		3a
535.	670/13	*scaphis... desertis*	Ø		3a
536.	670/36–37	*propugnatoribus... precurrentibus*	Ø		3a
537.	670/38	*rebus absumptis*	Ø		3a
538.	671/15	*autumnno... peracto*	Ø		3a
539.	671/16	*milibus... contractis*	Ø		3a
540.	671/19	*qua preterita*	Ø		3a
541.	671/21	*barbari... convivantibus*	Ø		3a
542.	671/26	*itinere... converso*	Ø		3a
543.	671/31	*satellite nunciante*	Ø		3a

544.	671/38	*relicta villa*	Ø		3a
545.	672/7–8	*ministris... prosequentibus*	Ø		3a
546.	672/8	*re gesta*	Ø		3a
547.	672/9	*pernoctatione habita*	Ø		3a
548.	672/9–10	*delectis reliquiis*	Ø		3a
549.	672/15	*labentibus alimentis*	Ø		3a
550.	672/16	*exactis... hybernis*	Ø		3a
551.	672/23	*se tacente*	Ø		3a
552.	672/30–31	*ardore... levante*	Ø		3a
553.	672/36	*pabulo... suppetente*	Ø		3a
554.	673/1	*ductantibus... peritis*	Ø		3a
555.	673/2	*errantibus ceteris*	Ø		3a
556.	673/8	*effusis manipulis*	Ø		3a
557.	673/11	*Esberno... monente*	Ø		3a
558.	673/14	*abiecta... simulacione*	Ø		3a
559.	673/18–19	*illato signo*	Ø		3a
560.	673/20	*captis hostibus*	Ø		3a
561.	673/27	*quo residente... stipante*	Ø		3a
562.	673/29	*digesta... processione*	Ø		3a
563.	673/30	*eoque... admonito*	Ø		3a
564.	674/1	*quibus... dicentibus*	Ø		3a
565.	674/18	*Absalone et Iarimaro... prebentibus*	Ø		3b
566.	674/19	*premia... pacta*	438/18	*ingentisque summe pecunie ... pacta*	1a
567.	674/27	*potu... sumpto*	Ø		3a
568.	674/31	*obstupefactis nervis*	Ø		3a
569.	674/32–34	*Absalone... iubente*	Ø		3a

570.	674/39	*pulso... somno*	Ø		3a
571.	675/4	*proceribus adductis*	438/22	*proceribus adductis*	1
572.	675/4	*genibus annixus*	438/22	*genibus flexis*	4
573.	675/6	*obsidibus... datis... promissis*	438/24	*obsidibus... datis... promissis*	4
574.	675/17	*milicia... supergrediente*	Ø		3a
575.	675/18	*volumine colliso*	Ø		3a

3. 4. 2. Results and discussions

Now we shall offer a discussion on the results obtained from the table above. Let us first present the results of the descriptive statistics:

1 – 51 instances (8,86%)

1a – 44 instances (7,65%)

1b – 131 instance (22,78%)

2 – 1 instance (0,01%)

3a – 156 instances (27,13%)

3b – 130 instances (22,60%)

4 – 62 instances (10,78%)

We would like to know what these results can tell us about the *CS* abbreviator's attitude towards the construction of ablative absolute and whether they enable us to claim that he tended to reduce or eliminate it from the shorter text. In fact, we are faced with results which differ in their tendencies. On one side, there are more than a few occasions where no convincing reason other than the wish to remove the construction can be offered for the change introduced by the *CS* abbreviator. In 21 instances among the 131 of *1b* only the construction has been lifted, while the same choice of words already present in the original has been retained. Check for example #104 where *quo cibum capiente* has been turned into *qui dum cibum caperet* or #154 where *rege devicto* became *cum regem devicisset*. More examples could be provided. It is clear that in such cases the only gain the abbreviator could have hoped to obtain was the absence of the ablative absolute.

However, on the other side, it is curious that he adds no small number of ablative absolutes of his own. These instances, symbolized in number *4*, are 62 in number. Although that might not be spectacularly many, it is quite enough to call into question the hypothesis that the author wished to systematically remove this particular construction – indeed, if he wished to do so, even one instance of *4* would have been enough to raise eyebrows. Now, it must be conceded that in some

instances the tendency to remove the ablative absolute is strongly present, while in the others the tendency to keep it and even add to its number is equally strong, both kind of instances being clear and definitive.

What the reader of our statistics will easily have noticed is a scarce and insignificant number of instances of *2*, that is of fallacious interpretations of original's absolute ablatives. We may rest assured that even these instances were probably due to negligence rather than the ignorance of the author of *CS*. The one instance we particularly noted is #113. Saxo says that when Frotho came to power and felt himself ready to wage his own wars he found *paterno thezauro absumpto*, namely that "his father's treasury was exhausted". It is not mentioned who was the one to blame for draining the money – Frotho, Hadingus or a third person. The *Compendium* here says *qui [Frotho] cum… thesaurum paternum expendisset…* making it certain that Frotho was to blame. This is the only instance where it seems that the author of the *Compendium* might have understood Saxo's ablative absolute as a mere participle which would then characterize the actions of the subject of the main clause, which is, to be sure, the king Frotho. This interpretation is, of course, incorrect – but as we have stated already at the beginning of this paragraph, one instance in so many others is to be attributed to negligence or haste rather than to ignorance of the author. Another interesting instance is #95. Saxo claims that Tosto, after losing many ships to a sea storm, went to the shore and *correptis integris* "acquired the ones that were not damaged". The author of the *Compendium*, however, changes this into *reparatis navibus* "repaired the ships that were damaged". It is clear to anyone that thus the text of the original was not only expressed in a different way, but that its contents were changed. However, since one would really be at pains to find a convincing motive as to why it was important for the *CS* abbreviator to have Tosto repair his ships rather than acquire new ones, we may safely attribute this instance too to the body of unconscious misunderstandings.

Another tendency is, however, clearly visible and uncontroversial. The number of instances of *1* and *1a* is almost equal, and among the *1b*s as many as 110 instances (around 84%) include not only the suppression of the ablative absolute, but also the change in the vocabulary. This – and we have touched upon the issue in our discussion on the words of death and killing – may have been the real driving tendency of the abbreviator – namely, to change the thesaurus of Saxo's original and make it simpler. But can this last point – the simplification of the vocabulary – be proven on the basis of our results, since statistical data as such cannot claim anything about it? We have noticed several tendencies heading in that direction while analysing all the instances.

It seems that there was a tendency to turn compound verbs into the simple ones. One can take a look at #185 where *imponere* was turned into *ponere*, #245 where *consalutare* changed into *salutare* or #326 where *perlegere* became *legere*. On other occasions, a compound verb from the original was exchanged for a different simple one – that is, with a different root: take, for example #226. where *accipere* turned into *dicere*. However, there are even the reverse cases – note, for instance, #281 where the simple *vocatis* from *GD* became *convocatis* in the *CS*.

Further on, a stronger case could be made for a tendency to reduce the number of irregular verbs. We can take one of the more complex and at the same time more frequent ones for a representative example – the verb *ferre* and its compounds. Many cases are found where the compounds of *ferre* has been removed. Take for example #68 where *relatis* becme *reportabant*, #191 where *prelato* was simply excluded from the *CS* and the same happened with *prelata* in #457, while in #200 *referre* became *replens* and in #367. *perlatis* was turned into *considerans*, and in #429. *oblatis* changed into *armare*. This is a decent host of examples that go in one direction. Again, however, at least one exception could be found, as in #430. *oblatis* was kept.

Another interesting point could be made regarding a very frequent family of verbs, which, due to their basic meaning, were important to any text, and especially to the one of Saxo. We would like to see the fate of the verbs connected to *petere*, which have a range of meanings from "going" and "traveling" all the way to "attacking". For instance, in #103. the sentence in *CS* was arranged in such a way that *petere* was substituted with *invitare*, in #153 *repetere* became *redire*, in #175. again, *repetere* was exchanged for a construction without a verb (*in oriente*), and again in #207. for *intrare*. Furthermore, instance #349. offers evidence of *petere* being exchanged for *accedere*, and #435 for the same verb suffering expulsion for the sake of *intrare*. Here again, however, one example was detected to testify against what was perceived as a general rule: #457. where *opprimere* was exchanged for *appetere*, a compound of *petere*.

Another interesting fact was noted related to the simplification of the vocabulary. Many of the words employed by Saxo in *Gesta* were exchanged for what we could perhaps call "empty" verbs: namely, general copulative verbs bearing little or no meaning in themselves and for the sense depending largely on the context. Such are the verbs *esse*, *habere* and *facere*. We can look at the following examples: #129 *urbe capta* was changed into a general construction *quo facto*, #249 *edita* turned into *facta*, #271 *sumpta* into *habita*, #312 *peracto* into *facto*, #453 *icto* into *facto*. Furthermore, in #35 *obtinere* turned into *habere*, #156 *vacuefacere* bacame simple *facere*, in #48 *compacere* changed into *facere*. In #101 an artistic expression *sopore discusso* was exchanged for *mane facto*. In #104 *occultato* changed into *habuit*, in #247 *contractis* turned into *habita*, #261 *obstante* into *fuerunt*, #269 *circumspectis* into a construction with *esse*.

On many occasions, the verb from *GD* was not simplified, as in the examples present in the previous passages, but removed altogether, possibly in an ultimate attempt at simplification. These are only some of the examples: #161 where *negare* was removed, #176 with *intercedere*, #191 with *prelato* (compare with our discussion on the compounds of *ferre*), #256 with *elapso*, #304 with *suscepta*, #339 with *impetrara*, #381 with *acta*, #407 with *receptis*, and #450 again with *prelata*.

Finally, some more evidence can be added by saying that among those verbs used in instances of *1b* both in the text of the original and in the text of the translation none seem to have been very complex (that is to say, no irregular verbs were revealed), while many belong to the group of those verbs in favour of which the author of the *CS* has already been changing Saxo's original verbs. Let us consider some examples: in #15 Saxo and *CS* share *interficere*, but we must be aware

that, apart from being *CS'* favourite verb for denoting murder (consider our previous discussion), the latter also exchanged some of Saxo's various other verbs and expressions precisely for *interficere*: note #391, where *prostrato* became *interfecto*, or #388, where *interimere* was turned again into *interficere*, and again in #457, when *opprimere* became *interficere*. Just like that, in the instance #313 the verb *interrogare* from *GD* is kept in the shorter version, but we see that in the #181 it was *percunctare* that was exchanged in favour of *interrogare*. In the same vein, among the verbs shared, we find *facere* (#221).

   Now, there is another issue that it would be appropriate to discuss here. On several instances, we have noted that the author of *CS* tried to express in a shorter, more concise and simple way what Saxo wrote more opulently. Otiosity is certainly a feature of Saxo' style, although not a defining one. Take for example #57 where *suspendio consumptis* ("executed by hanging") was exchanged for the simpler *suspensis* ("hanged"), which still conveys the whole point. There is one construction which is employed rather often by Saxo and which does not seem to be classical (although it might be very difficult to state with certainty whether it was of his own making or rather typical for his time), namely, that he often uses an additional empty word to separate the adjective from the noun. Most easily noticeable are the examples where this empty word is *genus*. Let us take look at the following examples: *GD* 10. 16. *levi monumenti genere* instead of *levi monumento*; *GD* 12. 38. *studioso exercicii genere* instead of *studioso exercicio*; *GD* 17. 19. *impensiori laudacionis genere* instead of *impensiori laudacione*; *GD* 18. 9. *impari dimicacionis genere* instead of *impari dimicacione*; *GD* 19. 35. *inauditi generis miracula* instead of *inaudita miracula*; *GD* 24. 29. *diversi generis aves*; *GD* 26. 6. *repentino mortis genere*; *GD* 28. 4. *callido commenti genere*; *GD* 29. 33. *inauditi generis bellorum*; *GD* 32. 23. *volunario mortis genere*; *GD* 34. 10–11. *acri genere minarum*; *GD* 34. 33. *ceptum vie genus*; *GD* 40. 38. *atroci mortis genere*; *GD* 662/32. *vario milicie genere*; *GD* 663/15. *eodem edicti genere*; *GD* 666/2. *celso cantilene genere*; *GD* 667/21. *inusitatum genus victorie*. This enormous bulk of examples has mostly been taken from the Books One and Sixteen – it should in no way be understood that they, many in number as they may be, exhaust the whole *Gesta* or even our limited sample. It should be noted, moreover, that some examples of the same kind, albeit with a different "empty" word inserted can also be detected – for instance, this role can be equally well played by *usum* as in *GD* 46/14. *assuete quietis usum* instead of *assuetum quietem* or by *exemplum* as in *GD* 49/34–35. *immoderatum cupiditatis exemplum*. We have devoted so much space to explanation of this phenomenon only to show how important a role it played in the composition of Saxo's style. We mentioned that *CS* used to cut down the surplus of words, as exemplified in #57. In that particular vein, it may be mentioned that we were unable to find any examples of the empty words principle we showed to have been so vital to the writer of the original. Someone might object that this would not have led to some particular simplification of the original, but it is equally plausible to argue on the contrary – any time that one does not have to connect only two, but three or more words into one construction there is a risk of making a fallacious connection, or of connecting one of the three words to a neighbouring construction. We may assume that this is what the author of *CS* was bearing in mind when introducing these changes.

3. 5. Summary of the results and conclusions

What is, finally, a general conclusion that can be deduced from the discussion in this chapter? Although one might wish to present readers with a clear-cut solution, I do not think that it is possible in this case. I do not believe that we have been able to find a systematic and conscious pattern of either removing the ablative absolute (instances of *1a* and some of the instances of *1b* speak in favour of that, but instances of *4* speak against it), or of systematically simplifying the vocabulary (although real patterns have been found regarding *ferre* and *petere*, for instance, they have been curiously called into question by singular instances offering evidence for the other side). We have succeeded in something else by this discussion, however, and I think that the conclusion we thus might have reached is in any way much more probable than the conclusion on the *CS* abbreviator systematically choosing to eliminate ablative constructions or picking on some particular words, like compounds of *ferre* and throwing them out in favour of something more simple, frequent or straightforward: for the *CS* abbreviator, who was in any case not an uneducated person, the absolute ablatives might not have stuck out of the text as it does for a modern reader of Latin. Many students are accustomed today to search through their texts in order to find instances of ablative absolute, to underline them and take particular care to translate them in a correct fashion once they go through the text the second time. It might not have been the same for a medieval writer fluent in Latin – for him, the ablative absolute might have been as easy and as uncontroversial part of the text as, say, an adverb or a conjunction. It is interesting to note and important to keep in mind that even the term "absolute ablative" is very late (it has been introduced by Petrus Helie in the twelfth century, cf. Resmark 2009, 10). Any author could pass it over in the text interpreting it correctly but not noticing that it is precisely that construction that he has encountered. When it comes to the vocabulary, we will do well to remember that the *CS* abbreviator did not have – as we do – lists of words that are most frequent in Latin. Neither did he have concordances of Saxo or of any other author. The only thing he could rely in his choice of words was his own ear joined with his intuition. This is, I think, the best way to explain how it happened that some ablative absolutes were removed and others kept, and how it came to be that what we perceive as awkward vocabulary got to be deleted only partially, that is, the abbreviator removed what he *felt* to be difficult. He did not run through the text cutting all the instances of *ferre* and the absolute ablative. He must have judged every instance on its own merit – changing those he deemed too hard and complicated, and keeping the others. It was not in keeping with a conscious, systematic agenda that he might have acted. His intention was a matter he was conscious about, but the method must have been vaguer. This is, I believe, the best way to explain how it was at all possible that almost all compounds of, for example, *petere* got removed, but one: he was not aware that he was after *petere* – it happened so, that each time he arrived to another instance of *petere* he judged it rightful to remove it – simply because the expression did not seem like something his targeted audience, his pupils, colleagues or friends, often used in their daily conversations or were positively familiar with. And where his instincts did not disapprove he

kept the verb he usually suppressed, not feeling that he was in any way going against the general principles of his work.

4. Conclusion

In the introductory chapter, we have discussed several theoretical stances which have a bearing on the issue of abridgments and promised to take a look back at them now that we have explored *Compendium Saxonis* in detail. It is important to recollect the structural elements common to most or all abridgments as they were recognized by Ilona Opelt. We will now see in what way the *Compendium* reflects this background in the light of our study. We are to take Opelt's points one by one and point to the previous discussions.

1) Selbstaussagen über die Methode (The author of abridgment reflects on his own method). This point has already been taken on by Dubschar (2010, 44–50) and discussed in our introduction. As other abbreviators, the author of the *Compendium* first praises Saxo, then relates the problems connected to his text and finally points to his own contribution.

2) Wörtlichkeit (Literality). There are passages in *Compendium* where *Gesta* have almost been copied – their contents and even their wording. We have noted such places on several spots in our previous discussion, most importantly in our large table dealing with the issues of content. One will also do well to remember that there were as many as 51 occasions in our table of the absolute ablatives where the construction has simply been copied from *GD* to *CS*. These instances also clearly speak in favor of occasional abbreviator's literality. It has been noted that some parts of *Ilias latina*, the abridgment of the Iliad, looked more like a translation (see Reitz 2007, 337).

3) Auslassungen von Reden (Omission of Speeches). This is a tendency we have pointed out several times during our previous discussion (see, for instance, pp. 73–74). It should be enough to repeat here that out of eighteen speeches given by various characters, only two have been merely shortened, while 16 have been deleted completely.

4) Auslassung beweisender, erläuternder und psychologischer Details (Omission of evidential, explanatory and psychological details). I would agree that the author of *Compendium* was not interested in giving any such details, since any explanation or in-depth analysis necessarily has to slow down the narrative and, as we have shown in the first chapter, the abbreviator seems to have been keen to keep the narrative flow steady. A necessary limitation is that he was certainly eager to offer explanations when he thought that the intricacies of the plot were too complex to follow (see for example our comment on *2. 15. 4.* in our table of contents, and later on our discussion, pp. 67–68).

5) Auslassung von Wiederholungen (Omission of repetitions). We have already discussed this tendency in *CS* on pp. 71–72.

6) Zusatze (Additions). Among the occasions of *3* in our table of content, good examples for additions are, for instance, *1. 3. 6.* and *2. 11. 1.*

7) Änderungen (Changes). Among the occasions of *3* in our table of content, good examples for changes are, for instance, *2. 5. 1.* and *2. 7.*

8) Missgriffe (Abuses). I have not been able to detect any instances where Saxo's text has consciously been misused by the author of *CS*.

9) Zusammenziehungen (Gathering of information to one place). We have noted that it sometimes occurred that the author of *CS*, most probably for didactical reasons, reorganized Saxo's material in a different way to make it easier for the reader to understand the plot. A notable example is to be found in the section *2. 13. 3.* of our table of contents.

Now that we have made a summary of our previous discussions with respect to the elements recognized by Ilona Opelt, it becomes clear that *Compendium* corresponds rather well with the general traditions connected with abridgments.

We may use this last opportunity to reiterate main points we made in our two central chapters. When it comes to the content, we have been able to show that the abbreviator's main concern was to follow the red thread of the Danish history and avoid not only what was essentially unnecessary and anecdotal, but also anything that slowed down the narrative by revealing details about motivation, moral reflections etc. This should be connected to the request of relevance, mentioned in our introduction as one of Grice's categories. For the author of the Compendium tracking the line of Danish kings and the main thread of Danish political and military exploits was of key relevance, in opposition to various anecdotal and picturesque details. We have, however, been able to establish that it is very likely that the abridger occasionally followed a different agenda as well and excluded episodes even if they were pertinent to the narrative, if he found fault with their content. We hypothesize that this may be true in the case of the excluded story on Suanhuita's battle against the ghosts.

Secondly, concerning the style, it is clear that the abbreviator's main goal was radical simplification. When it comes to the figures of style and tropes used, our discussion based on the sample from the Book II showed beyond reasonable doubt their predominance in the original text and, on the contrary, their deficiency in the shorter version. Furthermore, our discussion on the death vocabulary has been able with its telling numbers to show that the shorter text indulged in much less variety than the longer, original one. This should be interpreted in connection with the request for perspicuity, pertaining to one of the four Gricean categories discussed in the introduction. We have, nevertheless, shown, manly in our discussion prompted by the treatment of the absolute ablatives, that the methods the abbreviator made use of in order to achieve this simplification were less then clear and straightforward, and predominantly in the field of subconscious and intuitive. The aim was clear, the methods less so; the result convincing, yet imperfect.

Finally, we have not touched upon the quality of abridgments as such in our discussions nor do we think that passing judgments on literary quality of ancient and medieval texts, which we study first and foremost as living testimonies of the history of the human mind, are necessary. It is, nevertheless, the opinion of the writer of these lines that one shall do well to examine abridged and simplified texts and reflect upon reasons for their existence in a world which is at a rapid rate

sinking in oversimplifications and where short twitter replicas strive to eliminate detailed and rigorous treatises of the yore.

References

Backhaus, H. (2009). *Rikskanslern Axel Oxenstiernas skriften och brevväxling* 1/16, Brev 1636–1654. Stockholm: Kungliga Vitterhetsakademien.

Boserup, I. (2007). "The Angers fragment and the archetype of the Compendium Saxonis". *Rennaissance forum* 3 (*Album amicorum*), pp. 1–14

Conte, G. B. (1994). *Latin literature: A history.* (J. B. Solodow, trans. D. Fowler, G. Moss, revised). Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Drexler, M. (1982). "The extant abridgments of Walter Bower's 'Scotichronicon'". *The Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 61, no. 171/1, pp. 62–67

Dubischar, M. (2010). "Survival of the most condensed? Auxiliary texts, Communication theory and Condensation of knowledge" in *Condensing texts, Condensed texts* (eds. M. Horster, C. Reitz). Stuttgart: Frenz Steiner Verlag, pp. 39–67.

Elton, O. (1894). *The Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus*. New York: Norroena Society.

Friis-Jensen, K. (1987). *Saxo Grammaticus as Latin poet: Studies in the verse passages of the Gesta Danorum*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Friis-Jensen K. & P. Fisher (2015). *Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum: The History of the Danes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gertz, M. Cl. (1917–1918). *Scriptores minores historiae Danicae medii aevi*. Copenhagen: i kommission hos G. E. C: Gai.

Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and conversation" in *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech arts* (eds. P. Cole, J. Morgan). Waltham: Academic Pr, pp. 41–58.

Hill, D. E. (1978). "What Sort of Translation of Virgil do we need?" *Greece & Rome*, vol. 25 (n. 1), 59–68.

Holder, A. (1886). *Saxoni Grammatici Gesta Danorum*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Teubner.

Horster, M & C. Reitz. (2010). "Condensation of literature and pragmatics of literary poduction" in *Condensing texts, Condensed texts* (eds. M. Horster, C. Reitz). Stuttgart: Frenz Steiner Verlag, pp. 3–14.

Ieep, I. (1858). *Iustinus. Trogi Pompei historiarum philippicarum epitoma*. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

Pfeffer, W. (1977). *Proverbs in Medieval Occitan Literature*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Postgate, J. P. (1922). *Translation and Translations – theory and practice*. London: G. Bell and Sons LTD.

Reitz, C. (2007). "Verkürzen und Erweitern - Literarische Techniken für eilige leser? Die 'Ilias Latina' alspoetische Epitome". *Hermes* 135/3, pp. 334–351

Resmark, T. (2009). *Ablativus absolutus hos Ammianus Marcellinus*. Lund : D-uppsats i latin.

Sawyer, B. (1999). *Saxo Grammaticus* in "Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing", vol. 2 (ed. Kelly Boyd). London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.

Weibull, C. (1978). "Vem var Saxo: ett diskussionsinlägg". *Historisktidsskrift* 13/5.

West, M. (2007). *Indo european poetry and myth.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wifstrand-Schiebe, M. (2008). "Gudasöner fanns de?" in *Förbistringar och förklaringar: festskrift till Anders Piltz* (ed. P. Beskow, S. Borgehammar & A. Jönsson). Lund: Språk- och Litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet skåneförlaget.

Woodmorth, D. C. (1938). "Meaning and Verse Translation". *The Classical Journal*, vol. 33 (n. 4), 193–210.