

9-1-2015

Rulers and the Wolf: Archbishop Wulfstan, Anglo-Saxon Kings, and the Problems of His Present

Nicholas Schwartz

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schwartz, Nicholas. "Rulers and the Wolf: Archbishop Wulfstan, Anglo-Saxon Kings, and the Problems of His Present." (2015).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds/35

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Language and Literature ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Nicholas P. Schwartz

Candidate

English Language and Literature

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Jonathan Davis-Secord, Chairperson

Dr. Helen Damico

Dr. Timothy Graham

Dr. Anita Obermeier

**RULERS AND THE WOLF: ARCHBISHOP WULFSTAN,
ANGLO-SAXON KINGS, AND THE PROBLEMS OF HIS
PRESENT**

by

NICHOLAS P. SCHWARTZ

BA, Canisius College, 2008
MA, University of Toledo, 2010

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in English

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2015

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Sharon and Peter Schwartz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have incurred many debts while writing this dissertation. First, I would like to thank my committee, Drs. Jonathan Davis-Secord, Helen Damico, Timothy Graham, and Anita Obermeier. Without their knowledge and guidance this project could never have been completed. During the course of writing I was financially supported by the Russell J. and Dorothy S. Bilinski Fellowship, an award granted by the Bilinski Educational Foundation. The impact this award had on my dissertation is immeasurable, and the Foundation has my heartfelt thanks. Kevin Jackson and Mona Logarbo provided valuable assistance with certain pieces of scholarship, and they, along with Veronica Schornack, offered me much encouragement while writing. Dylan Gauntt made the procedures of finishing manageable. Thanks is also due to the staff of Zimmerman Library. Finally, I would like to especially thank my family for all of its support. Needless to say, any errors in the following pages are my own.

ABSTRACT

Until now, Wulfstan, Archbishop of York's relationship to and view of Anglo-Saxon kingship has never been comprehensively examined. The lack of attention this topic has received is a glaring omission in Wulfstan scholarship. Wulfstan worked under two kings, Æthelred and Cnut, and he had an interest in Edgar that has long been recognized. In response to Wulfstan's career under these kings and his interest in Edgar, scholars have been far too ready to assume that the archbishop's view of kingship was straightforward. It has too long been taken for granted that Wulfstan operated under Cnut in the same manner as his did under Æthelred, as if his political viewpoint never changed, for example. Moreover, Alfred and Edgar—both of whom had been vetted by history—left a considerable number of texts which Wulfstan mined extensively for material applicable to the kingdom's situation when he was active. His interaction with these earlier kings reveals that early in Wulfstan's career the archbishop found the position of king to be of the utmost importance to the governance and stability of the kingdom. The reigns of Æthelred and Cnut witnessed Wulfstan's application of his views on kingship and what the kingdom needed generally in order to improve, both of which changed over the course of his career. Under Æthelred, Wulfstan focused on admonishing and instructing the Anglo-Saxon laity, but after he drafted V Æthelred, Wulfstan's texts were aimed at the king, himself, and his *witan*. They stressed both the essentiality of law and order and the importance of the king to society as a whole. His texts from Cnut's reign, however, reveal that it is not primarily the king that interested Wulfstan during these years, but, rather, the administration of the kingdom in general. In them, the position of king was actually deemphasized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: <i>Dis syndon þa domas ðe Ælfred cyncg 7 Guðrum cyncg gecuron</i> : Wulfstan and King Alfred	6
Chapter 3: <i>Ane misdæda he dyde þeah to swiðe</i> : Wulfstan and King Edgar	71
Chapter 4: <i>Ac soð is þæt ic secge, þearf is þære bote</i> : Wulfstan in the Reign of Æthelred	140
<i>Wulfstan as IdeologFue: The Millenarian and Eschatological Homilies</i>	145
<i>Wulfstan as Teacher of the Faith: The Remaining Homilies for the Laity</i>	155
<i>Wulfstan the Adviser: The Remaining Homilies of Æthelred's Reign</i>	171
Chapter 5: <i>Ac to lyt is þara nu ða, þe þæt understande, swa swa man scolde</i> : Wulfstan during the Reign of Cnut	199
Chapter 6: Conclusion	240
BIBLIOGRAPHY	244

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Comparison of the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” and Other Wulfstan- Authored Codes.....	62-3
Table 3.1: Wulfstan-Authored Lawcodes and Their use of Edgar’s Legislation.....	139
Table 4.1: Selected Examples of Collapsing Social Order in the <i>Sermo Lupi ad Anglos</i>	194
Table 5.1: <i>II Canons of Edgar</i> 68e-i and Wulfstan-authored Legislation.....	209

Chapter 1

Introduction

The present study seeks to show that an understanding of Wulfstan, Archbishop of York's view of the position of king—both historical and contemporary—is instrumental for any examination of the archbishop's career and body of works. Until now, Wulfstan's relationship to and view of Anglo-Saxon kingship has never been comprehensively examined. The lack of attention this topic has received is something of a glaring omission in Wulfstan scholarship. Wulfstan worked under two kings, Æthelred (978-1016) and Cnut (1016-35), for example, and he had an interest in Edgar (957-75) that has long been recognized. In response to Wulfstan's career under these two kings and his interest in Edgar, scholars have been far too ready to assume that the archbishop's view of kingship was straightforward. It has too long been taken for granted that Wulfstan, chosen by two kings to be an advisor and legislator, operated under Cnut in the same manner as his did under Æthelred, as if his political viewpoint never changed, for example. Furthermore, scholars have been too often hung up on the notion that Wulfstan had a Benedictine interest in Edgar, and that he looked back on Edgar's reign as something of a Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon England. He very well may have—as will be seen—but not on account of Edgar's participation in the Reform, as has often been assumed. Moreover, scholars have had a far too limited approach to Wulfstan's source material, which has resulted in Alfred and his reign being largely overlooked in this regard, even though the fact that Wulfstan glossed Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care* clearly indicates he had a real interest in that king.

It is a good time to study Wulfstan. In recent years the archbishop's career and writings have attracted more scholarly interest than at any other time—including the mid twentieth century when several studies by Dorothy Whitelock, Dorothy Bethurum, and Karl Jost laid down the field's foundation. The work of these scholars was rooted in the bedrock set down by two other scholars who operated nearly 200 years apart from one other. It was Humfrey Wanley who effectively initiated critical study of Wulfstan and his works when, in 1705, he attributed fifty-four writings to the archbishop.¹ In 1883 Arthur Napier made these texts available, along with some others, in an edition that remains useful for Wulfstan scholars to this day.² Though his arguments for and against the authorial authenticity of these texts never appeared, it is a testament to the great abilities of Wanley that subsequent scholars have found his take on the body of Wulfstan's works to be more often correct than not.

More recent scholars have made hay of this earlier work by those mentioned, along with others. Jonathan Wilcox, and, more recently, Joyce Tally Lionarons, have mapped out much of Wulfstan's homiletic output.³ For his part, Patrick Wormald has provided an in-depth analysis of Wulfstan's participation in the legislation of Anglo-Saxon England.⁴ Additionally, Matthew Townend's edited collection of essays on various

¹ Humfrey Wanley, *Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium Catalogus*, vol. 2 of *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus*, ed. George Hickes (Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1705), 140.

² Arthur Napier, ed., *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883; repr. with a supplement by Klaus Ostheeren, Dublin: Weidmann, 1967).

³ Jonathan Wilcox, "The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies: The Wulfstan Tradition in Eleventh-Century Vernacular Preaching," in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 2/Paul Watkins Medieval Studies 12 (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), 199-217; and Joyce Tally Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 14 (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2010).

⁴ Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, vol. 1, *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

aspects of Wulfstaniana will continue to be fundamental reading for scholars of the archbishop, as the contributions to it are broad in scope, while their insights are sharp.⁵ Furthermore, Sara Pons-Sanz's recent injection of linguistic expertise into Wulfstan studies has provided it with a comprehensive overview of the archbishop's Scandinavian loanword usage.⁶

The time is thus right for a comprehensive consideration of Wulfstan's work that takes into account this important recent work, and such a study is what this dissertation seeks to provide. I have considered Wulfstan's entire corpus of works while writing, though not every single text from his pen makes an appearance in the pages that follow. In order to reduce the chance of redundancy I have often chosen to examine texts or parts of texts that are representative of a larger group or larger individual work. I have noted when this occurs.

At its core my study is about Wulfstan and his views on the role of Anglo-Saxon kings in the governance of England. As will be seen, Wulfstan's perception of the office of kingship was one that was dependent on his chronological relationship to individual monarchs. As such, my dissertation can be divided into two parts. The first is formed by Chapters Two and Three. These chapters discuss Wulfstan's use of material associated with the earlier kings Alfred and Edgar, respectively. These rulers were largely paragons of political thought and administration for the archbishop, with the main exception being Edgar's dealings with the Danes in England. Chapters Four and Five form Part Two of

⁵ Matthew Townend, ed., *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004).

⁶ Sara Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works, a Case Study*, North-Western European Language Evolution, Supplement 22 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007).

this study. These chapters, which focus on Wulfstan's career during the reigns of Æthelred and Cnut, respectively, form an examination of the evolution of Wulfstan's thought on the betterment of the English state and society.

Chapter Two argues that texts associated with King Alfred provided Wulfstan not only with a substantial font of source material, but also influenced his views on the role and scope of legislation. It thus expands the range of Wulfstan's known source material. Chapter Three reconsiders Wulfstan's view of King Edgar. It challenges the conventional scholarly view that the archbishop looked back on Edgar's reign nostalgically as a Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon England. The reality is that Wulfstan's opinion of Edgar was rather complicated—he valued most of Edgar's administrative abilities that are displayed in the king's lawcodes, but his seemingly amicable treatment of the Danes in IV Edgar found little favor with the archbishop.

In Chapter Four I argue there that Wulfstan's approach to the problems of Æthelred's reign was anything but static by dividing his homilies from this period into three chronological groups: the eschatological homilies, the homilies which instruct the laity on the basic tenets of their faith, and the political homilies intended for Æthelred and the *witan*. The change in Wulfstan's methodology exposed by these groups indicates that Wulfstan became more and more steeped in politics during Æthelred's reign, and that he considered the means for the improvement of Anglo-Saxon England rested firmly in the hands of the king and his counsellors.

Chapter Five complements Four, as it considers Wulfstan's textual output from Cnut's reign. In it I argue that, because Cnut's ascension had little impact on what Wulfstan had earlier identified as Anglo-Saxon England's core problems, the

archbishop's views on the governance and regulation of his society underwent a drastic change. During Cnut's reign Wulfstan actually deemphasized the roles of the king and his *witan* in favor of assigning more responsibilities to other sectors of his society, such as monks, priests, and reeves. The result is a vision of government that is rather close to being bureaucratic. This change is manifested most clearly in his revisions of the *Canons of Edgar*, *Institutes of Polity*, and in the great lawcode, I-II Cnut. These texts form the core of this chapter.

In its entirety, this dissertation ultimately shows that, though his methods often changed, the stability and condition of the kingdom were never far from Wulfstan's mind. Moreover, and in spite of the fact that his goals for the kingdom were never fully realized, Wulfstan strove more than any other late Anglo-Saxon figure to improve his society in multifaceted ways.

Chapter 2

Dis syndon þa domas ðe Ælfred cyncg 7 Guðrum cyncg gecuron:

Wulfstan and King Alfred

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 20 and the text contained in it, the Old English translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* and its famous Preface, have long been important to Anglo-Saxonists.¹ The Old English *Pastoral Care* is one of the longer pieces of prose in Old English, and it is the first of the translations undertaken by King Alfred (or by someone in his circle).² Hatton 20 also has the further distinction of being the most complete extant copy of the *Pastoral Care* that is contemporary with Alfred,³ and its Worcester provenance proves that Alfred's idea to distribute translated works around his kingdom, a plan recorded in the Preface to the translation, was actually carried out, at the very least in part.⁴ It is also a more accurate witness of the text compared to the almost

¹ For a facsimile of this manuscript along with others which contain the *Pastoral Care* in Old English see N. R. Ker, ed., *The Pastoral Care: King Alfred's Translation of St. Gregory's Regula pastoralis; Ms. Hatton 20 in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Ms. Cotton Tiberius B. XI in the British Museum, Ms. Anhang 19 in the Landesbibliothek at Kassel*, EEMF 6 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956). For an edition of the Old English *Pastoral Care* based on Hatton 20 (with the Cotton Tiberius B. xi manuscript on the facing page), see Henry Sweet, ed., *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, 2 vols., EETS o.s. 45, 50 (London: N. Trübner, 1871; repr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958). The manuscript is number 324 in N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957). It is number 626 in Helmut Gneuss, *A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts or Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001).

² The traditional view is that Alfred, himself, was responsible for the translation of the *Pastoral Care*, the *Soliloquies*, the *Old English Boethius*, and the *Psalms*, while the *Dialogues* were translated by Wærferth and the *Orosius* by someone else in his circle. For a challenge to the view that Alfred was intimately involved in the translations attributed to him, see M. R. Godden, "Did King Alfred Write Anything?" *Medium Ævum* 76 (2007): 1-13. For affirmations of the traditional view see David Pratt, "Problems of Authorship and Audience in the Writings of King Alfred the Great," in *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World*, ed. Patrick Wormald and Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 162-91; Janet Batley, "Did King Alfred Actually Translate Anything? The Integrity of the Alfredian Canon Revisited," *Medium Ævum* 78 (2009): 189-215.

³ Both Ker and Gneuss date the manuscript to 890-7; see Ker, *Catalogue*, §324 and Gneuss, *Handlist*, §626.

⁴ The Preface to the translation, really an epistle, has the following note centered on its upper margin: "Deos boc sceal to Wiogora Ceastre" (This book shall go to Worcester"). The manuscript did, in fact, make it to Worcester, where it was glossed by Wulfstan in the eleventh century (see below), and the Tremulous Hand of Worcester in the thirteenth century, and then later John Joscelyn in the sixteenth century. For the heading quoted see Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:3. For a description of how the copies would have been made

completely destroyed MS Cotton Tiberius B. xi, at least when it comes to how this copy appears in Francis Junius' transcription, Junius 53.⁵

With all this in mind, that the Preface to the *Pastoral Care* as it appears in Hatton 20 has attracted much scholarly attention is hardly surprising.⁶ This is especially the case when one considers that there exists a "cult" of King Alfred, to borrow Simon Keynes' terminology, which scholars are not immune to.⁷ The Preface as it survives in this manuscript is also rather likely one of the most common prose texts encountered when one first learns Old English, because of both its importance to Anglo-Saxon history and its manageable length. In the end the Preface to the *Pastoral Care* is popular among students and scholars today because it is written by, or in the voice of, one of the most famous kings in Anglo-Saxon history, if not English history in general, and it maps out a translation program which provided a massive portion of extant Old English literature.⁸

and distributed see Kenneth Sisam, "The Publication of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*," in *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 140-7.

⁵ K. Jost, "Zu Den Handschriften der *Cura Pastoralis*," *Anglia* 37 (1913): 63-88. Cotton Tiberius B. xi is also a contemporary copy of the text, but it was damaged in the infamous Cotton Library fire of 1731 and then almost totally destroyed in another fire on July 10, 1865. The manuscript was copied by Junius before the Cotton fire, however, and it is now preserved in Bodleian Library, Junius 53. Sweet relies on Junius' copy for his printing of Cotton Tiberius B. xi in his edition. A leaf from this damaged manuscript, which was removed at some point and used as part of another book's binding, survives in relatively good shape as Kassel, Landesbibliothek, Anhang 19. See Ker, *Catalogue*, §195.

⁶ See, for example, in addition to those studies cited elsewhere in this chapter, Paul E. Szarmach, "The Meaning of Alfred's *Preface* to the *Pastoral Care*," *Mediaevalia* 6 (1982): 57-96; T. A. Shippey, "Wealth and Wisdom in King Alfred's *Preface* to the Old English *Pastoral Care*," *English Historical Review* 94 (1979): 346-55.

⁷ Simon Keynes, "The Cult of King Alfred the Great," *Anglo-Saxon England* 28 (1999): 225-356. Keynes traces the perception of Alfred from his own day to well into the twentieth century. A study in a similar vein, though not so comprehensive, is E. G. Stanley, "The Glorification of Alfred King of Wessex (from the Publication of Sir John Spelman's *Life*, 1678 and 1709, to the Publication of Reinhold Pauli's, 1851)," *Poetica* 12 (1979): 103-33.

⁸ This is not to say that nothing came before Alfred; see Janet M. Bately, "Old English Prose Before and During the Reign of Alfred," *Anglo-Saxon England* 17 (1988): 93-138.

During the Anglo-Saxon period, however, signs that the Preface was extensively read and/or studied after Alfred's time are simply lacking.⁹ In fact, the extant evidence suggests that it was Archbishop Wulfstan, alone, who made a point of closely reading the Alfredian Preface, long after Wærferth's tenure as bishop of Worcester. Others may, of course, have picked up Hatton 20 and perused its leaves, but it was apparently only Wulfstan who made a study of the text of the Preface, and left physical proof of that study, during the Anglo-Saxon period. The Preface in Hatton 20 contains a number of glosses in Wulfstan's hand¹⁰ that make it clear the archbishop was not only interested in the text, but also apparently found it to be a useful piece of prose—one that was worth glossing, changing, and perhaps even adapting.¹¹ A discussion of Wulfstan and Alfred is overdue, and his glosses in this manuscript provide a convenient starting point from which to do so.

While it is certain that later Anglo-Saxon figures knew about Alfred and his various exploits—anyone with access to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or Asser's *Life of*

⁹ I take it for granted that, during Alfred's time, Wærferth read the Preface and translation in Hatton 20, just as I assume that the other bishops who received copies of the *Pastoral Care* also read their respective manuscripts, despite the fact that the evidence for this assumption is lacking.

¹⁰ The hand was recognized by N. R. Ker over a series of studies. See, for a preliminary view, Neil Ripley Ker, "Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. xiii," in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 49-75, at 70-2. Ker later convincingly showed that this hand, found in numerous Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in addition to Hatton 20, is, in fact, the archbishop's. In his *Catalogue*, Ker describes the hand as "very probably Wulfstan's own hand"; see Ker, *Catalogue*, 211. In 1971 he concluded that this is definitely the case; see Neil Ker, "The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan," in *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 315-31. For a list of Wulfstan's additions to the manuscript see Ker, *Pastoral Care*, 24-5.

¹¹ Timothy Graham suggests that Wulfstan might have been planning to use the preface for one of his homilies. See Timothy Graham, "The Opening of King Alfred's Preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care*: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 20," *Old English Newsletter* 38 (2004): 43-50, at 46. Richard Dance concludes that Wulfstan's glosses are simply an attempt to clean up Alfred's prose so that others could more easily understand the preface. For his view see Richard Dance, "Sound, Fury, and Signifiers; or Wulfstan's Language," in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townend, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 29-61, at 42. See also my discussion below.

Alfred,¹² for example, could learn a great deal about the king and his reign—scholars have rarely considered specific examples of later figures’ use of Alfredian material at length in order to unveil the larger implications of these authors’ invocation of Alfred or their borrowings from Alfredian texts. The exception is, of course, Malcolm Godden’s work on both Ælfric’s invocation of Alfred as well as his borrowings from Alfredian texts for source materials.¹³ Ælfric’s use of Alfred is complicated. On the one hand he validates his own use of the vernacular by connecting his work to the Alfredian translations in the Old English Preface to the First Series of *Catholic Homilies*, but, on the other, it is not clear which of those Alfredian texts he actually had in mind.¹⁴ Furthermore, Godden notes that Ælfric’s concern about the dangers associated with the use of the vernacular translations of Latin texts is not something Alfred appears to have worried about much.¹⁵ Though Ælfric used Alfredian material, his approach to the vernacular could not have been more different. For Alfred, translating important Latin texts into the vernacular—even if those translations contained some heterodox

¹² The standard edition remains William Henry Stevenson, ed., *Asser’s Life of King Alfred; Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904; repr. 1959). Subsequent references to this edition will be by chapter. The *Life* is translated in Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, eds., *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources* (London: Penguin, 1983), 67-110. Though the only manuscript of the work that is known, Cotton Otho A. xii, was largely destroyed in the Cotton Library fire of 1731, the great Humfrey Wanley dated the oldest hand of the *Life* to “1000 vel 1001” in a letter to Francis Wise, who includes Wanley’s opinion in his edition of the *Life* in 1722. For an account of this dating see Stevenson, *Asser’s Life of King Alfred*, xlv-xlv; Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 224-5. This late date suggests that there was some interest in Alfred in the early eleventh century.

¹³ Malcolm Godden, “Ælfric and the Vernacular Prose Tradition,” in *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard F. Huppé (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1978), 99-117, and Malcolm R. Godden, “Ælfric and the Alfredian Precedents,” in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 139-63. Also of note is Bernard F. Huppé, “Alfred and Aelfric: A Study of Two Prefaces,” in Szarmach and Huppé, *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, 119-37.

¹⁴ Godden, “Vernacular Prose Tradition,” 99; and Godden, “Alfredian Precedents,” 139.

¹⁵ Godden, “Alfredian Precedents,” 143-5.

material¹⁶—was a method to ignite learning amongst his kingdom. For Ælfric, the use of the vernacular was necessary in order to combat heterodox material already in Old English.¹⁷ But studies like Godden’s on Ælfric are simply lacking when it comes to Wulfstan.

While it has been said that there is “no evidence from the Anglo-Saxon period that Alfred was raised above his fellow kings in the estimation of his countrymen,”¹⁸ there is good evidence which suggests that Wulfstan may have been an exception to such a statement. This chapter argues that Wulfstan did, in fact, raise Alfred above some other kings in the Anglo-Saxon past by both explicitly—in the case of the Hatton 20 glosses—and subtly—in the case of the main text of the *Pastoral Care* and other texts—engaging with Alfredian materials in his own writings. Wulfstan did so in order to combine his own ethos with Alfred’s as one part of his eleventh-century mission which began as an effort to save the Anglo-Saxons from the invading Vikings by fostering proper Christianity and then, once the Dane Cnut came to power in 1016, to adapt the kingdom to Scandinavian rule by finalizing his blueprint for a Christian kingdom, the *Institutes of Polity*.

In order to provide context for this argument, however, it is useful to consider some of the many parallels between Alfred and Wulfstan before discussing the more specific evidence for my argument. These parallels are both numerous and various, and

¹⁶ M. Godden, “The Alfredian Project and its Aftermath: Rethinking the Literary History of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 162 (2009): 93-122, at 107; and Godden, “Alfredian Precedents,” 146-7.

¹⁷ Godden, “Alfredian Precedents,” 144: “For Ælfric, the whole process of writing in the vernacular was full of risks, and his own involvement in it was justified only by the view that the alternatives were worse—leaving the laity to the mercy of dangerous books in English or ill-educated clerics with poor Latin and less sense.”

¹⁸ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 45.

an initial focus on the shared qualities and experiences of these two men here will set the scene for a discussion of Wulfstan's specific borrowings from Alfredian texts as well as his engagement with Alfredian history.

Of course the most obvious parallel between the king and the archbishop is that each was active during Viking incursions into Anglo-Saxon England.¹⁹ When Alfred came to power in Wessex, Anglo-Saxon England as a whole was in the midst of what is commonly referred to as the first Viking Age. This period of Danish attacks began in 793—long before Alfred's birth²⁰—with the sack of Lindisfarne. The attack was harrowingly recorded after the fact by a *Chronicle* writer: “[h]er wæron reðe forebecna cumene ofer Norðhymbra land, 7 þæt folc earmlic bregdon, þæt wæron ormete þodenas 7 ligrescas, 7 fyrenne dracan wæron gesewene on þam lyfte fleogende. þam tacnum sona fyligde mycel hunger, 7 litel æfter þam, þæs ilcan geares on .vi. idus Ianuarii, earmlice heðendra manna hergunc adilegode Godes cyrican in Lindisfarnee þurh hreafiac 7 mansliht.”²¹ While at first the Viking attacks on England were opportunistic plundering missions on easily-accessed and unprotected coastal monastic centers—the next year, for

¹⁹ The following brief accounts of the Viking incursions into Anglo-Saxon England in the first and second Viking Age are based primarily on the applicable annals from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It should be noted that material in the *Chronicle* concerning Alfred's reign has been at times interpreted as pro-Alfredian propaganda. See, for example, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, “The Franks and the English in the Ninth Century: Some Common Historical Interests,” *History* 35 (1950): 202-18, and R. H. C. Davis, “Alfred the Great: Propaganda and Truth,” *History* 56 (1971): 169-82. These claims, especially those of Davis, are countered in Dorothy Whitelock, *The Importance of the Battle of Edington* (Edington: Friends of Edington Priory, 1977).

²⁰ Asser says that Alfred was born in 849; see Asser, ch. 1, but see too Stevenson's note on the passage on pp.152-3 and Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 228n2.

²¹ G. P. Cubbin, ed., *MS D, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 6* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1996), 19. Hereafter citations from this edition will be formatted “ASC D [year].” “In this year dire portents happened over Northumbria and wretchedly frightened the people: they were measureless flashes of lightning and fiery dragons were seen flying in the air. A great famine soon followed these signs, and not long after that, on 8 January of the same year, the plundering of the heathen wretchedly destroyed God's church on Lindisfarne through robbery and murder.” See also Susan Irvine, ed., *MS E, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 7* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), 42. Hereafter citations from this edition will be formatted “ASC E, [year].”

example, saw an attack on Jarrow, and the year after that Iona was sacked—it did not take much time for the attacks to become more organized and more severe. By the time Alfred came to power in 871 the attacks were essentially ongoing, and only a month after his ascension to the throne he was tasked with fighting, outnumbered, against the Vikings at Wilton—a battle ultimately lost even though the chronicler notes that Alfred and his men put up a good fight.²² Wessex remained in Alfred’s hands, however, since the kingdom “made peace” (*namon . . . frið*) with the Vikings. The Vikings then turned to Mercia, which was overrun in 874.²³ This made Wessex the only unconquered kingdom in Anglo-Saxon England. In 875 the invaders again tried for Wessex, and again Alfred “made peace” with them—this time much more equally—but, even so, the Danes soon went to Exeter during the night.²⁴ The following year the Vikings attempted to take Wessex once more, but they ran into foul weather, lost ships, and were chased by Alfred and his men to Exeter where they garrisoned themselves inside a fort and made terms with their pursuers.²⁵ The events of 878 determined the future of Alfred’s kingdom of Wessex and, by extension, the rest of Anglo-Saxon England. This time the Vikings met with some immediate success. The host entered Wessex during the winter, forcing Alfred and some of his men to flee to the marshes near Somerset. He built a fort at Athelney around Easter and was joined by men from Somerset. This combined force carried out attacks on the invaders from the new fort, though the *Chronicle* does not note how

²² *ASC DE*, 871.

²³ *ASC DE*, 874.

²⁴ *ASC DE*, 876. Frank Stenton notes that this engagement was with a diminished Danish force, as many of the original army had followed one of its leaders, Halfdan, to the area around York: “A large part of the original Danish host had followed Halfdan to the north, and in the autumn of 876, after a year of fighting, the West Saxons were able to treat with their enemies on equal terms”; see Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 252-3, quotation at 253.

²⁵ *ASC DE*, 877.

successful these campaigns were. Alfred was then aided by even more men who assisted him in winning the decisive battle at Edington. Alfred's army then laid siege on the Vikings until their leader, Guthrum, submitted to Alfred through the giving of hostages, promising to leave Wessex, and agreeing to be baptized with Alfred as his sponsor.²⁶

While the outcome of the Battle of Edington placed Wessex in a good position, the Viking problem remained. Guthrum's force went to East Anglia and took it for themselves in 879.²⁷ Another army came in 878 and wintered at Fulham, though apparently rather than attack it left for the Continent in 879.²⁸ A portion of this force returned in 884 to attack Rochester, but the raid was quelled by Alfred's forces. Alfred fought with Danish ships in 882 and 885, and lost a naval battle on the return home after the latter engagement.²⁹ Alfred did not sit idly by afterwards, however. In 886 he took London and entrusted it to the man ruling Mercia, ealdorman Æthelred³⁰—an intensely loyal individual who later married Alfred's daughter, Æthelflæd. The taking of London was a great achievement. The *Chronicle* notes that the English, other than those in Danish captivity (who rather likely would have if it were possible), submitted to Alfred.³¹

The consequences of London's taking extended beyond Alfred's recognition as some kind of English overlord. It expanded formal English control further outside of

²⁶ ASC DE, 878.

²⁷ ASC DE, 880.

²⁸ ASC DE, 881.

²⁹ ASC DE, 882 and 885, respectively.

³⁰ ASC DE, 886. Æthelred succeeded Ceolwulf II as ruler of part of (western?) Mercia under unknown circumstances in 883, and he appears to have immediately pledged allegiance to Alfred. See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 259-60. Ceolwulf II had received part of Mercia to rule from the Danes in 877. See ASC DE, 877.

³¹ ASC DE, 886. Stenton notes that Alfred's overlordship was rather different than the sort enjoyed by earlier kings. Rather than being rooted in force, "[t]he acceptance of Alfred's overlordship expressed a feeling that he stood for interests common to the whole English race." See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 259.

Wessex through the cooperation of Alfred and ealdorman Æthelred. The Mercian territory was then defended through the acts of Æthelflæd after her husband's death in 911.³² Most important to the present study, however, is the formal agreement, "The Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum," which, though of uncertain date, probably followed Alfred's occupation of London.³³ While Wulfstan's relationship to this document will be discussed below, it is worth making a few general comments on the treaty here. The treaty shows the political savviness of Alfred in some specific ways. First, Stenton points out that while the treaty is void of any indication that Guthrum was subservient to Alfred, it does suggest that Alfred protected Guthrum's English subjects by ensuring that both the Danes and the English in Guthrum's realm had the same *wergeld*.³⁴ In other words, while the treaty appears to be between equal powers,³⁵ it is really Alfred who has the upper hand. Secondly, the language of the opening of the treaty embraces the *Chronicle's* statement that Alfred had been made a kind of Anglo-Saxon overlord: "Ðis is the frið, þæt Ælfred cyninc 7 Gyðrum cyning 7 ealles Angelcynnes witan 7 eal seo ðeod ðe on

³² Manuscripts B and C of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* contain what is called the "Mercian Register," a block of annals (902-24) which deal exclusively with Mercia with a great emphasis on the actions of Æthelflæd. It is from these annals that Æthelflæd's actions to defend her land are known. In the D manuscript this information is integrated into the rest of the annals. For more on Æthelflæd see F. T. Wainwright, "Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians," in *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*, ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 44-55.

³³ The treaty is printed in F. Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1898-1916), 1:126-8. For an edition with an English translation see F. L. Attenborough, ed., *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922; repr. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 98-101. For a translation only see Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 171-2. There is a brief discussion of the possible dates for the text in Attenborough, *Laws*, 96. Stenton thinks it probable that the document is a record of the terms made by Alfred and Guthrum after their 886 engagement; see Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 260. Stenton's view is endorsed in R. H. C. Davis, "Alfred and Guthrum's Frontier," *English Historical Review* 97 (1982): 803-10, at 803. Keynes and Lapidge date the treaty to "in or soon after 886" and definitely before 890; see Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 171. Paul Kershaw dates the document to "some time in the 880s"; see Paul Kershaw, "The Alfred-Guthrum Treaty: Scripting Accommodation and Interaction in Viking Age England," in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 43-64, at 43.

³⁴ Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 261-2.

³⁵ Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 260.

Eastænglum beoð ealle gecweden habbað 7 mid aðum gefeostnod.”³⁶ Both the *Chronicle* and the “Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum” depict Alfred as a supreme ruler even though he was not king of all the English.³⁷ Additionally, the text paints the Danes in East Anglia as *beod*,³⁸ a word which has the connotation of nation or tribe rather than simply an assortment or group of individuals. Thus this carefully crafted text emphasizes Alfred’s role as an important figure not just for Wessex but for all Anglo-Saxon England, while simultaneously painting the Danes as a highly-organized nation-group in order to further enhance the significance of Alfred’s victory over them.

While Alfred was ultimately victorious in his protracted engagement with the Vikings, Wulfstan’s experience was rather different. By the time he was made bishop of London in 996³⁹ the second round of Viking incursions was well underway. The beginning of the 980s brought small, opportunistic raids to several coastal regions of Anglo-Saxon England.⁴⁰ 988 saw the return of the Vikings,⁴¹ but the raids remained small, and were of little consequence to the kingdom as a whole.⁴² In the beginning of the

³⁶ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1: 126. “This is the peace that King Alfred and King Guthrum and all the counsellors of the English people and all the people who are in East Anglia have completely agreed on and confirmed with oaths.”

³⁷ For a similar point see Davis, “Alfred and Guthrum’s Frontier,” 806: “The real importance of the treaty is that it demonstrates that King Alfred, West Saxon though he was, was able to negotiate a frontier with the East Anglian Danes, even though it ran for the whole of its length through territory which once had been Mercian. In the treaty there is no mention of ealdorman Ethelred or the Mercians, but only of King Alfred, King Guthrum, the councillors of all the English nation (*Angelcynnes*) and the people (*beod*) who dwelt in East Anglia.”

³⁸ The structure of the sentence suggests that “*beod*” refers to the Danish people in East Anglia rather than literally everyone who lived there, which would have included Anglo-Saxons (as the language of the treaty makes clear). The sentence alternates between English and Danish subjects; “*beod*” is the second Danish subject and the last subject in the sentence.

³⁹ Dorothy Whitelock, “A Note on the Career of Wulfstan the Homilist,” *The English Historical Review* 52 (1937): 460-5.

⁴⁰ Katherine O’Brien O’Keefe, ed., *MS C, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 5* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001), 84. Hereafter cited as “*ASC C*, [year].” See also *ASC C*, 981 and 982, respectively.

⁴¹ *ASC C*, 988.

⁴² Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 375.

following decade, however, the situation changed for the worse. The *Chronicle* notes that in 991 Ipswich was attacked by raiders. This group then moved on to Maldon where it defeated an Anglo-Saxon force commanded by ealdorman Byrhtnoth, who died in the fray.⁴³ Though the poem “The Battle of Maldon”⁴⁴ paints this military failure as something of a heroic loss, and perhaps it really was one, the *Chronicle* offers some, less subjective, additional information. 991 was the same year that the English paid off the Danes in this second era of Viking attacks, and this is a significant development.⁴⁵ Such a method of deflecting the Danes became standard procedure for Æthelred as the attacks wore on along with his reign. It is impossible to know for sure how familiar with the events of Maldon Wulfstan was, but it nevertheless is rather likely that he would have heard news of Danish attacks, whatever his whereabouts were at the time. In the instance of the battle at Maldon this might especially be the case, since, like Wulfstan, Byrhtnoth had some connection to Ely.⁴⁶ The two are, in fact, currently entombed only feet apart from one another, though it is not clear where their original burials may have been.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to think that Wulfstan might have heard news of Byrhtnoth’s death due to this institutional connection.

Geographically and chronologically closer to Wulfstan’s first known appointment as bishop of London in 996 is the attack on that city in 994. As recorded in the *Chronicle*,

⁴³ *ASC DE*, 991.

⁴⁴ The standard edition is D. G. Scragg, ed., *The Battle of Maldon*, Old and Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981).

⁴⁵ *ASC DE*, 991.

⁴⁶ That is, according to the *Liber Eliensis*; see Janet Fairweather, trans., *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely, from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005). For example, Byrhtnoth’s donations to Ely are mentioned in book 2 chapter 55, while a visit to Ely is recorded in book 2 chapter 62. Wulfstan’s Ely connections are found in book 2 chapter 87 and book 3 chapter 50.

⁴⁷ The current resting place of Byrhtnoth and Wulfstan dates to well after the Norman Conquest; see Elizabeth Coatsworth, “Byrhtnoth’s Tomb,” in *The Battle of Maldon, AD 991*, ed. D. G. Scragg (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991), 279-88, at 280.

it sounds as though this was a significant attack on London by Danish forces led by Olaf and Swein.⁴⁸ These men commanded ninety-four ships and their significant onboard forces⁴⁹ against the city for some time before ultimately deciding to burn it down. The people of London had other plans; they fought against the invaders until something resembling a standstill was achieved and they were able to buy peace from the Danes for 16,000 pounds.⁵⁰ This substantial payment was apparently offered by the English proactively,⁵¹ and thus it perhaps suggests a lack of confidence in their ability to fend off another attack without first literally buying themselves some time. But this is not how the chronicler saw what happened, or at least not how he chose to record the events following the initial attack on London. The text notes that the local English rose up against the Danes in response to their plan to burn the city: “[a]c hi þær geferdon maran hearm 7 yfel þonne hi æfre wendon þet him ænig burhwaru gedon sceolde, ac seo halig Godes moder on þæm dæg hyre mildheortnyse þære burhware gecyde, 7 hi ahrædde wið heora feondum.”⁵² The chronicler is impressed by, and proud of, the English response to their attackers. It was clearly a miraculous event, as evidenced by the fact that Mary is invoked to help explain the success of the English. Moreover, after recording the decision to pay off the invading Danes, the *Chronicle* notes a successful act of diplomacy committed on

⁴⁸ *ASC DE*, 994.

⁴⁹ The force probably consisted of “more than two thousand fighting men,” see Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 378.

⁵⁰ *ASC DE*, 994.

⁵¹ The *Chronicle* suggests that the tribute was not demanded by the Danes, but rather that the English decided to offer it on their own; see *ASC DE* 994: “Ða gerædde se cyning 7 his witan þæt him man to sende 7 him behet gafol and metsunge wið þon þe hi þære hergunge geswincon” (“Then the king and his councillors decided to send to them, offering tribute and provisions, if they would stop their harrying”). I quote here from D.

⁵² *ASC DE*, 994: “but there they [the Danes] suffered more harm and malice than they ever thought that any city’s people could do to them. But the holy mother of God made her mild-heartedness known to them [the people of the city] that day and delivered them from their enemies.” I quote from D.

the part of Æthelred: Anlaf was sent for, was treated with ceremonious respect, and was baptized with Æthelred as his sponsor with the result that “7 him ða Anlaf behet, eac swa gelæste, þet næfre eft to Angelcynne mid unfryðe cumon nolde.”⁵³ This is another bright spot in an otherwise gloomy span of years; Æthelred’s diplomacy effectively spared the kingdom from potential future attacks led by Anlaf, and, judging from the *Chronicle*, perhaps also from Viking attacks in general for the next two years.⁵⁴

It is worth emphasizing the potential importance of this attack on London to Wulfstan’s career. It occurred only two years before Wulfstan’s appointment as bishop of London, and it seems unlikely that talk of the successful repelling of the Vikings by the English would have died out by the time Wulfstan assumed office there, especially considering how much Maldon was celebrated, even though it was a military failure. Rather, I think it more than likely that the people of London would have still been talking about their miraculous defense of the city well into Wulfstan’s career as Bishop of London. It was a serious accomplishment, and serious accomplishments are not easily forgotten or neglected. In other words, not only did Wulfstan’s episcopal career start in the midst of the second era of Viking attacks, it also started in a place with a history of clashes with the invaders, the most recent recorded instance being the successful defense of London only two years prior.

The years following Wulfstan’s appointment as bishop of London brought further attacks, and with them, largely ineffective responses by the Anglo-Saxons. In 997 the

⁵³ ASC DE, 994: “and then Olaf promised, and also afterwards stuck by it, that he never again would come to England with intent of war.” I quote from D.

⁵⁴ Viking activity is not mentioned again until 997 in the *Chronicle*. It has been further suggested that Æthelred’s diplomatic efforts with Olaf earned him a foreign ally in Norway; see Richard Abels, “Paying the Danegeld: Anglo-Saxon Peacemaking with Vikings,” in *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History*, ed. Philip De Souza and John France (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 173-92, at 190-1.

invaders started with Cornwall, Wales, and Devon, but ultimately ended up attacking and plundering other areas as well. In 998 Dorset was attacked and those who had gathered to face them were called off, while 999 saw Rochester's invasion and the Kentish levies' subsequent retreat due to a lack of needed support.⁵⁵ The widespread attacks continued, and in 1002 Æthelred and his councilors decided to offer the Danes tribute once again, to the tune of £24,000.⁵⁶ In the same year the king ordered the elimination of all Danes in England on November 13th, an event now known as the St. Brice's Day Massacre, in response to intelligence he had received of their goal to take his life and kingdom.⁵⁷ This measure did nothing to quell the attacks, and they, along with payments of tribute from the English, continued. In 1012 archbishop Ælfheah was killed in a particularly grim way—he was “stoned” by Vikings who threw the bones of animals before being felled with an axe. It was an attack so brutal that the *Chronicle* notes forty-five ships defected to the English side.⁵⁸ In the next year Æthelred apparently saw the writing on the wall and sent his wife Emma/Ælfgifu across the Channel to her brother, Richard. He followed not long after, and remained there until Swein died in 1014.⁵⁹ His return was at the invitation of the Anglo-Saxon councilors, which Wulfstan was a part of, on the condition that he rule better than he had before.⁶⁰ In the meantime Swein's son Cnut had been selected leader of the Danes in England, and, soon after, he received the support of Eadric and the West Saxons.⁶¹ In 1016 Æthelred died, and Edmund was selected king. Edmund fought

⁵⁵ *ASC DE*, 1002.

⁵⁶ *ASC DE*, 1002.

⁵⁷ *ASC DE*, 1002.

⁵⁸ *ASC DE*, 1012.

⁵⁹ *ASC DE*, 1013-14.

⁶⁰ *ASC DE*, 1014.

⁶¹ *ASC DE*, 1015.

against Cnut until he died in November of the same year, at which point Cnut assumed power over all of England.⁶²

In addition to each coming to their positions in similar circumstances, both Alfred and Wulfstan also reacted in similar ways to the Viking incursions. One of Alfred's responses was to better equip his kingdom to respond to outside threats.⁶³ While Alfred's improvements for the defense of Wessex proved to be effective measures, of more importance to this study are his non-martial cultural reforms and their relation to the Danish attacks on Wessex. Like Alcuin⁶⁴ before him, Alfred saw the Viking attacks as punishment from God. In much of the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, the first work in his translation program, the Alfredian text strongly implies that there is a direct correlation between the decline of learning and education and the Viking invasions.⁶⁵ In fact, most of this opening epistle meditates on the long statement which follows the text's conventional opening:

& ðe cyðan hate ðæt me com swiðe oft on gemynd, hwelc wiotan iu wæron giond Angelcynn, ægðer ge godcundra hada ge worul[d]cundra; & hu gesæligica tida ða wæron giond Angelcynn; & hu ða kyningas ðe ðone onwald hælfdon ðæs folces [on ðam dagum] Gode & his ærendwrecum hersumedon; & hie ægðer ge hiora sibbe ge siodo ge hiora onweald innanbordes gehioldon, & eac ut hiora eðel gerymdon; & hu him ða speow ægðer ge mid wige ge mid wisdom; & eac ða

⁶² ASC DE, 1016-17.

⁶³ For a discussion of these measures see Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 23-5.

⁶⁴ See, for example, two of Alcuin's letters, numbered 193 and 194, in Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents: c. 500-1042*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 842-4 and 844-6, respectively.

⁶⁵ For the view that the Preface exaggerates the decline in learning see Jennifer Morrish, "King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England in the Ninth Century," in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: Sixteen Original Contributions*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), 87-105.

godcundan hadas hu giorne hie wæron ægðer ge ymb lare ge ymb liornunga, ge ymb ealle ða ðiowotdomas ðe hie Gode [don] scoldon; & hu man utanbordes wisdom & lare hieder on land sohte, & hu we hie nu sceoldon ute begietan gif we hie habban sceoldon.⁶⁶

The improvement of his kingdom's martial capabilities only addressed one side of Alfred's problem, in other words. In fact, doing so really only dealt with the consequence—Viking incursions—of the real issue—the decline in learning, and, by extension, religious observance. Alfred's kings from better days achieved the level of success they did not merely, or even primarily, according to the logic of the text, because of their martial prowess; they were successful because there were enough wise men, both religious and secular, to go around. The result of the presence and activity of this sort of men was a heady culture of education, one in which teachers were eager to instruct and students were eager to learn, according to the text. The fostering of learning was religiously significant. By engaging with and striving for wisdom, the earlier Anglo-Saxons performed an important and necessary service due to God—since it is He, the text itself notes, who grants that wisdom in the first place with the intention that it be utilized.⁶⁷ The Anglo-Saxons of Alfred's time, then, have not only failed their ancestors;⁶⁸ they have also failed God. They are not necessarily doomed, however. Some

⁶⁶ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:3.2-13: “and command it made known to you that it comes to me very often in my mind what wise men were formerly around England, both in holy and secular orders, and how happy times were then throughout England, and how the kings who had rule over the people in those days were obedient to God and His messengers, and they held their peace and morality and their power within the borders, and also expanded their authority outside them; and how it prospered for them both in war and in wisdom, and also how eager the holy orders were about both teaching and learning, and about all the services which they had to do for God, and how one from outside the borders sought wisdom and teaching in the land here, and how now we must get them abroad, if we should have them.”

⁶⁷ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:5.1-4.

⁶⁸ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:5.13-18.

teachers, like Wærferth and other bishops, remain,⁶⁹ which prompts the command to the bishops to “Geðenc hwelc witu us ða becomon for ðisse worulde, ða ða we hit nohwæðer ne selfe ne lufodon ne eac oðrum monnum ne lefdon.”⁷⁰ The result of privileging worldly matters over wisdom was that it created a population of hypocrites: “ðone naman anne we lufodon ðæt[te] we Cristne wæren, & swiðe feawe ða ðeawas.”⁷¹ Thus, Alfred’s understanding of the violence done to his people and kingdom is rooted firmly in his Christian faith and his belief that he and his people have failed their Creator.

Though Wulfstan wrote from the perspective of archbishop rather than king, his own understanding of the attacks on Anglo-Saxon England is remarkably similar to Alfred’s. I will focus here on what can be gleaned from Wulfstan’s most famous text, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*,⁷² though similar sentiments can be detected in some of his other writings.⁷³ Like Alfred’s Preface, part of this text harkens back in sentiment to Alcuin’s words on the attack on Lindisfarne by connecting the Viking attacks to the moral and religious failures of the Anglo-Saxons, though Wulfstan does not identify, as the Alfredian Preface did earlier, a lack of learning as a major culprit. He does, however, name what seems like all other possible failings and crimes, most of which are mentioned

⁶⁹ Kenneth Sisam notes that “perhaps a dozen more copies [of the *PC* translation] would be needed” for distribution around the kingdom. See Sisam, “Publication,” 141. This, then, would be the minimum number of available teachers in Wessex, though there were undoubtedly more men capable of the occupation. Evidence for this latter point may be found in Morrish, “Alfred’s Letter,” 90-7, especially.

⁷⁰ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:5.5-6. “Think what punishments came upon us then because of this world, when we neither loved it [wisdom] ourselves nor permitted it to other men.”

⁷¹ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:5.6-8. “We loved only that we be called Christians, and very few loved the virtues.”

⁷² I cite here by page and line number from Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, 3rd ed., Methuen’s Old English Library (London: Methuen, 1963). In all quotations from this edition I change “p” to “w” and “ȝ” to “g.”

⁷³ Simon Keynes, for example, has demonstrated that a number of Wulfstan’s law-codes appear to be actively in response to, or in preparation for, the Viking invasions of England, and are phrased within the context of these invasions constituting divine punishment; see Simon Keynes, “An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007): 151-220.

in several lists, which might be called “catalogs of sin,” in the text.⁷⁴ According to the sermon, these many sins are the cause of a number of punishments that have fallen upon the Anglo-Saxons. The most significant and damaging of these are the Danish attacks on the kingdom, which, according to the text, are very clearly sanctioned by God as punishment: “7 Engle nu lange eal sigeleas 7 to swyþe geyrigde þurh Godes yrre; 7 flotmen swa strange þurh Godes þafunge þæt oft on gefeohte an feseð tyne, 7 hwilum læs, hwilum ma, eal for urum synnum.”⁷⁵ Wulfstan’s interpretation of the events surrounding him and the kingdom is further emphasized in one of the more famous passages from the sermon where he explains God’s plan more fully:

An þeodwita wæs on Brytta tidum, Gildas hatte, se awrat be heora misdædum, hu hy mid heora synnum swa oferlic swyþe God gegræmedan þæt he let æt nyhstan Engla here heora eard gewinnan 7 Brytta dugeþa fordon mid ealle. . . . Ac wuton don swa us þearf is, warnian us be swilcan; 7 soþ is þæt ic secge, wyrse dæda we witan mid Englum þonne we mid Bryttan ahwar gehyrdan.⁷⁶

Though Wulfstan did not know Gildas first-hand, but rather through his familiarity with Alcuin,⁷⁷ he uses this passage to make an interesting point concerning both what is at

⁷⁴ These sometimes also include examples of consequences; see, for example, Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 53-4.56-8: “here 7 hunger, bryne 7 blodgyte on gewelhwylcan ende oft 7 gelome; 7 us stalu 7 cwalu, stric 7 steorfa, orfcwealm 7 uncoþu, hol 7 hete 7 rypera reaflac derede swyþe þearle.” (“devastation and hunger, burning and bloodshed in nearly every place often and continuously; and theft and destruction, plague and pestilence, murrain and disease, evil speech and hatred, and the plundering of robbers have injured us very sorely.”)

⁷⁵ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 59.113-16: “And now the English are long completely without victory and too disheartened because of God’s anger, and the pirates are so strong through God’s permission that often in battle one drives away ten, sometimes less, sometimes more, all because of our sins.”

⁷⁶ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 65-6.183-97: “There was a learned man in British times, named Gildas, who wrote about their misdeeds, how with their sins they so very excessively angered God that He finally allowed the English host to conquer their land and to completely destroy the nobility of the Britons. . . . But let us do as is necessary for us, warn ourselves by such things; and what I say is true, we know of worse deeds among the English than we have heard anywhere among the Britons.”

⁷⁷ See Dorothy Bethurum, “Archbishop Wulfstan’s Commonplace Book,” *PMLA* 57 (1942): 916-29, at 920-1; Dorothy Whitelock, “Two Notes on Ælfric and Wulfstan,” *Modern Language Review* 38 (1943):

stake for the Anglo-Saxons as well as what England, itself, means to God. The message for the Anglo-Saxons is clear: if they fail to improve themselves then God will allow the Danes to conquer them as punishment for their sins, just as He allowed the proto-Anglo-Saxons to conquer the Britons for their wrongdoings. This pattern of God punishing a culture by allowing another to conquer it establishes England (or Britain, for the Britons) as a privileged land, even more important than the peoples who have inhabited the island. England is cast as God's proving ground; it is a land that requires the best possible people for habitation: "[h]istory repeats itself—or threatens to repeat itself—because God works through the same pattern: the island must be cleansed of its sinful inhabitants by heathen outsiders."⁷⁸ The Britons were not up to the task of residing in Britain, and the sermon's goal is to encourage the Anglo-Saxons to prove themselves worthy of the island by changing their ways before they come to the same end. Thus, like Alfred, Wulfstan sees the Vikings not simply as invaders, but as the punitive hands of God.

There are additional parallels between Alfred and Wulfstan that are not directly associated with the Vikings that are nevertheless significant. To begin with, both Alfred and Wulfstan recognized the efficacy of the vernacular.⁷⁹ If Asser is to be believed,

122-26, at 125-6; and Nicholas Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989; repr. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 21-2. For a discussion of Alcuin texts in a Wulfstan manuscript see Gareth Mann, "The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 235-78.

⁷⁸ Howe, *Migration*, 12. Howe notes the biblical parallel of those inhabiting the island being identified by some authors as a chosen people; for the development of this idea see pp. 33-71.

⁷⁹ Neither figure is, of course, anti-Latin. Alfred, in the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, notes that some men in particular should learn it, for example: Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 7.13-15: "lære mon siððan furður on Lædengediode ða ðe mon furður læaran wille & to hieran hade don wille" ("afterwards let one teach further in the Latin language those who want to learn more and want to achieve a higher order"). Malcolm Godden has argued that the phrase "to hieran hade" does not necessarily refer to religious appointments as has often been assumed. If he is believed then Alfred sanctioned the learning of Latin to a far larger group than had previously been thought; see Malcolm Godden, "King Alfred's Preface and the Teaching of Latin in Anglo-Saxon England," *English Historical Review* 117 (2002): 596-604. Wulfstan, of course, wrote fairly extensively in Latin. The most recent study of some of these texts is Thomas N. Hall, "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 93-139. Of additional note, Dorothy Bethurum

Alfred had held a fondness for literature in the vernacular since he was a young boy, when he memorized an entire book of verse before his brothers could in order to win that book as a prize from his mother. Thus Alfred's education must have included the study of literature in the vernacular, for the then illiterate Alfred was able to learn the poems in his mother's book through the help of his teacher.⁸⁰ A similar backstory for Wulfstan's predilection for Old English does not exist, though it is tempting, and probably not unreasonable, to infer from his many extant Old English texts that he was educated at a center which emphasized the study of both Latin and Old English composition, including the craft of vernacular poetry.⁸¹ Regardless of how the vernacular came to be acknowledged as valuable by these men, it is clear that each recognized Old English as a tool quite useful for instruction, law, religious exhortation, and, specifically for Wulfstan, Christian political theory.⁸² This use of Old English betrays the practical minds of both Alfred and Wulfstan, as the vernacular would have a much wider audience than Latin even in Wulfstan's post-Benedictine Reform era.

Judging from the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, the use of the vernacular for Alfred was a logical choice because it was apparently the only option if wisdom was to be fostered around the kingdom. It would have been a fool's errand to attempt to address

successfully argued that Wulfstan was also responsible for a Latin letter to the pope which protested the necessity for Anglo-Saxon archbishops to travel to Rome—bearing gifts—in order to receive the pallium; see Dorothy Bethurum, “A Letter of Protest from the English Bishops to the Pope,” in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas Austin Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949), 97-104.

⁸⁰ Asser, ch. 23. Alfred's illiteracy is noted in ch. 22. In ch. 25 Asser notes Alfred's complaint that there were no teachers around to learn from. Ch. 23 suggests there must have been some, though, since Alfred learned the book of poetry with the help of one.

⁸¹ On Wulfstan's poetry, see below in this chapter for a very brief discussion. An extended discussion can be found in my chapter on Wulfstan and Edgar.

⁸² I refer here to the *Institutes of Polity*, which is extant in two versions: *I* and *II Polity*. The standard edition is Karl Jost, ed., *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, Swiss Studies in English 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959).

the decline in learning in England by emphasizing Latin over English when “swiðe feawa wæron behionan Humbre ðe hiora ðeninga cuðen understondan on Englisc, oððe furðum an ærendgewrit of Lædene on Englisc areccean; & ic wene ðæt[te] noht monige begiondan Humbre næren.”⁸³ While the situation is dire in general, the sense of the passage suggests that it is much more dire in relation to Latin than to English. Thus, Old English is the best way for Alfred to realize his important goal of encouraging the attainment of wisdom in his Wessex and, by extension, please God.

Wulfstan’s use of the vernacular deserves a bit more explanation. While the specific audience of many of Wulfstan’s homilies is uncertain or unknown—Jonathan Wilcox has made a good case for one particular audience of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, however⁸⁴—it is possible to reasonably speculate on their audiences. He probably delivered these texts occasionally to the *witan*, those in orders, the secular clergy, and the laity. Moreover, the style and content of Wulfstan’s homilies (and perhaps his other texts as well) suggests that they were designed to be distributed to others to deliver on their own. Unlike Ælfric, Wulfstan offers no information about himself in his texts because such information would be irrelevant at best and distracting at worst in a text designed to be able to be spoken by other preachers to additional Anglo-Saxons in need of salvation. Of further note in this vein are some of the three homiletic texts by Wulfstan inserted at the end of the York Gospels.⁸⁵ These texts appear to have been written specifically for inclusion in the York Gospels, and the fact that they are on a special gathering of leaves

⁸³ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:3.13-16: “very few were on this side of the Humber who were able to understand their services in English, or even translate one letter from Latin into English, and I think that there were not many beyond the Humber.”

⁸⁴ Jonathan Wilcox, “Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance: 16 February 1014 and Beyond,” in Townend, *Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, 375-96.

⁸⁵ For a complete facsimile of the manuscript see Nicolas Barker, ed., *The York Gospels* (London: The Roxburghe Club, 1986).

with corrections in Wulfstan's own hand "suggests strongly that he attached particular importance to them . . . and by placing them in the gospel book, Wulfstan evidently intended not only to enhance the authority behind them, but also to ensure that his message would not be forgotten."⁸⁶ Thus, Wulfstan's insertion of these three texts was not an exercise in massaging his ego; it was a way to preserve vernacular texts he felt were important for subsequent Anglo-Saxons and their preachers. Finally, Wulfstan is not terribly theologically interesting to modern scholars, as he stuck to brief explanations of basic tenets of the faith rather than any sort of complicated exegesis in his homilies. These kinds of texts presented in the vernacular made for both valuable resources for clergy whose Latin was not up to par as well as ready-made explanations for the laity of important aspects of the faith.⁸⁷ For Wulfstan, then, quite like for Alfred, the vernacular is the best way to reach the most people in order to reverse Anglo-Saxon England's standing with its Creator.

Alfred and Wulfstan not only favored the use of Old English in their prose endeavors, both also wrote poetry in the vernacular. The verse outputs of both men are admittedly slight and not particularly stirring. For Alfred, I am comfortable considering the metrical preface and epilogue to the *Pastoral Care* translation as Alfred's own poetic compositions.⁸⁸ These texts received little commendation from their first editor; Henry

⁸⁶ Simon Keynes, "The Additions in Old English," in Barker, *The York Gospels*, 81-99, at 92. For more on Wulfstan's connection to the York Gospels see T. A. Heslop, "Art and the Man: Archbishop Wulfstan and the York Gospel Book," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 279-308.

⁸⁷ Take, for example, Bethurum VIIIb and VIIIc—texts which discuss baptism in an accessible manner. See Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 172-4 and 175-84, respectively.

⁸⁸ I am not convinced that the Old English Metres of Boethius came from Alfred's pen given how different they are from the prose translation and the poetic skill they display. For a summary of the evidence for and against Alfred's authorship of the Metres see Malcolm Godden and Susan Irvine, eds., *The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophiae*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1: 146-50.

Sweet only prints the verse preface as poetry in his notes, while the main body of his edition prints the text as prose.⁸⁹ Moreover, he refers to the text as “curious doggrel,” though he does go on to admit that it is, in fact, poetry.⁹⁰ Additionally, he says nothing about the metrical qualities of the epilogue and simply prints it as prose,⁹¹ though some years later the text was determined to be verse by Ferdinand Holthausen.⁹² In the end both texts ended up being included in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*,⁹³ though, like many of the so-called “minor poems,” they have received little attention from scholars.⁹⁴ For his own part, Wulfstan wrote two verse texts which were inserted into some manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the 959DE and 975D annals.⁹⁵ While Karl Jost determined that these texts were by Wulfstan long ago,⁹⁶ up until quite recently these texts received little attention from scholars, and neither was included in the *Poetic Records*. While there is much to be said about these texts,⁹⁷ their importance for this discussion is that they show that both Alfred and Wulfstan participated in the same poetic tradition, albeit at different stages of that tradition. Alfred’s texts are attempts at poetry much closer to what one finds in the more metrically and formally rigid poems of

⁸⁹ For the text presented as prose and verse see Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:9 and 2:473-4, respectively.

⁹⁰ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 2:473.

⁹¹ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 2:467, 469.

⁹² F. Holthausen, “Die Gedichte in Ælfreds Übersetzung der *Cura pastoralis*,” *Archiv* 106 (1901): 346-7.

⁹³ The metrical preface and epilogue are printed in Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 110 and 111-12, respectively.

⁹⁴ But see Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe, *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 4 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 77-95; William T. Whorbrey, “King Alfred’s Metrical Epilogue to the ‘Pastoral Care,’” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90 (1991): 175-86; Nicole Guenther Discenza, “Alfred’s Verse Preface to the *Pastoral Care* and the Chain of Authority,” *Neophilologus* 85 (2001): 625-33; and Britt Mize, “Manipulations of the Mind-as-Container Motif in *Beowulf*, *Homiletic Fragment II*, and Alfred’s Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 107 (2008): 25-56.

⁹⁵ The D manuscript is British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv. The E manuscript is Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636.

⁹⁶ Karl Jost, “Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik,” *Anglia* 47 (1923): 105-23.

⁹⁷ A full discussion of the status of these texts as poems, their critical reception, and their importance can be found in my chapter on Wulfstan and Edgar.

Cynewulf or, for a later example, “The Battle of Maldon,” whereas Wulfstan’s *Chronicle* poems provide typical examples of late Old English verse and its metrical changes and other differing forms.⁹⁸

Each individual parallel is perhaps not so useful or compelling on its own, but they are important when considered as a group because they strongly suggest that, despite the wide gulf of years between their lives, Alfred’s and Wulfstan’s similar experiences and activities created two men with similar minds and actions. Some of this is, of course, due to convention or tradition—it has long been a typical reaction, for example, to attribute diseases, crop failures, invasions, and the like to a displeased God. Thus such a parallel by itself is not enough to suggest anything more than that these men lived during times that were in some ways analogous.

But it can be shown that Wulfstan recognized the analogous life and mind of Alfred, and that he actively made use of both the persona and the writings of the king (or those he would have associated with him). A good way to begin such a discussion is to return to Wulfstan’s use of the Hatton 20 *Pastoral Care* manuscript. It is clear that Wulfstan knew this manuscript—his hand glosses the Preface to the translation extensively.⁹⁹ The glosses are difficult to characterize, but they have attracted some critical attention. One particular gloss is worth briefly discussing before moving on to the rest as a group. This correction is one of the more substantial changes Wulfstan made to the text of the Preface on the first line of fol. 2r, where he crossed out the Alfredian *ealle*

⁹⁸ For a description of late Old English verse with numerous examples and scansion see Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Early English Metre*, Toronto Old English Series 15 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 70-98.

⁹⁹ Ker lists all of the glosses by Wulfstan in his introduction to the facsimile of the manuscript; see Ker, *Pastoral Care*, 24-5.

and substituted his own *mænig*. The result is that the text is made more accurate: the Greeks learned and translated *many*, not *all* other books.¹⁰⁰ The change itself is pretty innocuous; the real significance of this particular gloss is that it betrays Wulfstan's confidence that he is entitled to adapt potential source material at will, even to the extent of permanently changing the language of Alfred's Preface in the very manuscript he came across the text: "the insouciance with which the hand amends Alfred's preface to his *Gregory* translation . . . bespeaks an authoritative voice."¹⁰¹ This is all the more significant in light of Elaine Treharne's discussion of the text of the Preface in Hatton 20. Treharne has shown that the Preface is a highly choreographed and carefully written piece of political prose.¹⁰² Such precision would not be lost on Wulfstan given that he also produced texts which required a high level of formality,¹⁰³ and his glosses in the Preface in Hatton 20 despite this care and authority suggest, as Wormald claims, that he believed his hand to be an authoritative one with a license to do what he pleased with his source material.

To move briefly to the glosses as a group, Timothy Graham suggests that Wulfstan might have had a homily based on this text in mind:

¹⁰⁰ The original can be found in Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:7.

¹⁰¹ Patrick Wormald, "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society," in *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, ed. David A. E. Pelteret, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 6 (New York: Garland, 2000), 191-224, at 193.

¹⁰² Elaine Treharne, "The Politics of Early English," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 88 (2006): 101-122, at 101-5.

¹⁰³ Two examples are the Latin letter of protest he wrote to the pope and the Old English letter Wulfstan wrote to Cnut and Emma after consecrating Æthelnoth as Archbishop of Canterbury. The former is printed in Arthur West Haddan and William Stubbs, eds., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-78), 3:559-61. Wilhelm Levison determined that the letter dates to the eleventh century, and Dorothy Bethurum later showed it was authored by Wulfstan. See Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 241-8; Bethurum, "Letter of Protest." The latter text is printed in D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, eds., *Councils and Synods with other Documents Relating to the English Church*, vol. 1, bk. 1, 871-1066 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 447-9.

The corrections to the punctuation and the rhetorical character of Wulfstan's textual emendations on this page and throughout the rest of Alfred's preface in Hatton 20 raise the tantalizing possibility that the great homilist was marking up the text with the aim of reading it aloud.¹⁰⁴

A more extended but ultimately similar examination of the glosses is found in Richard Dance's study. He concludes that

these changes seem to reflect a desire for clarity, for comprehensibility, for the removal of forms that looked like impediments to understanding what the text was saying; linguistic forms not likely to cause any confusion were not altered.¹⁰⁵

Graham and Dance are both right, and they both in a sense make the same broad point: that Wulfstan wanted to make the Preface to Alfred's translation an accessible text both for himself and for others.

Whether the supposed plan to turn the Preface into a homily ever came to fruition is not known. There are no extant homilies which appear to be based on the Preface. Nonetheless, the main text of Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care* does seep into Wulfstan's writing—for example, in a text unique to Cotton Nero A. i, the so-called "Admonition to Bishops,"¹⁰⁶ the *Incipit de Synodo*, the *Institutes of Polity*, and in the lawcodes he wrote for Æthelred and Cnut.

Before examining these texts individually, something should be said about the first three since they are all related to a degree. Wulfstan's "Admonition to Bishops" is a

¹⁰⁴ Graham, "The Opening of King Alfred's Preface," 46.

¹⁰⁵ Dance, "Wulfstan's Language," 42. A similar point is made in Ker, *Pastoral Care*, 25.

¹⁰⁶ The text was first printed by Jost with a German translation in his edition of the "Institutes of Polity" under the title "Ermahnung an die Bischöfe"; see Jost, *Polity*, 262-7. It has been printed more recently with an English translation in Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 413-17. All citations are from Jost's edition, though I will refer to the text by its English title.

short text that is more important than the lack of scholarly attention it has received indicates. First, it is preserved in a small and messy manuscript that could very well have functioned as a handbook for Wulfstan.¹⁰⁷ Moreover the fact that this manuscript is littered with glosses by Wulfstan, himself, suggests that its contents had the particular approval and authorization of the archbishop.¹⁰⁸ Wulfstan also wrote the beginning and the end of this text in the manuscript himself, giving it further distinction: “[t]he first sixteen words . . . are apparently written in Wulfstan’s own hand; the final six words of the text as a whole . . . are in the same hand; a curious circumstance that lends a particular immediacy to the text as a whole, as if it had Wulfstan’s special endorsement.”¹⁰⁹ While his hand appears frequently across many manuscripts,¹¹⁰ the “Admonition to Bishops” is the only text Wulfstan starts and finishes with his hand. It is, and ought to be considered, a very important Wulfstan text.

The “Admonition” is a rather different text from the *Institutes of Polity*. Even though it is found in a manuscript which contains a version of *Polity* with which it shares lexical evidence of the archbishop’s use of the Alfredian *Pastoral Care*, the “Admonition” should not be considered a discarded portion of or draft of Wulfstan’s political theory. Nor should it be connected directly with the text it follows in the manuscript, the *Incipit de Synodo*,¹¹¹ which also displays that lexical evidence, though

¹⁰⁷ Ker, *Catalogue*, §164.

¹⁰⁸ The glosses of Wulfstan in Cotton Nero A. i are listed in Ker, “Handwriting,” 321-4.

¹⁰⁹ Andy Orchard, “Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter,” in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 311-41, at 328.

¹¹⁰ The list of the occurrences of Wulfstan’s hand can be found in Ker, “Handwriting,” 319-31 and Ker, *Pastoral Care*, 24-5. By Wormald’s count of Ker’s lists there are more than 250 occurrences of the hand; see Wormald, “Holiness,” 192.

¹¹¹ This text is printed in Jost, *Polity*, 210-16 and, with an English translation, in Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 406-13.

Polity and the *Incipit de Synodo* are rather akin to one another. Both works, while independent texts, share a common feature which distinguishes them from the “Admonition,” their tone. *Polity*, as an extended piece of political theory, is an anticipatory blueprint for a future Anglo-Saxon England. It presents a textual model for an ideal kingdom or nation. Neither version of the text, in other words, is primarily designed to describe Wulfstan’s imperfect eleventh-century England, though these concerns at times do appear in the text. The same is true of the *Incipit de Synodo*, albeit on a smaller and more specific scale. It is probable that this text either records rules for bishops that were decided upon at a synod and recorded by Wulfstan or that it preserves a text the archbishop compiled and then presented to the synod on his own.¹¹² Whatever the case may be, the *Incipit de Synodo* emphasizes *Polity*’s idealism, and it judiciously presents a set of guidelines which, if followed, would create a population of nearly perfect bishops. The “Admonition,” on the other hand, is a text which reacts to the eleventh-century reality. It is far more specific than *Polity* and the *Incipit de Synodo* when it comes to the behavior of these figures, and essentially lets them know as a present-day contemporary eleventh-century group that they have failed in appropriately performing their duties. In this way it is much more like the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, a sermon which purports to record some of the transgressions of the Anglo-Saxons, in both tone and content.¹¹³ The following passages from each text are representative of their general overall tenor:

¹¹² For both the former and latter suggestions see Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 408. For the former see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 39.

¹¹³ I agree with Lionarons that the “Admonition” is homiletic, though I disagree with her hypothesis that it might be a “fragment of a larger homily” since it is unlikely to me that a mere fragment would be begun and finished with Wulfstan’s own hand. For this reason I believe the text is complete as it stands. See Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 41-2, at 42.

“Admonition to Bishops”
 Ðonne is hit yfel soð, þeh
 þæt ic secge: sume we synt
 gewunode þæt we syn to
 liðie and to lofgeorne; and
 we willwyrdað mannum
 æfter freondscipe and þurh
 þæt olæcað oftost on unnyt
 and soþes geswygiap ealles
 to swyþe.¹¹⁴

Incipit de Synodo
 Bisceopum gebyreð þæt
 æfre sy god lar on heora
 hiredum, and beon, þær hi
 beon, beon a ymbe wisdom
 and æghwylc gefleard
 heom unwyrð lætan.¹¹⁵

II Polity
 A gerist bisceopum
 wisdom and wærscype and
 þæt þa habban weorðlice
 wisan, þa þa heom fylían
 and þæt hy sundorcraefta
 sume eac cunnen. Ne
 geriseð ænig unnyt æfre
 mid bisceopum, ne doll ne
 dysig ne to oferdruncen ne
 cildsung on spæce ne idel
 gegaf on ænig wisan ne æt
 ham ne on siðe ne on
 ænigre stowe. Ac wisdom
 and wærscipe gedafeniað
 heora hade, and gedrihþa
 gerisað þam, ðe heom
 fyliað.¹¹⁶

The difference between the “Admonition” and the other texts is rather clear. The “Admonition” strongly reacts to the *yfel soþ* of Wulfstan’s present: bishops are not behaving as they should. This is driven home by Wulfstan’s use of “we” in the text, a common and rhetorically effective feature of many of his writings which mitigates the chance of his audience feeling alienated by his criticisms. If the “Admonition” looks to the future, in other words, it implicitly does so by pointing out the flaws of the present which must be remedied. The *Incipit de Synodo* and *Polity* are composed in a different manner. In relation to the “Admonition,” these texts are the opposite side of the same

¹¹⁴ Jost, *Polity*, 262: “Then, however, it is an evil truth that I say: some of what we are used to is that we are too changeable and too eager for praise, and we are complaisant to men after friendship, and because of that we flatter most often in vanity, and we keep silent of the truth all too greatly.”

¹¹⁵ Jost, *Polity*, 216: “It befits bishops that there ever be good instruction in their households and, wherever they may be, let them always be interested in wisdom and let them think every folly unworthy of them.”

¹¹⁶ Jost, *Polity*, 77: “Wisdom and prudence are always fitting for bishops, and that those who attend to them have honorable manners, and that they [bishops] also know some special skill. Nothing useless is ever fitting among bishops; not foolishness or stupidity or excessive drunkenness or childishness in speech, or idle wantonness in any manner, neither at home or on a journey or in any place. But wisdom and prudence behoves their order, and forbearance is fitting for those who attend to them.”

coin. Both deal with correct behavior, but neither contains the same level of explicit criticism one finds in the “Admonition.” Rather than focus on what is wrong, these texts instead place their emphasis on examples of what is appropriate conduct. They present a theoretical and ideal description of the responsibilities and characteristics of the groups they discuss. Their concern is not primarily the immediate situation, but, rather, the future. This distinction is important since, as will be seen, it shows that Wulfstan employed the same source material in two quite different kinds of texts, each of which have different aims, and, by extension, that he recognizes that the problems of his day must continue to be advised against in the future.

Wulfstan’s interest in amending the behavior of his bishops and the secular clergy at large must have motivated his interest in the *Pastoral Care*. Still, that the archbishop used the main text of the *Pastoral Care* might be thought a curious development since he does not gloss the translation portion of the manuscript at all. But it is not unlikely that he read the entire manuscript—he had good reason to—despite the fact that this can only be proved partially by his markings in the Preface. For starters, it simply seems unlikely that Wulfstan would not have read the entire manuscript given that he was something of a prodigious reader, especially since, like many educated Anglo-Saxons, Wulfstan would have had a fondness for Pope Gregory the Great. It was Gregory, after all, who allegedly took a shine to the English and became responsible for their conversion to Christianity. Thus Wulfstan could have been simply predisposed to reading a text originally by Gregory and ended up finding it to be of use for his own writings.

More important, however, is Wulfstan’s known concern about bishops. A substantial portion of Gregory’s translated text deals with the role of bishops, and it is

here that one can find close parallels between the text and Wulfstan's own writings. Gregory, his Alfredian translator, and Wulfstan all had a keen interest in the activities of men in this position. For Alfred, bishops were a major component of his educational program; according to the Preface he planned to send a copy of his translation of the *Pastoral Care* to his bishops: "ic hie on Englisc awende; ond to ælcum bisepestole on minum rice wille ane onsendan."¹¹⁷ Ideally, these figures would then pass the wisdom gained from these tomes on to others. Alfred's choice of his bishops to receive his translation of the *Pastoral Care* is a logical one. First, these men would have been scattered throughout his kingdom and, because of this, could easily be made into agents of education, ideally among the people in general—or at the very least to those subordinate to them within the Church. One might suppose that Alfred had a sort of "trickle down" educational system in mind. Enlisting those men in positions of authority over entire groups of people is a good way to extend learning throughout the geography of Alfred's kingdom. Secondly, most bishops would have already been at least semi-educated. The majority of those who could not read Latin could certainly be expected to have the power to digest a text translated into the vernacular like Alfred's and then formulate their own instruction from such a text.¹¹⁸

Wulfstan's interest in the activities of bishops is similarly informed, though his focus is not specifically due to a perceived lack of education in England.¹¹⁹ While Wulfstan's reasons are broader, they do, like Alfred's, rely heavily on the performance of

¹¹⁷ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:7, 9: "I translated it [the *Pastoral Care*] into English and I wish to send one to all bishoprics in my kingdom."

¹¹⁸ If they could not read the translation there would have been no point in sending them a copy. See also Morrish, "Alfred's Letter," 100, especially.

¹¹⁹ See above.

bishops. Given his appointments, Wulfstan knew as well as anyone the integral role played by those in the position of bishop when it came to the spiritual health of the Anglo-Saxons as a whole, and this spiritual condition was of the utmost importance to him. It is difficult to read many of Wulfstan's texts—especially the famous *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*—without detecting a strong sense of his concern for the fate of the English people in the face of the Viking invasions and other disasters afflicting the kingdom.¹²⁰ Such texts reflect a fear on the archbishop's part that England is in dire straits morally because “hit is on us eallum swutol 7 gesene þæt we ær þysan oftor bræcan þonne we bettan.”¹²¹ This perceived condition of the English people is exactly why scholars like Roger Fowler have pointed out that Wulfstan's texts are often focused on the secular clergy while also emphasizing the importance of preaching to the people: “[t]his is, in Wulfstan's eyes, one of the prime duties of the clergy; by preaching to the laity they can achieve the Archbishop's plan of reform of the laity.”¹²² But the clergy, perhaps especially the secular clergy, must be able to find effective leadership in their bishops who Wulfstan believes are required to “call out, not remain silent, act as God's messenger, and convey God's law.”¹²³ In other words, Wulfstan is concerned about the spiritual condition of English people as a whole, and their reformation is heavily dependent on the performance of the secular clergy. The performance of these men, in

¹²⁰ Other homilies carry similar sentiments; see, for example, homilies Ia, Ib, II, III, and IV in Bethurum, *Homilies*.

¹²¹ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 53: “It is clear and evident in us all that before this we more often transgressed than we amended.”

¹²² Roger Fowler, ed., *Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar*, EETS o.s. 266 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), lii.

¹²³ Jonathan Wilcox, “The Wolf on the Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*,” in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York: Garland, 2000), 395-418, at 412.

turn, is heavily dependent on the performance of those they report to—the Anglo-Saxon bishops.

The material on bishops in the *Pastoral Care* is fairly extensive; only those passages most pertinent to establishing a connection with Wulfstan will be dealt with here. I will begin by presenting Alfredian analogues which match closely what Wulfstan voices about bishops in his own time. My first example deals with general concerns about bishops; the Alfredian translation points out that a bishop must be inspired to become ordained because of a calling to do good works and then details the problems which arise if this is not the case:

Se ðonne for ðære gewilnunge swelcra weorca biscopdom ne secð, he bið ðonne him self gewita ðæt he wilnað him selfum gielpes; ne deð he ðonne ðæt an yfel ðæt he ne lufað ða halgan ðegnunga, ac eallinga he hie forsiehð; ond ðonne he fundað to ðæm weorðscipe ðæs folgoðes, his mod bið afedd mid ðære smeunga ðære wilnunga oðerra monna hiernesse & his selfes upahæfenesse, & fægenað ðæs hu hienne mon scyle herigean. Ahefð ðonne his heortan forðy, & for ðære genyfe ðæs flowendan welan he blissað. He licet eaðmodnesse, & secð mid ðam ðisses middangeardes gestreon. On ðæm hiewe ðe he sceolde his gielpes stieran on ðæm he his strienð. Mid ðy ðe he sceolde his gestreon toweorpan, mid ðy he hie gadrað. ðonne ðæt mod ðenceð gegripan him to upahæfnesse ða eaðmodnesse, ðæt ðæt he utan eowað innan he hit anwent.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:55: “Then he, therefore, who does not seek the bishopric from a desire of such works, he then is the very witness that he longs for glory for himself; then not only does he commit the one evil that he loves not the holy ministries, but he also neglects them all, and then he strives for the honor of the body of worshippers; his mind is fed with the thought of a desire for the allegiance of other men and the elevation of himself, and he rejoices because of how one shall praise him. Then his spirit puffs up because of that, and he is glad for the possession of flowing wealth. He feigns humbleness, and seeks with that pretending the treasure of this earth. In the ruse (of humbleness) in which he is obliged to govern his glory,

And now Wulfstan, in the “Admonition to Bishops”:

Ðonne is hit yfel soð, þeh þæt ic secge: sume we synt gewunode þæt we syn to liðie, and to lofgeorne; and we will wyrdað mannum æfter freondscipe oftost and þurh þæt olæcað on unnyt [and] soþes geswygiað ealles to swyþe. And hit is egeslic gewuna, þæt we eac habbað: sylfe we bysniað oft and gelome, þæt [we] geornost scoldan æghwær forbeodan, þæt is woroldwlence and idele rence; and we oferdruncen lufiað to georne and mid þam huru þencaþ þæt we us sylfe weorðian wide, þe we oðre men drencan to swyþe.¹²⁵

The concerns shared in the translation of the *Pastoral Care* and Wulfstan’s “Admonition to Bishops” are clearly evident; generally speaking, both texts focus on the problems associated with privileging the worldly over the divine, and each strives to remind bishops that their goal is to build God’s flock, not their own. The fear is that when bishops focus on receiving praise, compliments, friendship, and the like from their flocks, then they will be far less effective in promoting God’s words and laws.

There are some additional specific analogues that can be offered from Wulfstan’s “Admonition to Bishops,” however. In the passage above from the *Pastoral Care*, the text makes it rather clear that a bishop’s wealth can impede or misguide his duties by causing him to focus on it rather than on what his position requires. Wulfstan shares this concern:

he amasses it. When he must cast off his treasure is when he collects it. Then the mind thinks to seek to acquire for itself, for exaltation, humility; that which he on the outside displays he perverts on the inside.”¹²⁵ Jost, *Polity*, 262-3: “Then, however, it is an evil truth that I speak of: some of what we are accustomed to is that we may be too changeable and too eager for praise; and we are obliging to men for their friendship; and through that we flatter most often in vanity, and we keep silent of the truth all too greatly. And it is a horrible custom that we also have; we, ourselves, set an example often and continually that we most eagerly were obliged everywhere to forbid; that is: worldly pride and empty pomp. And we love drunkenness too eagerly and with those we even think that we esteem ourselves widely in that we make drunk other men too greatly.” §5, §6, and §11 in the text voice similar concerns.

Ne gebyrað us æfre, þæt we on unriht awiht gestrynan, ne hit eac ræd ne bið, þæt we rihte begytan myrran on unnyt; ac us symle gebyreð þæt swyðe rihte, þæt we godes þearfan geornlice gladian mid feo and mid fodan, þæs þe we don magan.¹²⁶

And, again, on the wealth of bishops:

and we unriht gestreon eac lufiað to swyþe, syllað wið weorde oðre hwile, þæt we orcepe scoldan mid rihte.¹²⁷

Finally, regarding bishops neglecting their duties, Wulfstan remarks analogously to the *Pastoral Care*:

Biscopas scoldon smyle godes riht bodian and unriht forbeodan, and witodlice sona swa biscopas rihtas adumbiað, and sona swa hy eargiaþ and hy rihtes forscamiað and clumiað mid ceafum þonne hy scoldon clypian, sona heora wyrðmynt bið waniendeswiðe¹²⁸

These passages and the others listed in my notes show that Wulfstan's concerns about bishops are rather similar to those brought up in the Alfredian *Pastoral Care*. It is, of course, possible at this point that these anxieties are so general and widespread that they do not necessarily indicate a direct relationship between the *Pastoral Care* and the "Admonition to Bishops." But lexical evidence exists which tips the scales in favor of a

¹²⁶ Jost, *Polity*, 265: "It is not fitting us ever that we gain by any means in the wrong; it is also not advisable that we waste just acquisitions in frivolity; but it is ever fitting us that, very rightly, we eagerly make glad the needy of God with money and with food since we have the power to do that." The *Incipit de Synodo* offers a similar concern: "Bisceopum gebyreþ that hi ne beon to feohgeorne æt hadung ne æt halgunge ne æt synbote, ne on ænige wisan on unriht ne strynan" ("It befits bishops that they be not too covetous/greedy at ordination or at consecration or at penance, nor in any way acquire something unjustly"). See Jost, *Polity*, 213.

¹²⁷ Jost, *Polity*, 266: "And we also love inappropriate wealth too greatly; sometimes we sell for a price what we should give for free in accordance with justice."

¹²⁸ Jost, *Polity*, 262: "Bishops must always preach the rule of God and forbid evil. And certainly, as soon as bishops keep silent of the right—and as soon as they are idle and are ashamed of the rule and mutter with jaws when they must speak—at once their honor diminishes greatly." For similar sentiments see also §4 and §13 in the text.

strong textual connection linking the *Pastoral Care* and Wulfstan’s “Admonition to Bishops.” This evidence indicates that not only did Wulfstan read the Hatton 20 copy of the *Pastoral Care* and share its concerns—he also used the text as a source. In a chapter concerning the different ways the poor and the rich are to be dealt with, the *Pastoral Care* asserts that: “ac ða mon sceal [swa] micle ma hatan ðonne biddan sua man ongiæt ðæt hie for ðissum woruldwlencum bioð suiðor upahafene & on ofermettum aðudene.”¹²⁹ Of particular interest in this passage is the term *woruldwlencum* (“worldly prides/vanities”), a peculiar Old English compound because of its relative scarcity in the extant documents from the period. In fact, according to the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, the word occurs but six times—and this is accounting for variants in spelling. Alfred or his translator is the earliest author to use the word, which he employs once, in the passage just quoted. The next writer to use the term is Wulfstan, and he does so four times—in the *Institutes of Polity*, the “Admonition to Bishops,” and the *Incipit de Synodo*. See, for example, the first passage quoted from the “Admonition to Bishops” above. The three other times Wulfstan uses the compound are:

“Admonition to Bishops”	<i>Incipit de Synodo</i>	<i>II Polity</i>
And we hogiað eac swyðost a ymbe þa þing, þe we læst scoldan; smeagað ymbe woroldcara and idele bisga and þringað æfter þrymme and æfter woroldwlence. ¹³⁰	Bisceopum gybyreþ, þæt hi ne beon to gliggeorne, ne hunda ne hafeca hedon to swyðe ne woruldwlenc ne idelre rence. ¹³¹	. . . and maciað eall heom sylfum to worldwlenc and idelre rence, þæt hi Gode scealdon don to weorðunge on cyriclicum þingum oððon on earmra

¹²⁹ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:181: “but [rich] people must be commanded so much more than be asked, as one perceives that they, because of these worldly prides, are more puffed up and inflated in gluttony.”

¹³⁰ Jost, *Polity*, 266: “And also we think the most about the things that we least should; we talk about the cares of the world and idle occupations, and we hasten after glory and worldly pride.”

¹³¹ Jost, *Polity*, 213: “It befits bishops that they not be too fond of jest, nor care too much for dogs or hawks, nor worldly pride or vain display.”

manna hyððum oððon on
hernumenra bygenum.¹³²

The only other use is in an anonymous homily which appears in British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix, ff. 27v-31v and Cambridge, Corpus Christ College 302, pp. 78-83. The homily has been shown to not be a product of Wulfstan by its only modern editor in an unpublished dissertation.¹³³ Even if this was still a question, however, it would not be difficult to determine that the text was not from the pen of the archbishop since whoever wrote the homily seems to have had writing practices rather different from Wulfstan. Firstly, the anonymous homilist uses as his main source a homily from the Vercelli Book (Homily X), a source foreign to Wulfstan.¹³⁴ Moreover, he retained his source's *ubi sunt* motif, a literary trope never employed by the archbishop.¹³⁵ It appears that Wulfstan adopted the term from the Alfredian translation, and there is a good chance that the later anonymous homilist lifted it from one of Wulfstan's texts. This word is rather likely to have appealed to Wulfstan for adoption since he favors the use of compounds and recognizes the stylistic efficacy of alliteration.¹³⁶ Thus, the *Pastoral Care* not only informed Wulfstan in a general sense, it also provided the archbishop with additional rhetorical fodder.

¹³² Jost, *Polity*, 101: "and they [bad priests] make all things into their own worldly pride and vain display, those things which they should do for worship in Church matters for God, or for the provisions for poor men or for the purchase of prisoners of war." I cite from the X manuscript.

¹³³ Tolliver Cleveland Callison, III, "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Anglo-Saxon Homilies in MSS. CCCC 302 and Cotton Faustina A. ix" (doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1974), 117. For the term in use see p. 217.

¹³⁴ Callison, "Edition," 114. For Vercelli Homily X, see D. G. Scragg, ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS o.s. 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 191-218.

¹³⁵ Callison, "Edition," 218-20 (ll.135-50).

¹³⁶ For a recent study of Wulfstan's use of compounds see Jonathan Davis-Secord, "Rhetoric and Politics in Archbishop Wulfstan's Old English Homilies," *Anglia* 126 (2008): 65-96. Of additional note is Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 17-18: Wulfstan "is fond of compounds beginning with *worold* or *peod*." For Wulfstan's use of alliteration see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 90-1; Angus McIntosh, "Wulfstan's Prose," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949): 109-42, esp. 117; and Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 18.

Beyond its vocabulary, the concerns of the last passage quoted from the *Pastoral Care* are pertinent to this discussion as well, for similar language appears in additional texts by Wulfstan: his lawcodes for Æthelred and Cnut. The translation's instruction that the rich and the poor are to be reprov'd in differing manners is just one part of a lengthy discussion on the ways in which different kinds of people are to be admonished. The entire discussion can be found in chapters XXIII-LIX, which discuss specific ways in which opposite kinds of people (i.e. rich/poor, healthy/sick, etc.) are to be dealt with. Chapter XXVIII introduces this section of the work by explaining through the metaphor of a harper touching the strings of his instrument that various approaches must be used by the teacher with different types of people to achieve the same ends: "Ealle he gret mid anre honda, ðy ðe he wile ðæt hi anre song singen, ðeah he hie ungelice styrige. S[u]a sceal æghwelc lareow to anre lufan & [to] anum geleafan mid anre lare & mid mislicum manungum his hieremonna mod styrigean."¹³⁷ Religious teachers must be empathetic enough to understand the condition of their students and tailor their treatment of them accordingly if they are to have success leading them down the proper path of Christianity.

This effective and practical advice from the *Pastoral Care* was not lost on Wulfstan, and the archbishop adapted it for the lawcodes he wrote for Æthelred and Cnut. The *Pastoral Care*'s list of different kinds of people a teacher might need to instruct is extremely comprehensive—much more so than Wulfstan's own lists in his lawcodes—but, given his close relationship to the Hatton 20 version of the text and the evidence offered above regarding his use of the Alfredian translation, the text is a good candidate

¹³⁷ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:175: "He [the harpist] touches them all [the strings] with one hand, though he might stir them differently, because he wishes that they should all sing the same song. Thus each teacher must stir the minds of his listeners to one love and one faith with one doctrine and with various admonitions."

for the source for some of the archbishop's legal passages. Furthermore, nothing quite like it appears in earlier Anglo-Saxon codes, Wulfstan's favored sources for his own legal texts, and thus the presence of this language of opposites in the *Pastoral Care* provides a fitting explanation for its inclusion in two Wulfstan-authored lawcodes, VI Æthelred and II Cnut.¹³⁸ It is easiest to consider the applicable chapters from the *Pastoral Care* and the specific articles from these lawcodes if they are quoted parallel to one another:

<i>Pastoral Care</i>	VI Atr 52	II Cn 68.1-1b
XXV: Ðætte on oðre wisan sint to manianne ða iungan, on oðre ða ealdan.	7 a swa man bið mihtigra her nu for worulde oþþon þurh geþingða hearra on hade, swa sceal he deoppor synna gebetan 7 ælce misdæda deoror agyldan, for þam þe se maga 7 se unmaga ne beoð na gelic, ne ne magon na gelice byrþene ahebban, ne se unhala þe ma þam halum gelic; 7 þy man sceal medmian 7 gescadlice toscadan, ge on godcundan sciftan ge on woruldcundan steoran, ylde 7 geogoþe, welan 7 wædle,	1: Be ungestrangan. Forðam a man sceal ðam unstrangen men for Godes lufan 7 for his ege liðelicor deman 7 scrifan þonne ðam strangan; 1a: forðamðe we magon witan fulgeorne, þæt se unmaga 7 se mage ne mæg gelice mycele byrðene aberan, ne se unhala ðam halan gelice. 1b: 7 þi we sculon medemian 7 gescadelice todælan ylde 7 geogoðe, [welige 7 wædle, frige 7
XXVI: Ðætte on oðre wisan sint to manian[n]e ða welegan, on oðre ða wædlan.		
XXXVI: Ðætte on oðre wisan sint to manianne ða halan, on oðre ða unhalan. ¹³⁹		

¹³⁸ For a chart which identifies which earlier codes Wulfstan used in his own legal writings see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 356-60. It is common in the lawcodes, however, to treat criminals and victims differently according to their social rank (i.e. slave, reeve, etc.). This is not the same as treating them differently according to their condition, however, as the *Pastoral Care* and Wulfstan's lawcodes do. The closest parallel to Wulfstan's later codes is III Edg 1.1: "Þæt is þonne ærest þæt ic wille, þæt ælc man sy folcrichtes wurðe, ge earm ge eadig, 7 heom man rihte domas deme" ["First, I will that each man, rich or poor, be worthy of public law and that one determine fair judgments for them"]. This passage, however, does not suggest that different kinds of people should receive different treatment, but rather that all people should receive the same treatment. See Attenborough, *Laws*, 24.

¹³⁹ Sweet, *Pastoral Care*, 1:13, 15: XXV: "That in one way the young are to be admonished, and in another the old." XXVI: "That in one way the prosperous are to be admonished, and in another the impoverished." XXXVI: "That in one way the healthy are to be admonished, and in another the sick." I quote from the chapter list, here, for convenience.

hæle 7 unhæle, 7 hada þeowe],¹⁴¹ hale 7
 gehwiltne.¹⁴⁰ unhale.¹⁴²

There are clear lexical parallels between the *Pastoral Care* and Wulfstan's later lawcodes. The translation's *welegan* and *wædlan* are echoed in VI Atr 52 and in most manuscripts of II Cnut.¹⁴³ The same is true of *halan* and *unhalan*. But there are also discrepancies. Wulfstan's codes employ different words for "young" and "old," while the *Pastoral Care* does not discuss the polarity of the weak and the strong like it does the numerous other pairs of opposites in the text.

This is not a detrimental issue—it is quite the opposite, in fact. VI Æthelred 52 is a case of Wulfstanian adaptation through distillation and revision. In it Wulfstan condenses the concerns of chapters XXV, XXVI, and XXXVI of the *Pastoral Care* into a single clause, VI Æthelred 52,¹⁴⁴ to which he added some additional complementary material. VI Æthelred 52 was then used as a source for II Cnut 68.1-1b.¹⁴⁵ The clause was

¹⁴⁰ A. J. Robertson, ed., *Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1974), 106: "And always a man who is more powerful presently on account of the world or through higher dignity of rank, he must atone for sins more profoundly, and requite each misdeed more dearly, because the dependent and the powerful are not alike, nor are they able to lift the same burden, no more than the sick are like the healthy; and thus one must see it fit and rationally separate, both in religious penalties and secular regulations, old and young, prosperity and poverty, healthy and sick, and each rank."

¹⁴¹ Robertson bases her edition of II Cn on manuscript B, which is Corpus Christ College, Cambridge, MS 383. In this manuscript the bracketed words were written over an erasure sometime, she claims, following Liebermann, in the sixteenth century. For this see Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 208n1. In actuality, the bracketed words were written in the twelfth century, as Ker has shown; see Ker, *Catalogue*, §65. The other manuscripts of the code read "welan 7 wædle, freat 7 þeowet."

¹⁴² Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 206, 208: "1: Concerning the weak. Therefore, for the love of God and for awe of Him, one must always judge and assign sentences more mildly for weak people than for the strong.

1a: Because we are able to know full well that the dependent and the powerful are not able to bear the same great burden, nor can the sick bear the same as the healthy. 1b: And thus we must see it fit and rationally distinguish between old and young, wealth and poverty, freeman and slave, healthy and sick."

¹⁴³ See note 142.

¹⁴⁴ In fact, there is good evidence to suggest that VI Atr was never an actual code in its own right, but, rather, part of Wulfstan's writing process that ultimately produced 1018 Cnut. This will be discussed in the following chapter. That discussion is indebted to Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 333-5.

¹⁴⁵ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 358.

not used verbatim, however. Rather, Wulfstan revised it one more time for inclusion into II Cnut. The result is a clause that is as comprehensive as VI Æthelred 52, perhaps even more so since it also includes freemen and slaves, but with a far more homiletic tone. II Cnut 68.1-1b brings God into the picture, and also adopts the first-person plural pronoun so often seen in his homilies and sermons. This makes these three texts an especially valuable set, as they not only show that Wulfstan used the Alfredian *Pastoral Care* as a source for a particularly sensitive and sophisticated legal clause, but they also enable one to witness Wulfstan's writing process from draft to finished product.

Moreover, these lexical parallels between Wulfstan's codes and the *Pastoral Care* suggest that the Alfredian translation was more than only a source for two short passages when Wulfstan's legal writings as a whole are considered in light of the present argument. One of the most definitive aspects of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* is that it acknowledges that the performance of religious duties is far more complicated than simply mastering a single method of instruction or diocesan governance. The text recognizes that when one deals with individuals, either religious or secular, one is interacting with people with different experiences and points of view who require different methods of instruction. It is probable, in fact, that this is one of the reasons why Alfred chose to translate Gregory's text first. The *Pastoral Care* explicitly instructs bishops and others by implicitly training them in critical thinking. These sorts of men are precisely the type who would be useful to Alfred while rebounding from his protracted engagements with the invading Vikings. He would have needed men able to make decisions on the spot for the benefit of Wessex, and the *Pastoral Care* is a text which shows its readers by example how to fully consider an issue before springing to action.

The manner in which Wulfstan borrowed language from the Alfredian translation in what is quoted above shows that he, too, endorsed what is espoused in the *Pastoral Care* when it came to dealing with the Anglo-Saxon public from a legal point of view, but there are some additional passages which should also be noted to further illustrate this point. Some of the more general statements in Wulfstan's lawcodes are written to emphasize the importance of fully deliberating over punishments before handing them down. These suggest that the *Pastoral Care* is something of an intellectual source for Wulfstan as well, especially when the harshest of penalties, death, is on the table:

7 ures hlafordes gerædnes 7 his witena is, þæt man Cristne men for ealles to
litlum to deaðe ne fordeme; ac elles geræd man friðlice steora folce to þearf, 7 ne
forspille for litlum Godes handgeweorc 7 his agenne ceap þe he deore gebohte.¹⁴⁶

Among the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes, the sentiments in this particular code are unique to those authored by Wulfstan. Since this is the case, it appears that Wulfstan, at this point early in his lawmaking career, was reacting to a legal system he thought was far too predisposed to taking the life of Christian criminals rather than punishing them with other, non-mortal, means. By stressing the necessity of the deliberation of punishments while also pointing out that execution is often not an appropriate penalty for many crimes, this and other codes (such as those discussed above) by Wulfstan effectively usher in a new age of Anglo-Saxon law. The legal culture initiated by V Atr and fostered by Wulfstan's subsequent codes is defined by a new approach to law. Compared to the earlier laws Wulfstan's codes are both more sophisticated as well as more "humane,"

¹⁴⁶ V Atr 3; see Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 80: "And it is the decree of our lord and his council that Christian men should not be condemned to death for all too little, but, instead, one should gently determine punishments for the public good, and should not destroy God's handiwork and His own purchase which He dearly bought." See also VI Atr 10 and II Cn 2a.1.

relatively speaking. Granted, Wulfstan's codes do not shy away from mutilation as a potential punishment for a number of offenses, but they are also less inclined to sentence a criminal to death. Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe has noted that the earlier lawcodes of Anglo-Saxon England were largely interested in "satisfaction," either by the mutilation of the accused or by the payment of monetary compensation to the victim or his/her family, the extent of which was usually determined by social position.¹⁴⁷ In contrast, the codes authored by Wulfstan are much more motivated by a hope for the salvation of the criminal than merely by the desire for compensation:

action on the body is reassigned meaning over time as compensation for wrongdoing shifts from an external, and in some ways communal, responsibility satisfiable by compurgation and fine (as is paramount in the late-ninth-century laws of Alfred), to an internal guilt in the eleventh-century codes (in a mutilation which forever after forces the body to confess as part of the process of salvation).¹⁴⁸

In Wulfstan's codes, then, mutilation becomes as much a religious tool as it does a punishment. The tool works by both preserving the life of the accused as well as physically marking that person permanently with a sign of his or her guilt. On the one hand this might simply be effective as a deterrent to other would-be criminals, but O'Brien O'Keefe rightly suggests that it is much more than that: this mutilation, as it is interpreted in Wulfstan's codes, acknowledges that the state has a responsibility to

¹⁴⁷ Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe, "Body and Law in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998): 209-32, at 215.

¹⁴⁸ O'Brien O'Keefe, "Body and Law," 217.

individual souls.¹⁴⁹ That responsibility includes allowing the individual to attain salvation him/herself—something an execution would not allow.

Just where this new notion of law came from is probably impossible to pin down to a single source or influence. O'Brien O'Keeffe is rather likely right that it was influenced by "a synergism of monastic and royal concerns for regulation,"¹⁵⁰ but there must be more going on in the background of these late codes penned by a single individual. Thus, Wormald posits that Wulfstan was concerned that there "was a growing distinction between penalties which had once been 'common to Christ and king.'"¹⁵¹ His revision of the penalty of mutilation, then, was a way to maintain a strong Christian influence on penalties for even the most secular of crimes. I would add to these arguments that Wulfstan's use of the *Pastoral Care* influenced the more nuanced approach to punishments found in his lawcodes through its emphasis on deliberation and critical thinking, though this, too, is only a mere piece of a puzzle only partially put together. There were undoubtedly more influences on the archbishop and his legal thought, and they might never be completely identified, but, nevertheless, I am confident in numbering the *Pastoral Care* among them.

The Alfredian translation of the *Pastoral Care* is not the only text associated with the West Saxon king which provides evidence for his influence on Wulfstan's writings. Another of the translations, the *Old English Boethius*, offers an additional link: the passage on the Three Orders of society not present in Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae* but placed into the Old English translation of the text. Before examining

¹⁴⁹ O'Brien O'Keeffe, "Body and Law," 230.

¹⁵⁰ O'Brien O'Keeffe, "Body and Law," 230.

¹⁵¹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 342. See also his n. 363.

this passage of Alfred's text in relation to Wulfstan, however, scholarship regarding the transmission of the concept of the Three Orders during the medieval period ought to be briefly reviewed so that my modification of this theory below may be more fully understood in context.¹⁵² It was long accepted that King Alfred's *Old English Boethius* was the "first recorded use of the idea of the 'Three Orders' of society in an English context."¹⁵³ It now seems probable, however, that the concept was known much earlier in Anglo-Saxon England; Thomas D. Hill has convincingly suggested that the Three Orders is actually the intended answer to a riddle in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*.¹⁵⁴ While Hill's argument shows that the concept was current before Alfred's time, its appearance as the solution to a riddle does not have the same significance as the Alfredian discussion of the idea in the *Old English Boethius*. So, despite no longer being the earliest example in an English context, the importance of the Alfredian Three Orders has not been diminished.

A discussion of the Three Orders in the *Boethius* can be found in Chapter 17 of the B text, and in Prose 9 of the C text.¹⁵⁵ I only quote the pertinent passage from B

¹⁵² The classic work on the Three Orders in medieval Europe is Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). A discussion of the Three Orders in Anglo-Saxon England can be found on pp. 99-109.

¹⁵³ Timothy E. Powell, "The 'Three Orders' of Society in Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (1994): 103-32, at 103. See also Duby, *Orders*, 100.

¹⁵⁴ Thomas D. Hill, "A Riddle on the Three Orders in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*?" *Philological Quarterly* 80 (2001): 205-12. Duby assumed that Alfred and his helpers had indirectly learned of the Three Orders from the Continent: "Nothing was invented by Alfred and his assistants. They certainly heard echoes of ancient musings, those of the Carolingian bishops in particular. In this period the English Channel was less than ever an obstacle. Thousands of pilgrims crossed it to reach Rome by way of Boulogne, Cambrai, Laon, Rheims. As they traversed these less savage lands, they watched, they listened, they admired. And when they returned home, they told what they had seen"; see Duby, *Orders*, 101. This is certainly a possible explanation for how Alfred or his translator learned about the Three Orders, though Hill's article shows that this knowledge could have come from England, as well (though the composer of the riddle in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae* very well might have learned it in the way Duby describes).

¹⁵⁵ The letters refer to the sigla for versions of the text of the *Old English Boethius* in Godden and Irvine. The B text is the prose version of the text, and is based on manuscript B, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180. The C text is the prosimetrical version, based on London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. vi.

below since the corresponding passage from C, while at times a bit different, is similar enough to that in B for the purposes of this chapter. The connection, here, is more slight in terms of quantity when compared to that found in the *Pastoral Care*, but it is nevertheless quite significant. The passage in Chapter 17 of the B text is as follows:

‘Eala gesceadwisnes, hwæt þu wast þæt me næfre seo gitsung and seo gemægð þisses eorðlican anwealdes forwel ne licode, ne ic ealles forswiðe ne girnde þisses eorðlican rices, buton [tola] ic wilnode þeah and andweorces to þam weorce þe me beboden was to wyrcanne; þæt was þæt ic unfracodlice and gerisenlice mihte steoran and reccan þone anweald þe me befæst wæs. Hwæt þu wast þæt nan mon ne mæg nænne cræft cyþan ne nænne anweald reccan ne stioran butan tolum and andweorce. Þæt bið þonne ælces cræftes andweorc þæt mon þone cræft buton wyrcan ne mæg. Þæt bið þonne cyninges andweorc and his tol mid to ricsianne þæt he hæbbe his land fulmannod. He sceal habben gebedmen and fyrdmen and weorcmen. Hwæt þu wast þætte butan þisum tolum nan cyning his cræft ne mæg cyðan. Þæt is eac his andweorc þæt he habban sceal to þam tolum þam þrim geferscipum biwiste.’¹⁵⁶

The Alfredian take on the concept is that prayer-men, army-men, and work-men are groups necessary for a king to be able to rule. That the groups are cast as tools is rather

¹⁵⁶ Godden and Irvine, *Old English Boethius*, 1:277: “‘Oh Wisdom, truly you know that greed and the power of this earthly authority never pleased me very much, nor have I desired at all greatly this earthly authority, yet I nevertheless wished for tools and material for the deed which was commanded to me to produce; that was that I safely and suitably had the power to govern and to direct the authority which was entrusted to me. Truly you know that no one is ever able to make known a skill, nor ever to direct authority, nor govern without tools and material. The material of each skill is, therefore, that without which one is not able to produce the skill. Thus, the material of the king and his tools with which to rule is that he shall have his land fully populated. He must have prayer-men and army-men and work-men. Truly you know that without these tools no king is able to make known his skill. His material is also that he must have for these tools sustenance for these communities.’”

interesting. Like actual tools, the metaphor indicates that each of the Orders has a specific function, though the *Old English Boethius* does not elaborate on what that role is beyond its naming of the groups. This view of the Orders is maintained by both Ælfric and Wulfstan, but both of them add the implicit but important point that the Orders also cooperate. Not much should be made of the fact that this interpolated passage is in the first-person, tempting though that may be, since the context of the *Boethius* as a whole requires the use of this pronoun in order for the material to fit seamlessly with the rest of the text. That said, it is certainly reasonable to associate the passage with Alfred, himself, since it is an addition to the translation either undertaken by the king himself, or, if not, by someone else who adopted his voice.

Timothy E. Powell rightly identifies the next use of the concept after Alfred's in the writings of Ælfric, abbot of Eynsham.¹⁵⁷ Ælfric uses mentions the three orders on three separate occasions, in a homily based on Maccabees,¹⁵⁸ in a pastoral letter to Wulfstan,¹⁵⁹ and in a letter to the layman Sigeweard.¹⁶⁰ Since Ælfric writes a letter to Wulfstan which includes a passage discussing the three orders it is both natural and correct for Powell to assert that "we can establish a line of transmission between Alfred and Ælfric (and hence Wulfstan)."¹⁶¹ The passage from Ælfric's letter is as follows:

Suspignor non latere almitatem tuam tres ordines fore in ecclesia Dei: laboratores, bellatores, oratores. Ordo laboratorum adquiret nobis victum, et ordo bellatorum

¹⁵⁷ Powell, "Three Orders," 109-10.

¹⁵⁸ W. W. Skeat, ed., *Ælfric's Lives of Saints, being a Set of Sermons on Saints' Days Formerly Observed by the English Church*, 4 vols., EETS o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114 (London: N. Trübner, 1881-1900; repr. as 2 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 2:67-124.

¹⁵⁹ Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 242-55.

¹⁶⁰ Richard Marsden, ed., *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Novo*, vol. 1, *Introduction and Text*, EETS o.s. 330 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 201-30.

¹⁶¹ Powell, "Three Orders," 117.

debet armis patriam nostram ab incurribus hostium defendere, et ordo oratorum, id sunt clerici et monachi et episcopi, qui electi sunt ad spiritalem militiam, debent orare pro omnibus et servitiis seu officiis Dei semper insistere et fidem catholicam predicare et sancta charismata dare fidelibus.¹⁶²

Ælfric’s Latin account gives a bit more information on what each Order is specifically responsible for—the main function of *laboratores*, for example, is to provision the rest of the kingdom with food. Moreover, it notes that the Orders are complementary in a way that the Alfredian description did not.

Interestingly, it is not Ælfric’s letter to Wulfstan which most directly influences the *Institutes of Polity*, it is the abbot’s letter to Sigeward. Probably intended to be more of an open letter than only a personal letter to the layman, it includes a number of passages which seem unnecessary for Sigeward to know. One of these passages, which Jost notes is a source for *Polity*,¹⁶³ discusses the Three Orders as the three supports which hold up the throne:

Se cinestol stynt on þisum þrim stelum: Laboratores, bellatores, oratores.

Laboratores sind þe us bigleofan tiliað, yrðlingas and æhteman to þam anum betæhte. Oratores syndon þe us þingiað to Gode and cristendom fyrðriað on cristenum folcum on Godes þeowdome, to ðam gastlican gewinne, to þam anum betæhte, us eallum to þearf. Bellatores sindon þe ure burga healdað and eac urne eard wið þone sigende here, feohtende mid wæpnum . . . On þisum þrim stelum

¹⁶² Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 252: “There are three orders in the Church of God: *laboratores, bellatores, oratores*. The order of labourers secure our food, and the order of warriors must defend our land with weapons against invading armies, and the order of clergy, that is clerics and monks and bishops who are elected to the spiritual fight, must pray for all and always fulfill the services and offices of God and preach the Catholic faith and give holy sacraments to the faithful.” The translation is that in Powell, “Three Orders,” 112.

¹⁶³ Jost, *Polity*, 55.

stynt se cynestol, and gif an bið forud, he fylð adun sona, þam oðrum stelum to unðearfe gewiss.¹⁶⁴

It may seem curious that Wulfstan opts to use a letter addressed to another man rather than Ælfric's correspondence with him for use in his own writing, but such a curiosity is easily explained and is, in fact, not uncommon of the archbishop: "dramatic recasting of biblical prose, let alone that of other authors (including himself), can be said to be the hallmark of Wulfstan's distinctive prose style."¹⁶⁵ While Wulfstan was fond of re-using materials written by others, he seems to have preferred to do so with texts written in Old English if possible. One example is, of course, his use of Alfred's *Pastoral Care* rather than Gregory's Latin original, at least in the cases which I have treated above. Another example is the present document, Ælfric's letter to Sigeward.

Wulfstan's decision to crib from Ælfric's letter to Sigeward in the composition of the *Institutes of Polity* makes especially good sense. *Polity*, a piece of idealized Christian political theory, is a text prime for inclusion of such a passage like that of the Orders-as-supports which can be found in Ælfric's letter to Sigeward. Ælfric's conception of the Orders harkens back to Alfred's first description of them, but he develops their significance more. The *Old English Boethius* casts the Orders as materials necessary for a king to rule; the Three Orders make it possible for a king to rule. The

¹⁶⁴ Marsden, *Old English Heptateuch*, 229: "The throne stands on three supports: *Laboratores*, *Bellatores*, *Oratores*. *Laboratores* are those who cultivate to support us; ploughmen and farmers appointed to that alone. *Oratores* are those who pray to God for us and promote Christendom among Christian people in the divine service of God, at the holy conflict; they are appointed to that alone, for the benefit of us all. *Bellatores* are those who, fighting with weapons, defend our cities and also our land against the advancing army. . . The throne stands on these three supports, and if one is damaged, it topples down at once to the certain detriment to the other supports."

¹⁶⁵ Andy Orchard, "Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, Rewriter," in *The Old English Homily: Precedent Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 311-41, at 316.

stakes are a bit higher in Ælfric, whose passage focuses not on the king himself like in the Alfredian text, but on the idea of the throne itself. While the *Old English Boethius* discusses what is necessary for a single king to rule, Ælfric's letter to Sigeweard is concerned with what makes the very existence of the throne, from which individual kings may reign, a possibility. The passage in the letter narrows in on what enables the Anglo-Saxon political system in general to work, not a single king's tenure as ruler. This is precisely the kind of discussion befitting a piece of political theory; it is, thus, no surprise that Wulfstan makes use of Ælfric's take on the concept:

Ælc riht cynestol stent on þrym stapelum, þe fullice ariht stent: an is Oratores, and oðer is Laboratores, and ðridde is Bellatores. Oratores sindon gebedmen, þe Gode sculan þeowian and dægges and nihtes for ealne þeodscipe þingian georne.

Laboratores sindon weorcmen, þe tilian sculon þæs ðe eall þeodscype big sceall libban. Bellatores syndon wigmen, þe eard sculon werian wiglice mid wæpnum.

On þyssum ðrym stapelum sceall ælc cynestol standan mid riht on cristenre þeode. And awacie heora ænig, sona se stol scylfð; and fulberste heora ænig þonne hrysð se stol nyðer, and þæt wyrð þære þeode eall to unþearf.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁶ Jost, *Polity*, 55-7. I quote from the X manuscript: "Every just throne stands on three pillars, which stand fully upright: one is *Oratores*, and second is *Laboratores*, and third is *Bellatores*. *Oratores* are prayer-men, who are obliged to serve and to pray earnestly for all people, day and night. *Laboratores* are work-men, who are obliged to cultivate that by which all people shall live. *Bellatores* are war-men, who are obliged to guard the land, war-like with weapons. Each throne must stand on these three firmly in a Christian land. And should any of them weaken, at once the throne will totter, and should any of them shatter, then the throne will be shaken below and that will become wholly injurious to the nation." An additional text, Napier 50, also includes a discussion of the Three Orders. The pertinent passage from this text is essentially identical to that from *Polity*—the only differences are those in spelling. For this text see Napier, *Wulfstan*, 260-74, passage at 167. The text is certainly by Wulfstan, though it was excluded from Bethurum's edition on the grounds that she did not deem it homiletic enough. For this see Dorothy Bethurum, *Homilies of Wulfstan*, 39-40. See also Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 33-4.

While Ælfric's sophisticated image of the throne standing on three supports is obviously adapted in Wulfstan's text from the abbot's Letter to Sigeward, this passage also reveals another aspect of the transmission of the Three Orders in Anglo-Saxon England. While Wulfstan uses Ælfric as his primary source for this passage in *Polity*, he is not his only source. The other is the Alfredian *Boethius*, Ælfric's own source for the Three Orders. The evidence for this is in the language of the passage. Like Ælfric, Wulfstan gives the Latin terms for the Three Orders in his otherwise vernacular text. Moreover, and also like Ælfric, Wulfstan finds it necessary to explain what each of the Latin terms means. Interestingly, while Ælfric gives Old English equivalents for *Laboratores*—*yrðlingas*, *æhteman*—he does not for *Bellatores* or *Oratores* in the Letter to Sigeward. He chooses to define these orders by revealing their responsibilities rather than giving them a vernacular label. In his homily based on the apocryphal Maccabees, *Passio Machabeorum*, Ælfric does define each of the orders in English, translating *Laboratores* as *yrðlincg*; *Bellatores* as *woruld-cempa*; and *Oratores* as *godes þeowa*.¹⁶⁷ Ælfric's letter to Wulfstan is in Latin, so it need not be considered in a discussion of Old English terms.

While Wulfstan follows Ælfric's model of the image of the throne quite closely, he strays from the abbot's example when it comes to translating the Latin names for the Three Orders. As can be seen above, Wulfstan translates *Oratores* as *gebedmen*; *Laboratores* as *weorcmen*; and *Bellatores* as *wigmen*. If two thirds of these vernacular terms sound familiar it is for good reason; the entirely vernacular Alfredian account of the Three Orders employs both *gebedmen* and *weorcmen*. Thus, it seems probable that Wulfstan did not consult only Ælfric when compiling material for his *Institutes of Polity*;

¹⁶⁷ Skeat, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, 2:122.

he was also familiar with the Alfredian *Boethius*—something Wormald considered a possibility.¹⁶⁸ Though there is no extant physical evidence for this as there is for Wulfstan's familiarity with Alfred's *Pastoral Care* in Hatton 20, Godden and Irvine have shown that the copy of the *Old English Boethius* Ælfric seems to have been familiar with and worked from is no longer extant.¹⁶⁹ Because of this, it is reasonable to conclude that Wulfstan, too, must have had access to that or a different manuscript of the translation that is also no longer extant since he adopts the king's language for inclusion in the *Institutes of Polity*.

And yet, Wulfstan does not completely follow the Alfredian discussion of the Three Orders; he uses *wigmen* in place of *fyrðmen* in his own texts. There are some possible explanations for this. First, the compound *fyrðmen*, to my knowledge, occurs but once in all extant Old English, in the Alfredian *Boethius*. It is possible, though given Wulfstan's use of the equally scarce *woruldwlenc*, perhaps not probable, that Wulfstan simply did not wish to use such a dated compound. The un-compounded *fyrðfierd*, on the other hand, occurs many times both before and during Wulfstan's time, most notably and quite frequently in texts by Ælfric. But Wulfstan never uses the term in any of his extant writings. While *fyrð* appears in Napier 40,¹⁷⁰ Bethurum has shown that only parts of this homily, the beginning and the end, are actually by Wulfstan—the rest appears to be based on Vercelli II.¹⁷¹ The use of *fyrð* in this text occurs in an intermediary section of the homily that is not by Wulfstan. It must be admitted that Wulfstan's avoidance of the term is a bit odd, though it could be due to his associating the term with the Winchester School

¹⁶⁸ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 459. See also his n. 158.

¹⁶⁹ Godden and Irvine, *Old English Boethius*, 1:49.

¹⁷⁰ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 182-90, at 186.

¹⁷¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 42.

and its students' vocabulary, which Dance has shown Wulfstan seems to intentionally have shied away from using.¹⁷² Another possibility is that *wigmen* was a gloss in the manuscript version of the Alfredian *Boethius* that was available to the archbishop, and that he opted to use it rather than *fyrðmen*. Whatever his motivations, the evidence that Wulfstan directly engaged with the Alfredian *Boethius* remains strong despite the change in his source's vocabulary since this amendment is in accordance with Wulfstan's lexicon as a whole.

To turn to Anglo-Saxon law, it is no surprise that Wulfstan, the preeminent legislator of the period, looked to Alfred's law when drafting his own codes. Wormald has identified four specific clauses from Alfred's code that were modified by Wulfstan for inclusion in his later legislation: §§1, 3, 4.2, and 7.¹⁷³ §1 requires that every man abide by his oath and pledge, while §§3, 4.2, and 7 concern mostly crimes against the king (though §3 also adds a few other ranks). These crimes are violating the protection of the king and others (§3), plotting against the king (§4.2), and fighting or drawing a weapon in the king's hall (§7). According to Wormald, §1 ended up in VI Æthelred 28-28.1, 1018 Cnut 18-19, and I Cnut 19.1-19.2; §3 became *Grið* 11 and II Cnut 58-58.2; §4.2 found its place in VI Æthelred 37 and II Cnut 57; and §7 was used in II Cnut 59.¹⁷⁴ Compared to Wulfstan's use of Edgar's codes, which will be discussed in the following chapter, these adaptations are indeed slight, but they nonetheless remain important to a discussion of Wulfstan's interest in Alfredian materials. The texts in which clauses from Alfred's code are used suggest that Wulfstan had Alfredian materials in mind for

¹⁷² Dance, "Sound, Fury, and Signifiers," 50-1.

¹⁷³ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 356-9.

¹⁷⁴ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 356-9.

essentially his entire legislative career, from the early *Grið*¹⁷⁵ to the late II Cnut. The borrowed items are especially potent statements made by a strong king about some necessities for the maintenance of order. The keeping of one's oath or pledge was rather likely a ubiquitous concern of the period since virtually every aspect of Anglo-Saxon society depended on it in one way or another. Legislation requiring it was a useful legal tool when it came to dealing with numerous different wrongdoers, from frauds and deserters to corrupt reeves and judges, among others. In a period when the use of written records was far from universal or consistent, the keeping of one's word was an important part of keeping Anglo-Saxon society ordered. The adoption of the remaining items, with their focus on the protection of the king, is no surprise since Wulfstan had a strong respect for the throne. Moreover, the king was essential to the proper functioning of a Christian Anglo-Saxon society. Finally, it should be noted that Wulfstan does to Alfred's legislation, as well as his other legal sources, what Alfred claims to have done with previous Anglo-Saxon lawcodes:

Ac ða ðe ic gemette awðer oððe on Ines dæg, mines mæges, oððe on Offan
Mercna cyninges oððe on Æþelbryhtes, þe ærest fulluhte onfeng on Angelcynne,
þa ðe me ryhtoste ðuhton, ic þa heron gegaderode, 7 þa oðre forlet.¹⁷⁶

Though he is not nearly as explicit as Alfred is about it, this method of looking at what has been legislated in prior reigns and adopting suitable portions of those laws very much describes Wulfstan's own legal writing habits. This helps to explain why so little,

¹⁷⁵ *Grið* has been dated to c. 1006-1008; see Wormald, *Eleventh-Century State-Builder*, 26; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 394-5; and Andrew Rabin, trans., *The Political Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), 76.

¹⁷⁶ Attenborough, *Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, 62: "But each of those [i.e. laws] that I found that seemed most just to me, either in the time of Ine, my kinsman, or in Offa, the Mercian king's, or in Æthelberht's, the first baptized in England, I gathered them herein, and omitted the rest."

relatively speaking, of Alfred's legislation was used by the archbishop. Alfred's legislation is rather heavy on punishment, especially when it comes to personal injury. By the time of Wulfstan's legislative career, this kind of law had become outdated. While specific levels of punishment were still part of Anglo-Saxon lawcodes, these were not nearly as ubiquitous as they were in earlier codes like Alfred's. For example, long lists of penalties for injuring specific body parts like Alfred 44-77 were no longer a part of the law. Anglo-Saxon legislation had become too sophisticated to concern itself with trivialities like the differing values of each of the fingers.¹⁷⁷ Just as his Alfredian source claimed to have done, Wulfstan took what he found useful from Alfred's code for inclusion in his own legislation, though the old-fashioned nature of Alfred's code limited the viability of significant portions of the legislation for Wulfstan.

Before concluding, one final piece of legal prose needs to be discussed regarding the connection between Alfred and Wulfstan, the so-called "Laws of Edward and Guthrum." Apart from Wulfstan's glosses in Hatton 20, this text is the most explicit in its indication that the archbishop was interested in Alfred and his reign. This text is, in fact, the only Wulfstan-authored text which actually mentions Alfred by name, which makes it one of the most essential pieces of evidence for this chapter.

Until Whitelock's important 1941 article on the text¹⁷⁸ it was assumed that the document dated to the reign of Edward, as its preamble suggests. Liebermann, for example, thought that the text dated from 921-939, and attributed the historical error in the preamble, which notes that Edward and Guthrum were contemporary rulers, an

¹⁷⁷ Af 56-60.

¹⁷⁸ Dorothy Whitelock, "Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum," *English Historical Review* 56 (1941): 1-21.

impossibility since Guthrum died before Edward became king, to a later interpolation.¹⁷⁹ Whitelock, however, showed that the date and authorship of this text were straightforward. By comparing the language and contents of the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” to codes known to be authored by Wulfstan, Whitelock convincingly demonstrated that the text was actually an eleventh-century product of the archbishop himself.¹⁸⁰ But this conclusion raises an important question; why would Wulfstan have forged this “lawcode”? There are two answers. The first, put forward by Whitelock, is that Wulfstan wanted to establish historical legal precedents for his own codes so that they did not appear to be revolutionary or too new-fangled.¹⁸¹ The “Edward and Guthrum” code, then, is essentially fabricated historical ethos. I would like to add a second answer, somewhat related to the first: Wulfstan wished to strengthen the force of the actual treaty from Alfred’s reign, the “Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum,” in order to emphasize Alfred as an exemplary and model Christian king.

In demonstrating Wulfstan’s authorship of the code, Whitelock provides tables which demonstrate exhaustively that the language of the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” comes up repeatedly in other codes authored by Wulfstan. Her first table compares the lexical similarities between the “Edward and Guthrum” and Wulfstan’s earliest lawcodes, V and VI Atr,¹⁸² while the second focuses on lexical correspondences between the text and Wulfstan’s codes other than V and VI Atr.¹⁸³ There is no need to go over this material again, as Whitelock has definitively shown that the correspondences in

¹⁷⁹ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 3:86-9. For a summary of Liebermann’s view see Attenborough, *Laws*, 97.

¹⁸⁰ Whitelock, “Edward and Guthrum,” 2-5. Her attribution of the text to Wulfstan is on p. 11 and, more strongly, on p. 18. See also Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 302.

¹⁸¹ Whitelock, “Edward and Guthrum,” 18.

¹⁸² Whitelock, “Edward and Guthrum,” 2-3.

¹⁸³ Whitelock, “Edward and Guthrum,” 3-5.

phraseology among these texts are great. Because her article aimed to establish Wulfstan’s authorship of “Edward and Guthrum,” Whitelock logically limited her evidence in these tables to only those pieces from other codes which closely matched the wording found in the text. In light of her establishment of Wulfstan’s authorship of the text, though, these two tables can now be expanded to illustrate correspondences in content and concern as well as in phrasing. Thus Table 2.1 indicates all the material from the rest of Wulfstan’s codes which corresponds to the sentiments found in the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum.” I want to stress, however, that the table is rather conservative. I only include the portions of other Wulfstan-authored codes if they include regulations which are very close in meaning and scope to those found in “Edward and Guthrum.” For example, article 8 of the text notes the penalty for a freeman breaking a fast. Because a specific fast is not mentioned here, I do not include articles from the other codes which do include a specific fast since they do not correspond closely enough to this section. Finally, unlike Whitelock, I have not included any material from the “Northumbrian Priests’ Law” because it has been shown that this text is not actually from the pen of Wulfstan.¹⁸⁴

Table 2.1: Comparison of the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” and Other Wulfstan-Authored Codes	
“Edward and Guthrum”	Other Lawcodes by Wulfstan
Prologue 1. Love One God and Reject Heathendom	V Atr 1, V Atr 34, VI Atr 1, VI Atr 6, VIII Atr, 44, IX Atr 1, X Atr 1, 1018 Cn 1, I Cn 1, II Cn 5
Prologue 2. Explanation of Secular Penalties	-
1. Sanctuary	VI Atr 14, VIII Atr 1, I Cn 2.3
2. Offenses to Christianity and Honoring Heathendom	-

¹⁸⁴ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 396-7.

3. Crimes by Men in Orders	VI Atr 5, VI Atr 28.2, VIII Atr 26-7, I Cn 5a.3, II Cn 41, II Cn 44
4. Incest and Men in Orders who commit a “Capital Crime” (<i>deapscylde</i>)	VI Atr 12, I Cn 7, 1018 Cn 12, II Cn 43, II Cn 51
5. Confession for Those Condemned to Death	II Cn 44
6. Tithes and Church Dues	V Atr 11, V Atr 12.2, VI Atr 16-19, VI Atr 43, VII Atr 4, VII Atr 7, VIIa Atr 8, VIII Atr 7-12, VIII 14, 1018 Cn 13, 1018 Cn 30, I Cn 8-12, I Cn 14, II Cn 48
7. Business and Work on Sundays and during Festivals	V Atr 13, VI Atr 22.1, VI Atr 44, VIII Atr 17, 1018 Cn 14.1, 1018 Cn 15.2, 1018 Cn 31, I Cn 15, I Cn 17.3
8. Breaking of Fasts	V Atr 15, VI Atr 22.4, VII Atr 2.4, 1018 Cn 14, II Cn 46-7
9. Trial by Ordeal, the Giving of Oaths, and Executions on Festival and Fast Days	V Atr 18, V Atr 20, VI Atr 25, 1018 Cn 15, I Cn 17, II Cn 45
10. Aiding a Mutilated and Maimed Criminal	-
11. Wizards, Sorcerers, Prostitutes	VI Atr 7, VI Atr 48, VIII Atr 33, 1018 Cn 7, II Cn 4a
12. Attempts to Rob or Murder Strangers or Men in Orders	VI Atr 48, VIII Atr 33, 1018 Cn 35, II Cn 40

By expanding Whitelock’s tables in this way it becomes clear that “Edward and Guthrum” offers precedents for a substantial portion of Wulfstan’s later codes, many more than only those with which it shares lexical usages. It is, in fact, Wulfstan’s earliest legislative text.¹⁸⁵ But apparently mere “historical” precedents were not enough on their own since, theoretically, Wulfstan could have forged an anonymous code to achieve the same ends. In order to have real significance and value the code was connected directly with King Alfred: “And þis is seo gerædnis eac, þe Ælfred cyng 7 Guðrum cyng 7 eft Eadward cyng (7 Guðrum cyng) gecuron 7 gecwædon.”¹⁸⁶ Note that the text does not

¹⁸⁵ Wormald dates the text to c. 1006; see Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26. See also Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25. This places the text shortly before Wulfstan’s first official lawcode was written in 1008, V Atr.

¹⁸⁶ Attenborough, *Laws*, 102: “And this, also, is the decree which King Alfred and King Guthrum, and afterwards King Edward and King Guthrum, chose and agreed upon.”

claim to have been drafted in Edward's reign, but, rather, that Edward reinstated this code which allegedly came into being under Alfred's rule.¹⁸⁷ Thus, Wulfstan firmly roots the text in Alfred's reign.

Focusing on one aspect of "Edward and Guthrum" will adequately illustrate its value for Wulfstan as a manufactured legal source and precedent for the rest of his codes. As Table 2.1 shows, many sections of Wulfstan's lawcodes focus on tithing and the paying of Church dues. In fact, the material in "Edward and Guthrum" concerning these recurs more than any other individual article from this text in Wulfstan's other codes written for both Æthelred and Cnut. While perhaps far more mundane to modern scholars than the archbishop's numerous other activities, making sure the collection of tithes and dues was done in a smooth and timely fashion was certainly an important part of his position as a high-ranking Churchman. Stephen Baxter has shown, for example, that Wulfstan was an accomplished estate manager, and that he "regarded the protection of God's property to be an integral element of his wider programme for the regeneration of a Christian society."¹⁸⁸ The same can be said for the collection of tithes and dues, since Wulfstan lists the Anglo-Saxons' failure to adequately provide these payments as one of their many sins which God is punishing them for in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*: "Ac soð is þæt ic secge, þearf is þære bote, forþam Godes gerihta wanedan to lange innan þysse þeode on æghwylcan ænde."¹⁸⁹ His "Edward and Guthrum" code, then, is an important invented precedent which lends the credibility of tradition and history to Wulfstan's other

¹⁸⁷ Also pointed out in Whitelock, "Edward and Guthrum," 1.

¹⁸⁸ Stephen Baxter, "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 161-205, at 163.

¹⁸⁹ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 50: "But what I say is true, there is need for a remedy, because for too long God's dues have lessened within this land at every end."

lawcodes, all of which emphasize the importance of the payment of tithes and dues. Thus, Whitelock's explanation for the existence of this text, noted above, is correct, and, I believe, could certainly be applied to the vast majority of the other articles from the text as I have done here.

To turn to the second explanation, as noted above, "Edward and Guthrum" purports to be an extension of or supplement to the "Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum." This latter document, while its very existence is important to Anglo-Saxonists, is nevertheless somewhat less than impressive when it comes to its contents. While the calculated nature of the treaty has been discussed above, those expecting the kind of document which clearly maps out each party's responsibilities and/or punishments are destined to be disappointed. As it survives, the treaty contains no dating clause, and only about half of the text includes what one would expect to find in such a document. The preamble identifies the document as a peace agreement, and, as one would expect, names the parties involved. The second article establishes specific boundaries for the respective groups, while the third notes that English and Danish men have the same geld. To these should be added part of article 5, which says that the two groups are to be separated. This is, however, all of the document that seems typical of an agreement between two warring parties. The rest reads more like an Anglo-Saxon lawcode mixed with a trade agreement. Article 3 reads much like a typical law, as it discusses the procedure for a thegn accused of murder, while articles 4 and most of 5 deal with issues regarding trade. 4 requires anyone buying slaves or horses to know his warrantor, while the rest of 5 acknowledges that the borders established earlier in the text are not sealed, since each group apparently plans to trade with the other.

Those looking back at this text from later on in Anglo-Saxon history when Danish attacks were once again in full swing may have found this document lacking, especially when it came to ecclesiastical regulation. In fact, this is something of a glaring omission since Guthrum had only recently converted to Christianity with Alfred as his sponsor.¹⁹⁰ Furthermore, the document as it stands provides no guidelines for how Guthrum is supposed to rule as a Christian king or how his people should carry themselves as Christian subjects. Granted, some of this would be remedied if one supposes that books—a Gospel Book seems highly likely at the very least—were among the gifts given by Alfred to Guthrum and his men after his baptism, but this cannot be known for certain.¹⁹¹

The existence of “Edward and Guthrum” provides good evidence that Wulfstan viewed the “Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum” in this way. The archbishop’s creation of a supposed contemporary addendum to the genuine treaty is highly ecclesiastical, and is designed to give Alfred’s actual treaty Christian teeth. “Edward and Guthrum” creates the illusion that Alfred was very much involved in establishing proper Christian practices in the Danelaw by providing regulations for the area in the form of this code. Not only does part of the Prologue establish Christianity as the religion of the Danelaw,¹⁹² the rest of the code touches on aspects of the faith that would be necessary for a newly-converted king to be aware of, like the importance and necessity of tithes and dues, the importance of the Sabbath, and the preservation of sanctuary, among others.¹⁹³ The “Edward and Guthrum”

¹⁹⁰ *ASC E*, 878.

¹⁹¹ *ASC E*, 878: “7 he wes .xii. niht mid þam cyng, 7 he hine mycclum 7 geferan mid feo weorðode” (“and he [Guthrum] was twelve days with the king, he [Alfred] greatly honored him and his companions with riches”). See also Asser, ch. 56. Keynes and Lapidge think that Asser here refers to works of gold, perhaps shrines and/or reliquaries. See Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 249-50.

¹⁹² Attenborough, *Laws*, 102: “Ðæt is ærest, þæt hig gecwædon, þæt hi ænne God lufian woldon 7 ælcne hæþendom georne aworpen” (“First, they announced that they would love one God and eagerly cast off all heathen practices”).

¹⁹³ For these see Table 2.1.

code, in other words, presents Alfred, and, by extension, Edward, as propagators of the faith both inside and outside their realms.

The preservation and extension of Christianity is one of the first things Wulfstan mentions a Christian king should do in both versions of his *Institutes of Polity*: “And him gebyreþ, þæt he eallum mægne cristendom rære and Godes cyrican æghwær georne fyrðrie and friðie.”¹⁹⁴ While Alfred’s various accomplishments would place him well inside the category of Wulfstan’s notion of a Christian king, the treaty which documents his peace agreement with the invading heathens led by Guthrum, a real defining moment in his reign and in the Anglo-Saxon period in general, does little to emphasize these achievements. “Edward and Guthrum” does just that, at a time when the Anglo-Saxon king Æthelred perhaps most needed a reminder of what it meant to be a good Christian king. Whitelock dated “Edward and Guthrum” to between 1002, when Wulfstan was moved to York, and 1008, the year V and VI Æthelred were written.¹⁹⁵ This means that the text was written after at least two royal gaffes committed by Æthelred, both of which reveal that he did not always work to preserve and protect Church holdings. These occurred just before Wulfstan arrived on the scene, but they are nevertheless recorded for his and scholars’ eyes to see in charters from the period. In a charter from 993 Æthelred admits that he took possession of Church lands and distributed them to his nobles.¹⁹⁶ Another charter records the taking of Church lands under Æthelred’s supervision. This charter, which dates to 994 or 995, contains a record of the sale of an estate to Bishop

¹⁹⁴ Jost, *Polity*, 14: “And it befits him that he promote Christianity with all his power and everywhere earnestly advance and protect God’s church.” I quote from the X manuscript of II *Polity*. For the same statement in the earlier version see p. 13.

¹⁹⁵ Whitelock, “Edward and Guthrum,” 18-19.

¹⁹⁶ The charter is number 876 in Sawyer’s catalog; see Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, 269-70. It is printed in full in Benjamin Thorpe, ed., *Diplomatarium anglicum aevi saxonici* (London: Macmillan, 1865), 276-82.

Æscwig of Dorchester by Archbishop Sigeric.¹⁹⁷ The money from the sale was used to buy peace from an invading Danish army. Æthelred ratified this charter, and it is written in his voice. While the king does not appear to be the one who came up with this plan, the fact that he approves of it through his ratification makes him culpable in this misuse of Church lands. In addition it has been suggested that Wulfstan eventually distanced himself from Æthelred's decision to attempt to exterminate the Danes with the St. Brice's Day Massacre of 1002,¹⁹⁸ while his *Sermo Lupi* complains about Æthelred's excessive taxation.¹⁹⁹ These were troubled times, and the stability of Anglo-Saxon England was threatened by Æthelred's policies as well as by the invading Danes. While Wulfstan's loyalty to Æthelred should not be doubted, he had good reason to be less than enthused about some of Æthelred's decisions, and I have little doubt that he listened to his reforming spirit and attempted to guide Æthelred towards proper Christian kingship. What better way to do this than to invent a legal code which depicts Alfred as a Church-minded king and then use that code in Æthelred's own laws? Table 2.1 shows that "Edward and Guthrum" was employed for many of Æthelred's codes, especially the first laws Wulfstan wrote for him, V and VI Atr. The implicit message in this move by Wulfstan is that it encourages Æthelred to consider the past, even if part of that past is manufactured, and to apply it to his own present. It is a push to rule the way the king's lawcodes are drafted, in that each is mindful of both the decisions of the past and the necessities of the present.

¹⁹⁷ Number 882 in Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, 271. It is printed in full, as number 689, in J. M. Kemble, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, 6 vols. (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1839-48), 6:284-6. It is translated in Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 569-70.

¹⁹⁸ Jonathan Wilcox, "The St. Brice's Day Massacre and Archbishop Wulfstan," in *Peace and Negotiation: Strategies for Coexistence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Diane Wolfthal, Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 79-91, especially 86-91.

¹⁹⁹ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 54: "7 ungylda swyðe gedrehtan" [and excessive taxes exceedingly vex (us)].

Given the parallels between Alfred and Wulfstan, particularly their experiences with the invading Danes, it is not all that surprising that Wulfstan looked to Alfred, his reign, and associated texts for source material and for the context within which to create the forged “Edward and Guthrum” to invent source material. From Wulfstan’s eleventh-century perspective history was more or less repeating itself, and Alfred’s reign proved that the invaders could be withstood, that the Anglo-Saxons could ultimately triumph, and that his society could be cured of its ills. The Alfredian Preface to the *Pastoral Care* provided the archbishop with a proven strategy for English success. To Alfred the key was improving education in Anglo-Saxon England—admittedly not a major concern to Wulfstan. The archbishop fully endorsed improvement in a more general sense, however, as a way to please God and to strengthen the kingdom, and he used Alfredian materials and “Edward and Guthrum” to push for progress. The *Pastoral Care* found a place in Wulfstan’s program of bettering the secular clergy and Anglo-Saxon legislation. The Old English *Boethius* provided material for his exposition on the ideal throne. Alfred’s lawcode offered a legal source as well as a sophisticated method for the drafting of good legislation. The “Law of Alfred and Guthrum” provided the necessary historical context for Wulfstan’s “Edward and Guthrum,” which allowed the archbishop to fill in the Christian gaps in the original treaty and to provide his other legal codes with a “historical” source. As a whole this all shows that Wulfstan was even more widely read than has hitherto been noted, and that his interest in previous Anglo-Saxon rulers was certainly not limited to Edgar.

There is an important difference between Wulfstan’s interaction with Alfred and Edgar, however. Namely, he only mentions Alfred by name one time, and even then it is

only in the preamble to “Edward and Guthrum.” Edgar, on the other hand, is named multiple times in Wulfstan’s writings—something the next chapter discusses at length. What this indicates is that Wulfstan did not actively try to call explicit attention to the accomplishments of Alfred when he engaged with Alfredian materials other than by noting his victory over Guthrum and the Danes in his forgery’s preamble. In that case, Wulfstan’s forged lawcode is very much propped up by its connection to King Alfred, as he is the root of the text’s supposed authority. In the other cases, his silent use of Alfredian sources suggests that Wulfstan found much that was useful associated with the former king and his reign, and that he felt as free to borrow from Alfred as he did to alter the *Pastoral Care*’s Preface. Unlike Wulfstan’s use of Edgar, which, as will be seen, was rather complicated, Alfred was never used as symbol of better times in the archbishop’s writings—he was, however, a source of knowledge that Wulfstan used to guide Anglo-Saxon England towards an ideal Christian society.

Chapter 3

Ane misdæda he dyde þeah to swiðe: Wulfstan and King Edgar

Near the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century, Karl Jost noted that two passages in northern manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 959DE and 975D, were actually later interpolations from the pen of Archbishop Wulfstan.¹ The first of these interpolations discusses the reign of King Edgar, while the second focuses on his son and succeeding ruler, Edward. The consequence of Jost's article is important, as it reveals that, not unlike Wulfstan's drafting of the so-called "Laws of Edward and Guthrum" discussed in the previous chapter, Wulfstan was in the business of inventing Anglo-Saxon history. These annals are placed in the manuscripts at the appropriate chronological positions for their subject matter, and nothing other than their style betrays that they were the work of Wulfstan. Thus, each of Wulfstan's *Chronicle* passages casts itself as a contemporary reaction to the reigns of Edgar and Edward. Taking as a starting point Wulfstan's passage for the year 959DE of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, this chapter shows that the archbishop's view of King Edgar is not nearly as cut and dried as has been previously assumed. In fact, this annal reveals that Wulfstan was not uncritical of Edgar and his reign, particularly when it came to his dealings with the Danes and the Danelaw. Moving beyond the *Chronicle*, I will illustrate through an examination of Wulfstan's references to Edgar and his use of Edgar's lawcodes in his writings that Edgar—a king whose influence on the later Anglo-Saxon period is undeniable, including in Wulfstan's texts—is at times a problematic figure for the archbishop. At other times, however, his

¹ Karl Jost, "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," *Anglia* 47 (1923): 105-23. This chapter focuses on the 959DE poem in relation to Edgar. While the 975D poem mentions the king, it does not further the following discussion. I will discuss the 975D poem in a future study.

lawcodes, particularly II-III Edgar, proved to be invaluable to those drafted by Wulfstan. Ultimately, this chapter will emphasize the importance of recognizing that Wulfstan's view of Edgar is far from simple or straightforward.

This argument partially goes against what has become something of a scholarly commonplace regarding the characterization of Wulfstan's view of Edgar and his reign—that the archbishop looked back on the king's reign as a golden age of Anglo-Saxon England. Such was the opinion of the preeminent Wulfstan scholar Dorothy Whitelock in her seminal “Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman.”² Another highly influential scholar, Dorothy Bethurum, follows suit, and adds the Wulfstan passages from the *Chronicle* to the mix: “[m]ost telling of all for Wulfstan's admiration of Edgar is the poetic panegyric on Edgar in the *Chronicle* and the lament for his death.”³ It is no surprise then, given the great influence the work by these women has had on subsequent studies of Wulfstan, that these claims have often been repeated.⁴

Indeed, the suggestion that Wulfstan looked back on Edgar's reign fondly or with nostalgia is something of a natural scholarly development given other Anglo-Saxons' treatment of him in their writings. The *Chronicle* poems on Edgar in the ABC manuscripts that are included in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, for example, show that

² Dorothy Whitelock, “Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., 24 (1942): 25-45, at 29n4: “Wulfstan himself seems to look back on Edgar's reign as a golden age of law and order.” See also Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 27-8.

³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 83.

⁴ See, for example, Frank Barlow, *The English Church 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church* (New York: Longman, 1979), 69; Clare A. Lees, *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, *Medieval Cultures* 19 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 99; Joyce Hill, “Archbishop Wulfstan: Reformer?” in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townend, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 309-34, at 313; Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 34; and Renée R. Trilling, *The Aesthetics of Nostalgia: Historical Representation in Old English Verse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 235-6.

something like a cult of Edgar quickly developed in Anglo-Saxon England.⁵ Moreover, the *Regularis Concordia* opens with a passage which honors Edgar,⁶ and Lantfred heaps praise on the king in his *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni*.⁷ Further, the author of the so-called “An Account of King Edgar’s Establishment of Monasteries,” possibly Æthelwold, paints Edgar as a devout king and credits him with establishing proper monasticism throughout England.⁸ Additionally, there are two poems in Æthelweard’s *Chronicle* in praise of the king.⁹ In Wulfstan’s own time, Edgar is praised in the works of both Byrhtferth and Ælfric. Byrhtferth eulogizes Edgar in his *Life of Oswald*,¹⁰ while Ælfric, at the end of the translation of *Judges*, writes of Edgar:

Eadgar se æðela and se anræda cining arærde Godes lof on his leode gehwær,
ealra cininga swiðost ofer Engla ðeode, and him God gewilde his wiðerwinnan a,
ciningas and eorlas, þæt hi comon him to buton ælcum gefeohte, friðes wilniende,
him underþeodde to þam þe he wolde. And he wæs gewurðod wide geond land.¹¹

⁵ The poems are printed in Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records: A Collective Edition 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 21-2 and 22-4, respectively. It has been pointed out that, compared to the poems which celebrate Æthelstan and Edmund in the *Chronicle*, these poems on Edgar are unique in that they focus not on battles against the Vikings but on specific moments in his reign “that allow for elaboration on his strengths as a monarch, setting Edgar above the others.” See Mercedes Salvador-Bello, “The Edgar Panegyrics in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*,” in *Edgar, King of the English, 959-975*, ed. Donald Scragg, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 8 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 252-72, at 252.

⁶ Thomas Symons, ed., *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation*, Medieval Classics (London: Nelson, 1953), 1-4.

⁷ Michael Lapidge, ed., *The Cult of St. Swithun*, Winchester Studies 4.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 258.

⁸ Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 142-54, at 149-51, especially. For the claim of Æthelwold’s authorship see Dorothy Whitelock, “The Authorship of the Account of King Edgar’s Establishment of Monasteries,” in *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, ed. James L. Rosier, *Janua Linguarum, Series Maior*, 37 (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), 125-36.

⁹ A. Campbell, ed., *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, Medieval Texts (New York: Nelson, 1962), 55 and 56, respectively.

¹⁰ Michael Lapidge, ed., *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St. Oswald and St. Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), 74-6 and 102, respectively.

¹¹ Marsden, *Old English Heptateuch*, 200: “Edgar, the noble and steadfast king, exalted the praise of God everywhere, of all kings the strongest over the English nation, and for him God willed his opponents, kings

Thus the textual evidence from the period in general does strongly suggest that Edgar was not only a popular king in his own life, but he was also held in high regard well after his death and into the eleventh century.

Wulfstan's 959DE *Chronicle* passage is a bit different from the texts just mentioned since it does not discuss Edgar in completely positive terms—though most of the poem is, indeed, rather laudatory. Instead, Wulfstan includes a complaint about Edgar's policies regarding the Danes and the Danelaw towards the end of the text—one of the foremost concerns of his career, at least until the ascension of Cnut in 1016.

Because of its brevity, it is worth quoting the entire passage:

On his dagum hit godode georne, 7 God him geuðe
 þet he wunode on sibbe þa hwile þe he leofode,
 7 he dyde swa him þearf wæs, earnode þes georne.
 He arerde Godes lof wide 7 Godes lage lufode
 7 folces frið bette swiðost þara cyninga
 þe ær him gewurde be manna gemynde.
 7 God him eac fylste þet cyningas 7 eorlas
 georne him to bugon 7 wurden underþeodde
 to þam þe he wolde, 7 buton gefeohte
 eal he gewilde þet he sylf wolde.
 He wearð wide geond þeodland swiðe geweorðad,
 forþam þe he weorðode Godes naman georne
 7 Godes lage smeade oft 7 gelome

and earls, that they came to him without any fights, desiring peace, and he subjugated them to whatever he wished. And he was honored widely throughout the land.”

7 Godes lof rærde wide 7 side
 7 wislice rædde oftost a simle
 for God 7 for worulde eall his þeode.
 Ane misdæda he dyde þeah to swiðe,
 þet he ælþeodige unsida lufode
 7 hæðene þeawas innan þysan lande gebrohte to fæst
 7 utlændisce hider in tihte
 7 deoriende leoda bespeon to þysan earde.
 Ac God him geunne þet his gode dæda
 swyðran wearðan þonne misdæda
 his sawle to gescyldnesse on langsuman syðe.¹²

The implications of the final portion of this text, as well as explanations for Wulfstan's different view of Edgar's reign, will be discussed below. Now, however, it is necessary to pause in order to discuss the status of this passage as poetry, since the critical reception of the passage has caused it to be greatly under-studied. That the 959DE passage was excluded from the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* does not mean that it is not poetry. Even Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, in whose volume of the *Poetic Records* some of the *Chronicle*

¹² *ASC* E 959: "In his days it readily improved, and God granted to him that he dwelled in peace the time he lived, and he did as was necessary for him, he labored eagerly for this. He exalted the praise of God widely, and he loved the law of God, and he bettered the peace of the people more than the kings who were before him in the memory of men. And God also aided him so that kings and earls readily submitted to him and were subjugated to whatever he wished, and, without a fight, he ruled all he wanted himself. He became honored widely throughout the country because he eagerly honored the name of God, and constantly contemplated the law of God, and far and wide exalted the praise of God, and ever continually governed all his people wisely for God and for world. But he did one misdeed too exceedingly, that he loved evil foreign customs and brought too speedily heathen *mores* into this land, and urged foreigners hither, and enticed harming people to this land. But let God grant to him that his good deeds be greater than the misdeeds, in protection of his soul on the long journey." See also *ASC* D 959. I quote from E because Irvine lineates the annal as poetry.

poems appear, does not claim that the 959DE passage and others which were excluded from the *Poetic Records* are not poetic, but rather that they are “in irregular meter.”¹³ The meter of these poems was acceptable enough for Charles Plummer, however, who prints Wulfstan’s 959DE passage as verse, along with a number of other passages.¹⁴ Further, Walter Sedgefield found the text poetic, though in “irregular meter,” and he prints it in his appendix,¹⁵ while Jost lineates the text poetically in his article which attributes the text to Wulfstan.¹⁶ The opinions of these scholars were apparently accepted by many others, as it is rather common to note that the 959DE passage is a poem, though this assertion is often qualified with a remark or other suggestion that it is imperfect.¹⁷

This is not to say that the poetic status of the text has been universally accepted. Whitelock, for example, seems unconvinced by Jost’s claim that these *Chronicle* passages by Wulfstan were poetry.¹⁸ The same is true of T. A. Shippey, who calls the texts “rhythmic prose” rather than poetry.¹⁹ Moreover, G. P. Cubbin prints the 959D

¹³ Dobbie, *Minor Poems*, xxxii. In some ways this is an odd comment given that he does include “The Death of Alfred” in his edition, a poem which on the same page he explains “is partly prose and partly irregular rimed verse.” A full list of the poems excluded from Dobbie’s edition, including Wulfstan’s 975D poem, can be found on his p. xxxiiin1.

¹⁴ Charles Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel with Supplementary Extracts from Others*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), 1: 114-15. While I only focus on the reception here of Wulfstan’s *Chronicle* poems, specifically the 959DE text, there is an excellent overview of the editorial treatment of the *Chronicle* poems in Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 73-9. See also Trilling, *Aesthetics of Nostalgia*, 218-30.

¹⁵ Walter John Sedgefield, ed., *The Battle of Maldon and Short Poems from the Saxon Chronicle* (New York: D. C. Heath, 1904; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1972), 29-30. Sedgefield prints the text as a series of half-lines in paragraph form. He notes in his introduction on p. xxi that the 959 and 1086 poems are printed in his appendix because they are “the most perfect examples” of the poems of irregular meter.

¹⁶ Jost, “Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik,” 107.

¹⁷ Angus McIntosh, “Wulfstan’s Prose,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949): 109-42, at 112; Bredehoft, *Textual Histories*, 106-10; M. K. Lawson, *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century*, *The Medieval World* (New York: Longman, 1993), 6; Salvador-Bello, “Edgar Panegyrics,” 271-2; Trilling, *Aesthetics of Nostalgia*, 234; Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 98-9.

¹⁸ Whitelock, “Homilist and Statesman,” 38.

¹⁹ T. A. Shippey, *Old English Verse*, *English Literature* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1972), 187.

entry as prose because “[t]here is nothing in the MS to indicate verse in this annal.”²⁰ It is much more common, however, for scholars to simply avoid the question by referring to the Wulfstan poems as “insertions,” “panegyrics,” or as I have called them rather generically above, “passages,” among other terms.²¹

But perhaps the most damaging scholarly trend to the study of Wulfstan’s *Chronicle* poems is the tendency to omit them from discussion because they are perceived as being too flawed or simply because they are not included in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. This first attitude can be found most explicitly in an influential book by an influential Anglo-Saxonist, C. L. Wrenn, who notes that some of the poems of the later *Chronicle* are “merely popular verse of no literary merit,” and, thus, are undeserving of mention.²² Such a statement in this widely read general study of the literature of the period surely influenced at least some of its readers. Compounding the problem is the poems’ omission from the *Poetic Records* and the effect that has had on studies of the *Chronicle* poems. While work on the *Chronicle* poems, especially those on Edgar, has often appeared in recent years, the Wulfstan poems are rarely considered since they are not part of this “standard” group of Old English poems.²³

²⁰ Cubbin, *MS D*, 45n2.

²¹ See, for example, Barlow, *English Church*, 69n1; Pauline Stafford, *Unification and Conquest: A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London: Edward Arnold, 1989), 46; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 132; Matthew Townend, “Pre-Cnut Praise-Poetry in Viking Age England,” *Review of English Studies* 51 (2000): 349-70, at 356; Lesley Abrams, “The Conversion of the Danelaw,” in *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, ed. James Graham-Campbell et al. (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), 31-44, at 39; and Malcolm Godden, “The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment,” in Townend, *Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, 353-74, at 364.

²² C. L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature* (New York: Norton, 1967), 189.

²³ See, for example, O’Brien O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, 108-37; Martin Irvine, “Medieval Textuality and the Archaeology of Textual Culture,” in *Speaking Two Languages: Traditional Disciplines and Contemporary Theory in Medieval Studies*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 181-210, at 202-8; Julie Townsend, “The Metre of the *Chronicle*-verse,” *Studia Neophilologica* 68 (1996): 143-76; and Jayne Carroll, “*Engla Waldend, Rex Admirabilis*: Poetic Representations of King Edgar,” *Review of English Studies*, n. s., 58 (2007): 113-32. There is a passing reference to the Wulfstan poems

A much needed defense of late Old English poetry, of which the Wulfstan poems are good examples, has appeared in Thomas A. Bredehoft's book *Early English Metre*.²⁴ Among his other arguments, Bredehoft takes to task the notion that Old English meter somehow remained static throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, even though the Old English language did not, and points out, as I have above regarding Wulfstan's poems, that such a view of poetry has been detrimental to late Old English poems: The reality is not that the poetic tradition was rigid, but that Sievers-Bliss formalism is rigid: it has limited the ways in which scholars and students have thought about poetry and poetic developments, to the point that any detailed understanding of late Old English verse still escapes us and a number of late poems have been explicitly excluded from the published canon of Old English verse, Krapp and Dobbie's *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*.²⁵

Though Bredehoft's approach to classical and late Old English meter is in many ways flawed,²⁶ calling attention to the poetry from the later years of the Anglo-Saxon period, especially those texts deemed inferior, is nevertheless a significant contribution of his book. Rather than approach these texts as Bredehoft does by attempting to establish metrical rules for late Old English verse, however, I think it is more useful and practical

(though he does not note their authorship) in Scott Thompson Smith, "The Edgar Poems and the Poetics of Failure in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 39 (2011): 105-37, at 137; the same kind of reference is in Salvador-Bello, "Edgar Panegyrics," 271-2. There are some notable exceptions, however; see Janet Thormann, "The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* Poems and the Making of the English Nation," in *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*, ed. Alan J. Frantzen and John D. Niles (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997), 60-85, at 71-3; Bredehoft, *Textual Histories*, 73-118, especially 106-110; Trilling, *Aesthetics*, 214-52; and Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 26-38.

²⁴ Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Early English Metre* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

²⁵ Bredehoft, *Early English Metre*, 7-8.

²⁶ Thomas Cable, review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 107 (2008): 394-97; Donka Minkova, review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Speculum* 83 (2008): 673-5; and Mark Griffith, review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Notes & Queries* 56 (2009): 98-9.

to consider the place of these texts in the poetic corpus in terms other than their metrical quality, and to focus instead on their non-metrical poeticisms, for if one insists on comparing the meter of the late Old English texts to that which is found in the classical poems, not much that is new or worthy of discussion will be found. Besides, if scholars like Sedgefield, Plummer, Jost, Campbell, Bredehoft, and others have identified such texts as poetry I see no reason why Anglo-Saxons, themselves, would not have. Thus, the question of whether or not these texts qualify as verse is something of a moot point.

Just what kind of verse these texts are, however, is worthy of discussion. Over a century ago, anticipating Bredehoft, Sedgefield acknowledged that in the later poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* “a new metre and a new style emerge[d] for the first time in the history of English literature,” and he suggested that this new style is most different from classical verse because of its “popular tone.”²⁷ Some years later Alistair Campbell echoed this view when he noted that the later *Chronicle* poems are in a “new and loose versification,” and that Anglo-Saxon readers apparently appreciated them, perhaps even over the classical poems.²⁸ Sedgefield’s and Campbell’s suggestion that these late poems are the products of popular poets, rather than, for example, educated monks, is in all likelihood accurate, but it is nonetheless problematic. There is a tendency to dismiss works that are not monkish or scholastic on the grounds that they are simply inferior texts unworthy of attention. This is perhaps a valid point; the authors of the late poems in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, for example, are certainly no *Beowulf*-poet. And yet, these texts should be accepted for what they are: poetic compositions intended for a wide audience

²⁷ Sedgefield, *Battle of Maldon*, ix-x.

²⁸ Alistair Campbell, ed., *The Battle of Brunanburh* (London: William Heinemann, 1938), 37. On p. 38 Campbell calls this new popular kind of poetry “doggeral.”

which appear to have been well-received—if they had not been, one would think they would have been barred or redacted from the *Chronicle* instead of included or inserted to supplement the more metrically regular poems included in the *Poetic Records*. Further, it is telling that the other late and “irregular” poems which exist outside the *Chronicle* have survived at all; someone or some people must have valued them.

There are characteristics of this new kind of verse other than its relaxed use of meter, some of which have also been discussed by Bredehoft.²⁹ I will focus primarily on the texts in the *Chronicle*. To begin with, alliteration is not always an absolute requirement in late Old English verse (though it is generally present), and it is sometimes replaced with, or employed alongside, the use of rhyme. Bredehoft provides as an example lines 7b-10 of the prosimetrical but canonical *Death of Alfred*, which features internal rhyme along with alliteration.³⁰ Such features can be found in other late canonical poems³¹ as well as the others from the *Chronicle* that were left out of the *Poetic Records*.³² Another feature of some of these late poems, particularly of those not given a place in the canon of Old English poetry, is the frequent absence of poeticisms like

²⁹ Bredehoft, *Early English Metre*, 91-8.

³⁰ Bredehoft, *Early English Metre*, 93.

³¹ For additional examples of internal rhyme see the following selected lines from *Judgement Day II*, which are representative of this kind of rhyme in the canonical poems: “innon þam gemonge on ænlicum wonge” (l. 6); “Færð fyr ofer eall, ne byð þær nan foresteal” (l. 147); “on blindum scræfe byrnað and yrnað” (l. 231). This text is taken from Dobbie, *Minor Poems*, 58-67.

³² Bredehoft cites the *William the Conqueror* poem as an example; see Bredehoft, *Early English Metre*, 93-5. Of additional note, Wulfstan’s short 975D poem has internal rhyme: “and munecas todræfdon and Godes þeowas fesedon” (l. 5). I have used Jost’s lineation since Plummer prints this text in half-lines; see Jost, “Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik,” 119. The 1036C poem also provides many examples; see *ASC* C 1036. Also of note are the very short poetic *Chronicle* passages in 1075E and 1104E (as an example of end rhyme): “þær wæs þet brydeala mannum to beala,” and “eal þis wæs God mid to gremienne / 7 þas arme leode mid to tregienne.” For an explanation of these latter two texts and other short passages in the *Chronicle* as poetry see Bredehoft, *Textual Histories*, 79-83, as well as 202n82, where Bredehoft suggests that these short pieces point to a late tradition of the use of rhyme.

variation so common in much of classical verse.³³ Wulfstan's 975D poem lacks any examples of variation, as does the 1086E poem, *William the Conqueror*, the 979E poem on the murder of Edward,³⁴ and the 1036C poem *The Death of Alfred*.³⁵ Some of these poems do, however, feature other poetic constructions. The non-canonical poem on Edgar's death at 975DE, for example, includes a kenning for the sea, "ganetes bað,"³⁶ while Wulfstan's 975D poem features a chiasmic and paranomasiac construction using "yfelra" and "yfelode":

and yfelra unlaga arisan up siððan,
and aa æfter þam hit yfelode swiðe.³⁷

One final aspect of the late poems is their frequent use of non-poetic vocabulary. This can be seen even in the *Death of Alfred*, a canonical poem, where one does not find any poetic compounds or other vocabulary that is strictly poetic in nature. The rest of the canonical *Chronicle* poems include more or less poetic vocabulary, though it is by no means widespread in these texts, with the exception of the *Battle of Brunanburh*.³⁸ Some of the non-canonical poems actually do include a bit of poetic vocabulary as well, though its inclusion is by no means the rule. In addition to the kenning just mentioned, the 975DE poem, for example, employs "flota" when it implies that Edgar's reign was free

³³ Though do note that the non-canonical 975DE poem on the death of Edgar does feature variation in its first line.

³⁴ Irvine, *MS E*, 60, though also see her n.1 on this page.

³⁵ Dobbie, *Minor Poems*, 24-5.

³⁶ See Irvine, *MS E*, 59, and Cubbin, *MS D*, 46. Cubbin prints the annal as prose. See also Jost, "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," 119.

³⁷ This is according to Jost's lineation; see Jost, "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," 119. See also Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, 1:121.

³⁸ A selection of the poetic vocabulary from the poems other than *Brunanburh* is as follows: *The Capture of the Five Boroughs*, "mæggea mundbora" (l. 2), "dædfroma" (l. 3), "brimstream" (l. 5); *The Coronation of Edgar*, "corðre" (l. 2), "eafora" (l. 17), "niðweorca" (l. 18); *The Death of Edgar*, "gamolfeax" (l. 26), "hwænes eðel" (l. 28), "cræftgleawe" (l. 32); *The Death of Edward*, "kyneþrymme" (l. 5), "hæleða" (l. 8), "oretmægcum" (l. 11).

from Viking attacks, and the 979E poem includes “magas” to describe Edward’s kin. Though neither term is exclusively poetic, each, especially “flota,” is a common term in Old English poetry.

The preceding brief discussion of the late poems makes no claim of comprehensiveness. Rather, my purpose in pausing to discuss these texts is to emphasize that they are poetic even if they don’t always look like what one expects—or wants—of an Old English poem. The poeticisms present in these texts are no accident—their authors surely recognized the efficacy of using rhyme to connect half-lines, or of employing chiasmus and paranomasia for aesthetic effect. These poems are different from their classical predecessors, but they were undoubtedly influenced by them. As Bredehoft notes, they are literary works rather than poems rooted in classical oral tradition: it seems clear that late Old English verse was essentially a literary form, its basic forms descended from classical verse types, but otherwise radically separated from the formulaic, compound-filled, orally-derived standards of classical verse.³⁹ In other words, these late *Chronicle* poems are part of the Old English poetic tradition only partially—in their use of alliteration and some poetic vocabulary, for example. But they are also literary innovations in that they are defined by their accessibility rather than exclusivity while simultaneously exploring relatively new forms of poetic expression like rhyme and the adoption of mainstream vocabulary. The result is a group of poems with the potential to reach a wide audience.

Wulfstan’s 959DE *Chronicle* poem is certainly part of this group of late poems which I have briefly described, though a stylistic analysis of the poem to some extent

³⁹ Thomas A. Bredehoft, “Ælfric and Late Old English Verse,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 33 (2004): 77-107, at 97.

depends on which editorial lineation one uses. The poem has been lineated three times—by Plummer, Jost, and Irvine⁴⁰—and each does so a bit differently. When it comes to identifying many poeticisms in the text, however, any of these versions will do. Since it is probable that Irvine’s lineation will remain the standard for some time to come, I will focus on her version in what follows.⁴¹

Though not omnipresent, there are many examples of typical Old English verse alliteration in Wulfstan’s 959DE poem; see, for just one example, the opening of the poem: “On his dagum hit godode georne, 7 God him geuðe” (l. 1). Cross alliteration is also featured in the text; one example being “He arerde Godes lof wide 7 Godes lage lufode” (l. 4). Double alliteration is also found, both confined to the A line—“7 folces frið bette” (l. 5)—as well as connecting both half-lines—“He wearð wide geond þeodland swiðe geweorðad” (l. 11). As for rhyme, the text displays both internal and end-rhyme. Internal rhyme is found in “wide 7 side” (l. 14), while there is something of a clumsy example of end-rhyme in lines 23-4, which end with “dæda” and “misdæda,” respectively.⁴² As for other characteristics in the poem, it should first be noted that the text features no poetic vocabulary, though it does include, as is typical of Wulfstan-authored texts, compounds like “underþeodde” (l. 8) and “þeodland” (l. 11). The lack of strictly poetic vocabulary, however, should not disqualify the text as poetry, as I have

⁴⁰ Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, 1:114-15; Jost, “Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik,” 107; Irvine, *MS E*, 56. Irvine’s lineation is according to a suggestion from Bredehoft; see Irvine, *MS E*, 56n4. Sedgefield might also be included in this list, though he does not lineate the poem in the strictest sense since he only divides the text into half-lines; see Sedgefield, *Battle of Maldon*, 29-30.

⁴¹ Irvine does not number the lines of any of the poems in her edition. For convenience I have done so here. The 959E poem as printed in her edition is 24 lines long, and I will cite the text using line numbers in my main text. Moreover, though I cite from and discuss the E text, the observations offered here also apply to the D version of the text which, if lineated, could be done so in the very same way as the text appears in Irvine’s edition.

⁴² The poem also features inflectional rhyme in l. 7b, “þet cyningas 7 eorlas,” and there are perhaps two sets of half-rhymes in l. 11: “He wearð wide geond þeodland swiðe geweorðad” (emphasis mine).

discussed above. Moreover, the middle section of the poem emphasizes Edgar's religious devotion through repetition before voicing its closing criticism:

forþam þe he weorðode Godes naman georne

7 Godes lage smeade oft 7 gelome

7 Godes lof rærde wide 7 side

for Gode and for worulde eall his þeode. (ll. 12-15)

This passage is especially interesting in light of Wulfstan's source for the 959DE poem, the excerpt from Ælfric's epilogue to the Old English Heptateuch that I have quoted above.⁴³ In order to stress Edgar's religious conviction before qualifying it with a criticism, Wulfstan changes Ælfric's "arærde Godes lof" into a catalogue linked through repetition. The effect is striking; even a figure as apparently devout as Edgar is not immune to committing the "[a]ne misdæda" (l. 16) discussed in the following lines.

Wulfstan's 959DE poem stands out from the rest of the Anglo-Saxon texts on Edgar as it alone is critical of the king. There is perhaps good reason for this, since, excluding the *Chronicle* poems and those by Æthelweard, there is a readily identifiable thread of commonality when it comes to the authorship of the texts mentioned which praise Edgar: each of the authors was a Benedictine. This should be no surprise given that the Benedictine Reform was in many ways made possible through Edgar's royal support through his cooperation with Dunstan, Oswald, and Æthelwold. It seems rather likely, then, that the unknown, but probably monastic, authors of the *Chronicle* poems were influenced by the reform sentiments of the times, while Æthelweard, a layman, made

⁴³ Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, 152.

each into a “secular panegyric,”⁴⁴ perhaps also influenced by the Reform, itself, or by his Benedictine contacts like Ælfric.

It remains unclear whether Wulfstan was a Benedictine or even a monk, though earlier scholars often took for granted that he was both.⁴⁵ In recent scholarship this view has not been so readily accepted, and for good reason. Patrick Wormald, for example, has pointed out in his characteristically blunt style that “there is strikingly little evidence that our Wulfstan was educated in the Æthelwoldian style, and not a lot that he was even a monk.”⁴⁶ There is, in fact, little evidence for anything concerning Wulfstan’s life before his appointment in London in 996 other than what can be deduced from his own writings and/or gleaned from post-Conquest sources, the most important of these being the *Liber Eliensis*. However, these later texts are not the most useful of resources, particularly when it comes to shedding light on Wulfstan’s early learning and career.⁴⁷ What can be inferred from the archbishop’s writings about his training suggests that Wulfstan was not educated at a center directly associated with the Benedictine Reform. Richard Dance, for example, has shown, in fact, that Wulfstan seems to have avoided language associated with Æthelwold’s Winchester school in his writings.⁴⁸ Moreover, his focus on the laity and secular clergy in his writings further distinguishes him from the Benedictines as a whole, whose emphasis is heavily monastic. This discrepancy is dealt with in Joyce Hill’s

⁴⁴ Carroll, “Poetic Representations of King Edgar,” 132.

⁴⁵ See, for example, Bethurum, *Homilies*, 57; Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 8-9; Barlow, *The English Church*, 68; and Milton McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 18.

⁴⁶ Patrick Wormald, “Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-BUILDER,” in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 9-27, at 13.

⁴⁷ A review of what can be gleaned from the *Liber Eliensis* and other late sources can be found in Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 7-9.

⁴⁸ Dance, “Sound, Fury, and Signifiers,” 43-53, especially. This is also mentioned in Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, 11.

investigation of Wulfstan's relation to the Benedictine Reform. She ultimately determines that Wulfstan should be considered a part of the movement, though he expresses a different facet of it:

it is important to note that his interests are overwhelmingly oriented towards the secular church—a position which allies him more directly with continental metropolitans than with the more monastically oriented first-generation reformers in England. There is nothing intrinsically monastic about Wulfstan's liturgical materials and, given the positions he held, one would hardly expect there to be. But it is in the larger tradition of the reform that he stands, in his practice, his aspirations, and his textual resources.⁴⁹

In other words, Wulfstan adapts the general *mores* of the reformers and their movement to suit his concern for the secular clergy and the laity. A good example of this, briefly discussed by Hill, is Wulfstan's compilation of the so-called *Old English Benedictine Office*. While both Hill and its most recent editor acknowledge that the text is useless as an Office,⁵⁰ Hill also notes that Wulfstan is “demonstrably interested in and committed to the proper conduct within the secular church of relatively complex liturgical ritual in Holy Week,” and thus she suggests that the *Old English Benedictine Office* is an additional effort by the archbishop to regulate the secular clergy in a similar way as those in orders.⁵¹ This should not be surprising, as many of Wulfstan's texts both implicitly and

⁴⁹ Hill, “Reformer?” 317.

⁵⁰ Hill, “Reformer?” 316: “it is certainly not useable as an Office, most of the psalm-texts which are at the heart of the Office being absent,” and James M. Ure, ed., *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text*, Edinburgh University Publications, Language & Literature 11 (Edinburgh: University Press, 1957), 62: “it is not an Office, nor is it specifically Benedictine. . . . In point of fact this text as it stands could never have been used by anyone, religious or secular, as an Office.”

⁵¹ Hill, “Reformer?” 315-16.

explicitly discuss the importance of order and regulation in virtually all aspects of society.

But adapting the aims of the Benedictine Reform so that they applied to the secular clergy is not the only way in which Wulfstan was an atypical participant in the movement. By the time he was active, enough years had passed since Edgar's death to allow a note of dissent regarding the king to appear in the *Chronicle*. Such a sentiment had never appeared before, and it did not appear again in the Anglo-Saxon period. It was only after the Conquest that writers once more entertained Edgar's supposed flaws, using the 959DE annal as one of their sources.⁵² Nonetheless, Wulfstan's note of criticism, unique though it is, has often been overlooked by scholars, as will be seen below.

First, however, the nature of the criticism should be discussed. The last portion of the poem contains Wulfstan's reproach:

Ane misdæda he dyde þeah to swiðe,
 þet he ælþeodige unsida lufode
 7 hæðene þeawas innan þysan lande gebrohte to fæst
 7 utlændisce hider in tihte
 7 deoriende leoda bespeon to þysan earde.
 Ac God him geunne þet his gode dæda
 swyðran wearðan þonne misdæda
 his sawle to gescyldnesse on langsuman syðe.⁵³

⁵² For a brief overview of these authors' use of the 959DE annal see Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, 2:153.

⁵³ See note 12 the citation and translation of this passage.

The main impetus for this criticism is in all likelihood Edgar’s lawcodes—texts which Wulfstan knew, referenced, and used in the codes he wrote for both Æthelred and Cnut.⁵⁴ Specifically, it is IV Edgar which is of importance here, since this code was directed at the Danelaw.⁵⁵ Within this legal code, the following clauses are of primary interest:

IV Edg 2a

7 to ælcere byrig 7 on
ælcere scyre hæbbe ic
mines cynescippes gerihta
swa min fæder hæfde, 7
mine þegnas hæbben heora
scype on minum timan swa
hi hæfdon on mines fæder.
§1. 7 ic wille þæt
woruldgeriht min Denum
standan be swa godum
lagum,⁵⁶ swa hy betste
geceosan mægen.
§1a. Stande þonne mid
Englum þæt ic 7 mine
witan to minra yldrena
domum geyhton, eallum
leodscype to ðearfe.⁵⁷

IV Edg 12

Þonne wille ic þæt stande
mid Denum swa gode laga
swa hy betste geceosan; 7
ic heom a geþafode 7
geðafian wille, swa lange
swa me lif gelæst, for
eowrum hyldum þe ge me
symble cyddon.⁵⁸

IV Edg 13

7 ic wille þæt tunesmen 7
heora hyrdes habban þas
ylcan smeagunge on
minum cucan orfe 7 on
minra þegena, ealswa hy
habbað on heora agenum.
§1. Gif hit þonne min
gerefa oððe ænig oðer man,
riccre oððe unriccre,
onscunað 7 ungersena
gebyt aðer oððe
tunesmannum oððe heora
hyrdon, ceose Dene be
lagum hwylce steore hy be
ðan healdan willað.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ VIII Atr 37 names Edgar in the context of lawmaking, while VIII Atr 43 references the decrees of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar. Turning to Cnut, Edgar’s laws provided Wulfstan with much material for the codes he wrote for the Danish king; see table 5.4 in Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 356-60. There is no such chart available for the Wulfstan-authored laws of Æthelred, but one can see the influence Edgar’s law exerted on these codes in Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 326-42. See also my discussion and Table 3.1 below.

⁵⁵ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 317.

⁵⁶ In IV Edg the word *lagu* is used to refer specifically to Danish law; see Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 307-8.

⁵⁷ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 32: “And that in each city and each shire I hold my royal rights as my father held them, and my thanes hold their rank in my time as they held it in my father’s. §1. And I will that among the Danes secular rights be maintained, according to good legislation, as they are able to best choose. §1a. Among the English, though, what I and my *witan* have added to the judgments of my ancestors should be maintained, for the good of the entire nation.”

⁵⁸ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 36: “Moreover I will that, among the Danes, good laws be maintained as they can choose best, and I always allowed them, and I wish to allow it, as long as my life lasts, on account of your loyalty, which you have always shown me.”

⁵⁹ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 36: “And I will that townspeople and their shepherds have the same right of inquiry with my livestock and with my thanes’ just as they have with their own. §1. However, if my reeve or any other man, rich or poor, rejects this and offers indignity either to the townspeople or their shepherds, the Danes may choose, according to their laws, what punishment they will fix concerning that.”

As can be seen, very early into the text the code makes a clear distinction between the English and the Danes,⁶⁰ though perhaps not as one might expect. While article 2*a* does imply that a general separation of the two groups existed, it and the rest of the code give no indication that they were barred from mixing. While the two groups are loosely divided, the division is rooted not in a view of the Danes as a dangerous enemy, but rather in the recognition that they have different, but acceptable, customs and legal *mores*. Moreover, the same clause contains an explicit directive to the Danes, but it is merely an instruction on some new legal responsibilities that seems to be informed by Edgar's trust that the Danish ruling class will issue appropriate legislation as he and his *witan* have. Thus, the text reveals that Edgar knows that he is not in a position to legislate in the Danelaw, and so he leaves the specifics and issuance of law up to the Danes with the repeated assurance that "in spite of imposing this on them he has no intention of encroaching on their legal liberties."⁶¹ Article 12 extends Edgar's favor even more. While one might see this as simply a reiteration of the aforementioned code, it is really far more

⁶⁰ IV Edg's use of "Danes" is probably more of a catch-all term rather than an accurate description of the residents of the Danelaw. It is unlikely, for example, that when the Vikings arrived those living in what became the Danelaw simply left. Edgar and his councilors surely recognized this. It is significant, however, that IV Edg defines the population as Danish, even though there was rather likely a high degree of ethnic variation and mixing in the region. This suggests that to those outside the Danelaw, the region as a whole was conceived as a Danish entity despite its internal diversity. For a review of analyses of the actual make-up of the Danelaw see Lesley Abrams, "King Edgar and the Men of the Danelaw," in Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 171-91, at 173-80.

⁶¹ Niels Lund, "King Edgar and the Danelaw," *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 9 (1976): 181-95, at 184. See also Simon Keynes, "The Vikings in England, c. 790-1016," in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, ed. Peter Sawyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 48-82, at 72: "Edgar was pragmatically conscious of the limitations on his own ability to legislate for the 'Danish' part of his kingdom, and regarded the act of acknowledging the diversity of established customs among different peoples as the best way of maintaining the appearance of overall political unity." Recently this view has been partially challenged by Abrams, who argues that, while the IV Edg code acknowledges a difference between the English and the Danes, it also "marked a movement away from local distinctiveness towards common English practice." This is true only in a very broad sense, however, since the text notes that Edgar was content to allow the Danes to fill in the specifics of the individual clauses which applied to both regions. See Abrams, "Edgar and the Men of the Danelaw," 172.

than that. This section of IV Edgar establishes positive relations with the Danes which will extend long into the future, and it suggests that such a relationship was already in existence for some time.⁶² The code is almost paternal in nature; Edgar's lawcode positions the Danes as subjects who are rewarded for their dedication to him. There is no sense of strained relations here. In fact, it sounds as if Edgar and the Danes came to a mutually beneficial agreement: Edgar enjoyed the loyalty and support of the Danes, while they, for their part, were allowed what sounds like a fairly high degree of autonomy.

IV Edgar 13 provides equal rights to those looking for their cattle, and it also grants the Danes protection from Edgar's men, some of whom the king apparently worried might not be inclined to treat those in the Danelaw fairly. Though it concerns a mundane situation, this portion of the code is extremely important to an understanding of Edgar's policy towards the Danes. While it is significant in itself that Edgar's men are expected to uphold such a law outside the boundaries of his power of legislation, that the Danes are permitted to choose what punishment should befall a reeve or another man for not behaving in accordance with Edgar's code makes it all the more important. Edgar's men will not enjoy a sort of Anglo-Saxon "diplomatic immunity" while in the Danelaw—a significant concession, and gesture of good faith, to those in charge of that region.

Concerning IV Edgar 13, Lund notes that "Edgar is clearly seeking to be moderate."⁶³ Such a statement really applies generally to the entire code, but why Edgar wishes to be so moderate with the Danes in this text has yet to be explained. Lund has suggested that IV Edgar records rights given to the Danelaw in 957 "by a group of

⁶² In fact, Lund posits that it was Edgar, himself, who may have created the Danelaw. See Lund, "King Edgar and the Danelaw," 186.

⁶³ Lund, "King Edgar and the Danelaw," 184.

magnates” who established the fourteen-year-old Edgar as king as a way to thank the Danish districts for their support of Edgar over his brother, Eadwig.⁶⁴ This is possible, though there is no record of this supposed activity by these magnates that survives. Moreover, Wormald’s revision of the date for IV Edgar to the 970s⁶⁵ makes this claim a bit improbable, since it means that Edgar waited about a decade to record the privileges granted to the Danes. One would think that those who lent Edgar their support would have expected their thanks much earlier, if this supposed conspiracy ever actually took place.⁶⁶

While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine in depth the reasons for Edgar’s apparent favor towards the Danes, some brief comments are relevant. In the first place, it is important to remember that Edgar spent some of his formative years in what became known as the Danelaw when he was fostered by Æthelstan Half-King of East Anglia, though he was also sent to learn under Æthelwold and Dunstan at Glastonbury. It does not seem to be outside the realm of possibility that part of Edgar’s motivation for his issuing of IV Edgar was due to a fondness for the area he had come to know as his home. Moreover, he began his kingship in the Danelaw in 957 and, though a young man of fourteen, Edgar surely would have come to an intimate understanding of the politics and allegiances of the region. The charter and diploma evidence supports such a notion. Prior

⁶⁴ Lund, “King Edgar and the Danelaw,” 187.

⁶⁵ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 441-2. It was previously thought that IV Edg followed shortly after the plague of 962; see Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 434.

⁶⁶ It has recently been proposed, in fact, that Eadwig and Edgar were actually joint kings. If this is to be believed, then the notion that there was bad blood between the two is a moot point; see Frederick M. Biggs, “Edgar’s Path to the Throne,” in Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 124-39. See also C. P. Lewis, “Edgar, Chester, and the Kingdom of the Mercians, 957-9,” in Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 104-23, at 106: “In 957, when Edgar turned fourteen, there was an agreed division—no doubt brokered by the ealdorman and bishops—in which Eadwig retained the style of king of the English (and a monopoly over keeping his name on the coinage) but ruled only the shires south of the Thames. Edgar was allowed to call himself king, and ruled over the Mercians and Northumbrians.”

to his accession to the throne over all of England Edgar's surviving charters and diplomas contain a number of names—both Danish and English—which do not reappear after 959. While it is certain some of these documents have been lost, and it is not certain that charters were commonly issued in the Danelaw, Abrams notes that what survives suggests that these names belong to men who represented local interests there.⁶⁷ Edgar worked with these men, and what appears to be a decrease in his dealings with those from the Danelaw after 959⁶⁸ along with his drafting of IV Edgar probably reflects his experience there—he recognized that the Danelaw could be safely left to relative autonomy and without royal meddling.

But there might be an additional motivation as well. Shashi Jayakumar has pointed out that Edgar enlisted Danish men for assistance with the operation of his kingdom. This included the hiring of men with Scandinavian names as moneyers. Moreover, Scandinavian merchants were present in England during the tenth century—probably not invited by Edgar, but apparently tolerated by him. Finally, it seems that Edgar may have hired Scandinavian mercenaries as well, just as some previous Anglo-Saxon kings, including Alfred, had done, and like later rulers, such as Æthelred, would eventually do.⁶⁹ If this is true, then Edgar apparently recognized the skill and efficacy of these Scandinavian workers and fighters and opted to use them to his and England's advantage. His legal concessions, then, might also be due to his cooperation with the

⁶⁷ Abrams, "Edgar and the Men of the Danelaw," 183-6.

⁶⁸ Abrams, "Edgar and the Men of the Danelaw," 187. Abrams, however, rightly cautions that "we cannot assume that witness-lists represent unaltered records." When considered alongside the articles of self-rule contained in IV Edgar, though, her suggestion that contact with those from the Danelaw decreased after 959 makes sense.

⁶⁹ Shashi Jayakumar, "Some Reflections on the 'Foreign Policies' of Edgar 'the Peaceable,'" *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 17-37, esp. 25-31. See also his references for these pages.

Danes within his kingdom—an experience which very well could have spurred amity between them and Edgar.

While these are some possible explanations for Edgar’s fairly lenient policies towards the Danes, his ultimate motivation for IV Edgar was in all likelihood a host of reasons, some of which may never be known to modern scholars. Whatever the source of Edgar’s policies, Wulfstan’s 959DE poem notes that the archbishop clearly took issue with Edgar’s dealings with the Danes, and in a big way. One of Wulfstan’s primary concerns, after all, is the effect of the Danish invasions and their settlements in England on Anglo-Saxon society and religion. The main thrust of his most famous work, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, for example, makes it quite clear that he views the invaders and settlers as divine punishment. Moreover, Malcolm Godden has suggested that an earlier homily, Bethurum III, alludes to the Viking attacks.⁷⁰ VII Æthelred does more than allude—it is a text which directs the Anglo-Saxons to perform various acts of penance (fasting, going barefoot, giving dues, etc.) so that “we Godes miltse 7 his mildheortnesse habban moton 7 þæt we þurh his fultum magon feondum wiðstandan.”⁷¹ Furthermore, the various concerns Wulfstan notes across the rest of his writings in the Æthelred years are all connected in part to the Viking attacks, as he believed that God was punishing the Anglo-Saxons for their failure to live up to His standards, most damagingly with the attacks. Take, for example, the archbishop’s apparent obsession with the proper ordering of society that can be seen most significantly in the *Institutes of Polity*, but which is also

⁷⁰ Malcolm Godden, “Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies Presented to E. G. Stanley*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 130-62, at 143. See also pp. 154-6 for a discussion which considers Bethurum homilies VI, XI, and XIX as contextual evidence for Wulfstan’s consideration of the Viking attacks in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as divine punishment.

⁷¹ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 114-16, at 114: “we may have the compassion and mercy of God and that we may withstand the enemies by way of His help.”

in the collection of works Wormald calls the “*Gebyncðu* group”: *Gebyncðu, Norðleoda laga, Mircna Laga, Að, and Hadbot*.⁷² Wormald has elsewhere noted that “Wulfstan saw society in flux as an affront to its Creator.”⁷³ Social order was supposed to be taken seriously and preserved, but it disintegrated in England during Wulfstan’s career, and thus it became one of many of the Anglo-Saxons’ sins that warranted punishment from above. This point arises in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, where Wulfstan marries a stunning example of the dangers of unstable societal order with the Viking incursions:

Deh þræla hwylc hlaforde æthleape 7 of cristendome to wicinge weorþe, 7 hit æfter þam eft geweorþe þæt wæpngewrixl weorðe, gemæne þegene 7 þræle, gif þræl þæne þegen fullice afylle, licge ægyldde ealre his mægðe; 7, gif se þegen þæne þræl þe he ær ahte fullice afylle, gylde þegengylde.⁷⁴

Such a hypothetical situation not only practically dismantles the important Anglo-Saxon institution of wergeld, it also suggests that the invading Vikings provided a method of social mobility very dangerous to the Anglo-Saxon state. This is not to say that Wulfstan was against social mobility—*Grið* shows that he certainly was not—but that he favored a certain kind of mobility: that commissioned by God.⁷⁵ A slave’s joining of an invading army does not fit this bill, and that this situation was apparently possible to Wulfstan betrays his anxiety for the chaotic nature of society in his Anglo-Saxon England. In this case, the root of this problem is the Danes, for it is they who could provide such a slave

⁷² Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 391-4.

⁷³ Patrick Wormald, “Holiness of Society,” 206.

⁷⁴ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 58-9: “If a slave should run away from a lord and from Christianity and become a Viking, and after that it occurs that a hostile conflict happens between the thane and the slave, if the slave should completely kill the thane, then he will lie without compensation to all his kin; and, if the thane should completely kill the slave he previously owned, he should pay the compensation for a thane.”

⁷⁵ *Grið* is printed in Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:470-3. §§21-23.1 are of primary importance to this point, as they describe God’s role in raising status. See also Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 394-5.

with this opportunity. The fact that the hypothetical Vikings in Wulfstan's example would certainly not be the same Danes that Edgar allowed to self-govern is not an issue. Akin to how IV Edgar ignores the complexity of the Danelaw's population by referring to its members as "Danes," Wulfstan is not concerned by temporal issues in his 959DE poem.⁷⁶ He notes that Edgar invited "injuring peoples" to England during his reign, for example, but this comment derives from an early-eleventh-century perspective. Wulfstan's text thus depicts Edgar's relations with the Danes as a root of Anglo-Saxon England's later problems; Wulfstan and others were tasked with cleaning up a mess which was partly initiated by Edgar's legal policies.

Material in the *Institutes of Polity* moves this discussion of Wulfstan's concerns about the Danes from the hypothetical to the theoretical. *Polity* is extant in two versions, *I* and *II Polity*. *I Polity* will be considered here, as it dates to the reign of Æthelred when the Vikings were at the forefront of Anglo-Saxon concern, while it seems far more likely that the fuller *II Polity* dates to Cnut's reign.⁷⁷ As pieces of Christian political theory, both versions of *Polity* focus not primarily on the present, but, rather, on what needs to happen in the future in order for an ideal Christian kingdom to come into being. Amidst its discussion concerning the role and responsibilities of a king, *I Polity* notes the following requirements for a theoretically ideal king:

⁷⁶ Wulfstan, in fact, seems to have taken no issue with generalities across his texts. It has been noted, for example, that when it came to his use of *hæpene*, *hæpendom*, and *hæpenscipe*, Wulfstan not only accuses Scandinavians and Classical peoples of being heathens, but also "unworthy Christians"; see Audrey L. Meaney, "'And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe': Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse 'Heathenism,'" in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 461-500, quotation at 462.

⁷⁷ Karl Jost noted that *I Polity* dates to after 1008-10; see Jost, *Polity*, 33. See also Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 22. See also her Table 1 on p. 25, which attempts to list Wulfstan's works in chronological order. She lists *Polity* as a whole in the group labeled "F?" which falls between "E" and "G." These represent the years 1012 x 1014 and 1016 x 1023, respectively. I find this placement inadequate because what she calls "*Polity*" in her table is really two texts which are in many ways separate, though obviously related, works, *I* and *II Polity*. *II Polity* quite likely is not from the same period.

§11. Ðurh cyninges wisdom folc wyrð gesælig, gesund and sigefæst.

§12. And þy sceal wis king christendom and cyndom miclian and mærsian, and a he sceal hæþendom hindrian and hyrwan. . . .

§15. And do, swa him þearf is: clænsige his þeode for Gode and for worulde, gif he Godes miltse gearnian wylle.⁷⁸

Edgar, quite simply, does not fit the description. While it is well known that Edgar was instrumental in the maintenance and improvement of tenth-century Anglo-Saxon Christianity, he did little, from an eleventh-century point of view anyway, to eschew non-Christian practices, and thus, by extension, to “cleanse” Anglo-Saxon England. These requirements in the text are especially important, as *I Polity* goes on to suggest that they are necessary for a king to receive the mercy of God.

While it is unclear whether the 959DE poem was written before or after *I Polity*,⁷⁹ its closing lines seem to be informed by this notion:

Ac God him geunne þet his gode dæda
 swyðran wearðan þonne misdæda
 his sawle to gescyldnesse on langsuman syðe.⁸⁰

The final lines are essentially a prayer for Edgar’s soul, as I find the most literal translation of the text to be:

But let God grant to him that his good deeds

⁷⁸ Jost, *Institutes*, 47, 50: “§11. Through the wisdom of a king the people become happy [or, perhaps, “blessed”] and victorious. §12. Therefore a wise king must glorify and extend Christendom and kingdom, and he must always repress and condemn heathendom. . . . §15. And do what is necessary for him; he should cleanse his nation for God and for world, if he wishes to earn the mercy of God.”

⁷⁹ Pons-Sanz lists Wulfstan’s *Chronicle* passages and *Polity* in the same period, with the *Chronicle* passages earlier than the latter text, though a precise relative dating of these texts is currently not known. See Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25.

⁸⁰ See note 12 for the citation of this passage.

be greater than the misdeeds,
 in protection of his soul on the long journey.

The crux for the meaning of these final lines is how one translates “geunne,” and it has been translated in this passage in a variety of ways. According to Alistair Campbell, “unne” is a subjunctive imperative.⁸¹ In other words, it is a jussive subjunctive, and should be seen and translated as such in the 959DE poem. If the poem is translated in this way and one approaches the text using *I Polity* as contextual evidence, the true nature of Edgar’s policies towards the Danes from Wulfstan’s eleventh-century perspective becomes clear: the severity of this “ane misdæda” is enough to pitch it into competition with all that he did right—and indeed, most of the poem concerns itself generally with Edgar’s many accomplishments and successes—in a battle for the fate of his soul. It also places Edgar outside the category of the ideal king that Wulfstan describes in *Polity*.

Wulfstan’s writing of the 959DE *Chronicle* poem is itself also important for what it says about the archbishop’s view of Edgar’s policies. As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Wulfstan’s *Chronicle* passages are really interpolations; they were written in the eleventh century but were placed at the appropriate annals in the exemplars for the D and E versions of the *Chronicle*. Also mentioned, there is nothing which explicitly marks that these passages are Wulfstan’s other than that they are written in his recognizable style.⁸² This anonymity was very much intentional. While anonymity is a hallmark of much of Old English literature, Bredehoft has suggested that Wulfstan intentionally left any explicit reference to himself out of the *Chronicle* poems in order to divert attention away from him and to the subjects of the texts:

⁸¹ A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), §767.

⁸² This is discussed in Jost, “Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik,” 105-18.

Anonymous presentation, in this case, is once again a textual strategy. Indeed, it seems likely that the context of these poems within the *Chronicle* would have actively discouraged Wulfstan from attaching his name to them, as doing so would certainly have pinpointed his own authorial positioning in ways that would certainly have shaped the poems' interpretation. . . . But the poems' anonymous presentation in tenth-century annals implies that Wulfstan did not wish them to be read as eleventh-century compositions, but rather as works more or less contemporaneous with Edgar's reign.⁸³

In other words, these poems are another example of the archbishop's interaction with Anglo-Saxon history. He does not invent history this time as he did with the Laws of Edward and Guthrum, however, nor does he say anything in the texts which is clearly untrue, though there is perhaps some exaggeration at work in them. Rather than invention, his *Chronicle* poems are a manipulation of history. Through masking his poems as those of some tenth-century writer(s), Wulfstan effectively goes back in time in order to offer a more or less "contemporary" reaction to the reigns of Edgar and his son Edward. Essentially, this made it possible for Wulfstan to qualify the general atmosphere of praise for Edgar during his own lifetime by fabricating a past complaint about the king. Edgar had become something of a hero, not so undeservedly, to many writers who published texts following his death, and Wulfstan's 959DE poem serves as a reminder that he was not a perfect king. In fact, the poem, with its mention of the "evil foreign customs" and "injuring peoples," closely approaches blaming Edgar for the early-eleventh-century struggles against invading Danes.

⁸³ Bredehoft, *Authors*, 34-5.

At the risk of repetition, it needs to be said that the content of the lines of criticism in the text reveal why Wulfstan wanted to send this sentiment out into the literate Anglo-Saxon world. Again, it is the Danes—more specifically, Edgar’s leniency and cooperation with them. Recently, however, Jayakumar has challenged what he calls the “traditional view” of IV Edgar; that is, that in the code “many concessions are made to the Danelaw.”⁸⁴ While much of his opposition to this typical reading of the code is initially in response to the failures of Lund’s controversial 1976 argument, he moves beyond those claims to suggest that IV Edgar is not actually unique in its policies towards the Danes.⁸⁵ Jayakumar’s evidence for this preexisting royal attitude is II Edmund 5, which he connects with IV Edgar 16, though he does not quote II Edmund directly:

Eac ic ðancie Gode 7 eow eallum, ðe me fylston, ðæs friðes ðe we nu habbað æt ðam ðyfðam; ðonne gelyfe ic to eow, ðæt ge willan fylstan to ðyssum swa micle bet, swa us is eallum mare ðearf ðæt hit gehealden sy.⁸⁶

Similar language is, indeed, later used in IV Edgar:⁸⁷

Ic beo eow swyðe hold hlaford þa hwyle þe me lif gelæst, 7 eow eallum swyðe bliðe eom, for ði þe ge swa georne ymbe friðe syndon.⁸⁸

Aside from the language connection, however, I do not see how II Edmund indicates that “Edgar simply seems to have been permitting the continuance of certain customs (mainly involving tithe and theft) in which the Danelaw had always had a certain amount of

⁸⁴ Jayakumar, “Foreign Policies,” 21.

⁸⁵ Jayakumar, “Foreign Policies,” 22-3.

⁸⁶ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 10: “Also, I thank God and all of you, who have given aid to me, for the peace which we now have from thefts; thus I trust you, that you will give support to this, so much the better as for us it is all the more necessary that it be maintained.”

⁸⁷ Jayakumar, “Foreign Policies,” 22-3. This is also pointed out in Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 311.

⁸⁸ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 38: “I will be a very gracious lord to you for the time that my life lasts, and I am very happy with you all, since you are so eager about peace.”

latitude.”⁸⁹ It is true, as Jayakumar points out,⁹⁰ that it is noted in IV Edgar 2*a* that the king claims the same royal rights as Edmund did in all of the areas in which he rules, but there is not a lot of evidence to say what these specific rights actually were. Most probable is that this was Edgar’s way of endorsing the codes issued by Edmund as a whole. This kind of thing had been done before, most famously by Alfred, who tacked Ine’s code onto his own, despite the fact that Ine’s laws contradicted his own in some areas.⁹¹ If this is the case, then it becomes apparent that Jayakumar’s interpretation of the evidence is lacking, for there is nothing in any of Edmund’s codes (I-III) which deal specifically with the Danes in England.

Turning to Wulfstan, Jayakumar notes that “*Wulfstan would have balked at very little that he saw in IV Ed.*”⁹² His argument here needs to be considered, as I have suggested above that Wulfstan certainly would have taken and did take issue with Edgar’s fourth code in the 959DE poem. In a brief discussion of the “Law of Edward and Guthrum” Jayakumar takes as evidence for this statement both that the text ascribes differing punishments to English and Danish offenders and its prologue, in which he claims “Wulfstan is anxious to give the impression that this fundamental difference [i.e. the difference between English and Danish law] stemmed from long-established custom.”⁹³ “Edward and Guthrum” does indeed give differing punishments for English and Danish offenders: the English pay *wite*, while the Danes pay *lahslit*.⁹⁴ This does not mean that it is akin to IV Edgar, however. In Edgar’s fourth code the Danes are subject to

⁸⁹ Jayakumar, ““Foreign Policies,”” 23.

⁹⁰ Jayakumar, ““Foreign Policies,”” 23.

⁹¹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 267-9.

⁹² Jayakumar, ““Foreign Policies,”” 24, emphasis in original.

⁹³ Jayakumar, ““Foreign Policies,”” 23-4.

⁹⁴ It is worth noting here that Wulfstan apparently introduced this word to Old English.

different punishments that they are permitted to select themselves, whereas in Wulfstan's forgery all of the alternative punishments for the Danes are prescribed by the English of Alfred's and Edward's time, ventriloquized by Wulfstan. Moreover, when specific monetary amounts are named in "Edward and Guthrum," the Danes are expected to pay more.⁹⁵ The approaches of these respective texts are fundamentally different. IV Edgar is defined by cooperation, including concession, while the emphasis of "Edward and Guthrum" is religious regulation, including punishment. "Edward and Guthrum" actually strengthens the original "Alfred and Guthrum" by placing the English firmly in the position of power over the Danes in England. It should not be seen as a text similar to IV Edgar.

While the beginning of "Edward and Guthrum" suggests to Jayakumar that the acknowledgement of the differences between English and Danish law had long been recognized and accepted, this does not seem to be precisely the case when the text as a whole is considered. Jayakumar's assertion might, in fact, partially describe Wulfstan's aims for the preface, however. The ascribed differing fines in "Edward and Guthrum" which I have just mentioned suggest that the archbishop invoked this sense of tradition for the purpose of validating punishing Danish offenders more severely than English ones rather than to signal an established custom of cooperation or mutual acceptance. This supposed tradition in this fabricated document, then, becomes a tool for Wulfstan, as it shows that the English were in a position of authority over the Danes in the wake of Alfred's reign and into the reign of his son, Edward.

⁹⁵ Attenborough, *Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, 202.

An additional piece of Jayakumar's evidence can be rather easily dispensed with. He cites the text *Norðleoda laga* as evidence to note that "Wulfstan similarly distinguishes between the wergelds in place between different classes of people in the north of England."⁹⁶ This is not totally accurate. The beginning of the text does, in fact, note wergilds for ranks of those in the north; indeed the rubric in CCCC 201 calls the text "NORÐ LEODA LAGA,"⁹⁷ but most of this opening section of the work is not actually from the pen of Wulfstan.⁹⁸ The only part of sections 1-5 that can be ascribed to the archbishop is section 5, which establishes that a thane and a priest have the same wergeld.⁹⁹ Wulfstan's interest in the initial portion of this text is not, then, specifically the value of varying ranks in the north, but rather in using the code to establish a precedent for the monetary equality of thane and priest. Such a reading is supported by the version of the text in the *Textus Roffensis*, which further indicates that Wulfstan's point in engaging with and adding to this short text was not necessarily to meditate on northern gelds but rather to use the text as a foundation from which to consider the proper ordering of society. While clearly still a version of the same text, this manuscript witness shows clear signs of revision. This version omits wording that fixes its concerns on gelds of the north. The beginning of the text, for example, changes from "Norðleoda cynges gild is XXX þusend þrymsa" to "Cyninges wergild is inne mid Englum on folcricht XXX þusend þrymsa."¹⁰⁰ The rubric is also changed in the *Textus Roffensis* from the geographically

⁹⁶ Jayakumar, "Foreign Policies," 23.

⁹⁷ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201, fol. 102r. See also Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:458.

⁹⁸ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 393. This was previously pointed out in an important article by Bethurum; see Dorothy Bethurum, "Six Anonymous Old English Codes," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 49 (1950): 449-63, at 459: "Norðleoda laga has two parts, sections 1-6 and 7-12. The first part is an older code stating the wergeld of different ranks in Northumbria."

⁹⁹ Pointed out by Wormald, this is a slight revision of Bethurum's argument on the authorship of the first and second half of the text; see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 393. See also his n. 588 on this page.

¹⁰⁰ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:458.

specific version in CCCC 201 to the more general “Be Wergylde.”¹⁰¹ Thus, not only was Wulfstan not the author of the portion of *Norðleoda laga* which discusses northern wergelds, his revision of the text shows that this was not what caught his attention in the first place. Judging by his addition in section 5, his interest was rooted in the text’s ordering of society rather than its original northern focus, and his additions to the original, and then his wholesale revision of the document, suggest that it was a prelude to the *Institutes of Polity*.

One final aspect of Jayakumar’s argument needs to be discussed before moving on: that Wulfstan recognized the “legal distinctiveness of the Danelaw.”¹⁰² While he notes that there are further examples which point in this direction, and it is not clear what these are, Jayakumar zeroes in on VI Æthelred 37 because of its apparent endorsement of allowing the Danes to determine punishment for their own.¹⁰³

7 gyf hwa ymbe cyninges feorh syrwe, sy he his feores scyldig 7 ealles þæs þe he age, gif hit him ongesoþod weorðe; 7 gif he hine ladian wille 7 mage, do þæt be þam deopestan aðe oþþe mid þryfealdan ordale on Ængla lage, 7 on Dena laga be þam þe heora lagu sy.¹⁰⁴

Initially, this passage appears to be good evidence for Jayakumar’s claim—it does, after all, allow the Danes to determine their own punishment for this particular crime. It also

¹⁰¹ See also Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:458.

¹⁰² Jayakumar, “Foreign Policies,” 23.

¹⁰³ Jayakumar, “Foreign Policies,” 24.

¹⁰⁴ I have chosen to quote the entire passage, whereas Jayakumar opts to quote only the applicable part of the text in translation. For the text see Robertson, *Laws of the English Kings*, 102: “And if someone conspires about the king’s life, then he shall give up his life and all that he owns, if it is proved against him; and if he wishes and is able to clear himself, he should do that by the most profound oath or with a threefold ordeal under English law, and under Danish law by that which be their law.”

seems likely that this code was informed by IV Edgar 12 and 13, quoted above, which offer similar concessions to the Danes.

While I have no doubt that this code came from the pen of Wulfstan, the date and purpose of the text call into question Jayakumar's assertion that VI Æthelred is in essential agreement with IV Edgar when it comes to English policy concerning the Danes. VI Æthelred has long been a problematic text for scholars of Wulfstan and Anglo-Saxon law, and both the date and the purpose of this text have been debated for some time. Felix Liebermann, for example, argued that both V and VI Æthelred are variants of the decisions made at the same meeting of the *witan* at Enham in 1008.¹⁰⁵ Many years later Whitelock reconsidered this view and decided that V and VI Æthelred were probably from different meetings—V being the result of an earlier assembly, while VI could date as late as 1011.¹⁰⁶ Jost countered in 1950 by returning to Liebermann's thesis, and by positing that VI Æthelred is from a recension not meant for circulation, but, rather, for personal use.¹⁰⁷ Kenneth Sisam followed with the suggestion that V Æthelred is closest to the original text, while the Latin (L) and Old English versions of VI Æthelred were authorized variations for the higher and lower religious in Wulfstan's northern diocese, respectively.¹⁰⁸ Sisam's interpretation of the evidence found favor with Whitelock, who repeated it in two later publications.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 3:167.

¹⁰⁶ Dorothy Whitelock, "Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut," *English Historical Review* 63 (1948): 433-52, at 433-4, n. 3.

¹⁰⁷ Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23 (Bern: Francke, 1950), 43.

¹⁰⁸ Kenneth Sisam, "The Relationship of Æthelred's Codes V and VI," in *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*, 278-87.

¹⁰⁹ See Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 442; and Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 341-3.

More recent scholarship has cast some doubt on these studies. In fact, it seems probable that VI Æthelred never actually existed as a lawcode in its own right, but, rather, was part of Wulfstan's writing process which ultimately produced Cnut's 1018 code. Though he does not argue such a possibility, A. G. Kennedy, for example, includes in the introduction to his edition of 1018 Cnut a chart which clearly shows the text's indebtedness to VI Æthelred.¹¹⁰ Wormald, on the other hand, has explicitly suggested that the VI Æthelred texts are not what scholars have traditionally assumed them to be but are, rather, drafts made by Wulfstan while preparing the 1018 legislation.¹¹¹ Much of his evidence for this claim lies in the existence of the Latin version of VI Æthelred and its inconsistencies with the Old English text. One of the prime differences, Wormald notes, occurs at the end of the Latin VI code:

At the end came the most important clause wherein 'Archbishop [Wulfstan] of York', speaking in the first person, says that he has written down 'what King [Æthelred] decreed and what magnates promised faithfully to observe'; 'N' was entered in place of the king's and archbishop's, and it was Wulfstan's hand that filled in the blanks. The Old English 'VI Æthelred' had none of this.¹¹²

Moreover, the Latin VI code does not have the same amount of material as the Old English version on certain matters, such as "on heathen usage, on appropriately merciful punishments, on the prohibited degrees of marriage and on fidelity to a single wife, on

¹¹⁰ A. G. Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," *Anglo-Saxon England* 11 (1983): 57-81, at 59. See also the similar, condensed, table published earlier in Whitelock, "Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut," 434-5.

¹¹¹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 334. See also his earlier study, Patrick Wormald, "Æthelred the Lawmaker," in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. David Hill, BAR British Series 59 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1978), 47-80.

¹¹² Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 334. See also his n. 330 on the same page, where he points out the blank after *rex* in §40 of the code. These passages discussed by Wormald can be seen in Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:257.

what was to be eschewed during feasts and fasts, and on the improvement of the peace and standardization of coins, weights, and measures”—all of which end up later in Cnut’s codes authored by Wulfstan.¹¹³ It appears, then, that the Latin VI code was the first of the versions written, and that the Old English VI Æthelred was adapted from it. This fits well with what is known of Wulfstan’s writing process when it came to writing homilies.

Wormald notes that some of Wulfstan’s Latin homilies can be seen as “Latin arrangements of the matter intended for vernacular compositions” which include Wulfstan’s sources, just as the Latin VI Æthelred text does.¹¹⁴ That Wulfstan entered his and Æthelred’s names into the Latin version is not necessarily problematic to this conclusion. It is possible that originally Wulfstan did intend for the code to be issued under Æthelred, but that this plan was forced to change once Cnut took the throne. The presence of Æthelred’s name in the text, then, is either a remnant of the first purpose for the draft or the archbishop’s note on the original impetus for the code. That the Old English version lacks any mention of Æthelred then makes good sense—the writing of the code was now in its second draft, after the Danish conquest. Also possible is a variation on the second option. The VI texts are indebted in some ways to Wulfstan’s V Æthelred, and the presence of the king’s name in the Latin copy of VI is simply Wulfstan’s way of referring to what he wrote for that king and that he made use of while in the midst of devising a code for Cnut. Of additional note regarding this possibility is the beginning of the Latin version, which notes that Æthelred held the council that met at

¹¹³ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 334; see also his n. 332, which collates the similarities between the Old English VI Æthelred and Cnut’s codes.

¹¹⁴ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 335. See, for example, the relationship between Bethurum Ia and Bethurum I. This and other examples are mentioned in Wormald’s n. 334.

Enham on Pentecost.¹¹⁵ This also functions as an acknowledgement in the Latin draft of Wulfstan's source—a note that would have been out of place in the archbishop's subsequent draft, the Old English VI Æthelred, since that text was the second stepping stone to his legislation for Cnut.

By his own admission, Wormald's suggestion that the VI Æthelred texts are actually Wulfstan's drafts does not clear up all of the mystery surrounding these documents,¹¹⁶ though his conclusion about them is the most viable. Some portions of the Old English version of VI Æthelred brought up by Kennedy need to be addressed in light of Wormald's argument, however, as they form the best evidence against the point that the texts are prelims to Cnut's codes. That 1018 Cnut does not include the portions of VI Æthelred which discuss military and naval issues suggests to Kennedy that this latter code was written "with the Viking threat in mind."¹¹⁷ These items are found in VI Æthelred 33-5.¹¹⁸ §33 notes that it is prudent (*wærlīc*) to ready the warships every year after Easter, §34 discusses the punishments for damaging or destroying a warship, and §35 says that those who desert an army commanded by the king may lose their property. They certainly could have been penned under Æthelred with the Vikings in mind, but they could have just as easily been drafted for Cnut. One must remember that once the fighting was done, Cnut's ascension to the English throne was not a seamless one. For example, Cnut had his share of enemies and those he considered to be threats in England. The *Chronicle* notes that Cnut was not at all shy about banishing or killing potential

¹¹⁵ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:247.

¹¹⁶ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 335.

¹¹⁷ Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," 67.

¹¹⁸ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 100-2.

trouble-makers soon after his ascension.¹¹⁹ Moreover, Cnut's 1020 decree reveals that the potential for additional attack from outside England still existed—the king made sure to assure his people in the proclamation that he had taken action while in Denmark to prevent them.¹²⁰ The sections of the code which deal with martial matters could very well have been intended to face both internal and external threats in the early years of Cnut's reign.

Because it is rather likely the Old English VI Æthelred was neither a code written for King Æthelred nor ever an official piece of legislation, I am unconvinced by Jayakumar's claim that the text shows that Wulfstan would not have been concerned with the concessions present in IV Edgar. Additionally, it should be pointed out that while VI Æthelred does permit those in the Danelaw to choose what punishment should befall one who plots against the king, it does not do so in the same first-person and practically paternal way IV Edgar grants the Danelaw privileges. Moreover, in the official code that ends up the product of VI Æthelred, 1018 Cnut, the language and breadth of the portion concerning the Danelaw are both stronger than they were in draft form: "And se ðe [on] denelaga . rihte laga wirde . gilde he lahslite."¹²¹ There is no longer the implication, as there was in VI Æthelred 37, that those in the Danelaw are subject to their own laws (*heora lagu*).¹²² The lawcode defines itself as "just law" (*rihte laga*) in this portion of the

¹¹⁹ See, for example, *Chronicle* D 1017.

¹²⁰ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 140.

¹²¹ Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," 79: "And he who violates just law in the Danelaw, he shall pay *lahslit*."

¹²² It must be noted, however, that similar language reappears in II Cn 62 concerning the punishment for breaking into another's house (*hamsocne*). In *Engla lage* the fine is £5, but the following is said concerning the fine in the Danelaw: "7 on Dena lage swa hit ær stod" ("And in the Danelaw [the amount] earlier established"). The very existence of this clause in the code is odd, since this material had already been covered in II Cn 12-15. The penalty for attacks on another's home (the crime is listed in II Cn 12) is said in II Cn 13 to be a loss of one's property in Wessex, which II Cn 15 suggests also applies to the Danelaw, as the same crimes are listed in this clause with words synonymous with those used in II Cn 12 in some cases

text, and it applies to the Danelaw as well as to the rest of the kingdom: those in the Danelaw who break it are to pay *lahslit* as penalty. While the law covers all of Anglo-Saxon England, textual emphasis is seemingly on punishments for crimes committed in certain areas. 1018 Cnut 26.4 notes that if a violation takes place *on engla lage* (literally “in/under English law,” but more likely something like “in English jurisdiction”), then an offender might end up paying more if his/her crime is of concern to more than one class of high-ranking officials.¹²³ This distinction in all likelihood refers to Cnut’s realm outside of the Danelaw, since the following portion of the code (1018 Cn 27) notes that those in the Danelaw are to pay *lahslit*, though to what specific area outside the Danelaw *Engla lage* refers is unclear in the text itself. This section of 1018 Cnut does not mean, however, that the legal regulations were any different, since there is no explicit mention in the 1018 code of an area in which the law was to be enforced in a different way. It is highly likely that the penalties, including the obligation to pay each of those who were affected by the crime, were the very same in the Danelaw given that the penalty of *lahslit* comes in the very next section of the code and since the fines mentioned in 1018 Cnut 26 and its sub-clauses are surely intended to distribute down and apply to this section of the code as well. The ultimate point here is that one should not read too much into what seem like omissions in this code. By listing penalties only once, gratuitous repetition was avoided, parchment was saved, and comprehensiveness was preserved. Therefore, Cnut’s 1018 code is in its essentials “national” law, applicable anywhere Cnut wielded power, including the Danelaw. That the term *lahslit* is used when the Danelaw is mentioned in

(II Cn 12’s *forstal*, “assault,” “fine for assault,” becomes II Cn 15’s *fihtwite* “fine for fighting,” for example), while in others, as in the case of an attack on another’s home, the same word, here, *hamsocne*, is used. This is perhaps a case of *Engla lage* meaning something other than Wessex, which II Cn 12 concerns.
¹²³ Kennedy, “Cnut’s Law Code of 1018,” 79.

the code is a non-issue, for it has long been recognized that the term is the Anglo-Scandinavian equivalent of *wite* (“punishment,” “fine”).¹²⁴ The word is used in relation to the Danes and/or the Danelaw only, and while it defines the law for a specific group, it certainly does not alter the force of the legislation in any way. The presence of this portion of the 1018 Cnut code thus cleanses the Old English VI Æthelred of its weak language when discussing the Danelaw, and, in its place, inserts a clause which essentially makes it known that Cnut’s law wields power over all of England, legislation to which all are subject.

In sum, VI Æthelred is part of Wulfstan’s writing process that ultimately produced 1018 Cnut, and which also eventually informed parts of I-II Cnut. It did not exist as official legislation, and in all likelihood it was never meant to. That it contains a clause which grants those in the Danelaw the choice of punishment for those who plot against the king’s life is, indeed, something of a surprise in light of Wulfstan’s general anxieties about the Danes as well as his 959DE poem, but it is, in the end, a discarded passage in a draft of a lawcode. Thus, Jayakumar’s claim that VI Æthelred 37 provides evidence that Wulfstan saw the Danelaw as a distinct legal entity does not hold water.

The situation muddies, though does not become impenetrable, when one moves to examine Wulfstan’s use of Edgar’s lawcodes. While I have offered evidence why Wulfstan would not have approved of Edgar’s policies towards the Danes, this material should not be interpreted to mean that Wulfstan considered Edgar a bad or unsuitable king—rather, he did not live up to the ideal described in *I Polity* in some key ways. Probably no king would, in fact. Furthermore, one must remember that most of the

¹²⁴ This has most recently been discussed in Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 69-70.

959DE poem is quite panegyric. For example, it includes the claim that Edgar improved the Anglo-Saxons' peace more than any king in memory—rather high praise from a man familiar with Alfredian history. A discussion of Wulfstan and King Edgar should not focus on whether the former approved or disapproved of the latter wholesale—the reality is that Wulfstan's view of this previous Anglo-Saxon king is complicated, and, thus, is frustratingly difficult to categorize.

If the 959DE poem indicates that Wulfstan thought of Edgar as a generally good king who nevertheless made some serious errors in policy and in the selection of those to work and fight for him, Wulfstan's use of Edgar's lawcodes in the legal texts he wrote for Æthelred and Cnut, as well as throughout the rest of his body of works, shows that the archbishop recognized the cultural value of Edgar and his reign. In these texts, this use of Edgar's laws manifests itself in a couple of ways. Firstly, Wulfstan alludes—at times this is strong enough to be deemed a reference or citation—to Edgar's legislation in his texts by mentioning Edgar and/or his laws. Secondly, and far more frequently, Wulfstan silently borrows clauses from Edgar's codes for insertion into his own works.

Edgar is explicitly mentioned in the following lawcodes associated with Wulfstan: VIII Æthelred, dated to 1014 in its Old English copy,¹²⁵ 1018 Cnut, and Cnut's 1020 decree.¹²⁶ In the process of discussing these, many other Wulfstan texts which name Edgar will be discussed as well because use Edgar's lawcodes in the same way. Those which are not mentioned alongside the legal codes will be examined before moving on to the archbishop's silent borrowings from Edgar's codes.

¹²⁵ The date is recorded in the rubric on fol. 93r of the D copy of the lawcode, which is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201.

¹²⁶ Hereafter "1020 Cnut."

Two of the three references to Edgar in VIII Æthelred strongly suggest that Wulfstan found it worthwhile to mention Edgar by name not because his reign was one associated with peace or since he helped to spur monastic reform, but, rather, for a far more practical purpose: Edgar had strong laws concerning the necessity of tithes and dues. This is a major concern of Wulfstan not only in his lawcodes (as I briefly discussed in the previous chapter), but also in his other writings, as will be seen. The parts of the code in question are the following:

VIII Atr 7

7. And wite Cristenra manna gehwilc, þæt he his Drihtene his teoþunge, a swa seo sulh þone teoðan æcere gegá, rihtlice gelæste be Godes miltse 7 be þam fullan wite þe Eadgar cyningc gelagode.¹²⁷

VIII Atr 43

43. Ac uton don swa us þea[r]f is: uton niman us to bisnan þæt ærran worldwitan to ræde geræddon, Æþelstan 7 Eadmund 7 Eadgar þe nihst wæs, hu hi God weorðodon 7 Godes lagu heoldan 7 Godes gafel læston, þa hwile þe hi leofodon.¹²⁸

VIII Æthelred 8 goes on to describe the penalty referenced by clause 7, and it is a severe one. The code notes that in response to one's failure to furnish tithes, secular and religious officials would seize them "without consent" (*niman unþances*). Punishment was still needed, however—the rest of the possessions, save a tenth which the offender was allowed to keep, would also be taken and divided up, with one half going to a secular authority and the other to the bishop.¹²⁹ It is not difficult to decipher which of Edgar's specific codes Wulfstan refers to, here, as VIII Æthelred 8, this description of the punishment, is almost a verbatim copy of II Edgar 3.1.¹³⁰ Moreover, the language in the

¹²⁷ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 120: "And the punishment of each Christian man, so that he shall rightly render his tithe to his Lord—always the tenth of a plowed field—because of God's mercy, is the full punishment which King Edgar established by law."

¹²⁸ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 128: "But let us do as is necessary for us: let us take for an example what former secular councilors, Æthelstan, Edmund and Edgar, who came last, decreed at council: how they honored God, held God's law, and rendered God's tribute the time that they lived."

¹²⁹ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 120.

¹³⁰ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 20-2.

timeline for the paying of dues in VIII Æthelred 9-12 is clearly informed by II Edgar.¹³¹ VIII Æthelred 43 is also in all likelihood a reference to the regulations on tithing and dues discussed in II Edgar, and, due to its more generic language, perhaps also IV Edgar 1.4-1.7, which further notes the necessity and universality of paying God's dues.¹³² The additional references to Æthelstan and Edmund both emphasize the long-standing responsibility to collect tithes and signal Wulfstan's indebtedness to their codes in his own legislation.

Though there is often not a solid generic boundary between many of Wulfstan's lawcodes and some of his other writings, especially his homilies, connecting Edgar with tithing forms a substantial portion of the archbishop's explicit references to the king when this occurs in the rest of his corpus, especially when one less than explicit, but still clearly about Edgar, is added for consideration. These are found in the following texts:

Napier 50	Napier 61	Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (ll. 53-106)
And þæt gehwīlc man his teoðunge rihtlice gelæste be godes miltse and be þæs cynges and be ealles cristenes folces and be þære steore, þe Eadgar gelagode. ¹³³	and arise seo æcerteoðung a, be ðam þe seo sulh þone teoðan æcer ær geeode, be godes miltse and be ðæs cynges and be ealles cristenes folces and be ðære steore, þe Eadgar cyng gelagode. ¹³⁴	ðonne is þærtoeacan gyt to understandenne, þæt ure ylðran hwilum ær gode behetan, ðæt is sulhælmessan and rompenegas and cyricsceattas and leohtgescota, and se, ðe þæt deð, þæt ic ymbe spece, he deð him sylfum mycle ðearf. ¹³⁵

¹³¹ See especially II Edg 3-4.

¹³² Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 30-2.

¹³³ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 266-74, at 272: "And that each man rightly render his tithe because of God's mercy and because of the king and because of all Christian people and because of the regulation which Edgar established by law."

¹³⁴ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 310-11, at 310: "and the field-tithe always comes from the tenth of a field, already plowed, because of God's mercy and because of the king and because of all Christian people and because of the regulation which King Edgar established by law."

¹³⁵ The text is quoted from Napier, *Wulfstan*, 112-15, at 113. See also Bethurum, *Homilies*, 228-32, at 229-30. "There is yet more to understand, what our ancestors promised to God in earlier times; that is plough-

Napier 50 and 61¹³⁶ are clearly related closely to one another, despite some differences, while Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (ll. 53-106)¹³⁷ is the product of a slightly removed line. Conveniently, however, these paths can be traced directly to the codes from VIII Æthelred, quoted above. Napier 50 and 61 are connected with VIII Æthelred 7 in some obvious ways, while VIII Æthelred 7 itself, as noted above, relates to a section of the code which harkens back to II Edgar. For its part, Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (ll. 53-106) is, on the surface, less forthcoming in its allusion to “our elders,” but VIII Æthelred 43 points to Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar as the most likely candidates referenced by this homily.

VIII Æthelred 7, Napier 50, and Napier 61 share much of their wording, though they also include important variations: VIII Æthelred 7 mentions “punishment” (*wite*), while Napier 50 and 61 both prefer “regulation” (*steore*), though both texts do mention punishments in their following lines. Additionally, Napier 50 and Napier 61 add the king and Christian people to VIII Æthelred 7’s list of reasons for the necessity of tithes.¹³⁸

These differences can be explained by considering the genre and purpose of each of these texts. Since it is a lawcode, Wulfstan’s choice in VIII Æthelred to retain II Edgar’s *wite* is

alms and Rome pennies and church dues for the lighting of churches, and he who performs what I speak about, he does himself a great service.”

¹³⁶ Napier 50, which is rather similar in parts to 1018 Cn, dates from about the same time; see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 335 and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 34. Earlier, Bethurum had dated the text to “after 1020”; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 40. Napier 61 probably dates even closer to the end of Wulfstan’s career, as it, like the other Wulfstan homilies in the manuscript, was probably written specifically for inclusion in the York Gospels; see Keynes, “Additions,” 92.

¹³⁷ Wormald dates this text to 1005-06; see Wormald, “Archbishop Wulfstan,” 26. Pons-Sanz, on the other hand, prefers 1012-14; see Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25.

¹³⁸ It may seem that there are more differences than there really are among these documents, but this is simply due to what I have quoted here. For example, one might note that VIII Æthelred 7 and Napier 61/Bethurum XIII (ll. 53-106) overtly concern plough-alms (*sulh þone teoðan æcere gega* and *æcerteodung*, respectively), while Napier 50 discusses tithing in more general terms. In reality, all three texts discuss alms and dues in rather similar ways, just not fully in the portions quoted.

not surprising, as this is exactly the kind of document where one would expect mention of punishment for failing to render tithes. Furthermore, an acknowledgement of the authority and importance of Edgar's code is also probably at work, here, as the preservation of II Edgar's language when it comes to the consequences of not tithing creates a direct link between Wulfstan's and Edgar's codes. The choice to substitute *wite* with *steore* in Napier 50 and 61 is due to these texts being homilies, though they have not always been classified as such.¹³⁹

The opening of Napier 50 indicates that it had a royal audience in Cnut, but also that its message was intended to be received more widely: “[w]e secgað urum cynehlaforde and eallum folce cyðan wyllað.”¹⁴⁰ Over its course the text goes on to address those in other positions—both religious and lay—in the style of *Polity*, a principal source for the homily. Interestingly, and unlike *Polity*, the body of the homily says little about the average Anglo-Saxon laity, which suggests that its primary audience consisted of those of higher standing.¹⁴¹ Concerning its other sources, the text itself is a composite homily that uses material from a variety of Wulfstan's previous works. This is not to say, however, that it was composed without care or skill.¹⁴²

The homily's contents vary significantly, though its overarching concern is the importance of order and proper behavior. The reference to Edgar's regulation on tithes

¹³⁹ For example, Napier 50 and 61 were excluded from Bethurum's edition of Wulfstan's homilies. Concerning 50, Bethurum simply does not think it is a sermon, while she cites Jost's opinion that 61 contains notes or a pastoral letter; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 39-40. Whitelock is willing to accept 61 as a homily, but not 50; see Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 20 (re. 61) and 21-2 (re. 50). Jonathan Wilcox, however, includes both texts in his list of genuine homilies; see Wilcox, “Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies,” 201. Lionarons likewise accepts both texts as homilies; see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 33 (re. 50) and 35 (re. 61).

¹⁴⁰ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 266: “we announce to our sovereign lord and desire all people to know.”

¹⁴¹ Cf. Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 173.

¹⁴² The homily, its sources, and its composition are discussed in Joyce Tally Lionarons, “Napier Homily L: Wulfstan's Eschatology at the Close of His Career,” in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 413-28.

comes roughly after Wulfstan has catalogued the responsibilities of the various stations of society and before the text's eschatological closing.¹⁴³ This section¹⁴⁴ deals with peace and currency, tithes and dues, holy days and fasts, along with some other religious directives like the rejection of heathendom. It is a portion of the homily that is especially thick with passages which share material with Wulfstan's lawcodes, relatively speaking, that is, in a text littered with these references.¹⁴⁵ This supports Lionarons's suggestion that the homily was drafted for delivery at a meeting of the *witan*.¹⁴⁶ The king and the *witan* form the only plausible audience for a homily dominated by discussion of the responsibilities of various aspects of society and calls for legislative regulation.¹⁴⁷ They were the only people who could actually effect change in any significant way. In the case of tithes, what was apparently needed was enforcement of law that Wulfstan emphasizes had long been current. With the language of the passage which names Edgar, Wulfstan's homily references VIII Æthelred, which is in turn connected to II Edgar. Perhaps coming from the same meeting of the *witan*, 1018 Cnut 1 also claims, in a more general sense,

¹⁴³ It should be noted, however, that it has been shown that this closing is not simply tacked on to the end of the homily by Lionarons, who notes that Wulfstan builds up to this ending; see Lionarons, "Napier Homily L," 419-21, especially.

¹⁴⁴ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 271 (ll. 30-31)-272 (ll. 1-29). Unlike Napier's edition, Andrew Rabin's translation of the homily recognizes that this portion of the text forms its own section; see Rabin, *Political Writings*, 150-2.

¹⁴⁵ These are listed in Rabin's notes; see Rabin, *Political Writings*, 150-2. It should be mentioned, however, that if one considers the material in Napier L in more general terms (for example, tithing and dues as a whole rather than only L's *romfeoh*), then the list of corresponding material from the lawcodes would be exponentially longer in most cases.

¹⁴⁶ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 175.

¹⁴⁷ Though I agree with Lionarons that the homily was intended to be read at a meeting of the *witan*, I cannot agree completely with the rest of her conclusion—that Wulfstan “returned to the writing of his early years to give a last warning to the *witan* about the Last Days that would inevitably arrive.” See Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 175. At the risk of splitting hairs, the homily is not really about the Last Days. Rather, it is in the main on the importance of order and proper behavior. The eschatological conclusion (along with some snippets over the course of the text) emphasizes the need for order and proper behavior. In other words, the Last Days are not the argument of the homily; instead, they are used to drive the main points of the text home, and to precipitate urgency.

that Edgar's laws are to be observed.¹⁴⁸ This last note was repeated two years later in 1020 Cnut 13.¹⁴⁹

Edgar (and Æthelstan and Edmund, to a much lesser degree in VIII Æthelred 43 and Napier 22/Bethurum XIII) thus becomes the keystone in an intertextual narrative which declares the necessity of law and order through effective legislation and its enforcement, and, specifically in this case, the importance and essentiality of the collection of tithes and dues. This is why *steore* is employed in these homilies as well. The term is used in each text to emphasize the regulation and before the punishment for disobedience as a way to encourage enforcement of the existing law. The same can be said of the homilies' inclusion of the king and Christian people among the reasons why such law is important. Enforcement of law is an act of respect to the king, who, through issuing the code in the first place, sanctioned what was written on his behalf as law. To turn to the homilies' inclusion of all Christian people (*ealles cristenes folces*), this group is included because their tithes and dues, whether they go to lighting a church or to Rome, are theoretically intended to benefit them spiritually. The *witan* is thus given two reasons for the importance of enforcing a law that is rooted in Edgar's legislation in addition to VIII Æthelred 7's claim that collecting tithes and dues leads to the receiving of God's mercy.

While most of what has been said also applies to Napier 61, this text very likely had a different audience, and so it should be briefly discussed on its own. Compared to Napier 50, 61 is a rather short document—though it is possible that it was intended to be

¹⁴⁸ Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," 72.

¹⁴⁹ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 142.

read alongside *Be Hæðendome* (Napier 60), which precedes it in the York Gospels.¹⁵⁰ Its inclusion in the York Gospels has led Elaine Treharne to plausibly suggest that this and the other texts by the archbishop were intentionally inserted at the end of the manuscript to provide Wulfstan's "successor, Ælfric Puttoc (d. 1051) with a set of work that is itself a snapshot of major archiepiscopal duties and concerns."¹⁵¹ Her suggestion makes especially good sense regarding Napier 61, as the work is concerned only with the payment of tithes and dues, and therefore does not seem like it could be effectively delivered orally. This could also explain why, though the essentials are present, details concerning these payments do not line up perfectly with Wulfstan's previous writings on the subject.¹⁵² It is also possible, however, that he wrote the text from memory rather than with his earlier comments at hand. Regardless of who the texts at the end of the York Gospels were meant for—and they were surely meant for someone, if not posterity in general, since they are not mere personal notes—it is clear that Napier 61 was drafted to assert the essentiality of tithes and dues, and Wulfstan did so in part using the same tactic seen in Napier 50, the historical appeal to Edgar combined with the importance of the law to the king and Christian people as a whole.

Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (ll. 53-106) is a text fraught with editorial difficulties, which, fortunately, do not cause much trouble for the current discussion. That said, some context is necessary. It should be noted, for example, that the passage cited here is really one part of a longer homily that Bethurum prints as *Sermo ad Populum*, but which Napier printed as discrete entities, numbered 19-26 in his edition. Lionarons endorses the method

¹⁵⁰ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 35; Keynes, "Additions," 94.

¹⁵¹ Elaine Treharne, *Living through the Conquest: The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220*, Oxford Textual Perspectives (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 66.

¹⁵² Keynes, "Additions," 94.

of presenting the text as Napier does, though she adds that two additional versions must be edited as well to account for the discrepancies seen across the five manuscripts in which the work appears.¹⁵³ She prints these other editions in the appendices to her article as a supplement to Napier's edition.¹⁵⁴ Because the passage under examination remains stable across all the editions now printed, my citations will come from Napier since his edition is still widely used to complement Bethurum's. The genre of the work is another complication, as it depends on what manuscript version of the text is under consideration. The manuscript evidence is in favor of the text being either a sermon or a pastoral letter; apparently it was both at various times over the course of its transmission.¹⁵⁵ The different versions of the text have different audiences. Though Lionarons suggests that a wider audience is possible, the pastoral letter version was directed primarily at thanes, according to its opening that appears in Cambridge, Corpus Christ College 201: "Wulfstan arcebisceop greteð freondlice þegnas on ðeode gehadode and læwede."¹⁵⁶ The homily, on the other hand, had a wider audience: "[t]he homily is directed to the people and draws heavily on Wulfstan's catechetical sermons."¹⁵⁷ Lionarons's conclusion regarding the purposes of the differing versions of these texts is quite reasonable: "Wulfstan intended the homily as edifying reading matter for his lay recipients (whether they were literate themselves or had the text read to them) and as an exemplary sermon to be preached to the people for his clerical audience."¹⁵⁸ In other words, while the texts

¹⁵³ Joyce Tally Lionarons, "Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*," *Review of English Studies*, n. s., 55 (2004): 157-82, at 175.

¹⁵⁴ Lionarons, "Textual Identity," 176-82.

¹⁵⁵ Lionarons, "Textual Identity," 168-75.

¹⁵⁶ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 116; and Napier, *Wulfstan*, 108: "Archbishop Wulfstan greets with friendship the thanes in the nation, religious and secular."

¹⁵⁷ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 118.

¹⁵⁸ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 123.

have different audiences and varying forms, at their core they are rather similar in both content and purpose. Each provides its readers and listeners with basic tenets of the faith along with material which notes proper conduct for all Christians.

Wulfstan's allusion to Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar (*ure ylðran*)¹⁵⁹ in Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (53-106) is part of the instruction in the text regarding the actions of good Christians. Unsurprisingly, one aspect of being a good Christian to Wulfstan is the regular payment of Church dues and tithes. That these three kings are not explicitly named—but are certainly implied—in the text is due to the audience of both versions of the work. Though the primary audience of the pastoral letter is not the same as that of the homily, the two audiences share an important feature: each is a group in the lower portion of Anglo-Saxon society. The texts are intended for lesser thanes and the common laity. There is no mention, for example, of people of higher rank like there is in Napier 50 (*eorlan, heretogan, etc.*).¹⁶⁰ I therefore find Bethurum's suggestion that the text may have been written for delivery to the *witan* to be suspect.¹⁶¹ Rather, it was more likely meant to be read by and/or performed to the people at large, as Lionarons has claimed. The naming of previous Anglo-Saxon kings would not have the same effect with this audience as it would have to the *witan* and other high-ranking officials. Many of these people would not have had direct access to written records like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or codified law,

¹⁵⁹ Wulfstan makes a similar appeal in VII Atr 1. This part of the code instructs the Anglo-Saxons to be obedient to the king *sicut antecessores sui* ("just like their ancestors"). Neither Edgar nor tithing/dues are named, however, and so this reference does not fit seamlessly with Napier 50, Napier 61, and Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (53-106). This note about obedience is followed by an additional instruction to defend the realm: *et cum eo pariter defendant regnum suum* ("and with him, together they should defend his kingdom"). It is probable nonetheless that Edgar is among those alluded to, here, along with Æthelstan and Edmund as in VIII Atr 43 and Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (53-106). The note on the defense of the kingdom might also include Alfred in this group. That said, what follows on Napier 22/Bethurum XIII (53-106) can also be applied to this code, which was originally drafted in Old English.

¹⁶⁰ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 267.

¹⁶¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 339.

though in this text and others Wulfstan provides his audience with snippets from the latter. Moreover, whether one accepts Wormald's or Pons-Sanz's dating for the text, the fact remains that much of the Anglo-Saxon population would not remember Edgar's reign first hand, and certainly none could have possibly lived long enough to recall that of his predecessors. This is not to say that the allusion fell on deaf ears completely. During Æthelred's troubled reign, within which both Wormald's and Pons-Sanz's dating of the text fall, it is likely that the peaceful years of previous reigns, especially Edgar's, became part of the inventory of orally-transmitted material. Wulfstan's homily is thus able to have it both ways: some would connect his allusion with specific kings like Edgar, while others would simply recognize that in earlier times things had been better for the kingdom. Connecting these better days with the importance of tithes and dues is an effective way to reinforce their importance, since it implies that there was a correlation between these payments and the stability enjoyed by those who came before. The use of *yldran* ("ancestors," "forefathers," "predecessors") combined with Wulfstan's use of the first person plural pronoun further emphasizes this point by making it personal in addition to a historical allusion. The language forces the audience to take ownership of what Wulfstan casts as fact: that they have failed to live up to the example set by their own ancestors. Some of the audience would have understood the allusion to former kings like Edgar, while others would have taken the point in personal or familial terms.

The final reference to Edgar in VIII Æthelred is actually the second, chronologically speaking, in the lawcode. It is a bit different from those just discussed, though it can be usefully paired with a passage from the *Institutes of Polity*, specifically its second iteration, *II Polity*. Both texts use Edgar's reign as a historical benchmark:

VIII Æthelred 37

Ac on þam gemotan, þeah rædlice wurðan
on namcuðan stowan, æfter Eadgares
lifdagum, Cristes lage wanodan 7
cyninges laga litledon.¹⁶²

II Polity 94-5

Riht is, ðæt gerefan geornlice tylian and
symle heora hlafordan strynan mid rihte.
Ac nu hit is geworden ealles to swyðe,
syððan Eadgar geendode, swa God wolde,
þæt ma is þæra rypera þonne rihtwisra,
and is earmlic ðing, þæt ða syndon
ryperas, þe sceoldan beon hydras cristenes
folces.¹⁶³

On the secular side, Simon Keynes has noted that VIII Æthelred 37 most likely refers to some complaints which were earlier voiced by Wulfstan in V Æthelred 32-32.5.¹⁶⁴ The context of this section of the code suggests some additional concerns, however. Each clause that follows VIII Æthelred 37 until the end of the code is related to it. §37 notes the downward trend, while §38 names an additional symptom of it. §39 notes that improvement is possible, while §§40-42 note crimes and their punishments that are part of the problem. §43 and §44 suggest additional remedies. Thus, to Keynes' list should be added VIII Æthelred 40, which calls for a search for the wicked so that they can be brought to justice. On the religious side, the context of this section of the code is once again enlightening. The following two clauses reveal that apostate priests and monks (§41) and the protection of the excommunicated (§42) are of prime concern. The last part of the code encourages proper behavior, with the implication that acting in the

¹⁶² Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 126: "And in the meetings since Edgar's life, though wisely held in well-known places, the laws of Christ have been neglected and the laws of the king disregarded." I follow Robertson's translation (p. 127) of *wanodan* and *litledon*.

¹⁶³ Jost, *Polity*, 81: "It is right that reeves eagerly labor and always gain for their lord according to what is proper. But now it has come to pass all too greatly since Edgar died, just as God willed, that there are more robbers than righteous people, and it is a miserable thing that they are robbers, those who should be shepherds of Christian people."

¹⁶⁴ Simon Keynes, "Crime and Punishment in the Reign of King Æthelred the Unready," in *People and Places in Northern Europe, 500-1600: Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer*, ed. I. N. Wood and Niels Lund (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991), 67-81, at 74-5.

correct manner will also mitigate the general decline since Edgar's time. §43 contains the instruction discussed above to follow the examples of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar, who loved God, followed his laws and, specifically, paid their tithes and dues, while §44 contains an injunction to honor Christianity, support Æthelred, and to treat one another well. In the most general sense, VIII Æthelred 37 explicitly contrasts its present with the more stable past with its use of *æfter Eadgares lifdagum*—a time when such meetings resulted in healthy respect for law and therefore fostered strength and stability. The clauses which follow provide a foundation upon which Anglo-Saxon England could once more achieve its former status. This is not to say, of course, that this section of VIII Æthelred trumps the rest of the code. Rather, it is a part of the whole—a part which attempts to facilitate change by contrasting the present with the accomplishments of an earlier age.

II Polity 94-5 also contrasts its present with Edgar's time, though this is a different present than what is discussed in VIII Æthelred. *II Polity* dates to Cnut's reign, probably close or up to the end of Wulfstan's life.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, *II Polity*, a piece of political theory, is, generally speaking, of a quite different genre than VIII Æthelred. Therefore, though they invoke Edgar in similar ways, these should not be seen as totally analogous texts. The mention of Edgar is in the section concerning reeves in *II Polity*. This section of the tract is especially fierce in its criticism of Wulfstan's present—close, in fact, to the level found in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.¹⁶⁶ Because of this, it stands a bit

¹⁶⁵ The evidence for this dating will be discussed in my chapter on Cnut and Wulfstan.

¹⁶⁶ In fact, this part of *Polity* is probably connected to the *Sermo Lupi*, specifically the version preserved in E, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, where the phrase *siððan Eadgar geendode* also appears. Though reeves are not mentioned in connection to the phrase in the sermon, the reference to Edgar is made to make the same contrast between the present and the period of Edgar's reign, though in a more general sense. See Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 50n39.

apart from much of the rest of the text, which emphasizes the ideal or theoretical over contemporary conditions. Given Wulfstan's knowledge and use of Edgar's legislation and the lack of other pertinent evidence regarding reeves from Edgar's time, Wulfstan in all likelihood had some specific codes in mind. Reeves are mentioned three times in Edgar's codes, namely II Edgar 3.1, IV Edgar 1.5, and IV Edgar 13.1. Of these three, II Edgar 3.1 is the best candidate, as it was used by Wulfstan in codes for both Æthelred and Cnut.¹⁶⁷ Moreover, II Edgar as a whole was used far more often than IV Edgar by Wulfstan in the legislation he wrote for both kings. That said, IV Edgar 1.5 is rather similar in its scope, and it, too, can also be considered a viable candidate in this discussion. II Edgar 3.1 and IV Edgar 1.5 both discuss the responsibility of reeves to make sure that tithes and dues are paid on time. As should be clear, this is one of Wulfstan's paramount concerns—one that he apparently respected Edgar for due to his strong legislation on the matter. Once again, Edgar is invoked in order to suggest a contrast between former times and *II Polity's* present. The difference, according to Wulfstan, is stark:

Ac hwilum man ceas wislice þa men on þeode folce to hyrdum, þa noldan for
 woruldsceame ne dorstan for Godes ege ænig ðing swician ne strynan on unriht,
 ac stryndad mid rihte. And siððan hit man sohte be þam ealra geornast, þe
 nearwlicast cuðan swician and befcian and mid leasbregdum earmum mannum
 derian and of unbealafullum rapost feoh geræcan.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ VIII Atr 8 and I Cn 8.2, specifically. See table 3.1.

¹⁶⁸ Jost, *Polity*, 82: "but before one chose these men wisely from the nation as shepherds for the people; these men did not want, because of worldly shame, nor did they dare, because of God's anger, to cheat in anything or to acquire with unjust means, instead, they obtained things according to justice. And since then it was sought most eagerly of all by those who know to cheat and to deceive most grievously, and to hurt poor men with frauds, and to seize property from the innocent most rapidly."

Unlike earlier times, Wulfstan claims, reeves in England have become corrupt, as they have allegedly fleeced Anglo-Saxons out of their money and property under the guise, it seems, given the portions from Edgar's codes which inform this passage, of collecting tithes and dues. Edgar's reeves were certainly not perfect—IV Edgar 13.1 suggests that they had the capacity to misbehave—but it is noteworthy that Wulfstan claims that they were compared to the reeves of his own day. The reality of Edgar's reign is not rhetorically useful, however, in a text which attempts to map out the responsibilities of the various ranks of Anglo-Saxon society in order to establish its ideal. This text, like most of the others discussed, emphasizes the good of the past in order to contrast it with the failings of his present in order to suggest not only that there is an ideal reality, but also that that reality is attainable by suggesting that it once existed.

1018 and 1020 Cnut can also be discussed together, as they are related texts. 1018 Cnut was the first lawcode issued in Cnut's reign, and there is no reason to doubt that it was written by Wulfstan or that it was associated with the 1018 meeting at Oxford that is recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, one manuscript of which adds to the note that the English and the Danes came to an agreement with the claim that this agreement was according to Edgar's law.¹⁶⁹ The code contains mostly recycled legal material, which led Kennedy to suggest that it was put together hastily.¹⁷⁰ Wormald adds that the text “represents a provisional statement of the aspects of the previous regime [i.e. Æthelred's] that the archbishop considered fundamental (those, that is to say, which directly affected its relationship with God),” and that the code foreshadows the much fuller I-II Cnut.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ The agreement is mentioned in all versions of the *Chronicle* for 1018. D adds the note on Edgar. See also Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 346.

¹⁷⁰ Kennedy, “Cnut's Law Code of 1018,” 66.

¹⁷¹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 346.

The code, it seems, was drafted to meet the perceived need for legislation which carried Cnut's name, perhaps as part of the process of legitimizing the rule of the invader-turned-king.

1020 Cnut is not so different in its thrust, though Wulfstan's connection with the document, while known, has yet to be ironed out completely. The text is extant only in the York Gospels, a manuscript with well-known Wulfstan connections. Whitelock noted that 1020 Cnut must have been sent by Cnut from Denmark in 1019 or 1020 because it is addressed to Earl Thorkel, whom Cnut asks to mete out justice to wrongdoers. Had Cnut been in England, then Thorkel would not have had jurisdiction over the entire kingdom.¹⁷² Keynes then noted that the latter part of the text (§§14-20) was composed in Wulfstan's style.¹⁷³ The best explanation for this is that Wulfstan added these passages to the existing document written by Cnut or by someone in his circle while he was in Denmark.¹⁷⁴ It remains unclear, however, whether the proclamation as it survives in the York Gospels is the "official" version, Wulfstan's additions and all, or whether these were added to the text specifically for inclusion in the manuscript. To a certain extent this does not matter for the present discussion as, interestingly, the reference to Edgar in the code, as Wulfstanian as it seems, comes just before the section clearly written by Wulfstan. That said, however, the reference to Edgar surely has something to do with Wulfstan influence.

The references to Edgar in these documents can now be discussed:

¹⁷² Whitelock, "Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws," 83-4 and 84n1.

¹⁷³ Keynes, "Additions," 95.

¹⁷⁴ Keynes, "Additions," 95. This opinion of Keynes is informed by Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," 62-4.

1018 Cnut

1. Þonne is þæt ærest þæt witan geræddan
 . þæt hi ofer ealle oðre þingc ænne god
 æfre wurðodon . 7 ænne cristendom
 anrædlice healdon . 7 cnut cyngc . lufian .
 mid rihtan . 7 mid trywðan . 7 eadgares
 lagan . geonlice folgian .¹⁷⁵

1020 Cnut

13. 7 ic wille þæt eal þeodscype, gehadode
 7 læwede, fæstlice Eadgares lage healed
 þe ealle men habbað gecoren 7 to
 gesworen on Oxenforda.¹⁷⁶

The obvious difference between these texts is that 1018 makes no claim of coming directly from the pen of Cnut, while 1020 Cnut does with its use of the first person. Another important difference is that 1018 Cnut is a purely legislative document, while 1020 Cnut is part memorandum and part law. In 1020 Cnut the king makes promises to his subjects to be an amicable ruler—one that is devoted to Christianity, the safety of his people, and, as the legislative part of the non-Wulfstan-authored section of the decree implies, law and order. Wulfstan does his part to emphasize Cnut’s dedication to this last point by adding the rest of the legal material to the text.¹⁷⁷ The most important similarity for this discussion is, of course, that both texts make it a point to connect Cnut with Edgar. Though it was undoubtedly Wulfstan’s move to connect Cnut with Edgar given that Wulfstan had earlier connected Æthelred with Edgar in his earlier lawcodes for that king, the 1018 text suggests that the decision to observe Edgar’s laws was something of a communal decision. The claim of group decision-making is admittedly a convention found in many Anglo-Saxon lawcodes and would not be all that important on its own. That the 1020 text written in Cnut’s voice makes this same move, however, is rather

¹⁷⁵ Kennedy, “Cnut’s Law Code of 1018,” 72: “This is what is first: that the *witan* decreed that, above everything else, they always will honor one God and resolutely hold one Christian faith, and love King Cnut with justice and with truth, and eagerly observe the laws of Edgar.”

¹⁷⁶ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 142: “And I desire that the whole nation, religious and lay, should firmly hold the law of Edgar, which all people have chosen and sworn to at Oxford.”

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Treharne, *Living through Conques: The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220*, Oxford Textual Perspectives (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 26.

significant. It shows that Cnut, himself, recognized the efficacy of the claim to rule according to the legal guidelines set down in Edgar's reign. In other words, in 1020 Cnut, the king apparently included the reference to Edgar through his own volition, an ocean away from Wulfstan.¹⁷⁸

The naming of Edgar in these texts signaled to the Anglo-Saxons that their new Danish king was not interested in radically changing the status quo, but, rather, in maintaining the legislative tradition that he inherited.¹⁷⁹ Moreover, the claim to rule in the style of Edgar is a reference to an important Anglo-Saxon royal line, but one which usefully skips over the most recent iteration of that line, the conquered Æthelred.¹⁸⁰ The message sent—perhaps oddly coming from England's conqueror—is that Cnut will turn Anglo-Saxon England back to the sort of stability achieved in the years before Æthelred (and, incidentally, before Cnut and his father, Swein, caused the instability in the first place). But there is something peculiar about all of this. Unlike Æthelred's lawcodes which mention Edgar, neither 1018 Cnut nor 1020 Cnut indicates what it is that is so applicable in his codes. Moreover, in Cnut's later legislation, the very comprehensive I-II Cnut, no explicit mention of Edgar is made. This first observation can partially be explained by the long-standing Anglo-Saxon legal tradition of referencing and endorsing codes by those who legislated in previous times, if they are deemed suitable. Given what is extant, this practice was apparently started by Hlothhere and Eadric.¹⁸¹ It was practiced most famously by Alfred, who not only claims in the introduction to his laws that he

¹⁷⁸ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 348.

¹⁷⁹ Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 24.

¹⁸⁰ Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 80.

¹⁸¹ Attenborough, *Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, 18.

referred to codes by Ine, Offa, and Æthelberht when drafting his own law,¹⁸² but who also appended Ine's code to his own. Moreover, I have suggested above that Edgar followed this practice in IV Edgar 2*a*. Æthelred's laws, of course, followed suit with their invocations of Edgar's laws (as well as those by Æthelstan and Edmund), albeit with more particular intentions than such references in other kings' codes. The timing and nature of 1018 Cnut and 1020 Cnut indicate that this is not all that is going on, however—especially, that is, given Wulfstan's earlier invocations, with their specificity, of Edgar's legislation in Æthelred's laws. As mentioned, 1018 and 1020 Cnut are texts whose main purpose is to legitimize Cnut's rule in the eyes of the Anglo-Saxons. In order to do this, as also mentioned, both texts invoke Edgar's laws, but apparently no need was felt to divulge why this legislation was important.

The references to Edgar were used, by Wulfstan in 1018 Cnut and by Cnut, following Wulfstan, in 1020 Cnut, as one way to ease the transition from Anglo-Saxon to Danish rule in England. In other words, these early years of Cnut's reign are when one can finally observe Edgar as representing something of that golden age which scholars have so often proposed dominated Wulfstan's opinion of the earlier king. In these texts Edgar was no longer simply the king Wulfstan found legislatively useful because he favored strong legislation regarding the payment of tithes and dues. He became something more universal and more significant in Cnut's early legislative texts: a symbol or reminder of peaceful and stable times. Moreover, Wulfstan could no longer concern himself with the dangers of the Danes, a group he had spoken out against so forcibly in Æthelred's time. The criticism of Edgar in the 959DE poem, for example, had become a

¹⁸² Attenborough, *Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, 62.

moot point. In response to Cnut's victory and subsequent ascension to power, Wulfstan adapted to his new king and continued on his mission to establish what Wormald famously referred to as a "Holy Society" in England. That Edgar's name does not make an appearance in I-II Cnut is no surprise. Both the 1018 and 1020 Cnut connected themselves with Edgar's legislation in order to emphasize that Cnut's reign would provide the same stability Edgar's subjects enjoyed through congruent legal policy. I-II Cnut is by far the most comprehensive legal code from the entire period;¹⁸³ it did not need the endorsement provided by a reference to Edgar like Cnut's previous fledgling codes did.

Before moving on to Wulfstan's silent use of Edgar's lawcodes, there is a final work by the archbishop, the *Canons of Edgar*, which names Edgar in in a rubric in one of its manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201 (D): "HER GEBIRAD NU TO EADGARES GERÆDNES BE GEHADODRA MANNRA LIFFADUNGE."¹⁸⁴ Like *Polity*, the *Canons of Edgar* is extant in two versions that are best represented by the manuscript witnesses printed by Roger Fowler, D and Bodleian MS Junius 121 (X). These versions are not directly related.¹⁸⁵ Their most recent editor finds X to be the superior version of the text, and he notes that the manuscript tradition that culminated with D resulted in inferior readings because it occurred outside Worcester and away from those most familiar with Wulfstan's work.¹⁸⁶ Whitelock adds that D is closer to the

¹⁸³ Wormald notes that "The Winchester code [i.e. I-II Cn] does deserve to rank among the most sophisticated legislative statements of post-Roman Europe"; see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 349-66, quotation at 365.

¹⁸⁴ Fowler, *Canons*, 2: "Here now are those things which befit the ordering of the lives of those in orders, according to Edgar's decrees."

¹⁸⁵ Fowler, *Canons*, xvi.

¹⁸⁶ Fowler, *Canons*, xvii-xx.

original and that X is the product of Wulfstan's revision.¹⁸⁷ Wormald has dated the D version to c. 1005-6, while he believes X dates to 1014-16.¹⁸⁸ At stake for the present argument is whether or not the rubric in D is accurate or whether it is the result of a scribal misunderstanding. The authenticity of the rubric found some favor with Bethurum, who noted that the rubrics in this manuscript are generally accurate.¹⁸⁹ This has also been entertained more recently, with both Wormald and Rabin noting that an intentional misrepresentation of the text in the style of "Edward and Guthrum" is possible.¹⁹⁰ Given "Edward and Guthrum," the nature of the *Chronicle* poems, and Wulfstan's alteration of Edgar's lawcodes, discussed below, I consider it probable that Wulfstan's *Canons of Edgar* were intentionally attributed to the earlier king, as this kind of historical manipulation was clearly not a questionable endeavor for Wulfstan. The *Canons* are highly derivative, though nothing in the text can be firmly pinned to Edgar's reign.¹⁹¹ Some correspondences do exist between the *Canons* and Edgar's lawcodes, but these are not specific enough to suggest a direct relationship.¹⁹² The purpose for the attribution of the text to Edgar is thus different than Wulfstan's references to the king in his laws and other texts. It is closest, in fact, to the motivation behind Wulfstan's anonymous writing of the 959DE poem, which purports to be a contemporary reaction to Edgar's reign—most significantly, to his Danish policies. The approach to the subject matter in these texts is rather different, however. The 959DE poem was written to emphasize the accomplishments of Edgar's reign in order to qualify them by noting his

¹⁸⁷ Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 314.

¹⁸⁸ Wormald, "State-Builder," 26-7. Cf. Fowler, *Canons*, xxvi-xxix, where Fowler dates the text to 1005-7.

¹⁸⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 83. Fowler is neutral on the issue; see Fowler, *Canons*, 22.

¹⁹⁰ Rabin, *Political Writings*, 85, and Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 391 n. 579.

¹⁹¹ The text's sources are discussed in Fowler, *Canons*, xxxiv-xlv.

¹⁹² Mainly II Edg 3-5, which correspond generally with Canon 54.

missteps with the Danes. The *Canons of Edgar* is another story. There is nothing critical of Edgar in this text—in fact, there is no mention of the king at all other than by D’s rubric—nor is there anything laudatory. The purpose of the text is not to cast judgment, good or bad, on Edgar’s reign. It is intended to supplement it. Edgar’s reign was one of well-known monastic reform, but this kind of activity was not on Wulfstan’s radar. What was, as Hill has shown through the example of the *Benedictine Office*, was the extension of Reform principles beyond monastic communities to the secular clergy.¹⁹³ Though not a Benedictine text, the *Canons of Edgar* is a part of Wulfstan’s program of regulating the secular clergy and, in this case, also the laity. The attribution of the work to Edgar’s reign is also a move rather similar to Wulfstan’s forged “Edward and Guthrum.” Like that text, the *Canons* provides an important “historical” precedent, in this case, backed by Edgar’s strong ecclesiastical record, for Wulfstan’s other works—it functions as a source for the archbishop’s *Polity*, lawcodes, homilies, and other texts.¹⁹⁴ That only a single early version of the work contains the rubric that connects the text to Edgar is admittedly difficult to account for. The best explanation, though still one that is lacking, is that Wulfstan apparently no longer needed to lean on Edgar’s reputation for the regulation of the secular clergy and laity as his career progressed. Perhaps by this time his own reputation in this area was enough.

While there is a substantial number of explicit references to Edgar in Wulfstan’s texts, the number of silent adoptions from Edgar’s lawcodes in Wulfstan-authored legislation is truly massive. This method of engaging with previous Anglo-Saxon law is a far more common Wulfstanian practice than the explicit references just discussed,

¹⁹³ Hill, “Reformer?” 316.

¹⁹⁴ This material is most easily seen in Fowler’s notes; see Fowler, *Canons*, 22-42.

though, due to its nature, it is far more difficult to detect. An additional complication is that Wulfstan's borrowings from Edgar's codes are simply too numerous to discuss individually. The most effective way to offer this information is in chart form. Table 3.1 is a record of Wulfstan's silent use of Edgar's lawcodes (II-IV)¹⁹⁵ in the legislation—or drafts of legislation—he authored on behalf of Æthelred and Cnut. Only the codes which contain items from Edgar's laws are included, though the only ones which do not include applicable material are the fragments IX and X Æthelred. All of 1020 Cnut has been included even though Wulfstan was only responsible for §§14-20 because the earlier portion of the proclamation's use of Edgar's legislation suggests to me that Cnut, or whoever wrote the text on his behalf, was influenced by Wulfstan's habit of doing likewise.

The presentation of the evidence in chart form enables some general observations to be made about Wulfstan's use of Edgar's codes. The first is that Wulfstan did not include the great number of selections from Edgar's laws as a way to explicitly channel Edgar's authority and reputation. Only those with an intimate knowledge of Anglo-Saxon lawcodes would have been able to detect the tremendous number of these passages which have precedents in Edgar's legislation. It is probable, in fact, no one other than Wulfstan would have had such a broad legal perspective. Edgar thus was not just a talking-point in Wulfstan's texts—the archbishop had a legitimate interest in and respect for the legislation from Edgar's reign. Most of these lawcodes provided Wulfstan with a considerable store of applicable legislation of time-tested quality.

¹⁹⁵ I have excluded I Edgar, also known as the Hundred Ordinance, from consideration because it cannot be firmly attributed to Edgar. See Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 313 and 378-9. Of additional note is Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 429.

The second observation is that Wulfstan overwhelmingly favored II-III Edgar over IV Edgar when drafting his codes. This could not have been due to a lack of access to IV Edgar, for Wulfstan does borrow, albeit sparingly, from it. Moreover, this piece of legislation survives in two manuscripts, one of which, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265, is a part of Wulfstan's so-called "Commonplace Book" group of manuscripts,¹⁹⁶ while the second, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, Wulfstan would have been able to access.¹⁹⁷ This supports my argument above that IV Edgar found little favor with Wulfstan due to the freedoms it granted to the Danelaw. Across his authored legislation, Wulfstan borrows from IV Edgar a mere four times. None of these borrowings is of material I have suggested would be controversial to the archbishop. Three (IV Edgar 1.4, 1.5, and 1.7) concern tithes and dues, while the fourth (IV Edgar 6) necessitates the presence of witnesses when buying or selling. The author of the first part of 1020 Cnut follows suit, as he adapted IV Edgar 16, a promise to the Danelaw that Edgar will be a good king, into an identical promise from Cnut—but this time to all of Anglo-Saxon England.

The third observation corresponds largely with the evidence presented above concerning Wulfstan's explicit references to King Edgar in his laws and other texts. I noted there that Wulfstan seems to have especially valued Edgar's legislation on the payment of tithes and dues. This remains true in the silent borrowings from Edgar's codes, as a large chunk of Wulfstan's legislation that is indebted to the earlier king's law

¹⁹⁶ For a discussion of the "Commonplace Book" manuscripts see Hans Sauer, "The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book,'" in Szarmach, *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, 339-393. See also Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 210-19. Wormald has rightly challenged the use of the term "Commonplace Book" to describe the contents of these manuscripts. See Wormald, "Holiness of Society," 202.

¹⁹⁷ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 182-5.

concerns such payments. Regulations on tithes, dues, and other ecclesiastical payments like those for the dead were often taken from Edgar's codes by the archbishop.¹⁹⁸ But this is not all that an examination of these borrowings reveals. The codes that are collated in Table 3.1 indicate that Wulfstan mined Edgar's lawcodes for material concerning secular and ecclesiastical administration in a more general manner as well. This material includes the observation of fasts, festivals, and the Sunday Sabbath;¹⁹⁹ the regulation of coinage, weights, and measures;²⁰⁰ the protection of churches;²⁰¹ the prohibition against unjust judgments and false accusations;²⁰² the obligation to attend courts;²⁰³ and the declaration that all are entitled to the benefit of the law.²⁰⁴ The remaining items vary in their scope from the note that punishments must be acceptable to God²⁰⁵ to procedures for those who attack houses,²⁰⁶ among others. All of this makes it rather clear that Wulfstan's interest in Edgar's legislation was rooted in a recognition that the earlier king displayed an impressive level of administrative prowess—precisely the characteristic one would expect an archbishop so committed to law and order to find appealing.

Before ending, a final aspect of Wulfstan's use of Edgar's lawcodes must be discussed. Wormald has shown that the copies of II-III Edgar in manuscripts with Wulfstan connections contain some material that stands out from the rest, II Edgar 2.3,

¹⁹⁸ V Atr 11, 11.1, 12, and 12.1; VI Atr 18.1; VII Atr 4, 4.1, 4.2 and 7; VIII Atr 7, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 11, and 12; 1018 Cn 13.2, 13.3, and 13.4; I Cn 8.2, 11, 11.1, and 11.2.

¹⁹⁹ V Atr 12.3, 13, 15, and 17; VIII Atr 16; 1018 Cn 14.1, 14.3-14.4, and 14.7; 1020 Cn 18 and 19; I Cn 14.1, 14.2, and 16.

²⁰⁰ V Atr 24; VI Atr 32.1 and 32.2; 1018 Cn 20.2; II Cn 8.

²⁰¹ VIII Atr 1, 1.1, 2, and 5.1.

²⁰² 1018 Cn 25-26.1; II Cn 15*a*.1 and 16.

²⁰³ II Cn 17.1, 18, 18.1, 25, 25*a*, 25*a*.1, and 25*a*.2.

²⁰⁴ V Atr 1.1; VI Atr 8.1; VII Atr 6.1; 1018 Cn 3.1; II Cn 1.1.

²⁰⁵ VI Atr 10.1.

²⁰⁶ II Cn 64.

5.1, 5.2, and 5.3; III Edgar 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3.²⁰⁷ This content only appears elsewhere in texts authored by Wulfstan, including V Æthelred 11.1, 12.1, and 17; VI Æthelred 16, 21, and 24; 1018 Cnut 13.1, 13.7, and 14.7; I Cnut 13.1 and 16a.²⁰⁸ Wormald's inevitable conclusion is that Wulfstan "not only drafted royal laws; he amended those already made."²⁰⁹ This observation is exceptionally important. The codes just mentioned are about festivals, fasts, and ecclesiastical payments. Wulfstan interpolated them into Edgar's codes in order to strengthen the king's already fairly comprehensive legislation on these matters. It is yet another example of Wulfstan's predilection for manipulating history, in this case through the invention/forgery of parts of Edgar's codes which reflect his own eleventh-century concerns. This move is not so different from his creation of "Edward and Guthrum," a text which also includes clauses about festivals, fasts, and payments.²¹⁰ Like "Edward and Guthrum," moreover, Wulfstan used these legal inventions to lend credibility to his legitimate legislation since, as discussed above, he holds Edgar, especially, but also Æthelstan and Edmund²¹¹ up as examples of kings who competently and rightly legislated on tithes and dues, most notably, but also on other items of ecclesiastical importance. It is now clear that the archbishop references his own interpolated material in addition to these kings' genuine legislation; he justifies his own codes in part by using content in them that he had interpolated into earlier law.

The point of this chapter has not been to discredit the opinion that Wulfstan looked back on Edgar's reign as a "Golden Age," but rather to tease out the

²⁰⁷ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 314. See also his n. 228 on this page.

²⁰⁸ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 314. See also his n. 230 on this page.

²⁰⁹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 315.

²¹⁰ EGu 5.1, 6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7, 7.1, 7.2, and 8.

²¹¹ See Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 295 and 309.

complications with this interpretation by examining Wulfstan's interaction with Edgar's reign and the lawcodes associated with it. On the one hand, Wulfstan does seem to have regarded Edgar's period as such an era, but not for the reasons scholars have suspected. The extant evidence suggests that Wulfstan's admiration for Edgar had little, if anything, to do with the king's role in the Benedictine Reform. The only borrowed material from Edgar's laws used by Wulfstan that concerns monks is contained in VIII Æthelred 32, which states that reeves must support abbots and aid their stewards, and I Cnut 6*a*.1, which notes the necessity for God's servants, especially priests, to be celibate. Neither of these clauses is strictly "Benedictine." Rather, the evidence suggests that the true appeal of Edgar's reign to Wulfstan was the weight of credibility Edgar's name carried with it, which, for Wulfstan's purposes, was rooted in his peaceful reign and his comprehensive legislation on items of secular and ecclesiastical administrative import—a characteristic of these laws which Wulfstan's interpolations serve to strengthen even more. On the other hand, the text which opened my discussion, the 959DE *Chronicle* poem, reveals that Edgar's policies towards the Danes and the Danelaw in IV Edgar were a cause of considerable anxiety for the archbishop, though this is masked by his ventriloquizing a tenth-century voice in that text. His almost complete avoidance of incorporating clauses from IV Edgar into his lawcodes, a point made clear by Table 3.1, furthers this point. In the end these two views of Edgar, seemingly conflicting to modern eyes, are informed by the same desire for a secure and ideal Anglo-Saxon England. In the Æthelred years this meant eschewing Edgar's Danish policies but valuing his administrative abilities. In the Anglo-Danish years of Cnut's reign this meant favoring legislation that encouraged a

movement towards unity over the policies in IV Edgar and a continued endorsement of the valuable material in Edgar's other codes.

Table 3.1: Wulfstan-Authoring Lawcodes and Their use of Edgar's Legislation²¹²

V Atr	VI Atr	VII Atr	VIII Atr	VIIa Atr	VIII Atr	VIII Atr
1.1	III Edg 1.1	III Edg 1.1	1	II Edg 5.3	Pre.	?IV Edg Pre.-1
4	IV Edg 1.7	III Edg 1.2	4	II Edg 1.1		III Edg 7.3
11	II Edg 2.3; 3	II Edg 3	4.1	II Edg 2.2		III Edg 4
11.1	II Edg 2.3	III Edg 8	4.2	II Edg 3; 3.1		II Edg 1.1- 2.1
12	II Edg 5.2	III Edg 8.1	6.1	III Edg 1.1		II Edg 3.1
12.1	II Edg 5.2		7	II Edg 3		II Edg 3.1
12.3	II Edg 5.1					II Edg 3
13	II Edg 5					II Edg 4
15	II Edg 5.3					II Edg 4.1
17	II Edg 5.1					II Edg 3
24	III Edg 8.1					II Edg 2.3
						II Edg 5.1
						IV Edg 1.5
1018 Cn						II Cn
3.1	III Edg 1.1	IV Edg 16	Pre.	II Edg Pre.	Pre.	III Edg 1
4	III Edg 1.2	III Edg 5.2	6a.1	IV Edg 1.4	1.1	III Edg 1.1
13.2	II Edg 3	II Edg 5	8.2	II Edg 3.1	8	III Edg 8
13.3	II Edg 3	II Edg 5.1	11	II Edg 2	15a.1	III Edg 3
13.4	II Edg 4		11.1	II Edg 2.1	16	III Edg 4
14.1	II Edg 5		11.2	II Edg 2.2	17	III Edg 2
14.3-14.4	II Edg 5.1		14.1	II Edg 5; 5.1	17.1	III Edg 5
14.7	II Edg 5.1		14.2	II Edg 5	18	III Edg 5.1
20.2	III Edg 8		16	II Edg 5.1	18.1	III Edg 5.2
25-26.1	III Edg 3				24	IV Edg 6
					25	III Edg 7

²¹² This table is very much indebted to previous scholarship, though I have added to and revised what was noted in these works. In the rare occurrence that I did not find a sufficient enough similarity to suggest a borrowing by Wulfstan of a particular part of a code I have silently omitted it. For the scholarship used in the assembling of this material see: Wormald, *Making of English Law, passim*, but especially 313-66; Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, *Councils and Synods*, 338-82; Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018," 59; Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 431-67; Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 302-59; Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 3:133-214.

Chapter 4

Ac soð is þæt ic secge, þearf is þære bote: Wulfstan in the Reign of Æthelred

The reign of Æthelred (978-1016) was a period of Anglo-Saxon history fraught with difficulties from its very beginning. Though he was surely too young to have been involved in the crime, the murder of his half-brother, King Edward—the event which placed Æthelred on the Anglo-Saxon throne—was a mark against the king that was probably never fully erased.¹ The remainder of Æthelred’s long reign was punctuated by various royal transgressions, including the seizure of Church lands² and his instruction to exterminate the Danes in England on St. Brice’s Day in 1002. Additional strain on the kingdom came in the form of incursions by the Danes, a number of martial failures in response to them, and the gathering of funds with which to pay them off. Æthelred’s reign also marks Wulfstan’s entrance into the extant narrative of Anglo-Saxon history, as Bishop of London, in 996.³ He came into the picture with a flurry of administrative signatures in Æthelred’s charters and with a booming millenarian and eschatological voice in Bethurum homilies Iab-V. By the time Æthelred’s reign concluded the number of Wulfstan’s extant writings had ballooned to include several more texts generally called homilies (or “homiletic”) by scholars even though many are technically sermons, plus sets of lawcodes for Æthelred, the “Edward and Guthrum” forgery, the first iterations of the *Canons of Edgar* and *Institutes of Polity*, a series of short texts on status, and the

¹ For a discussion of the murder and its possible perpetrators see Simon Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred ‘The Unready,’ 978-1016: A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life & Thought, Third Series 13 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 163-74. For an extended discussion of medieval historians’ treatment of the crime see Simon Keynes, “The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready,” in Hill, *Ethelred the Unready*, 227-53.

² Keynes, *Diplomas*, 176-86.

³ Whitelock, “Note on the Career of Wulfstan the Homilist,” 460-65.

prose portions of the *Benedictine Office*, among others.⁴ It was also during this time that Wulfstan was promoted to the bishopric of Worcester and the archbishopric of York, which he held in plurality from 1002 to at least 1016, when he either ceded Worcester to Leofsige or appointed him as an assistant.⁵ Though it seems to modern eyes that Wulfstan simply appeared out of nowhere, his reputation as a skilled writer was already established by 1002 at the latest, for by then a cleric wrote to him in praise of his eloquence and to note that he was ill-equipped to emulate it in a translation of Wulfstan's work.⁶

Wulfstan's textual output is noteworthy when one considers how varied his extant writings are, both generically and otherwise. Such variety makes the surviving collection of Wulfstan's writings an ideal candidate for an examination of the evolution of the archbishop's thought. The large number of extant documents, however, requires that the evidence be considered over this and the following chapter. This chapter, then, considers Wulfstan's texts which were penned during the reign of Æthelred, while the following chapter considers those documents which are dated to Cnut's reign. Such an approach is warranted by the events of 1016, when Cnut ascended to the Anglo-Saxon throne and initiated an era of Danish rule. This was a turning point not only for Anglo-Saxon

⁴ I rely on two scholars' chronology of Wulfstan's works here. The first is that in Patrick Wormald, "Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-Builder," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 9-27, at 26-7. The second is found in Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25. Neither scholar's chronology is totally comprehensive, though I find Wormald's to be more useful generally because he distinguishes between the different extant versions of the *Canons of Edgar* and *Institutes of Polity*.

⁵ Wulfstan's predecessors, Oswald and Ealdulf, also held these positions in plurality despite the unorthodox nature of such an arrangement. Dorothy Whitelock notes that this was probably because York was such a poor diocese, but also suggests that this kind of arrangement would allow the king to keep a closer eye on those stationed at York by also anchoring them further south. For her full argument see Dorothy Whitelock, "The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Some Aspects of Their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickens on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Peter Clemons (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959), 70-88, at 72-6. For a distilled version of this argument along with the position of Leofsige, see Dorothy Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Methuen's Old English Library, 3rd ed. (London: Methuen, 1963), 10-12.

⁶ Dorothy Whitelock, "Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., 24 (1942): 24-45, at 28.

England, but also for Wulfstan and his views on the administration of the kingdom. As for Æthelred's reign, my focus will be primarily on the homiletic writings of Wulfstan written during this period, though I bring up texts of other genres when the need arises or when it is illustrative to do so. The reasons for this are as follows. First, focusing on Wulfstan's homilies through close reading allows one to most easily see Wulfstan's changing thought since these texts from Æthelred's reign can easily be divided into three main categories based on their subject matter, concerns, audience, and date. In chronological order, these are millenarian and eschatological homilies for the laity, homilies intended to inform the laity about their faith, and, finally, homilies for the *witan*, and perhaps also Æthelred, himself, intended to remind them of their political and spiritual responsibilities to the kingdom. Thus, as Æthelred's reign wore on, Wulfstan's extant homiletic writings allow one to witness the development of his thought from "Homilist and Statesman" far closer to "Statesman and Homilist."

In the earlier years of Wulfstan studies much emphasis was placed on continuity, and for good reason. The corpus of Wulfstan's extant writings was in its early stages of assembly, and noting corresponding characteristics between candidates for inclusion with those already deemed a part of it was an invaluable scholarly tool. Thus scholars looked for similarities in style, vocabulary, rhythm, and specific content when building the Wulfstan corpus.⁷ This is not to say that such an approach is no longer useful—it

⁷ These studies are directly or indirectly influenced, of course, by Wanley, *Catalogus*; and Napier, *Wulfstan*. For other important work on establishing Wulfstan's corpus through the detection of continuity see Arthur Napier, ed., *Über die Werke des altenglischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan* (Berlin: Hof-Buchdruckerei, 1882); J. P. Kinard, *A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies: Their Style and Sources* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1897); Richard Becher, *Wulfstans Homilien* (Leipzig: Sturm, 1910); Jost, "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik"; Karl Jost, "Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen," *Anglia* 56 (1932): 265-315; Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*; Whitelock, "Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum"; Robert J. Menner, "Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary," *Modern Language Notes* 63 (1948): 1-9; Whitelock, "Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut"; Dorothy Bethurum, "A Letter of Protest from the English

undoubtedly is, as some recent studies prove, and this approach to Wulfstan's writings will surely continue to offer valuable insights into these texts.⁸ This method has, however, had the unintended consequence of oversimplifying Wulfstan and his writings through allowing something of a caricature of the archbishop to develop: "most of his [Wulfstan's] life must in any case have been spent not in a library, but in a saddle. He could easily have whiled away the time on horseback putting into rhythmical prose matter fed to him by a secretary."⁹ This statement was as incorrect in 1975 as it is now given the vast amount of scholarship on Wulfstan which had appeared by then, but it nevertheless provides a valuable—albeit exaggerated—insight into what effect the earlier years of Wulfstan scholarship's methods had on later views of the archbishop. The search for textual continuity that had been so useful for some scholars in determining whether or not Wulfstan authored particular works had helped give the impression to at least one commentator that Wulfstan and his texts were static, unsophisticated, and robotic in their composition—works capable of being produced in an offhand manner by an itinerant churchman. Such a view flies in the face of the fact that Wulfstan's writings are in reality rather nuanced and tailored to specific periods of Anglo-Saxon history and his career.

Bishops to the Pope," in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas Austin Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949), 97-104; Angus McIntosh, "Wulfstan's Prose," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949): 109-42; Dorothy Bethurum, "Six Anonymous Old English Codes," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 49 (1950): 449-63; Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*; Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 2nd ed.; Whitelock, "Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws"; Bethurum, *Homilies*; Otto Funke, "Some Remarks on Wulfstan's Prose Rhythm," *English Studies* 43 (1962): 311-18; and Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 3rd ed.

⁸ A selection of these studies includes: Wilcox, "The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies"; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, *passim*, but for a specific example see 396-7, where Wormald in part uses Wulfstan's static view against priests taking wives to conclude that the *Northumbrian Priests' Law* is not his; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 23-42, especially.

⁹ C. E. Hohler, "Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church," in *Tenth-Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, ed. David Parsons (London: Phillimore, 1975), 60-86, at 74n59. Hohler is also mentioned in Wormald, "State-Builder," 11-12.

A few studies have appeared, however, which acknowledge that Wulfstan's texts show not only that the archbishop made a habit of writing and revising texts for specific occasions or according to particular events, but also that he altered his thinking on certain matters. The order of the three extant versions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, for example, has been discussed by Stephanie Dien, Malcolm Godden, and Jonathan Wilcox, each of whom argues that Wulfstan crafted the different versions for specific reasons.¹⁰ Moreover, Wilcox has also shown that Wulfstan subtly distanced himself from the St. Brice's Day Massacre as his career wore on.¹¹ For his part, Wormald has noted that Wulfstan's career can be divided into a number of phases. In the first of these Wulfstan was concerned primarily with strengthening Anglo-Saxon society for the coming of both the Antichrist and Christ, Himself; the second phase includes more forceful legislation as well as a focus on the ordering of the populace; the third and final phase involves an enhanced ecclesiastical element in Wulfstan's legislation, further use of earlier Anglo-Saxon laws, and an attempt to make law practical rather than something informed by the imminent end of the world.¹²

There are some important elements of the beginning of Wulfstan's known career that are useful to keep in mind in a discussion of the evolution of his thought. Firstly, his

¹⁰ Stephanie Dien, "Sermo Lupi ad Anglos: The Order and Date of the Three Versions," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 76 (1975): 561-70; Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 142-62; and Wilcox, "Political Performance."

¹¹ Wilcox, "The St. Brice's Day Massacre and Archbishop Wulfstan."

¹² Patrick Wormald, "State-Builder," 17-21. This chapter and the one which follows are very much informed by Wormald's general approach. His discussion is, however, abbreviated out of necessity—it was a keynote address—and so it contains some gaps that should be filled in as well as details that need to be fleshed out. I differ from Wormald in that I find it more useful to divide Wulfstan's intellectual development by king rather than into his three sections, though each of my two sections may readily be seen to have subcategories. The events of 1016 are some of the most important in Anglo-Saxon history, and, for Wulfstan, the year marks a rather important benchmark in the development of his political thought. By dividing my discussion by king this benchmark is most readily observed.

appointment as bishop of London in 996 coincided with the rapid approach of the millennium, and, secondly, he had not yet written a single word in a legislative document. Concerning the latter, that the start of his known career dates to before Wulfstan was a part of Æthelred's *witan* as an advisor and legislator is significant, as it helps to explain his tendency during much of that king's reign to focus more on the spiritual than the pragmatic. In other words, prior to being elected to the *witan*, Wulfstan's earlier career had groomed him to take religious rather than worldly action in his homilies during this period. As for the millennium, Wulfstan's millenarian beliefs fostered his eschatology—or perhaps *vice versa*—in his early writings.

Wulfstan as Ideologue: The Millenarian and Eschatological Homilies

Wulfstan began his known career as something of an eschatological ideologue. Though it has been noted that there was not a general feeling of anxiety in Europe regarding the year 1000,¹³ Wulfstan was an exception. He knew as well as anyone the unorthodox nature of discussing the coming of the last days with chronological precision; Wulfstan translated the caution against this in Matthew 24:36 in Bethurum II: “[a]nd swa þeahhwæðere nis se man on eorðan ne se encgel on heofonan þe wite þæne andagan butan Gode sylfum.”¹⁴ Moreover, he inserted language into Bethurum Ib to guard against any accusation that his calls for preparation were heretical: “7 ðeah þæt geweorðe þæt ure ænig þe nu leofað þonne ne libbe.”¹⁵ This is a revision of Bethurum Ia's “[e]t quamuis

¹³ Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, 78.

¹⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 121: “and nevertheless there is no man on earth nor angel in heaven who knows the appointed day other than God, Himself.” See also Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 51-2; and Mary P. Richards, “Wulfstan and the Millennium,” in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2002), 41-8, at 41-2.

¹⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 118: “And even though it may come to pass that any of us who live now may not be alive then [i.e. when the Antichrist arrives].”

multi hoc periculum uisuri non sunt,” which was in all likelihood altered because it came too close to predicting the moment of the coming of the Antichrist, as it implies that he will come during some of the audience’s lifetime.¹⁶ This is merely an orthodox possibility in Bethurum Ib. But all of this does not excuse Wulfstan from millenarian belief. The coming millennium made explicit precision on his part unnecessary, and it is quite likely that Wulfstan realized that he could have it both ways. The millennium was a significant happening, and Wulfstan could count on his audience connecting the eschatological material in his early homilies to this upcoming event without explicitly connecting the two and stepping into the territory of heterodoxy. The texts themselves make hay of this possibility when they discuss the last days as though they are imminent. While Bethurum Ia, a draft of Ib, predicts that the Antichrist will arrive within some of the audience’s lifetime, Bethurum Ib, for example, still suggests that laity must be forewarned: “Nu is mycel neod eac eallum Godes bydelum þæt hy Godes folc warnian gelome wið egesan þe mannum is towerd.”¹⁷ Bethurum II and III suggest that it is clear that the end will soon come: “we witan mid gewisse þæt hit þærto nealæcað georne”¹⁸; “7 ðærto hit nealæcað nu swyðe georne.”¹⁹ It is interesting, however, that in Bethurum II Wulfstan earlier noted that the gospel must be preached throughout the world before the final days.²⁰ If this is a warning against specifying a time for the coming of the final days, as Bethurum thinks it is,²¹ then Wulfstan certainly brushes up against his own warning in the lines that follow.²²

¹⁶ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 115: “And yet many will not be [alive] to see this peril.”

¹⁷ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 117: “Now also there is a great need for all of God’s preachers: that they warn God’s people constantly about the horror which is coming to mankind.”

¹⁸ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 121: “We know with certainty that it eagerly approaches.”

¹⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 123: “And it now approaches very eagerly.”

²⁰ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 121.

²¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 286n62.

²² See also the discussion in Malcolm Godden, “Millennium, Time, and History for the Anglo-Saxons,” in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1000*, ed. Richard Allen

Finally, Bethurum IV opens with a call to be attentive to the coming end: “Leofan men, us is mycel þearf þæt we wære beon þæs egeslican timan þe towerd is. Nu bið swyðe raðe Antechristes tima.”²³ There is a clear sense of urgency in these early texts by Wulfstan, and that they all were written during Wulfstan’s tenure as bishop of London and are also his most thoroughly eschatological texts is no coincidence. This position lasted until just after the millennium, and Wulfstan’s thought during this period was dominated by his millenarian-influenced eschatology which, in turn, was the impetus for his obsession with remedying the spiritual ills of the Anglo-Saxon populace so that they would be prepared for the last days.

Though precise dating of these texts, like most of Wulfstan’s works, is a difficult task, it is rather likely that Bethurum Iab-IV date before, or perhaps it is better to say, up to, the year 1000,²⁴ while Wulfstan’s final purely eschatological homily, Bethurum V, can be dated to after 1000 based on internal textual evidence. In the midst of a discussion of the Antichrist Wulfstan references Revelation 20:7 and its note that after a thousand years Satan will be unbound. He follows this with “Þusend geara 7 eac ma is nu agan syððan Crist wæs mid mannum on menniscan hiwe, 7 nu syndon Satanases bendas swyðe toslovene, 7 Antecristes time is wel gehende.”²⁵ Wulfstan’s mention of the amount of time that has passed signals that this text dates to after 1000, perhaps even as late as his

Landes, Andrew Colin Gow, and David C. Van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 155-80, at 168.

²³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 128: “Beloved people, it is a great need for us that we be aware of the horrible time which is approaching. Now it will quickly be the time of the Antichrist.”

²⁴ They were probably not written in the order in which Bethurum prints them, however. She suggests that the most likely order is II, III, Ia, Ib, IV; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 282. This order is endorsed in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 49.

²⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 136-7: “A thousand years and more has now passed since Christ was among mankind in human appearance, and now Satan’s bonds are very loose, and the Antichrist’s time is well at hand.”

promotion to Worcester and York in 1002.²⁶ The passage quoted also demonstrates that in *Bethurum V* Wulfstan comes close to conflating, as he actually did elsewhere,²⁷ the Antichrist—who is not mentioned at all in Revelation 20:7—and Satan. The effect is once again a sense of urgency, in this case because Satan’s unbinding, and, by extension, the Antichrist’s activity, are overdue since the millennium has passed.

That millenarian thinking receded from Wulfstan’s writings in the years following *Bethurum V* is a natural development—the millennium was no longer something to prepare for or to look back to in the recent past with anxiety. The lack of need for immediate concern is also more or less true of his eschatology, though unlike Wulfstan’s millenarian thought, it seems to have stayed in his mind for some time. He employed it differently, though. After *Bethurum V*, the eschatological material in Wulfstan’s writings transformed from ideological conviction to rhetorical tool. Godden has shown, for example, that the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, with all of its apparent eschatology, is not actually an apocalyptic text in two of its three versions.²⁸ Even the version that appears to retain some apocalypticism to Godden in that study, *Bethurum XX* (BH), is not really a tract on the upcoming end of the world, for, as he later pointed out, it focuses mostly on Anglo-Saxon England alone.²⁹ What can be seen across the three versions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, then, is Wulfstan’s changing thought on the end of the world. As the years, his career, and the Viking invasions wore on Wulfstan deemphasized the last days in favor of bringing the Anglo-Saxons’ responsibility for the kingdom-wide calamity to the fore:

²⁶ *Bethurum*, *Homilies*, 290.

²⁷ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 61.

²⁸ Godden, “Apocalypse and Invasion,” 142-62.

²⁹ Godden, “Millennium, Time, and History,” 172-3.

What the textual history suggests is the rapidity with which Wulfstan found himself rethinking his ideas and finding a framework for the Viking raids and invasions. The text seems to have originated early in 1014 as a short apocalyptic sermon, but twice within the next two years, probably within the same year, Wulfstan expanded it to take into account the Viking attacks. In the process, its emphasis gradually shifted from the apocalyptic crisis to the national one. The sense of an approaching end of all things, so strong in the earlier homilies on the last days and still very evident in the first version of the sermon, gives way to a sense of the longer and continuing movement of history. The successive stages of the text reflect both a diminishing concern with apocalypse and a growing concern with invasion, and the process of rethinking the crisis has left its marks on the text.³⁰

Godden's characterization of Bethurum XX (BH) as "a short apocalyptic sermon" is not totally accurate for reasons noted above, which he noted in 2003. Wulfstan certainly realized that there was more to the world than just Anglo-Saxon England and that its potential downfall would not necessarily signal the end of the world. The BH version of the *Sermo Lupi*, then, is, like the other versions: it is a sermon on the precarious state of Anglo-Saxon England, albeit one that discusses this problem in more general terms than the C and EI versions, which include substantial passages on the invading Vikings. This is not to say, however, that the eschatological material disappeared completely from Wulfstan's writings. The various versions of the *Sermo Lupi*, for example, all open with the assertion that the end of the world is nigh, a supremely effective method of capturing

³⁰ Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 152.

an audience's attention.³¹ What is important to emphasize, though, is that the rest of the “eschatological” material in these three versions of the text—beginning with Bethurum XX (BH) and especially so in Bethurum XX (C and EI)—is no longer present due to an actual conviction that the world was close to ending, but rather because Wulfstan recognized that such material was rhetorically arresting. In other words, Wulfstan's method remained, though his prime concern—formerly the arrival of the last days—changed to the coming of the end of Anglo-Saxon England.

That Wulfstan phased “true” eschatology (i.e. material influenced by a belief in the coming end) out of his texts as the years after the millennium progressed is further evidenced by the content of the rest of his extant writings, none of which appear to be written with the imminent end of the world in mind.³² To be sure, Wulfstan remained no stranger to strong language during this period as well as after it, but he does not again return to his eschatological roots following the drafting of Bethurum V. Bethurum XIII/Napier 19-22, otherwise known as the *Sermo ad Populum*, for example, contains strong notes of brimstone, but not in the context of the final days, or even the end of Anglo-Saxon England. Rather, its sections of fiery language are intended to remind individuals of their responsibilities as Christians and to warn them of the dangers of sin and of the terror of Hell.³³ Judgment Day (*domesdæge*) comes up in Bethurum VII, *De Fide Catholica*, but this is in the context of explaining the events of the final days rather

³¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 255, 261, and 267.

³² Lionarons argues that Wulfstan returns to eschatological discussion in the final portion of Napier 50, written during Cnut's reign. I noted in the previous chapter that this does not seem to me to be accurate, as this material is used to rhetorically enhance the text rather than to discuss the actual end of the world. See also below.

³³ See especially Bethurum, *Homilies*, 230-2 (ll. 84-105).

than in a discussion of their imminent arrival.³⁴ *To Eallum Folke*, Bethurum VIIa, in which Wulfstan offers an Old English translation of the Pater Noster and Creed, mentions *domes dæg* in the translation of the latter text, and thus it carries no real eschatological force.³⁵

Though it is outside the historical scope of this chapter, Napier 50, written during Cnut's reign, should be addressed, here, as its conclusion has suggested to Lionarons that Wulfstan held onto his eschatological beliefs much further into his career than Bethurum V: "the closing paragraphs of Napier 50, a homily written to be preached to the *witan* towards the end of Wulfstan's life, are devoted entirely to eschatological themes."³⁶ She does, however, acknowledge that Napier 50 displays a different type of eschatology, influenced, she believes, by an "extended view of history" due to the end of the Danish invasions as well as from "the archbishop's consciousness of his own advancing age and, perhaps, frailty."³⁷ According to Lionarons, these influences caused Wulfstan to reevaluate the timeline for the apocalypse: "[c]learly, while Wulfstan has no doubt of the coming apocalypse, he no longer believes it to be as imminent as he had at the beginning of his career."³⁸ The evidence presented for this claim is Wulfstan's note in the text that people may continue to live on this earth, albeit with struggles: "þæt gelimpe þæt men sume hwile syn her on worolde, swa þeah hig beoþ aa on geswince and mid sorge."³⁹ A

³⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 163 (l. 142). This sort of explanatory material is rather common in Wulfstan's homilies. Similar material written in Æthelred's reign which warns the average individual against unrepentant sin and frivolous behavior—which potentially carry a severe penalty in the next world, though this is not always stated—are also found in, for example, Bethurum Xbc, XIV, and XXI, among others.

³⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 167 (l. 32).

³⁶ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 71.

³⁷ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 73.

³⁸ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 73.

³⁹ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 273 (ll.11-13): "It may come to pass that people be here in the world for some time, though they will be always in toil and with sorrow."

version of the first portion of this statement was included in the much earlier Bethurum Ib, quoted above, though the other eschatological texts surrounding the millennium emphasized the immediacy of the coming final days.⁴⁰ This return to the more orthodox approach to the apocalypse found in Ib, along with the latter portion of the quoted passage, is what primarily informs Lionarons's point that Wulfstan's eschatological views no longer consider the apocalypse to be imminent, but that it is nevertheless eventual. Of additional note is the patristic theory of the macrocosm—the world—and the microcosm—the person. In its essentials, the theory says that as the world advances towards its end the people who inhabit the world will depreciate in various ways. Lionarons sees this at work in the text, when Wulfstan notes the condition of people after discussing the hastening state of the world: “þæt nu ne beoð naht fela manna ætsamne, þæt heora sum ne si seoc and samhal.”⁴¹

There are a couple of aspects of Napier 50 that need to be discussed alongside Lionarons's observations. First, the change in Wulfstan's eschatological thought that Lionarons identifies in the text is not quite as significant as it may seem at first. It is right to point out that there no longer is a sense of a soon-coming apocalypse in Napier 50, but Lionarons's note that Wulfstan still expected the apocalypse to come has less to do with the archbishop's personal eschatological thought than with an adherence to Church dogma. Wulfstan, in other words, was no different from any other Christian figure who held onto his orthodoxy regarding the apocalypse at this point in his career. The same can

⁴⁰ Also pointed out in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 73.

⁴¹ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 273 (ll. 9-10): “so that now there are not many people gathered together, of whom some be not sick and weak.” For Lionarons's discussion see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 73-4. For the theory of the macrocosm and microcosm in Old English see J. E. Cross, “Some Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature,” in *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield (Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1963), 1-22.

be said of his apparent engagement with the idea of the macrocosm and microcosm, though perhaps fewer people would be aware of this teaching. It is difficult, I think, to argue that the apocalypse was much of a serious concern for Wulfstan towards the end of his career, especially since he continued to work on *II Polity*, a blueprint for the future of the kingdom, during this period, and perhaps up until the end of his life.⁴² Rather, the archbishop's eschatology in Napier 50 is used for rhetorical purposes, much as similar language—though not strictly eschatological—was employed in the three versions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.

That the eschatology in Napier 50 is essentially a rhetorical tool brings up another point: there is far more to the text than its fiery closing, and to focus only on the concluding passage is to take it out of context.⁴³ Its bulk has little to nothing to do with the apocalypse—and the nature of this material suggests that the text's closing is intended primarily to emphasize the importance of these earlier passages rather than function as a discrete discussion of the end times.⁴⁴ The opening of the sermon shows that the king (*cynehlaforde*)—and presumably the *witan*—were the primary audience for the text, though Wulfstan also mentions people in general (*eallum folce*), who perhaps function as a secondary audience. There is little in the sermon, however, that would be applicable to the general Anglo-Saxon audience other than the following few lines which urge acts like the submission to God and His commandments, the confession of sins, and the admonition to be loyal and faithful to the king. Rather, the content of the sermon betrays

⁴² Wormald, "State-Builder," 27.

⁴³ Lionarons, in fact, calls it a "complete sermon," and adds that the text which precedes it in the manuscript, *Secundum Lucam*, may have been intended to be read alongside it or as the beginning part of the homily; see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 171-2, quotation at 171.

⁴⁴ Such a characterization follows that in Davis-Secord, "Rhetoric and Politics," 93.

the fact that its audience are those in positions of power. The text progresses from the responsibilities of the king and the nature of the throne (including a passage on the Three Orders). Next is a discussion of the obligations of nobles (*eorlan*), generals (*heretogan*), judges (*deman*), and reeves (*gerefan*), with a note that their previous misbehavior caused Anglo-Saxon England to suffer: “and we eac þæs habbað fela byrsta and bysmora gebiden, and gif we ænige bote gebiden sceolan, þonne mote we þæs to god earnian bet, þonne we ær þysan dydon.”⁴⁵ Wulfstan then moves to the duties of God’s servants (*godes þeowas*), bishops and abbots (*biscopas and abbodas*), male and female monks (*munecas and mynecena*), and priests and nuns (*preostas and nunnan*). Once more this discussion is connected to Anglo-Saxon England; no one, for example, is to carry weapons into a monastery or drink with the monks unless the king (*urum hlaforde*) or someone else with a fear of God be with them, so as not to show disrespect to the rule. Moreover, Wulfstan’s constant use of *we* here and throughout the sermon strongly suggests a localized Anglo-Saxon focus such as one sees, for example, in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Following this is a brief discussion of the history of Church synods, starting with Constantine’s at Nicea, with a warning against disobeying their decisions. Wulfstan then moves to what should be done if a disaster strikes in the land—amends should be made to God and the Anglo-Saxon king (*ure hlaford*) should allow England’s wrongdoers to be judged. Next is a discussion of sexual transgressions like incest and bigamy, along with protections for widows and a prohibition against wedding a nun—all of which is rooted in Anglo-Saxon law, including in codes written by Wulfstan. The final section before the text’s closing is similarly anchored in the law of the land—here Wulfstan discusses the

⁴⁵ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 268 (ll. 12-15): “And because of this we have endured many injuries and calumnies, and if we should expect any relief, then we must earn it better than we have before this.”

need for the restoration of both security and coinage and the correction of false weights and measures. Tithes, dues, feasts, and fasts follow. The final remark before the closing is the common instruction to renounce heathendom, also present in Wulfstan's lawcodes.

The point of this brief summary is to show that the Napier 50 is not a sermon about the apocalypse—it, in a vein similar to the earlier *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, is a text about the then current state of Anglo-Saxon England and what needs to be done by those in privileged positions to better themselves and the kingdom. Furthermore, like the three versions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Napier 50 is concerned with England rather than the Christian world at large. For this reason I do not think that the text's closing is eschatological in the theological sense other than when it acknowledges that the apocalypse will come at some uncertain point. The real purpose of this closing is to spark a sense of spiritual obligation to the kingdom in Wulfstan's privileged, and, in many cases, powerful, audience. What better way to do so than with eschatological-esque language? The reminder that each will be judged at the end of the world, in other words, is not included for the primary purpose of advising the audience to prepare itself for the end of the world—it is there to prompt the audience to act on the text's earlier admonitions to behave properly so that the kingdom can improve and be spared from God's punishments. Eschatological thought, with its abundance of attention-grabbing details, is not a conviction in Napier 50; rather, it is a rhetorical tool.

Wulfstan as Teacher of the Faith: The Remaining Homilies for the Laity

Wulfstan's departure from eschatological conviction is not the only change that occurred in his thought over the course of his career. While it is true that from the beginning of his known career Wulfstan took up the mantle of spiritual teacher in Anglo-

Saxon England—a role defined by its emphasis on the ideological and theological rather than the pragmatic and worldly—this role manifested itself differently at various times of his career. As discussed, in its beginning this role consisted primarily of admonishing the Anglo-Saxon populace to ready themselves spiritually for the coming apocalypse in Bethurum Iab-V. In these early years he also had an interest in the spiritual welfare of some particular Anglo-Saxons—his so-called Penitential Letters I-III petition prayers for three men, each of whom had been found guilty of murder.⁴⁶ As murders go, these crimes were especially appalling; their victims were a father, a child, and a brother, respectively. Wulfstan’s concern for the spiritual health of the Anglo-Saxons was thus apparently universal, and such emphasis on the importance of receiving divine forgiveness following these letters and the eschatological homilies becomes a significant part of Wulfstan’s spiritual guidance. Other emphases in these texts, as will be seen, are of a similar vein, as they present aspects of Christian doctrine that are most necessary for the Anglo-Saxons—especially the laity in these texts—to know, understand, and practice. Though rather important to this discussion of Wulfstan’s changing thought over the course of Æthelred’s tenure as king, these homilies are decidedly orthodox and uncontroversial. They strive to effect change not through accusation or complaint, but rather through spiritual instruction and exhortation.

To begin with, some extant homilies from Æthelred’s reign by Wulfstan focus on corrective ritual.⁴⁷ Take Bethurum XIV and XV (both c. 1004-5), Wulfstan’s only

⁴⁶ These letters are printed in Bethurum, *Homilies*, 374-6. See also Janet M. Cooper, *The Last Four Anglo-Saxon Archbishops of York*, Borthwick Papers 38 (York: St. Anthony’s Press, 1970), 5.

⁴⁷ I do not include Napier 38 in this discussion since it seems unlikely that it is from Wulfstan’s pen. While Wormald includes it in his chronology of Wulfstan’s works (Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26), other commentators have shied away from ascribing the text to Wulfstan. Both Bethurum and Wilcox find the authenticity of the text questionable, Pons-Sanz leaves it out of her chronology, and Lionarons notes that “it may be impossible ever to prove Wulfstan’s authorship of Napier 38 one way or the other; however, doubt

homilies which follow the Church calendar, for example. Written for delivery on Ash Wednesday, Bethurum XIV is either fragmentary or an outline for a text which was never written or has not survived. XIV is an especially good example of Wulfstan's effort to make Latin material accessible to the Anglo-Saxon laity via an Old English translation, as it is based on an anonymous Latin homily printed by Fehr.⁴⁸ As Lionarons points out, that homily, despite its rubric, *Sermo ad populum*, is "in fact directed to an exclusively clerical audience."⁴⁹ Wulfstan's translation thus provides the laity with additional Christian guidelines of the same tenor as many of his other homilies directed at the same audience, though in this case with Lent specifically in mind. The audience is instructed, to list some examples, to tithe, fast, attend church daily, give alms, avoid drunkenness, and to confess sins. Moreover, Adam—who was transported from great pleasure (*myclum myrhðum*) to hard labor (*hefigum geswincum*) for his sins—is invoked to explain the reasoning behind Lenten responsibilities to those Anglo-Saxons who had to perform great acts of penance for capital crimes. Bethurum XV, for Holy Thursday, is also a translation and revision of a Latin text, this time by Abbo of St. Germain.⁵⁰ In part this text complements XIV, as it, too, uses Adam to explain the content of part of the sermon: the experience of penitents.⁵¹ The homily also emphasizes the importance of bishops to the laity. Bishops are connected directly with God when He is referred to as "the bishop of all bishops" (*ealra bisceopa bisceop*), and when the homily notes that, like God led

seems in this case well founded." For these studies see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 42; Wilcox, "Dissemination," 200; Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 32-33, quotation at 33, respectively.

⁴⁸ Bernhard Fehr, ed., *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*, Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 4 (Hamburg: Henri Grand, 1914; repr. with a Supplement to the Introduction by Peter Clemoes, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 247.

⁴⁹ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 142.

⁵⁰ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 345; Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 142.

⁵¹ A full discussion of this aspect of the text is found in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 142-3.

Adam into His heavenly church (*heofonlican cyrican*) after his penance outside of paradise and in hell, bishops bring penitents back into the church after their “eager repentance” (*geornfule bote*).⁵² Thus the text simultaneously explains bishops’ role in ritual as well as their place in the Church’s hierarchy.

Moreover, Bethurum VIIIabc signal that Wulfstan wanted to emphasize baptism and its curative and redeeming spiritual power. These texts are all interconnected—VIIIa is a Latin draft for VIIIb, while VIIIc is an expansion of that text.⁵³ They are fairly early texts; VIIIab were written in the early years after Wulfstan’s promotion to Worcester and York, while VIIIc dates to only shortly after, around 1007.⁵⁴ These are essentially instructive homilies which explain the ritual of baptism and highlight its spiritual benefits. Bethurum VIIIc, for example, notes that after baptism one is absolved of original sin and shielded from the devil: “7 ðonne þurh Godes mihte sona deofol swyðe geyrged, 7 mid þæs sacerdes halsunge se deofol wyrð aflymed fram þare menniscan gesceafte þe ær ðurh Adam forworht wæs, 7 ðam halgum gaste byð sona eardungstow on þam menn gerymed.”⁵⁵ Moreover, Bethurum VIIIb reminds its audience that baptism includes them in a tight-knit Christian community: “Ælc cristen man is oðres nehsta, forþam we synd þurh cristendom ealle gebroðra.”⁵⁶ The sermons on baptism, aimed at the Anglo-Saxon laity in general, thus form an important part of Wulfstan’s program of strengthening the kingdom through spiritual instruction.

⁵² For a similar discussion see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 142-3.

⁵³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 302.

⁵⁴ Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26.

⁵⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 176-77 (ll. 31-5): “and then through the might of God the devil is at once very terrified, and with the beseeching of the priest the devil becomes driven away from the human creation, which before, because of Adam, had been guilty, and the Holy Spirit will at once manifest a dwelling-place in the person.”

⁵⁶ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 174 (ll. 77-8): “Each Christian man is next of kin to another, for we are all brothers through Christendom.” A similar sentiment is in Bethurum VIIIc; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 180 (ll. 93-6).

Other homiletic texts from Æthelred's reign follow suit, albeit on different and sometimes more general spiritual topics. Take, for example, Bethurum Xb and Xc. These texts have the same relationship as Bethurum Ia and Ib—Xb is a Latin draft or outline for Xc. Xb is largely based on the *Dictas abbatis Pirmini* and Atto of Vercelli's *De pressuris ecclesiasticis*,⁵⁷ and Xc is essentially a translation of Xb with additional material added from the Benedictine Rule and from Bethurum Xa.⁵⁸ Bethurum Xc makes available to the Anglo-Saxon laity some important points of Church doctrine found in its Latin sources. Some of these are rather basic, but were nonetheless considered important points; for example: “[b]e Cristes agenum naman syn cristene genamode.”⁵⁹ But there is more material one might consider a bit more substantial. The text also includes a translation of the Ten Commandments⁶⁰ and a list of the eight capital sins which the devil instigates: “gitsung 7 gifernes, galnes 7 weamodnys, unrohtnys 7 asolcennys, gylpgeornys 7 ofermodignys.”⁶¹ These are countered with eight virtues (*eahta healice mægnu*): “rumheortnys 7 syfernys, clænnys 7 modþwærnys, glædnes 7 anrædnys, sybgeornes 7 eadmodnes.”⁶² The first portion of the text also contains material on God's church, including a warning against doing literal harm to its physical buildings.⁶³ The rest of the text includes further instructions to the laity against committing the capital sins along with a host of additional sins and crimes. This material is emphasized through an

⁵⁷ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 307; Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 93.

⁵⁸ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 307.

⁵⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 200 (ll. 5-6): “Christians are named after Christ's own name.”

⁶⁰ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 201 (ll. 20-38).

⁶¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 203 (ll. 62-5): “covetousness and greediness, lustfulness and wrathfulness, gloominess and slothfulness, boastfulness and pridefulness.” Possible influences for Wulfstan's list of eight sins are discussed in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 95-7.

⁶² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 203 (ll. 68-9): “liberalness and reasonableness, pureness and gentleness, gladness and agreeableness, friendliness and humbleness.”

⁶³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 201-2 (ll. 39-49).

arresting repetition of “[n]e æfre ænig man,” “[n]e ænig man,” and “[n]e ænig,” as in “Ne æfre ænig man idelnesse lufige ealles to gelome.”⁶⁴ After an interlude which discusses other Christian responsibilities, such as tithes, fasts, feasts, penance, and the like,⁶⁵ Wulfstan employs yet another passage full of attention-catching repetition, only this time the repeated words are “[s]e þe.” Here the repetition is used to emphasize what will happen when people turn to God (*to Gode wendað*). Take, for example, “[s]e þe wære hohmod, weorðe se glædmod.”⁶⁶ This passage nicely complements the previous section of advisory repetition since now Wulfstan is interested in listing the benefits of a Christian life. Other matters of importance for Christians are also given mention following this second list. For example, the Trinity is mentioned and explained, and the audience is instructed to follow religious teachings (*Godcundre lare*). Furthermore, among other items, Wulfstan notes that it is important that elders know (*mymerian*) the Pater Noster and Creed so that they can teach (*tæcan*) them to the younger generations before closing the text with a call—in the first-person plural—to steer their lives towards God.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 204 (ll. 83-4): “Nor should anyone love idleness all too frequently.” The full block of text dominated by the repetition of “[n]e æfre ænig man,” “[n]e ænig man,” and “[n]e ænig” can be found in Bethurum, *Homilies*, 204-5 (ll. 81-106).

⁶⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 205-6 (ll. 107-17).

⁶⁶ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 206 (ll. 126-7): “He who was anxious, he will become cheerful.” The full passage which contains the “[s]e þe” repetition can be found in Bethurum, *Homilies*, 206-7 (ll. 118-40). The significance of lists in poetry has been discussed in Elizabeth Jackson, “‘Not Simply Lists’: An Eddic Perspective on Short-Item Lists in Old English Poems,” *Speculum* 73 (1998): 338-71. For an application of Jackson’s argument to Wulfstan’s prose see Davis-Secord, “Rhetoric and Politics,” 82.

⁶⁷ This aspect of the text is especially interesting, as much of it casts Wulfstan as the person with the knowledge and experience necessary to instruct the laity, while here he includes himself in the audience: “[t]he performativity of this homily is particularly interesting, as Wulfstan must alternate between positioning himself outside of the community as an authority figure fit to instruct his congregation, and inside the community as a humble fellow Christian who must also follow the instructions he gives.” See Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 94.

Bethurum VII is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, one of the two prayers—the other being the Pater Noster—which all Christians were to have memorized. The text is indebted in various ways to Ælfric's *De initio creaturae*.⁶⁸ Though he does not translate the Creed in VII, Wulfstan does offer a lengthy commentary on it, which occupies essentially the first half of the document. Included here is a short history of the text—the apostles (*leorningcnitas*) recited it before they dispersed to evangelize—along with pertinent details from Jesus's life which supplement and contextualize the Creed, such as His wonderful deeds: “He hælde blinde 7 dumbe 7 mistlice gebrocode 7 arærde mænige man of deape.”⁶⁹ The second portion of the sermon contains a description of Judgement Day which uses passages from Wulfstan's earlier homilies along with new material.⁷⁰ This portion is not eschatological in its tone even though some of it is borrowed from Wulfstan's eschatological homilies.⁷¹ It, like the first part of the sermon's commentary on the Creed, is instead an accessible explanation of the events of Doomsday of some literary merit. All the world will burn, Wulfstan says, and people will rise from the dead and proceed through the flames untouched if they are clean of sin. They will join God in heaven, while the sinful—many examples of which are given in a long and alliterating list that forms a model for the later *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*—will be hell-bound. The text ends in a familiar manner: Wulfstan encourages—once again in the first-person plural—the audience to embrace correct Christian beliefs he has presented to them in the homily. Bethurum VIIa fills in Bethurum VII's gaps by

⁶⁸ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 88. Cf. Bethurum, *Homilies*, 301: “This homily is not closely dependent on any source.”

⁶⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 159 (ll. 51-3): “He healed the blind and the mute and the variously injured, and he raised many people from death.”

⁷⁰ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 92-3.

⁷¹ For the entire passage see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 161-4 (ll. 104-58).

providing Old English translations of the Pater Noster and the Creed. While the laity could surely have been taught to memorize the prayers in Latin, Wulfstan's translations gave them a better chance to actually know, and, ideally, to be stirred by, what it was that they were reciting.⁷² For its part in Wulfstan's effort to strengthen the Anglo-Saxon faith, Bethurum VI offers its audience a succinct narrative of Christian history that begins with Creation and ends with a look forward to the time of the Antichrist, once again in explanatory terms rather than with a sense of impending doom.⁷³

Bethurum IX, Wulfstan's rewriting of Ælfric's *De septiformi spiritu*, explains part of the Book of Isaiah to its once again general audience, though priests, specifically, may also form a specific sub-audience.⁷⁴ Wulfstan follows Ælfric's text by naming the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 11:2-3) which were proffered to newly confirmed Christians in Latin along with an English translation, and, as in Ælfric and in Wulfstan's discussion of the eight cardinal sins in Bethurum Xc (though there the material is presented in opposite order), these are complemented by a list of seven faults instigated by the devil. He also adds a short passage on bishops very much akin to the material in Bethurum XV, as it once more emphasizes the importance of bishops—in this case, it is suggested that bishops are the ones who can grant the sevenfold gifts at confirmation.⁷⁵ Wulfstan's major divergence from Ælfric's text (though, see also below) is the addition of a concluding passage which further expounds on the dangers associated

⁷² The usefulness of having these texts available in the vernacular for those who did not know Latin had been recognized long before Wulfstan's life by Bede in his Letter to Egbert; for that text see Charles Plummer, ed., *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), 1:405-23.

⁷³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 142-56.

⁷⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 304: "Here it is also possible that Wulfstan in providing his priests with a clear statement is touching upon liturgical and theological matters about which there was doubt: whether baptism and confirmation were one ceremony or two, and whether confirmation could be administered by anyone other than a bishop."

⁷⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 186 (ll. 30-1). This suggestion is teased out in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 131.

with the Antichrist in light of the eventual end of the world. The passage is eschatological only in that it includes some of that trope's essentials like a discussion of the Antichrist and a mention of the end of the world. As Jonathan Davis-Secord has shown, however, the Antichrist—called the *beodfeond*—is discussed in the text for reasons other than the end of the world:

Wulfstan makes it clear in this section of homily IX that the greatest threat from the Antichrist is his treacherous deception which infects more and more people as they themselves become treacherous deceivers, spreading the Antichrist's lies far and wide. Society, the *beod* itself, begins to break down.⁷⁶

The force of the passage is thus not rooted in the Apocalypse, but rather in its use of eschatological themes to emphasize the importance of shielding one's self from those eight perverted gifts (*ungifta*) of the devil and the wiles of the Antichrist, not unlike Wulfstan's use of eschatological themes in Napier 50.

Bethurum XII, Wulfstan's rewriting of part of Ælfric's homiletic treatise on false gods,⁷⁷ is yet another homily which fits in among the others under discussion, though its contents are admittedly different in nature. Wulfstan does little to explain the nature of the faith in this text. Rather, Bethurum XII focuses on explaining the foolishness of paganism in rather straightforward terms. The text probably found an audience in the laity, as most of the other texts currently under discussion did. It may also have been aimed at churchmen, such as priests and bishops, who had regular contact with the perhaps sometimes-curious laity, since the work provides talking points which discredit

⁷⁶ Davis-Secord, "Rhetoric and Politics," 90.

⁷⁷ For discussions on the relationship of Wulfstan's text to Ælfric's see Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, 71-7; Meaney, "Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse 'Heathenism,'" 462-7; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 104-6.

pagan gods and the perceived process by which they were made deities in the first place. XII is fairly academic, but it is also brief and is not a terribly complex document compared to its source, which stretches to an exhausting 676 lines in John C. Pope's edition.⁷⁸ The difference in length is because Ælfric wrote his text for monks, an audience who would have had time for a protracted text. Wulfstan's, on the other hand, is aimed at the laity and secular clergy, and thus it is necessarily briefer than its source. Rather than an exposition on the current condition of the Anglo-Saxon faith, Bethurum XII is essentially a treatise on the weakness of humankind to the deceptions of the devil that uses the creation of pagan gods as its case study. Consider its opening: "Eala, gefyrn is þæt ðurh deofol fela þinga misfor, 7 þæt mancynn to swyðe Gode mishyrde, 7 þæt hæðenscipe ealles to wide swyðe gederede 7 gyt dereð wide."⁷⁹ It was the devil who took advantage of humanity's moral frailty, in other words, and caused people to choose to invent false gods. As Clare A. Lees notes, in contrast to Ælfric, Wulfstan "emphasizes human agency in choosing to worship the false."⁸⁰ Through the influence of the devil, for example, people made heathen gods (*hæþene godas*), worshipped the sun and the moon because of their appearance (*for heora scinendan beorhtnesse*) along with a myriad of God's other creations instead of God, Himself. Soon more gods were added to the heathen pantheon, including "entas and strece woruldmen þe mihtige wurdan on woruldafelum 7 egesfulle wæron þa hwyle þe hy leofedon, 7 heora agenum lustum fullice

⁷⁸ John C. Pope, ed., *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, EETS o.s. 259, 260, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967-8), 2:676-712.

⁷⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 221 (ll. 3-5): "Oh, it was long ago that through the devil many things went astray, and humankind disobeyed God too much, and heathendom all too much caused harm, and it still widely causes harm."

⁸⁰ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, 73.

fulleodan.”⁸¹ The emphasis here is on the worldly, which pagans and those they deify, the sermon claims, privilege over the truly divine. Brief discussions of Classical Roman deities and Odin follow, revealing that the immoral and worldly nature of these deities remains the emphasis. Venus, for example, was a lecher “swa ful and swa fracod on galnysse þæt hyre agen broðor wið hy gehæmde.”⁸² The closing of the sermon once again reminds its audience of the weakness of humankind when the influence of the contriving devil (*syrwienda deofol*) is once again brought up to explain the errors of paganism. Thus, in its essentials, Bethurum XII is a treatise Wulfstan adapted from his source which warns its audience how easy it is to be misled by the devil and the worldly, and that one’s resistance to such influences carries with it a great reward: “[a]c se bið gesælig þe eal swylc oferhogað 7 þone soðan Godd lufað 7 weorðað þe ealle þing gescop and geworhte.”⁸³

Theologically speaking, there is nothing in these homilies dating to Æthelred’s reign that is really notable or atypical other than the millenarianism detectable in Wulfstan’s early eschatological homilies. This is precisely their intention. These texts are exercises in distilling the elementary but important facets of Christianity so that they are digestible for an uneducated and varied Anglo-Saxon laity. A prime and representative example is Bethurum Xc, a homily written to train the laity in the basics of their faith as part of Wulfstan’s larger program of strengthening Anglo-Saxon England through

⁸¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 222 (ll. 37-9): “giants and violent men of the world who were mighty in worldly power and terrible the times when they lives, and they foully followed their own lusts.”

⁸² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 224 (ll. 78-9): “so foul and so vile in lust that she fornicated with her own brother.” See also Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, 75, in which it is noted that Wulfstan is more timid than Ælfric was about describing the sexual perversion of Venus, perhaps due to his intention for his text to be delivered orally.

⁸³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 224 (ll.89-91): “but he will be blessed who scorns all such things and loves and worships the true God who created and wrought everything.”

firming up its Christianity. This goal continues through the rest of Wulfstan's career, and action directed at the laity towards it during most of Æthelred's reign follows this course of spiritual guidance. Up until the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, in other words, Wulfstan's methods in his homilies and sermons to the laity did not change.

These homilies do not obviously delve into anything one might loosely consider political, though close examination of the texts turns up some subtle allusions to contemporary Anglo-Saxon events—topics that come to the fore in later homilies. The relative scarcity of such references is rather likely due in part to the fact that it took a few years into Wulfstan's known career for him to go from simply homilist to Whitelock's "Homilist and Statesman." He had not yet written any lawcodes, for example, unless one counts the first version of the *Canons of Edgar* (c. 1005-6), a set of regulations for the secular clergy which Wormald nevertheless includes in his category "Legal tracts."⁸⁴ At this point in his career, Wulfstan's political thought was still in its developing stages and for the most part it had not yet crossed over into the (arch)bishop's homiletic writings (though snippets may be found here and there). None, however, are blatantly obvious. Godden, for example, has shown that some of these homilies "hint at an identification of Old Testament events with the contemporary Viking situation."⁸⁵ These include Bethurum VI, discussed above, as well as XI and XIX, which are discussed in the following section.⁸⁶ Those texts returns to the connection made between the unsteady faith of the Anglo-Saxons and the invading Vikings in Bethurum III, based on Matthew 24:7:

⁸⁴ Wormald, "State-Builder," 26.

⁸⁵ Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 154.

⁸⁶ Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 154-5.

And ðy us deriað 7 ðearle dyrfað fela ungelimpa, and ælþeodige men 7
 utancumene swyðe us swencað, ealswa Crist on his godspelle swutollice sæde þæt
 scolde geweorðan. He cwæð: *Surget gens contra gentem, et reliqua*. Ðæt is on
 Englisc, upp ræsað þeoda, he cwæð, 7 wiðerræde weorþað 7 hetelice winnað 7
 sacað heom betweenan for ðam unrihte þe to wide wyrð mid mannum on
 eorðan.⁸⁷

The connection made is pretty clear. Wulfstan notes that what the kingdom is facing is primarily due to prevalent injustice (*unrihte*). This is a failure not only of those people who engage in such activity, but also of the Anglo-Saxon state since it is its job through legislation and regulation—and the enforcement of both—to maintain order and, most especially, justice.

There is a bit more from these early homilies that should be considered, though. In the first place, Wulfstan’s apparent interest in informing or reminding the Anglo-Saxon laity of the importance and necessity of bishops in Bethurum IX and XV deserves reiteration. Though I find it unlikely, it is possible that Wulfstan was self-centered enough to stress the position of bishops because he was one, himself, as a way of emphasizing his own standing and essentiality, along with those of his fellow bishops.⁸⁸

What is more likely is that bishops are given a place in these texts in order to call

⁸⁷ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 124 (ll. 20-6): “And thus many misfortunes greatly hurt and afflict us, and foreign and strange men severely oppress us, just as Christ in His gospel plainly said must come to pass. He said *Surget gens contra gentem, et reliqua*. That is in English: He said, nations will rise up, and become opposed, and bitterly fight and contend amongst themselves because of the injustice which has become too widespread among people on earth.”

⁸⁸ The Latin poem in honor of Wulfstan in British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fol. 148v—which appears to be in his own hand—may lend credence to the suggestion that Wulfstan was not the totally humble figure one might want and/or expect him to be. For the poem see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 377-8. It is also printed with a discussion and translation in Orchard, “Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter,” 328-31.

attention to their importance to the Anglo-Saxon Church as administrators and performers of Christian rituals, but also to Anglo-Saxon society as landlords, royal counselors, and intercessors for the people, among other posts and obligations. This keeps with the general tenor of this group of homilies as a whole, as it maintains their overarching emphasis on exposition and on the spiritually ideal. There is nothing in these short passages on bishops, in other words, that contains any note of criticism or displeasure on Wulfstan's part—the sort of material that will show up in the later years of his career. What are present are the early stages of a main political concern of Wulfstan, the role of bishops.

But the content in these homilies is not always uncritical, though Wulfstan's concerns certainly remain veiled. To return to Bethurum IX, Wulfstan's list of the gifts of the Holy Spirit contains political undertones: "*sapientia* on Leden, þæt is wisdom on Englisc; *intellectus* on Leden, andgyt on Englisc; *consilium* on Leden, þæt is rædgeðeht on Englisc; *fortitudo* on Leden, modes strengð on Englisc; *scientia* on Leden, god ingehyd on Englisc; *pietas* on Leden, arfæstnyss on Englisc; *timor Domini*, Godes ege on Englisc."⁸⁹ Wulfstan follows Ælfric's Latin terminology precisely, while his English translations are almost exact. Ælfric translates *consilium* simply as "ræd," whereas Wulfstan opts for the compound "rædgeðeht." This is the only use of the compound in extant Old English prose and, to my knowledge, Wulfstan's use of the compound has yet to be adequately defined. The Bosworth-Toller dictionary defines the compound as

⁸⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 185 (ll. 21-7): "*sapientia* in Latin, that is wisdom in English; *intellectus* in Latin, intellect in English; *consilium* in Latin, that is counsel in English; *fortitudo* in Latin, that is strength of mind in English; *scientia* in Latin, good mind in English; *pietas* in Latin, honorableness/piety in English; *timor Domini* in Latin, fear of God in English."

“counsel,” and thus simplifies the nature of the word by ignoring its compound nature.⁹⁰ The same is true of Loring Holmes Dodd, who takes it to mean “prudence,” a meaning “ræd” and possibly “geðe(a)ht” can have on their own.⁹¹ Bethurum says nothing about the term, though she does note that at times Wulfstan uses two words in place of Ælfric’s one in IX⁹²— it is doubtful that she has compounds in mind with this comment, however. Finally, Mabel Falberg Dobyns’s unpublished glossary to Bethurum’s edition of the homily follows Dobbs.⁹³ Such definitions apply to Ælfric’s “ræd” well enough, but they lose sight of the fact that Wulfstan intentionally substituted a compound for Ælfric’s term. To suggest, as these studies do, that Wulfstan’s compound has the same meaning as “ræd” is to oversimplify the matter. The term as a whole must be considered. The second part of the compound, “geðe(a)ht,” can mean “counsel” or “advice,”⁹⁴ but it can also mean “assembly” or “council,”⁹⁵ which is more likely in Wulfstan’s case. Such is Ælfric’s usage in his *Passio beati Stephani protomartiris*, when he narrates that the Jewish scribes brought Stephen to their assembly (*heora gepeahte*).⁹⁶ This meaning, in other words, was still current. Thus, I find the most reasonable definition for “rædgeðeht” to be the most literal one: “assembly-counsel,” or perhaps “council’s counsel.” This is far more specific than “prudence” or “counsel,” and it also seems rather timely. Many of the

⁹⁰ Joseph Bosworth, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*, ed. T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), 783.

⁹¹ Loring Holmes Dodd, *A Glossary of Wulfstan’s Homilies*, Yale Studies in English 35 (New York: Henry Holt, 1908; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968), 170. Dodd’s title is a misnomer, as her glossary is for all of the works printed by Napier. It nonetheless remains a useful work.

⁹² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 306.

⁹³ Mabel Falberg Dobyns, “Wulfstan’s Vocabulary: A Glossary of the *Homilies* with Commentary” (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973), 95.

⁹⁴ Bosworth, *Dictionary*, 453 lists other options in this vein (definition 1). See also the definition for “peaht,” which accords with this definition but not the one below; Bosworth-Toller, 1040.

⁹⁵ Bosworth and Toller, *Dictionary*, 453 (definition 2).

⁹⁶ Peter Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, vol. 1, *Text*, EETS s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 199 (l. 23). The term is used with the same meaning in l. 27.

difficulties of Æthelred's reign alluded to above and discussed in my second chapter could have been avoided or lessened by the availability of thoughtful and well-meaning counsel from his advisors, and perhaps Wulfstan sought to remind Æthelred of this with Bethurum IX. At odds with such an interpretation, however, is the text's presumed audience, which, as noted above, consisted of the laity and probably also priests. While it is certainly possible that Wulfstan nevertheless made this particular change to his source with the idea of Æthelred reading or hearing this text in mind, it is more probable that the archbishop took the opportunity instead, as he so often did in his earlier homilies, to shore up the laity. Informing the laity—particularly those in administrative roles like certain reeves—that *rædgeþehte* was bestowed upon them by the bishop at their confirmation on behalf of the Holy Spirit was to place on them a heavy spiritual and moral burden to live their lives and perform their roles in a manner befitting such a gift from so pre-eminent a provider. The addition of *geþeht* to *ræd* emphasizes the multipersonal nature of counsel and advice, and it implies that decision-making is part of a collective rather than individual process. The fostering of this manner of reaching decisions could have important consequences. Ideally speaking, such a practice would help yield the best plans of action both in the lives of individual Anglo-Saxons and, more importantly to a blossoming statesman, in the running of the kingdom. This is not so different from the emphasis Wulfstan put on deliberation when it came to punishing criminals I discussed in Chapter Two. Thoughtfulness in decision-making—whether in assigning punishment or in more usual instances—is a characteristic of both the state at large and of individuals, especially those in some position of authority, that Wulfstan actively tried to foster.

Wulfstan the Adviser: The Remaining Homilies of Æthelred's Reign

A watershed event in Wulfstan's career occurred in 1008, when he penned his first official Anglo-Saxon lawcode, V Æthelred, and also assembled important legal matters in the Latin draft of Æthelred VI. Slightly earlier than this, probably c. 1007, Wulfstan had also put together the "Laws of Edward and Guthrum," a text which aped legislative authority. What followed was a flurry of legislative activity. In c.1009 Wulfstan drew up VII Æthelred and soon after completed Napier 35,⁹⁷ a (homiletic?) revision of the code that has suffered from additions by an overzealous reviser, along with Napier 39/VIIa Æthelred. This new foray into a firmly political sphere had lasting effects on the rest of his homiletic writings during Æthelred's reign. Wulfstan's new position as legislator for the kingdom put him in a position that probably no other Anglo-Saxon, not even Æthelred, could claim. He was a legal expert. He knew the law of the land, and he was learning its previous laws, more than any other person alive. Even if V Æthelred's preamble is true when it claims that the entire *witan* along with Æthelred assembled the code,⁹⁸ it was Wulfstan who actually drafted it in his familiar style and, by doing so, he would have had to have come to an especially intimate knowledge of the legislation at hand. Moreover, that Æthelred and/or the *witan* selected Wulfstan for the job signals that his authority and talents were recognized, and thus it is not outside of the realm of possibility to suggest that the king and his councilors had a high level of respect for Archbishop Wulfstan.

⁹⁷ The probable additions made by Wulfstan's reviser are printed in brackets in Napier's edition; see Napier, *Wulfstan*, 169-72. When these additions are stripped away, what remains is essentially a rephrasing of VII Atr that is more suited to oral delivery than the actual code would have been. That said, and like Napier 39/VIIa Atr, the text presents VII's material in much more general terms, as if it was designed to be performed in the face of any disaster rather than the Viking threat, specifically; see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 330-2.

⁹⁸ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 78.

It is a high level of authority that permits someone like Wulfstan to criticize the king and *witan* from the inside. While earlier texts like Bethurum IX in all likelihood were not penned with a royal audience in mind, there is good evidence from a later homily of Æthelred's reign, Bethurum XI, which suggests that it did. Andy Orchard notes that this text features Wulfstan's only use of *unræd* in his "preaching works."⁹⁹ Here the term comes out of Jeremiah's mouth in a speech in which he chides Israel on behalf of God because they, among other transgressions, "unræd filigdon" ("followed poor counsel").¹⁰⁰ This leads Orchard to suggest, with some apparent hesitation, that "Wulfstan's words could be construed as a mark of frustration with the ruling elite that he had joined."¹⁰¹ They can be. Bethurum XI, which dates to c.1012,¹⁰² initiates a short but nevertheless new phase in Wulfstan's homiletic career—one that reaches its height with the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. The texts in this phase are far more thoroughly political even if they do not always comment directly or explicitly on the condition of Anglo-Saxon England the way the *Sermo Lupi* does.

Bethurum XI, which consists of excerpts from Isaiah and Jeremiah,¹⁰³ appears to be an experimental text. Commentators agree that it is not structured as a homily,¹⁰⁴ though Lionarons rightly notes that the biblical passages selected by Wulfstan "are clearly shaped for homiletic expression" that he chose especially for an Anglo-Saxon

⁹⁹ Orchard, "Reader, Writer, and Rewriter," 314.

¹⁰⁰ Orchard, "Reader, Writer, and Rewriter," 315. For the passage in Bethurum's edition see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 219 (ll. 206-9).

¹⁰¹ Orchard, "Reader, Writer, and Rewriter," 315.

¹⁰² Wormald, "State-Builder," 26; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 147-8. While I agree with Wormald and Lionarons, other scholars have dated the text much closer to the start of Wulfstan's career; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 331-2 and Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25.

¹⁰³ For the specific passages from these books used in the sermon see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 322-3.

¹⁰⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 331; Hall, "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons," 96; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 147.

audience.¹⁰⁵ It is bipartite in structure, with the first portion (ll. 1-97) containing Latin excerpts from Isaiah and Jeremiah while the second (ll. 98-234) provides translations of those passages along with homiletic embellishments typical of Wulfstan. While it is tempting to say that the Latin and Old English parts of the text have the same relationship as, for example, Bethurum Ia and Ib—that is, that the Latin version is an outline or draft for the Old English copy—the manuscript evidence suggests otherwise. The text is extant in three manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, pp. 61-64; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, ff. 21-27; and Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. S. 1595, ff. 65v-66v. It is complete only in Hatton 113, though it probably would be also in Corpus 201 if the manuscript was not wanting a leaf. The Copenhagen manuscript, on the other hand, contains only the Latin excerpts from Isaiah and Jeremiah that are included in Bethurum XI along with some English paragraphs in Wulfstan's hand. The opening to these suggests that they refer to the preceding Latin passages: "Se ðe þyses lytlan nele andgyt niman. ne truwie ic æt maran þæt he wille gyman swa he scolde his agenre þearf."¹⁰⁶ The rest of the passage is classic Wulfstan in its sentiment—he instructs his reader to love God and follow His teachings, for example¹⁰⁷—though it is too brief to speculate on what message it was to have if it were ever finished. The Old English is rather clumsily written, though the variation in the size of Wulfstan's script offers an explanation for this, as it suggests that the sentence just quoted was added to "on three or four occasions."¹⁰⁸ Wulfstan's repeated return to the text indicates that he had a lasting

¹⁰⁵ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 148.

¹⁰⁶ The text here is taken from Ker, "Handwriting," 320: "He who does not wish to receive the understanding of this short [passage], I would no more trust that he will take care of, though he should, his own needs."

¹⁰⁷ See also the brief summary of the text in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 36.

¹⁰⁸ Ker, "Handwriting," 320.

interest in the excerpts from Jeremiah and Isaiah, and thus Lionarons's suggestion that the Old English additions to them are "notes for a homily" is probably valid, though I would emphasize that what Wulfstan was working on could very well have been an additional homily on the biblical excerpts rather than a reworking of Bethurum XI since the appended English passages contain material not in that homily.¹⁰⁹

The point of noting the state of the text in its manuscripts is to show that unlike my example of the Latin version of *De antichristo*, Bethurum Ia, the Latin portion of Bethurum XI never exists on its own, divorced from complementary Old English material. In the case of Bethurum Ia, Wulfstan himself apparently considered the text fit to stand apart from its Old English version, as it appears without its vernacular version in Wulfstan's Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. S. 1595. The rest of the manuscripts in which Bethurum Ia appears on its own were outside of Wulfstan's control, which indicates that the compilers of those books saw Ia as a discrete and finished text.¹¹⁰ The opposite is true of Bethurum XI. The Latin and Old English sections are extant in one manuscript because Wulfstan apparently wanted the text presented that way. He had a high level of control over the compilation the Copenhagen manuscript—it features his handwriting and is one of the so-called "Commonplace Book" manuscripts. But the second and third manuscripts, Corpus 201 and Hatton 113, even though they contain Wulfstanian material, fall outside of his sphere of influence because they date to after Wulfstan's death.¹¹¹ The compilers of these manuscripts, then, recognized the

¹⁰⁹ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 36. I take the point that Wulfstan was working on drafting an additional homily as implicitly stated by Lionarons since she refers to the composition in question as "a homily" rather than a revision of Bethurum XI. If this is not what was meant I still take this to be the case.

¹¹⁰ These are: London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. ii; Cambridge, St. John's College, 42; and Madrid, Real Biblioteca del Escorial, T.I.12. For this list see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 49.

¹¹¹ Ker dates the Hatton 113 manuscript to "S. XI (3rd quarter)," and Corpus 201 to "S. XI med.,"; see Ker, *Catalogue*, §331 and §49, respectively.

homogeneity and cohesiveness of Wulfstan's dual-language text and copied it in its entirety.

Bethurum XI was a new kind of text for Wulfstan. Though he by no means avoided intermingling Latin in his vernacular homilies, none of the homiletic texts prior to XI, with the exception of Bethurum II, came close to including so much Latin material.¹¹² Bethurum II, quite possibly Wulfstan's earliest homily, is a true homily in its simplest form. The text presents a passage from Scripture (in this case from the Gospel of Matthew) which it then explains and comments on in the vernacular for the spiritual benefit of the laity and the otherwise unlearned.¹¹³ It is the kind of homily one would expect a new Bishop of London to produce, and it may very well have been the type Wulfstan was familiar with from his previous posts, wherever and whatever they were.

As his career progressed, however, lengthy Latin prelims apparently fell out of favor with Wulfstan. The Latin opening to Bethurum III, for example, is significantly pared down, and the remaining two Latin snippets in that text are promptly translated into English.¹¹⁴ As has been noted above, the homilies printed by Bethurum entirely in Latin constitute drafts and/or outlines for their Old English counterparts. The same is rather likely true of the Latin homilies attributed to Wulfstan by J. E. Cross and Thomas N. Hall,¹¹⁵ with one possible exception, though apparently their vernacular final drafts were

¹¹² Note that the opening Latin passage which Bethurum prints at the beginning of Bethurum IX is not Wulfstan's work, but Ælfric's, and that it does not precede any of the manuscript versions of Wulfstan's text; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 321.

¹¹³ Cf. Bethurum's comments in Bethurum, *Homilies*, 286. I agree with her comments regarding Bethurum II, but, as will be seen below, do not subscribe to her characterization of Bethurum XI and XIX as similar texts.

¹¹⁴ Latin material is treated similarly in Bethurum VI, VIIa, VIIIc, IX, Xa, Xc, etc.

¹¹⁵ J. E. Cross, "Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript," *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 203-20; J. E. Cross, "A Newly-Identified Manuscript of Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book,' Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 1382 (U. 109), ff. 173r-198v," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992): 63-83; James E. Cross, "Contents of the Manuscript," in *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection*:

either never written or have not survived. The content of all but one of these sermons indicates that they were probably meant to be finished in Old English since they are clearly intended for the laity, the vast majority of whom would have had no knowledge of Latin.¹¹⁶ The potential exception is the *Admonitio episcoporum utilis*, Hall's Appendix 1, which clearly has an audience of bishops in mind, many, if not most or all, of whom should have had a level of comfort with Latin.¹¹⁷ It is thus hard to avoid the conclusion that Wulfstan recognized that the laity would receive little benefit from overly Latinate texts since all of the homilies which precede Bethurum XI are aimed at the very least in part at this group. Though its date is uncertain, the *Admonitio*, however, shows that Wulfstan retained the use of Latin in texts intended for a more educated part of the population, in this case bishops.

Bethurum XI and the text most similar to it, Bethurum XIX,¹¹⁸ thus do not signal a return to Wulfstan's earliest days of homiletic writing. Far from it. Bethurum XI and XIX make up instead a new form of Wulfstan's homiletic writing—one that is directed at the higher eschelons of society, those Anglo-Saxons who had a role in the legislation of the kingdom. Evidence for this is the importance of the Latin passages to these texts as well as their presentations of Old Testament admonitions against improper conduct and

Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595, EEMF 25, ed. James E. Cross and Jennifer Morrish Tunberg (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1993), 14-23; James E. Cross and Jennifer Morrish Tunberg, "Introduction," in Cross and Tunberg, *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection*, 1-13; and Hall, "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons," 93-139.

¹¹⁶ These texts are edited with translations in Appendix 2 in Hall, "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons," 115-39.

¹¹⁷ See also Hall, "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons," 108-9.

¹¹⁸ A discussion similar to that concerning Bethurum IX is not necessary in the case of XIX, as it is no wonder that it survives in its entirety in three manuscripts, two of which were outside of Wulfstan's control, since it is structured far more like a single cohesive piece than is Bethurum IX. Bethurum XIX is extant in the Wulfstan-connected London, British Library, Cotton Nero A. i (I). The other manuscripts, without Wulfstan connections, are Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121.

law—material that would have been of especial interest to the *witan* and Æthelred. Though it was a short-lived tactic, Wulfstan’s dual-language approach in these texts is designed to emphasize the biblical history associated with legislation and the regulation of conduct. It is both, on the one hand, a version of the method of emphasizing the importance and spiritual tradition of law that Alfred employed in the preface to his lawcode when he connected his own lawmaking with early biblical history, and, on the other, a rhetorical tactic which forces those in the audience to confront their responsibility to uphold biblical principles by presenting a selection of those values in sacred Latin alongside the vernacular.¹¹⁹ Concerning the former, Wulfstan does not reach as far back as Alfred had, when he, for example, opened his lawcode with an account of Moses receiving the Ten Commandments from God, but the archbishop’s strategy in Bethurum XI and XIX is nevertheless akin to that of Alfred.¹²⁰ These texts present selected passages from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Leviticus, some of which will be discussed below, alongside Old English translations to call the attention of the *witan* and Æthelred to concerns and issues which were anything but new, and which God, Himself, had warned Israel about through His prophets. In this way Bethurum XI and XIX cast Anglo-Saxon England as the new Israel, and thus they stress to Æthelred and his councilors that they have a responsibility to please God through proper law and order.¹²¹ To turn to the latter suggestion, Wulfstan makes it a point in XI and XIX to provide essentially the same content in both Latin and Old English for his audience, despite the fact that he

¹¹⁹ In its essentials this is a version of what Wulfstan did late in his career when he inserted Old English materials into the York Gospels. For this see Treharne, “Politics of Early English,” 108-22.

¹²⁰ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:26-8 (Af. Int.- Int. 1.11.)

¹²¹ Analysis of authors, including Wulfstan in the *Sermo Lupi*, connecting the Anglo-Saxons with Israel and the Israelites may be found in Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking*, esp. 8-32.

acknowledges that some will not be learned enough to understand the Latin sections in XIX: “And se þe ne cunne þæt Leden understandan, hlyste nu on Englisc.”¹²² While I am not interested in denying that this text and XI are dual-language in order to aid in the audience’s comprehension, that is not all that is going on in these works directed at the important men of the kingdom. The Latin portions of these homilies may very well have been impenetrable to some in the audience at the sentence-level, but they would have been symbolic to all who heard or read the texts. In both Bethurum XI and XIX the Latin is privileged over English because spiritually—even though XIX’s section is more of a paraphrase than a duplication of biblical material—the content and language of both passages are sacred, and because the presentation of them in the primary position is most useful rhetorically. Even if one could not understand the first sections, one would still recognize that he was hearing God’s word in God’s language. Thus the Latin both primes the listener for the second half of each text as well as endorses the latter parts’ content though the implicit reminder that both pieces are rooted in God.

Bethurum XI further stands out because of its highly developed prose rhythm. It is, in fact, the most advanced in this regard of any of Wulfstan’s prose works.¹²³ The rhythm adds force to the text’s content, much like it would a few years later in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* in the striking catalogs of sin peppered throughout that text. In terms of content, Wulfstan’s choice of passages to present to his audience is rather savvy, as Lionarons has shown: he “omits details which would dilute his purpose in adapting the prophet’s exhortations to current events, such as the name of Isaiah’s father and those of

¹²² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 252 (ll. 42-43): “And he who is unable to understand Latin, listen now in English.”

¹²³ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 332; Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 147.

the kings of Judah.”¹²⁴ Rather than focus on such details of no immediate use or import to his audience, Wulfstan focuses on the divine consequences of wrongful conduct, beginning with a lengthy passage as timely as it is frightening:

Bearn ic afedde, he cwæð, 7 up hy arærde, ac hi me forletan 7 swyðe ofersawan.
 Hy hyrwdan mid wordan þæt hy sceoldan herigean, 7 forletan on dædan þæt hy
 scoldan healdan, 7 naman heom to ðeawan ælðeodige gewunan, 7 on bæc
 hwyrfdan ealle heora wisan; 7 forðam sceal geweorðan, he cwæð, to soðe ic eow
 secge, eower eard weste 7 eac eowre burga mid fyre forbærnde. Ælðeodige men
 eow sculon hergian, 7 ðonne ge gebiddaþ 7 to me clypiað, nelle ic eow gehyran,
 forðam þe ge syndon mid mane afyllede ealles to swyðe 7 mid unrihte.¹²⁵

Wulfstan is beginning to bare his teeth. This is no mere recapitulation of portions of Isaiah 1—this is a stern warning to Æthelred and the *witan* about the state of the kingdom and the consequences which it will face if that condition is not improved, adapted from God’s warnings to Israel in Isaiah. It also reacts to previous and contemporary events. Despite not having an exact date for the text, c.1012 places it at an extremely tumultuous part of Æthelred’s reign even if it is off by a year or two. By this time the number of areas which had been harried by or fallen to Swein, Cnut, and their men was immense,¹²⁶ and Wulfstan’s audience would have had no trouble connecting the laying waste of land

¹²⁴ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 148.

¹²⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 215 (ll. 108-16): “‘I nourished children,’ He said, ‘and raised them up, but they forsook and very much neglected me. They blasphemed with words what they should have praised, and they forsook in deeds what they should have retained, and they adopted for themselves customs from foreign practices, and they turned their back on all their prudence; and therefore it shall come to pass,’ He said, ‘in truth I say to you, your land will be waste and your cities will be burned with fire. Foreign men shall harry you, and then you will entreat and call out to me, and I will not hear you, because you are filled all too greatly with sin and injustice.’”

¹²⁶ For a brief account of this activity up to c.1012 in Æthelred’s reign see Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 373-82.

and burning of cities at the hands of foreign men from God's warning to Israel with their own situation.

Wulfstan gets into some specific areas of failure after this warning, once again from specially chosen biblical material. As with the opening, it is up to the audience to connect the material in the text to contemporary events, and, like that earlier passage, this would not have been difficult to do. The passages chosen for inclusion in the text are effective because they are general—they refer to common societal and spiritual issues, and Wulfstan avoids connecting them to specific contemporary events. The strength of such generality is that it forces the audience to take an active role in the sermon; they must connect contemporary events to what is discussed in the text on their own. Take, for example, injustice:

Wa þam, he cwæð, þe ræreð unriht to rihte 7 undom demeð earmum to hynðe 7 wudewan 7 steopcild oftost ahwæneð; 7 forðam he sceal drefan dimme 7 deopne helleswites grund, helpes bedæled.¹²⁷

Wulfstan's biblical source includes some examples of injustice and improper behavior, and he lets them stand on their own even though he surely could have included numerous contemporary examples. That move was up to the audience. Wulfstan does, however, insert the final portion (ll. 178-9) of the quoted passage, and, by doing so, emphasizes an individual's responsibility—in the case of this text, that of Æthelred and the *witan*—to heed Isaiah's message with a healthy dose of brimstone. This is accomplished through

¹²⁷ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 218 (ll. 176-9): “‘Woe to those,’ he said, ‘who raise up injustice as justice, pronounce unjust judgements, and most often vex to the point of humiliation the weak, widows, and orphans, and therefore he shall disturb the dark and deep ground of hell-torments, bereft of help.’”

pronoun switch, from *þam* to *he*—a move which forces the audience to consider the message on the individual level.

As mentioned, the text most similar to Bethurum XI is another dual-language sermon written soon after, Bethurum XIX. XIX is the more structurally polished of the pair—its Latin is integrated smoothly into the work—though it is not as rhythmically impressive as XI. The purpose of frontloading passages in Latin, sometimes paraphrased, from Leviticus 26 is the same as in XI, and, also like that text, the sermon’s lengthy Latin sections and its focus on the importance of proper conduct and divine punishment suggest that it was intended for the ruling elite. Additionally, it is clearly designed to remind the audience that they have a responsibility to govern the people just like Moses was charged with instilling regulation on the Israelites. The homily, through its paraphrasing of parts of Leviticus 26, offers the audience access to part of what God told Moses. In making the audience privy to God’s instructions to His earthly representative, Wulfstan effectively places them at the receiving end of the divine message. The audience is supposed to follow in Moses’ footsteps in directing the people and to hold the model up as an example: “[e]ala, leofan men, by þyllocan bysenan we us magan warnian, gif we willað smeagan ure þearfe, swa us þearf is.”¹²⁸ The connection between the Anglo-Saxons and the Israelites is further made when God gives Moses a warning to relate to the people:

And gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan 7 lara 7 laga mine forgymað
oððe oferhogiað, þonne sceal eow sona weaxan to hearne wædl 7 wawa, sacu 7

¹²⁸ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 252 (ll. 41-2): “oh, beloved people, by such examples we are able to warn ourselves, if we wish to consider our duty, just as is a duty/necessity for us.”

wracu, here 7 hunger; 7 scylan eowre heortan eargian swyþe 7 eowre feonda
mægen strangian þearle.¹²⁹

The message is a familiar one—right along the lines of Bethurum XI—and Wulfstan’s audience is once again expected to map this biblical narrative onto contemporary events. Like the material picked from the Old Testament in XI, Bethurum XIX’s use of Leviticus provides the audience with an explanation for the disastrous events of Æthelred’s reign: the Anglo-Saxons have eschewed God’s wisdom and law and so they are subjected to divine anger. The violent and damaging aspects of this anger, again expressed through the actions of the people’s enemies, is given an additional mention¹³⁰ before Wulfstan moves on to a vernacular paraphrase of Leviticus 26:39-45 that is fuller than his Latin account. While the Latin paraphrase stops at 26:43 with the note that the land of the Israelites will enjoy Sabbaths on its own, without the people, Wulfstan provides more of the narrative in his Old English account. Here the audience learns that even though God said he would punish the Israelites severely for turning from Him, He will not abandon them completely. Eventually, in fact—once the people have been almost totally destroyed and they begin to seek forgiveness for their sins and for those of their ancestors—God will *ræde 7 ryme* (“counsel and aid”) them. This is more of a reminder of God’s steadfastness rather than some sort of comfort to the audience. Unlike the Israelites and, by extension, the Anglo-Saxons, God will not abandon his people if and when they come to their spiritual senses. Rather than a comfort, the passage is more of a warning of the

¹²⁹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 253 (ll. 59-63): “And then if you turn your hearts from me and neglect or despise my wisdom and law, then at once you shall experience an increase in affliction from poverty and misery, strife and suffering, invaders and hunger; and your hearts shall grow very timid and the might of your enemies shall grow severely stronger.”

¹³⁰ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 253 (ll. 67-8): “Land hy awestað 7 burga forbærnað 7 æhta forspillað, 7 eard hy amyrrað” (“They will lay waste to the land, burn the cities, destroy property, and defile the country”).

immediate need for remediation. While Leviticus 26 says that God will not forsake His people, before His punishments wane the people will be almost utterly destroyed:

And þonne land wyrðeð for synnum forworden 7 þæs folces dugoð swyþost
fordwineð, þonne fehð seo wealaf sorhful 7 sarimod geomrigendum mode synna
bemænen 7 sarlice syfian, þæt hy 7 heora ylðran me swa gegremedan þurh þæt hy
noldan mine lage healdan ac me ofersawan on mænigfealde wisan.¹³¹

The inclusion of this passage is ingenious, as it appeals to the self-interest of the ruling elite. Wulfstan recognizes that those in power rarely want to lose that power—indeed, by this time Æthelred had already used questionable means, such as the St. Brice’s Day Massacre, to attempt to preserve his position. God will not abandon his people, Leviticus says, but by the time His punishments end and His people successfully appeal to Him their population will look rather different. Many will perish and their worldly authority will be removed. Those in charge who hear Wulfstan’s sermon will be long gone, relegated to history as the survivors’ ancestors who angered God in the first place. It is a powerful statement, and it builds on the biblical warning presented in Bethurum XI, once again appealing to the ruling elite on an individual level—in this case, by making it clear that those in positions of power will personally come to disaster along with the kingdom as a whole.

¹³¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 253-4 (ll. 68-73): “And when the land becomes desolate because of sins and the multitude of people has mostly vanished, then the survivors, sorrowful and sad-hearted, will start to lament their sins with mournful spirit, and they will sorely lament that they and their ancestors so provoked me through not wanting to follow my laws, but they rather neglected me in manifold ways.”

Bethurum XVIab (c.1012)¹³² round out this series of texts rooted in biblical narrative.¹³³ As is typical of Wulfstan's texts which are extant in a Latin and Old English version, the Latin XVIa is a draft or outline for XVIb,¹³⁴ though in the vernacular version "he translated the Latin material selectively and augmented it."¹³⁵ It has been pointed out that XVIb is probably not a finished homily—it lacks Wulfstan's usual homiletic opening *Leofan men*, for example, and so it may have been written for the archbishop to personally refer to when drafting other texts.¹³⁶ As Wilcox has shown, however, the text was composed with great care and skill.¹³⁷ It is thus easy to imagine it ending up on the desks of some Anglo-Saxon churchmen, though the lack of evidence for this possibility means this can only remain a speculation.

While Bethurum XI and XIX found audiences in the *witan* and probably King Æthelred, himself, Bethurum XVIb is aimed at bishops and priests—those responsible for the spiritual well-being of the Anglo-Saxon laity. It thus adds an additional facet to the archbishop's program of remedying his society's ills by addressing one of their symptoms: the performance of those churchmen who dealt the most with the Anglo-Saxon laity. XVIb is a brief and pithy text. In a mere thirty-six lines in Bethurum's

¹³² The approximate date used here is Wormald's, and I consider it more or less accurate since the concerns of XVIab fit in well with Bethurum XI and XIX, discussed above, and Bethurum XXI, Napier 51, and Bethurum XX, discussed below. See Wormald, "State-Builder," 26. Pons-Sanz is more tentative in her dating of this text and others which will be discussed in this section of the chapter. She places XVIab in her group F (?) which includes other texts of an uncertain date, and which falls in between her group E (1012 x 1014) and G (1016 x 1018); see Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25.

¹³³ The main biblical sources are Ezekiel 33-4 and Isaiah 56. Additional sources include Halitger's *Penitential*, a letter of Boniface, and a homily of Gregory the Great; see Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 111.

¹³⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 348.

¹³⁵ Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 398.

¹³⁶ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, 69; Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 398; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 111-12. Material from Bethurum XVIb was, in fact, used in other texts by Wulfstan such as, for example, *Polity* and the so-called "Admonition to Bishops"; see Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 402-6. See also Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 112.

¹³⁷ Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 399-400.

edition,¹³⁸ Wulfstan voices a host of admonitions related to the actions of priests and bishops, once again couched in the authority of the Old Testament. On the whole it seems that Wulfstan selected passages from his sources which would lend themselves most favorably to exceptionally memorable translation and adaptation. As both Wilcox and Lionarons have pointed out, for example, Wulfstan's passage adapted from Isaiah 56:10 is especially well-wrought.¹³⁹ After noting that shepherds need to keep a careful eye out for the enemies of the people (*þeodscaðan*), especially the devil, who will do whatever it takes to pollute them, Wulfstan adds:

Donne motan þa hyrdas beon swiðe wacole 7 geornlice clipigende þe wið þone
þeodscaðan folc sculon warnian, þæt sindon biscopas 7 mæssepreostas, þe
godcunde heorda bewarian 7 bewerian sculon mid wislican laran, þæt se
wodfræca werewolf to swiðe ne slite ne to fela ne abite of godcundre heorde.¹⁴⁰

The passage is striking, and its violent imagery makes tangible the intangible battle for the souls of the Anglo-Saxons. Even with its fantastic content, the physicality of the passage works to stress the precarious condition of the Anglo-Saxon laity to its audience. The laity needs protection and guidance, and it is up to priests and bishops to provide both.

While Wulfstan's werewolf passage is designed to remind priests and bishops of their pastoral responsibilities, other parts of *Bethurum XVIIb* are included to caution them about the consequences for neglecting those duties. An example is Wulfstan's adaptation

¹³⁸ The final sentence, in Latin, is not actually Wulfstan's, but, rather, is from the pen of the Corpus 201 scribe; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 351.

¹³⁹ Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 399-400; and Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 112-13.

¹⁴⁰ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 241 (ll. 31-6): "Then the shepherds must be very vigilant and eagerly crying against the people's enemy, those who must warn the population—they are bishops and priests—who must guard and defend the flock with wise teachings, so that the ravenous werewolf may not rend them too greatly nor devour too many of them from the sacred flock."

of Ezekiel 33:7: “Cyð swiðe georne, he cwæð, Godes word wide þe of Gode silfum æror asprungon, 7 gif þu sinfullan nelt synna gestiran 7 þam manfullan mandæda cyþan, þu scealt þa sawle bitere forgildan.”¹⁴¹ Those churchmen who deal with the laity must guide them away from sin and wrongdoing or they will be punished, themselves. Though it is addressed to a different audience, Bethurum XVIIb is not so different from XI and XIX. While the authority of these texts is rooted in the Bible, their force is fixed in their insistence on the personal responsibility on the part of the members of their audiences to use their positions to push Anglo-Saxon England towards the achievement of a Holy Society.

The preceding three homilies heavily indebted to the Bible—most notably the Old Testament—are complemented by three more homiletic writings which comprise Wulfstan’s final texts of their kind written during Æthelred’s reign: Bethurum XXI,¹⁴² Napier 51, and at least one version of Bethurum XX. Each of these texts is directed at the *witan* rather than Æthelred. This is not to say that the king is overlooked, however. While the discussions which follow aim to be comprehensive, it is important to note at the outset that these texts largely center on the significance of that position. The *witan* have a dual obligation to Æthelred; they must perform their role in the governance of the kingdom on his behalf as well as preserve his position as king.

¹⁴¹ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 240 (ll. 8-11): “‘Proclaim very eagerly,’ he said, ‘the word of God widely, which before originated from God, Himself, and if you do not wish to correct the sinful nor proclaim wicked evil deeds to him, then you shall bitterly pay the soul.’”

¹⁴² Andy Orchard has examined XXI in an article which discusses the difficulties associated with editing Wulfstan’s texts. This article brings to light a number of editorial deficiencies in Bethurum’s edition, and Orchard reedits XXI in his Appendix I. In the discussion which follows my quotations will be taken from Bethurum’s edition, though I will also cite the applicable portion of Orchard’s. For his study see Andy Orchard, “On Editing Wulfstan,” in *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies 252 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 311-40, Appendix I at 328-32.

While Bethurum prefers a post-1016 date for XXI, I find Wormald's dating of c. 1013 to be more probable since the brief sermon's contrast of the deplorable present with the ideal past in the face of Viking domination—not unlike Alfred's account of the state of education in the wake of similar attacks in his Preface to the *Pastoral Care*—makes this dating especially appropriate.¹⁴³ Wulfstan gives no indication of what past he has in mind in XXI, however, unlike in some of his laws and later homilies where he alludes specifically to administrative success during the reigns of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar. His vagueness here implies that a symbolic past is envisioned—one that is ahistorical but is nevertheless a useful model with which to contrast Anglo-Saxon England's pre-Cnut eleventh-century reality. Indeed, this “past” is rather utopian:

Ac hwilum þa hit god was, eal he wearð to woroldscame se þe stod on mane 7 on misdæde ænig hwile, butan he gewende þe raþor to his Drihtne; 7 se þe gewunede þæt he wolde leogan, ealle hine leadan þa þe God lufedon. And þa hyt wæs on þeode for God 7 for worolde wislic 7 weorðlic, þa men riht lufode 7 unrihte ascunode.¹⁴⁴

Wulfstan's romantic appeal to the days of yore is a timeless rhetorical tactic that relies on the convincing illusion that as time progresses society as a whole becomes more and more complicated and debased. Here the archbishop fosters that illusion with the claim

¹⁴³Part of Bethurum's argument for a later date is that the text is in “Wulfstan's most polished style.” The very same point, however, can be made about the earlier XIX; see Bethurum, *Homilies*, 364. For Wormald's date see Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26. His date is tentatively followed in Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary*, 25

¹⁴⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 277 (ll.17-23): “And then at that time, when it was good, he would come completely to worldly shame, he who dwelled in wickedness and in misdeed for any time, unless he turned more quickly to his Lord; and he who still wished to speak falsely, all those who loved God scorned him. And then it was among the people, before God and world, wise and honorable, when they loved justice and shunned injustice.” See also Orchard, “On Editing Wulfstan,” 329 (ll. 47-62), with textual variants on p. 331.

that society was once exceptionally well-regulated and ordered—the offenders either turned to God on their own, suffered worldly shame, or became the targets of others’ scorn. Times have changed according to the following lines of Wulfstan’s sermon; in his and his audience’s day the misbehavior that was so well controlled in Wulfstan’s idealized past has since become a means of worldly advancement.¹⁴⁵ What the kingdom needs, Wulfstan’s text insists, are corrective measures, among which is handling offenders who will not repent: “7 se ðe þæt nelle, ehte we his ealle mid woroldlicre steore.”¹⁴⁶ Criminals must be punished, and the groups responsible for such worldly punishment are the ruling elite and its agents, like reeves. This call to action is yet another development in Wulfstan’s political activity as it is expressed in his homiletic writings, as it forms the first explicit call to those of high rank to exert their authority and the power of legislation in response to the crimes of individual Anglo-Saxons. Previously, in the eschatological homilies, for example, appeals were made to the laity, itself, in order to remind its members to straighten their lives in the face of coming doom. Even Wulfstan’s other homiletic texts directed at those in secular power that have already been discussed, Bethurum XI and XIX, strong statements that they are, do not go so far as to plainly note that worldly punishment should be given to offenders since in those texts, as has been seen, Wulfstan prefers to point out biblical antecedents of contemporary events to the *witan* as well as emphasize their personal responsibility to remedy the situation. In them, however, he stops short of calling specifically for legal action, a response that Wulfstan reemphasizes in the closing to the second version (C²) of

¹⁴⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 277 (ll. 23-5); Orchard, “On Editing Wulfstan,” 329-30 (ll. 63-8), with textual variants on p. 331.)

¹⁴⁶ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 277 (ll. 28-9): “and he who will not [repent], let us all afflict him with worldly punishment.” See also Orchard, “On Editing Wulfstan,” 330 (ll. 80-1).

XXI in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201 by once again referring to an ideal past: “[w]ise wæron worldwitan þe to godcundan. rihtlagan worldlaga settan, folce to steore, 7 Criste 7 cyninge gerehtan þa bote þar man swa scolde manega for neode gewildan to rihte.”¹⁴⁷ In the past the *witan* had an active role—a more active role—in the management of the kingdom on behalf of God and its king by issuing good-quality legislation and by punishing those who crossed it. This version of the text finally issues a call for the renewal of those practices.

Napier 51’s opening call to legislate indicates that here Wulfstan’s *Leofan men* once again comprise of the *witan*: “Leofan men, lagiað worldlagan and lecgað þærtoeacan, þæt ure cristendom fæste stande, and þæt ures hlafordes kinedom up arise, and þæt ealles folces frið wyrðe betere, þonne hit git sig.”¹⁴⁸ Wulfstan then reminds his audience that a just law is one that is rooted in the Golden Rule before beginning a timely discussion of legal protocol. In addition to the familiar instruction to love one God (*ænne god lufian*), Wulfstan adds the important admonitions to have a single king (*ænne cynehlaford rihtlice healdan*) and to defend life and land (*lif and land samod ealle wyrian*). Such concerns place the date of this text firmly within the years of Viking incursions, as both Jost and Wormald have observed. Jost connects the text with the council at Enham in 1008, while Wormald in one publication raises the possibility that it

¹⁴⁷ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 277 (in critical apparatus): “The worldly counselors were wise who established worldly and just laws pertaining to God as punishment for the people, and [they did so] on behalf of Christ, and then they directed compensations on behalf of the king, as many as one should, for the need to rule with justice.” See also Orchard, “On Editing Wulfstan,” noted at 316, text at 332. Note that Orchard’s C², the notation I use here because it is more current, is Bethurum’s C¹.

¹⁴⁸ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 274 (ll. 7-10): “Beloved people, legislate civil law and moreover ordain it so that our Christendom firmly stands, and so that the kingdom of our lord rises up, and so that the peace of the people becomes better than it is now.”

was preached in 1014, but, in another, suggests c. 1012-13.¹⁴⁹ The final option is most convincing given the content of the sermon, for, as Wilcox has plausibly suggested, the *witan* could very well have had a hand in naming Swein king of England in 1013.¹⁵⁰

While a precise date is still uncertain, it seems probable that Napier 51 was written either before the kingdom submitted to Swein—perhaps in response to murmurings of this plan—or, on the other hand, in reaction to the announcement. Indeed, treachery against the king (*hlafordes searwu*) is listed among other crimes that are without compensation (*botleas*) in Napier 51, and traitors (*manswican*) and those who forsake their king (*ba heora hlaford forlætað*) are listed among the people God hates if they do not repent. It is thus quite possible that this text was written in direct response to the wavering support for Æthelred among his royal council to remind these men of the dangerous legal and spiritual territory they could find themselves in.

The apex of Wulfstan's homiletic writings of Æthelred's reign, and perhaps of his entire career, was Bethurum XX, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. The sermon is extant in three distinct versions across five separate manuscripts. The shortest of these versions is contained in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 419, pp. 95-112 (B) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343, ff. 143v-144v (H); the second longest is extant in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, pp. 82-6 (C); while the longest survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, ff. 84r-90v (E) and London, British Library, Cotton Nero A. I, ff. 110r-115r (I). To earlier scholars the order of these three versions

¹⁴⁹ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, 108; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 337n334; and Wormald, "State-Builder," 26, respectively.

¹⁵⁰ Wilcox, "Political Performance," 378-9. See also *ASC* 1013E.

was fairly straightforward.¹⁵¹ Both Bethurum and Whitelock operated on the assumption that as time went on Wulfstan added to the *Sermo Lupi*, with BH being the first version, followed by C, and then, finally, by EI.¹⁵² Some years later Stephanie Dien reevaluated the situation and came to a different conclusion. According to her, EI was Wulfstan's first version, C followed, while BH constitutes a further revision of the sermon.¹⁵³ This version of the transmission of the text's three versions stood unchallenged until 1994, when Godden raised the issue once again and argued for a return to the order proposed by Bethurum and Whitelock.¹⁵⁴ Wilcox followed in 2004 with an argument that endorsed Dien's order of composition, though for different reasons. Rather than focus on the *Sermo Lupi* as an eschatological text as she had—and as Godden has convincingly shown that it is not—Wilcox considers the sermon as a historical document that Wulfstan adapted to the times by shortening it rather than by following his usual practice of expansion.¹⁵⁵ According to him, the longest of the extant versions (EI) can be dated with precision to roughly 16 February 1014.¹⁵⁶ A more recent attempt to straighten the situation out is that of Keynes in 2007. Keynes agrees that the longest extant version of the sermon is closest to what Wulfstan preached in 1014,¹⁵⁷ though he speculates that an earlier version, now lost, was distributed in 1009-12, and that other copies were subsequently made in the wake of the 1014 version which ended up forming the C and

¹⁵¹ An admirable survey of the scholarship associated with the order of these versions, much fuller than my own, can be seen in Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 152-56.

¹⁵² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 22-4; and Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 3-5.

¹⁵³ Dien, "Order and Date of the Three Versions," 561-70. See also her follow-up article, published under a different surname: Stephanie Hollis, "Thematic Structure of the *Sermo Lupi*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977): 175-95.

¹⁵⁴ Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 143-62.

¹⁵⁵ Wilcox, "Political Performance," 376-96.

¹⁵⁶ Wilcox, "Political Performance," 376 and 388-92.

¹⁵⁷ Simon Keynes, "An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12," *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007): 151-220, at 208-9.

BH texts.¹⁵⁸ Finally, Lionarons follows Keynes, though she posits that the copy of the text which Keynes suggests could have circulated before 1014 would have looked like C.¹⁵⁹

While the issue may never be resolved—the fact that so many good scholars have offered different solutions is a testament to the complexity of the problem—I find the suggestions of Dien/Hollis, Wilcox, and Keynes to be the most convincing in terms of which version of the text should be considered the first composed, or at the very least, the first version to be performed in an official capacity. Additionally, I find Wilcox’s arguments for the context of its first performance especially compelling. Briefly, he argues that at the beginning of 1014 the situation must have truly looked dire to Wulfstan, who, by this time, was very much an active participant in the government of Anglo-Saxon England: “it must have looked as if Viking incursions had finally given way to full-blown Viking conquest and as if Swein was the established king of England.”¹⁶⁰ Swein died on 3 February before he could be formally accepted as king by the *witan*, however—an occasion Wilcox presumes to have prompted the royal council’s meeting on 16 February 1016. While the meeting went on as scheduled, instead of taking his son Cnut in his place, the *witan* decided to invite Æthelred back to the throne.¹⁶¹ Something happened to change the *witan*’s mind, and it is well within the scope of believability that what did so was the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, which Wulfstan, Wilcox believes, performed at the meeting.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ Keynes, “An Abbot,” 210-13.

¹⁵⁹ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 155-6.

¹⁶⁰ Wilcox, “Political Performance,” 378.

¹⁶¹ Wilcox, “Political Performance,” 378-9.

¹⁶² Wilcox, “Political Performance,” 382-3.

Concerns similar to those found in Napier 51 regarding traitors and treachery, along with a multitude of additional and timely anxieties, appear in Bethurum XX, which Wilcox has exhaustively chronicled.¹⁶³ There is no real need to cover that ground again for the purposes of this chapter. What is most useful for the present argument is to consider how the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* defines Wulfstan's thought at the end of Æthelred's reign. To some extent it forms a conglomeration of the concerns of his preceding homiletic texts. Though not an eschatological document, the sermon retains some eschatological elements, such as its opening "ðeos worold is on oftste, 7 hit nealæcað þone ende."¹⁶⁴ Material representative of the middle portion of Wulfstan's Æthelredian career, in which he taught the laity its spiritual responsibilities, is also present: "[a]nd micel is nydþearf manna gehwilcum þæt he Godes lage gyne heonanforð georne 7 Godes gerihta mid rihte gelæste."¹⁶⁵ The majority of the text's content, however, fits firmly into the last of my sections of his career under Æthelred, and it, alongside Napier 51, forms Wulfstan's most thoroughly political sermon from this period. Though it is present in order to emphasize God's displeasure with the Anglo-Saxons, the vast majority of the content in Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi* is thoroughly worldly. A major concern of Wulfstan's text, and what I will focus on here, is the contemporary dismantling of Anglo-Saxon England's supposed formerly ordered society. Once again Wulfstan alludes to a past which contrasts with his present when he argues that the kingdom's current state is the result of the devil's influence on its people: "[u]nderstandað eac georne þæt deofol

¹⁶³ Wilcox, "Political Performance," 383-8, especially.

¹⁶⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 267 (ll. 7-8): "this world is in haste and it nears the end." I cite from the EI version of the sermon in the discussion that follows.

¹⁶⁵ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 268 (ll. 25-7): "and it is a great necessity of each man that he observe the laws of God eagerly henceforth and pay God's dues accordingly."

pas peode nu fela geara dwelode to swyþe.”¹⁶⁶ A considerable bulk of the sermon describes the disorder of society, which Wulfstan casts as a major cause of Anglo-Saxon England’s current struggles. As in previous cases, the nature of the evidence means that individual examination of passages would be far too tedious. Table 4.1 catalogs the most significant of these remarks on the collapsing social order of England from the text along with references to Wulfstan’s laws written during Æthelred’s reign which deal with the same issues.

Table 4.1: Selected Examples of Collapsing Social Order in the <i>Sermo Lupi ad Anglos</i>	
<i>Sermo Lupi ad Anglos</i> (EI)	Legislation
Forcing widows to take husbands: ll. 42-3.	V Atr 21.1; VI Atr 26.1.
Selling people into foreign slavery: ll. 43-5; 89-91; 92-6.	V Atr 2; VI Atr 9; VII Atr 5.
Disintegrating families: ll. 61-3.	-
Plotting against/killing a lord, with Edward as an example: ll. 73-7	V Atr 30; VI 37. See also V Atr 16, on Edward’s festival.
Breaking oaths: ll. 96-97, 196	V Atr 22.2; VI Atr 28
Potential dismantling of compensation system, with slave and thane as examples: ll. 101-6.	-

The selections collected in Table 4.1 indicate that the damage already done to social order, along with that which could potentially occur, forms a seam of evidence which runs the length of the *Sermo Lupi*. It must be stressed that these are only some of the most substantial of comments on the state of social order one finds in the text as well. Many of the crimes listed in the catalogues of sins which pepper the sermon and elsewhere, for example, constitute further threats to social order in various degrees. Attacks on priests

¹⁶⁶ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 267 (ll. 11-12): “also, eagerly understand that the devil has too greatly led this nation astray for many years.”

and others in holy orders (ll. 33-7 and *passim*), along with incest, adultery, and *mistic forligru*, “various fornications” (ll.138)—whatever those are—are all challengers to proper order according to the logic of the text. What the table also shows is that, as in Napier 51, Wulfstan’s homiletic and legal minds work in tandem in the *Sermo Lupi* to a significant degree. Not everything in the sermon is related to legislation, of course, but a good deal is, and its engagement with legislation significantly contributes to the sermon’s political nature—especially given that it is a document intended for those who should know and enforce the law.

Before moving on, one further aspect of the *Sermo Lupi* should be discussed, the closing. Andrew Rabin has pointed out that the ending of the *Institutes of Polity* is “derived nearly *verbatim*” from the *Sermo Lupi*’s conclusion (ll. 195-202).¹⁶⁷ The ending is present in both *I* and *II Polity*,¹⁶⁸ and so it is possible that Wulfstan actually derived the ending of the *Sermo Lupi* from *I Polity* if, in fact, Wormald is right to date that text earlier than the sermon.¹⁶⁹ Regardless of its specific path of transmission, the passage’s presence places each in a direct relationship with the other. To Rabin, the passage is present in *Polity* to prompt a process of internalization in the audience since the passage “suggests that the individual, in ordering his words and actions according to legal authority, likewise internalizes the law as a means of structuring himself as a proper subject.”¹⁷⁰ The language of the passage shows that this reading has merit. While most of the rest of *Polity* is written in the third person, Wulfstan switches to the first-person

¹⁶⁷ Rabin, *Political Writings*, 124n126.

¹⁶⁸ Jost, *Polity*, 163-4.

¹⁶⁹ Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26.

¹⁷⁰ Andrew Rabin, “The Wolf’s Testimony to the English: Law and Witness in the ‘Sermo Lupi ad Anglos,’” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105 (2006): 388-414, at 394.

plural—his favorite for homiletic writings—for the conclusion of the text. The switch helps to emphasize the responsibility of the individual to act in an appropriate manner, as the pronoun change gives the instructions of *Polity*'s closing a personal feel. The use of *we* and *us* here of course includes Wulfstan, himself, as it does elsewhere in his writings. The audience's learning that he, too, must cleanse his thoughts, for example, and keep oaths and pledges as well as shield himself from the torments of Hell makes for an apt reminder of an individual's duty to act likewise.¹⁷¹ In other words, such responsibilities can only be fulfilled through the will of each Anglo-Saxon, which Wulfstan's language at the end of *Polity* aims to underscore.

The purpose of *Polity*'s concluding passage, then, is not so dissimilar from what I suggested above regarding Bethurum XVIIb, XI, and XIX, as these texts, too, are designed to remind their audiences of individual responsibility. The *Sermo Lupi* should be counted among those homilies, as its concluding lines operate much as they do in *Polity*. Once again Rabin suggests that the passage prompts a process of internalization for its audience, who must bear witness to their own sins along with those of the Britons from Wulfstan's preceding excerpt on Gildas.¹⁷² There is more to emphasize, however. While the lines may very well have encouraged the audience to look within themselves and to reflect on their island's previous inhabitants, they do so in order to spur external action. Even if Wilcox is wrong about the specifics of the *Sermo Lupi*'s first performance, his identification of its audience as the *witan* is spot on. As I have

¹⁷¹ Wulfstan was sometimes more explicit about his own shortcomings; see Jost, *Polity*, 66: "Ic wat swyðe georne me sylfne forworhtne worde and dæde ealles to swyðe, ne deað þeah for forswyrgan mid ealle Godes ege fela þara þinga, þe dereð þisse þeode" ("I know very much that I, myself, sin all too greatly in word and deed; nevertheless, with a complete fear of God, I do not dare to keep silent about the many things which harm this nation"). On Wulfstan's references to himself, see Wilcox, "Wolf on Shepherds," 409-12.

¹⁷² Rabin, "Wolf's Testimony," 407-8.

suggested numerous times above, the point of addressing this audience in Wulfstan's Æthelredian homilies was always, whether implicitly or explicitly stated, to encourage them to take action against the ills of the time. Thus when Wulfstan directs his audience to properly attend to their individual moral and spiritual duties he absolutely "emphasizes their own implication in the fall of the English."¹⁷³ But this is not where the message ends. Those implicated in the fall of the English are also fingered as those responsible for their restoration, as the lines in the *Sermo Lupi* leading up to the closing shared by the text and *Polity* indicate: "[a]nd utan don swa us þearf is, gebugan to rihte 7 be suman dæle unrihte forlætan 7 betan swyþe georne þæt we ær bræcan."¹⁷⁴ It is up to the audience, those with legal power and authority, to make these changes. It is interesting that Wulfstan here instructs his audience to forsake *unrihte* merely in part—a directive that is much more pragmatic than calling for a wholesale aversion to injustice (or perhaps "what is wrong") in light of the alleged moral weakness of the current population. That the following lines of the sermon call for internalization on the part of the audience does not negate the earlier instruction to remedy society's ills. Rather, it adds to it. The audience has a responsibility to order both themselves and their society appropriately.

Wulfstan's homilies from Æthelred's reign provide a useful case study from which to examine the evolution of his thought during this period. To briefly reiterate this process, Wulfstan started his career obsessed with eschatology in Bethurum Iab-V—probably because of the impending millennium, and, in the case of Bethurum V, of its recent passing. The Penitential Letters (I-III) from the same early stage of Wulfstan's

¹⁷³ Rabin, "Wolf's Testimony," 408.

¹⁷⁴ Bethurum, *Homilies*, 275 (ll. 190-2): "and let us do what is necessary: submit to justice and to some extent forsake injustice, and very eagerly amend for what we previously did wrong."

career show, as if one needed additional evidence, that Wulfstan had the spiritual health of the Anglo-Saxons on his mind in more general terms as well. This concern was carried through the intermediary portion of Wulfstan's Æthelredian career in the form of Bethurum XIV-XV, VIIIabc, Xabc, VII and VIIa, IX and XII, all of which explain important aspects of Church doctrine and belief to the laity. In the waning years of Æthelred's reign Wulfstan's homilies (Bethurum XI, XIX, XVIab, XXI, Napier 51, and Bethurum XX(EI)) began to be directed at Æthelred and/or the ruling elite and, thus, became far more politically motivated. This final stage of Wulfstan's homiletic career is the one that is primarily expressed throughout Cnut's reign and up to the archbishop's death, though, as will be seen, it manifests itself in a different manner. This change in approach to these writings was surely due to Wulfstan's new position as a lawmaker and member of the *witan* that he came into sometime before his first legal codes appeared in 1008. In sum, over the course of the first portion of Wulfstan's career, the homiletic writings show that Wulfstan gradually transitioned from Whitelock's "Homilist and Statesman" to Statesman and Homilist.

Chapter 5

Ac to lyt is þara nu ða, þe þæt understande, swa swa man scolde:

Wulfstan during the Reign of Cnut

In the previous chapter I argued that Wulfstan's thought changed over the course of Æthelred's reign by focusing primarily on the homiletic writings written during that period of Anglo-Saxon history. There I identified three stages of Wulfstan's developing thought, the last of which consisted of the homilies written by the archbishop in the waning years of Æthelred's reign. These texts were directed at Æthelred and/or his *witan*, and their purpose was not only to remind these men of their responsibility to properly govern the kingdom, but also to outright criticize them when it was deemed necessary to do so. The importance of Æthelred's position as king was made clear, and in these texts Wulfstan vehemently protested crimes against the king.

This chapter complements the last portion of the previous chapter by examining selected writings which date from Cnut's ascension to the English throne in 1016 until Wulfstan's death in 1023. Unlike that chapter, however, only some of the archbishop's homiletic writings will be discussed—those contained in the York Gospels and Napier 50. While these homilies are rather important, Wulfstan's other texts like the *Canons of Edgar*, *Institutes of Polity*, and I-II Cnut reveal a significant development in Wulfstan's political thought—one that is unseen until Cnut's ascension. During the Cnut years Wulfstan deemphasized the role of the king in order to stress the importance of those in lower positions of authority, such as the secular clergy, reeves, and those associated with local courts. The result is a far more thorough and pragmatic approach to the regulation

and governance of Anglo-Saxon England—one that comes close to being bureaucratic in nature.

When Cnut ascended to the Anglo-Saxon throne in 1016, the very fabric of the kingdom changed. The dynasty that had produced some of the major players of Anglo-Saxon rule, Alfred, Edgar, and Æthelred, for example, was sidelined by the death of Edmund Ironside on 30 November 1016, shortly after he came to terms with Cnut at Olney. Cnut, the budding emperor of the north that he was, also reorganized the kingdom politically soon after his ascension. He divided it up amongst three of his earls—two of whom were of Scandinavian extraction—who operated as sub-rulers, while Cnut kept Wessex for himself.¹ Moreover, Cnut was politically astute enough to take care of possible threats to his power from within; he banished and/or killed a number of potential troublemakers with the aim of preserving his rule, including Prince Eadwig.²

But Cnut was also interested in establishing continuity with the Anglo-Saxon England that existed before his arrival and conquest. Some of his earls, aside from Eadric Streona who Cnut briefly employed but then had killed, for example, were taken from Æthelred's cohort.³ Moreover, though they were coupled before Cnut became king, his choice of Ælfgifu, an Anglo-Saxon from a family of some prestige, as his first wife (or

¹ For a discussion of this see Simon Keynes, "Cnut's Earls," in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994), 43-88. Keynes notes (p. 81) that it is unclear whether this was a permanent feature of Cnut's reign or if it was a "temporary expedient" to solidify his rule.

² Stenton claims that these acts were due to "the barbarian strain in Cnut's mentality" which was in conflict with his Christianity. Though perhaps barbaric to modern eyes, Cnut's ridding of potential contenders was in reality more likely rooted in the necessary pragmatism of a conqueror. See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 397.

³ Keynes rightly notes, however, that such continuity is not as present as it was across the reigns of kings in the tenth century, and that it is important to keep in mind that there was still an important changing of the guard; see Keynes, "Cnut's Earls," 79-80.

mistress) anchored him to the kingdom he was in the process of conquering.⁴ Moreover, when, in 1017, he married his second wife, Emma of Normandy, Æthelred's widow Ælfgifu was not gotten rid of like Eadric Streona had been—she was sent to Denmark, apparently as some kind of royal agent⁵—though she did lend her name to Emma, it seems, for continuity's sake. Additionally, Cnut seems to have taken pains to present himself as a Christian king to his new subjects as a way to further ease the transition into his rule.⁶

Wulfstan was quite likely part of this effort by Cnut to establish a sense of continuity between his reign and the preceding Anglo-Saxon dynasty. By the time Cnut came to power the archbishop had long been the most prominent Church voice heard by the laity, and by the end of Æthelred's reign he had cut his teeth as a legislator and royal adviser. While it is unknown precisely how Wulfstan and Cnut's arrangement came to be, it was certainly in effect by 1018 when Cnut's first lawcode, assembled by Wulfstan, was issued.⁷ That the code appears to have been "hastily compiled"⁸ is perhaps evidence that Wulfstan and Cnut's working relationship was very new, but it could also simply indicate that the men realized that issuing a code in Cnut's name would lend legitimacy to the opening years of his fledgling rule. It is possible, in other words, that Wulfstan and Cnut connected earlier, though probably not before Edmund Ironside died in November 1016.

⁴ This perhaps occurred as early as 1013; see Miles W. Campbell, "Queen Emma and Ælfgifu of Northampton: Canute the Great's Women," *Medieval Scandinavia* 4 (1971): 66-79, at 69.

⁵ Campbell, "Queen Emma," 70.

⁶ See Catherine Karkov, *The Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 3 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), 121-45; M. K. Lawson, *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century*, The Medieval World (New York: Longman, 1993), 133-60; and Jan Gerchow, "Prayers for King Cnut: The Liturgical Commemoration of a Conqueror," in Hicks, *England in the Eleventh Century*, 219-38. In response to Gerchow and Karkov, on the frontispiece of the Winchester *Liber Vitae*, see Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 13.

⁷ For the code see Kennedy, "Cnut's Lawcode of 1018," *Anglo-Saxon England* 11 (1983): 57-81, at 71-81.

⁸ Kennedy, "Cnut's Lawcode," 66.

While there is no extant evidence which shows any relationship between Wulfstan and Edmund, the intense loyalty the archbishop had given to Æthelred makes it unlikely that he abandoned that king's line for Cnut's after his death. As I noted in the previous chapter, Jonathan Wilcox has shown that the very first performance of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* was done in part to chastise the *witan* for choosing Swein as king over Æthelred.⁹ Though Æthelred's reign was tumultuous and the king, himself, heavily flawed, Æthelred was still king, and, for Wulfstan, that position was untouchable. Upon Æthelred's return to England following his exile in Normandy in 1014, Wulfstan once again was at his side, and he drafted VIII Æthelred on his behalf. Furthermore, while the later *II Polity* includes a note on the dangers of a poor king—probably added in light of Æthelred's rule—not a word is said about getting rid of such a ruler for the sake of the kingdom.¹⁰ In fact, the famous passage on the Three Orders in both versions of *Polity* indicates that the quality and stability of rule is a responsibility of more than just the king. The ingenious image borrowed from Alfred and Ælfric of the throne as a stool which stands on three legs, each of which represents *oratores*, *laboratores*, and *bellatores*, respectively, shows that the stability of rule is dependent on all of England's free society: “and awacie heora ænig, sona se stol scylfð; and fulberste heora ænig, þonne hrysð se stol nyðer, and þæt wyrð þære þeode eall to unþearf.”¹¹ For the throne to be secure the kingdom must be ordered; all must perform the duties ascribed to them in this tripartite model of society. Thus, when the kingdom is unstable or in some kind of danger it is not merely the fault of he

⁹ Wilcox, “Political Performance,” 383-4.

¹⁰ See Jost, *Polity*, 47.

¹¹ Jost, *Polity*, 57: “and should any of them [the legs] weaken, at once the stool will totter; and should any of them be shattered, then the stool will fall down, and that will be the detriment to all the nation.” I quote from *II Polity* here, but *I Polity* contains the same passage with spelling variations.

who is in charge. Rather, all share the burden of blame, as Wulfstan's homilies from the final era of Æthelred's reign—particularly the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*—make clear.

Wulfstan had a commitment to Æthelred and his line, and thus I find it improbable that Wulfstan began to work under Cnut with Edmund still in the picture. The beginning of that relationship must have occurred sometime between Edmund's death (30 November 1016) and the time when 1018 Cnut was begun.

However and whenever it happened specifically, Wulfstan and Cnut did come to work together, and it was not long into the Dane's reign that Wulfstan once again began to produce new material as well as revise his existing works. The archbishop's homiletic output followed the shift in methodology which occurred earlier in his career, when Wulfstan apparently realized that teaching on the intricacies of the Christian faith during the second stage of his career under Æthelred was not enough to shore up the kingdom. Instead, he turned his attention to the ruling elite in a series of admonitory and political homilies. One of his homilies, Napier 50, from Cnut's reign follows the trend established by these final texts from Æthelred's reign, and this continuity is rather interesting in light of the regime change which took place in its midst. The nature of homilies Bethurum XI, XIX, XVIab, XXI, XX, and Napier 51, discussed in the last chapter, fit well with the events of the time. In the face of Viking invasion and eventual domination, political texts like these which attempted to initiate change by admonishing the king and *witan* for the sake of the kingdom were particularly apt. Following Cnut's ascension, however, one would think that this method of address would have been abandoned in light of the new political situation. In Napier 50, however, it did not—in it Wulfstan proceeded as he did at the end of Æthelred's reign.

Though it is only one homily, it has been shown that Napier 50 is an important text. To Bethurum the text was merely a set of Wulfstan's notes for "a polished and ordered address" that was to be given at an unknown occasion.¹² Wormald, however, has suggested that Napier 50 is associated with 1018 Cnut,¹³ which led Lionarons to posit that it may well have been preached at the meeting of the *witan* at Oxford in 1018.¹⁴ As for Bethurum's assertion that it is a draft rather than a polished work, Lionarons has shown that Napier 50 is actually a text written with care and skill.¹⁵ It is a completed work that was very possibly performed to the *witan* at a specific occasion. Interestingly, and despite the recent regime change, Napier 50 reveals that many of the problems which had plagued the kingdom under Æthelred still remained, in spite of Wulfstan's best efforts. Some of these issues, of course, had cleared themselves up—there was no longer any point in decrying tribute payments to the invaders or calling out atrocities committed by Danes after Cnut ascended to the throne, for example, as Wulfstan had in the *Sermo Lupi*. Some problems remained current, though. Napier 50 reveals, for example, that the Church had still not been granted the respect and protection it deserved: "and þæt godes circan beon beteran mæðe and mund wyrðe, þonne hig ær þysan wæron: þæt is, þæt cyricgrið binnan wagum and gehalgodes cyninges handgrið stande efen unwemme."¹⁶

Moreover, the laws of the land and of the Church had yet to be properly acknowledged:

hit wæs nu lange, þæt wæron to wide godes laga laðe and lara forsawne,
and woroldlaga syndan innan þysan earde wraðe forhwyrfde on

¹² Bethurum, *Homilies*, 41.

¹³ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 335; Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 34.

¹⁴ Lionarons, *Homiletic Writings*, 34.

¹⁵ Lionarons, "Napier Homily L."

¹⁶ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 266 (ll. 9-12): "and God's Church is to be granted a greater degree of respect and protection than it has been before this: that is, sanctuary inside the walls and the protection of the consecrated king are to be upheld, equally undamaged."

æghwylcan ende; and þæt is gesyne wide and side, þæt man god gremede mid þam unrihte ealles to lange.¹⁷

Additionally, and as my final example, oaths and pledges, the very foundations of much of Anglo-Saxon law, have not been kept: “fela syn forsworene and swiðe forlogone and wedd eac abrocene oft and gelome.”¹⁸ These passages and others from Napier 50 illustrate that Cnut’s ascension to the throne in 1016 had a minimal impact on the basic problems of Anglo-Saxon society. While it is undeniable that Cnut’s ascension provided Anglo-Saxon England with some sort of stability,¹⁹ particularly in shielding it from outside attacks, from Wulfstan’s point of view as both Churchman and lawman, the kingdom was still plagued within by lawlessness, dishonesty, and impiety.

Cnut’s ascension did little to nothing to curb these problems. Wulfstan’s remaining texts from Cnut’s reign strongly suggest that he recognized that Cnut and his advisors as a whole could not be relied on to remedy the various problems of the kingdom. A multifaceted approach to the issues at hand was needed. While Napier 50 suggests that Wulfstan continued to admonish the king and his *witan*—it was rather likely preached again at times after its initial delivery in 1018—most of the rest of Wulfstan’s texts from Cnut’s reign apply to or are directed towards other figures in the kingdom

¹⁷ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 268 (ll. 3-7): “it has now been a long time that God’s laws and teachings were loathly rejected, and secular laws are within this land bitterly perverted everywhere, and it is evident far and wide that God has been provoked with this injustice far too long.”

¹⁸ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 268 (ll. 26-8): “many are forsworn and exceedingly deceived, and pledges are also broken often and frequently.”

¹⁹ It has been rather common for scholars to praise Cnut for the supposed stability of his kingdom, in fact. See, for example, Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 399: “It [Cnut’s reign] was so successful that contemporaries found little to say about it”; and Lawson, *Cnut*, 214: “It is sufficiently clear . . . that Cnut was, by the standards of his day, the most successful of all pre-Conquest rulers in Britain.” These comments have recently been qualified by Elaine Treharne, however, who shows that Cnut’s reign was one punctuated by trauma; see Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 67-90, especially.

because “[Cnut] could not have appeared at the beginning of his reign as a reliable defence for a Christian society.”²⁰ Others had to pick up the slack.

This lack of improvement under Cnut and the good chance that the new king would not, in fact, better Anglo-Saxon society probably make up what prompted Wulfstan to revamp texts he had written earlier. The first on the archbishop’s docket was a revision of the so-called *Canons of Edgar*, a guideline for the secular clergy—a group that needed to uphold their pastoral duties if society was to be improved under Cnut. The first version of this text, *I Canons*, contained in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, pp. 97-101, dates relatively early in Wulfstan’s career, from 1005-7.²¹ Wulfstan’s revision, *II Canons*, however, found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121, ff. 25v-31v, and, in a fragmentary version, in Cambridge, University Library Additional 3206, the remains of a manuscript used as binding material for another book, dates to the beginning of Cnut’s reign, c. 1016-18.²² The *Canons of Edgar* resists generic categorization. Wormald lists it among other “legal tracts” in his chronology of Wulfstan’s works, and this may very well be the best characterization possible even though it is not exactly precise.²³ What kind of legal authority the *Canons* had is far from clear. *I Canons*, for example, contains material from Wulfstan-authored lawcodes, but it probably predates all of them.²⁴ The question is thus whether these portions had legal

²⁰ Dorothy Bethurum Loomis, “*Regnum and Sacerdotium* in the Early Eleventh Century,” in Clemoes and Hughes, *England before the Conquest*, 129-45, at 130.

²¹ The date is that of Fowler, the text’s editor, who only gives one date for both *I* and *II Canons*; see Fowler, *Canons*, xxviii. His suggestion is a slight revision of Jost’s, who took the date to be 1004-6; see Jost, “Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen,” 301.

²² Wormald, “State-Builder,” 27.

²³ Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26-7.

²⁴ This material is usefully collected in Rabin’s notes to his translation of the text; see Rabin, *Political Writings*, 87-100. Note, however, that at least one of Rabin’s notes is incorrect. On p. 90n28, he says that Canon 21, an injunction against the taking of a concubine and an instruction to love one’s wife, is omitted from the CCC 201 version of the text (*I Canons*). In actuality, it is not present in Junius 121 (*II Canons*).

authority in *I Canons* or whether such material was later deemed useful for inclusion in Wulfstan's lawcodes when the time came to draft them. I find the latter to be more probable, since this material consists essentially of ecclesiastical regulation that can stand on its own in *I Canons* but also fits in rather seamlessly with Wulfstan's later highly ecclesiastical legislation. The injunction that there should be no conflict on holy days and fast days (Canon 23), for example, is a prelim to the same legal instruction in V Æthelred 19, VI Æthelred 25.1, and I Cnut 17.2.²⁵ The value of this portion of *I Canons* was apparently recognized, and thus it was granted legal authority in these codes.

More important for the present discussion, however, is that the reverse is true in *II Canons*: legislation was inserted into Wulfstan's second draft from already existing codes in order to imbue this text with legal authority, thus blurring the boundary between ecclesiastical instruction and the kingdom's law. Granted, not all of the changes in *II Canons* can be explained in this way. Some of them were made in order to establish a higher degree of specificity regarding the issue in question. One example, Canon 16, will aptly illustrate this. This portion of the text is concerned with priests' responsibility to abolish heathen practices, which include in *I Canons*:

wilweorþunga, and lichwíglunga, and hwata, and galdra, and manweorðunga, and þa gemearr ðe man drifð on mistlicum gewíglungum and on friðsplottum and on ellenum, and eac on oðrum mistlicum treowum and on stanum, and on manegum mistlicum gedwimerum þe men on dreogað fela þæs þe hi na ne scoldan.²⁶

It is difficult to resist coming to the conclusion that this change was made with Cnut's personal relationships in mind. Cnut was guilty of bigamy, and the omission of Canon 21 perhaps reflects Wulfstan's willingness to overlook this transgression for the sake of the kingdom's stability.

²⁵ Rabin, *Political Writings*, 91n30.

²⁶ Fowler, *Canons*, 4: "worship of wells, and necromancies, and auguries, and spells, and worship of men, and those errors which one carries out in various enchantments and at heathen sites and at elder-trees and

While this is quite the comprehensive catalog, *II Canons* provides even more detail about the heathen practices in question. In place of “manweorðunga” and “and eac on oðrum mistlicum treowum and on stanum,” Wulfstan’s second draft says “treowwurðunga, and stanwurðunga, and þone deofles cræft þe man dryhð þær man þa cild þurh þa eorðan tihð.”²⁷ Additionally, Wulfstan makes “ðe man drifð” more specific temporally by adding “on New Year’s night” (*on geares niht*).²⁸ Everything other than the worship of men (*manweorðunga*) is retained in the revision, but it is expanded to make it more specific. It is possible that Wulfstan had learned more about the heathen practices he was so worried about by the time he revised the text, or perhaps merely that he wanted to make the text reflect more accurately what he had initially had in mind.²⁹

The most substantial revision, in the form of an addition, present in *II Canons*, however, cannot be explained only through the argument that Wulfstan returned to his text with the aim of making it more comprehensive, though it certainly does that. In *II Canons*, Wulfstan added a substantial block of text, Canons 68b-i, for the most part taken from the legislation he wrote for Æthelred and Cnut. This addition can be divided into two unequal groups. Canons 68b-d consist of guidelines for the legal status of priests, while 68e-i provide legal procedures for when various members of the religious order are accused of a crime or inappropriate behavior. Though each set of clauses concerns different matters, both, as will be seen, are intended to shore up the position of priests by emphasizing their responsibilities and importance to the kingdom as whole. *II Canons*

also at other various trees and at stones and in many various delusions which men perform much of that which they should not.

²⁷ Fowler, *Canons*, 5: “the worship of trees and stones, and the skill of the devil which one performs there when children are drawn through the earth.”

²⁸ Fowler, *Canons*, 5.

²⁹ For Wulfstan’s definition and treatment of heathenism see Meaney, “Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse ‘Heathenism,’” 461-500.

thus forms one part of Wulfstan's efforts to remedy the kingdom's ills by engaging with those in positions well below Cnut's and those of his advisers.

Wulfstan had long been concerned with the topics of these two groups of clauses by the time *II Canons* was completed. Early in his career he had interpolated clauses into both *Norðleoda laga* and *Að* which placed the wergeld and oath, respectively, of priests at the same level as those of thanes.³⁰ These claims turn up again, for example, in the legal codes V Æthelred 9.1, VI Æthelred 5.3, VIII Æthelred 28, and, after *II Canons*, in 1018 Cnut 11.2 and I Cnut 6a.2-2a. As for the second group, procedures for a member of various religious stations accused of wrongdoing are also found in Wulfstan's legislation, as Table 5.1 shows.

<i>Canon</i>	<i>Earlier Legislation</i>	<i>Later Legislation</i>
68e	VIII Atr 19-19.1	I Cn 5-5a
68f	VIII Atr 20-20.1	I Cn 5a.1-1a
68g	VIII Atr 21	I Cn 5a.2
68h	VIII Atr 22	I Cn 5a.2a
68i	VIII Atr 23-24	I Cn 5a.2b-2c

The obvious conclusion here is that Wulfstan imbued *II Canons* with more legal force than its predecessor, *I Canons*, could provide, but there is more to this story.

Canons 68b-d, in claiming a high status for priests, actually reinforce, albeit in a slightly veiled manner, Wulfstan's view of an ordered society that is most easily seen in the discussions of the Three Orders in *I* and *II Polity* and Napier 50.³¹ It is useful to consider Canon 68b in full in light of this point:

³⁰ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 393. The clauses in question are *Norðl* 5 and *Að* 2, respectively.

³¹ Jost, *Polity*, 55-6; and Napier, *Wulfstan*, 267.

And riht is gif weofodþen his agen lif be boca tæcinge rihtlice fadige, þonne sy he fulles þegnscipes wyrþe ge on life ge on legere. Gyf he his lif misfadige, wanige his wyrðscipe be ðam þe seo dæd sy. Wite, gif he wylle, ne gebyrað him naðor ne to wife ne to woruldwige, gif he Gode wile rihtlice hyran and Godes lage rihtlice healdan.³²

Those who have the position of *weofodþen*, literally “altar-thane,” and more idiomatically, “priest,” are expected to order their lives in a general sense, according to biblical principles (*be boca*), if they are to hold the same status as a thane. The use of the compound containing “thane” for “priest” is a clever way of emphasizing the point. Only two specifics are mentioned; so that they could best emulate Christ, priests were not to marry or engage in earthly war. Their brides were their churches (*I and II Canons 8, I Canons 61, and II Canons 68a*), and their struggles were supposed to be of the spiritual variety. Canon 68b in *II Canons* thus brings to the fore a discussion that is latently present throughout much of the text: priests, as representatives of the *oratores* in the tripartite model of society, were not supposed to engage in actions reserved for the other two orders, *laboratores* and *bellatores*. It does so by bringing up the social status priests could enjoy if they behaved according to the precepts of the Bible in general terms, but then also by mentioning two specific regulations that priests must follow but which did not apply to the other two portions of society. What the Canon in effect argues is that while a priest may hold the same status as a secular thane, he must not behave as if he is a member of the thane’s order. Thus Canon 68b clarifies material found elsewhere in the

³² Fowler, *Canons*, 17: “And it is right that, if a clergyman orders his own life according to the teaching of the book, then he is worthy of the full status of a thane, both in life and in the grave. If he does not order his life, his status lessens according to his deeds. Let him know, if he will, that it is not appropriate for him to have a wife or to engage in earthly war, if he rightly obeys God and rightly holds God’s laws.”

text that runs along the same lines. Canon 65, for example, also subject to an expansion in *II Canons*, notes that a priest should not be a hunter, hawker, or gambler (*ne beo hunta ne hafecere ne tæflere*), but that he should instead “plega on his bocum swa his hade gebyrað.”³³ While I am not prepared to suggest that Wulfstan here uses *hade* to refer to “order” in the sense of what scholars call the Three Orders, he is certainly noting that a priest, because of his religious position, is a different kind of individual than those secular men who are permitted to engage in worldly pastimes. The expansion in *II Canons* reinforces this fundamental difference; it notes specific punishments for priests and deacons who do go hunting.³⁴ Canons 59 and 66, the latter only in *II Canons*, are of the same ilk. Both are injunctions against alcohol-related transgressions that Wulfstan makes sure his readers know are not appropriate for the priestly profession.³⁵ What befits one group is unbecoming for another, and *II Canons*, particularly through Canon 68b, endeavors to make this distinction more clear than it had been in *I Canons* to those who operate as *oratores*, especially to those who hold the same legal status as a thane.

The legal additions in *II Canons*, contained in Canons 68e-i, inform Wulfstan’s readers in religious positions of the legal means through which to clear themselves of criminal accusation.³⁶ Other than being directed at the same audience as the rest of the text,³⁷ their inclusion in the work is far from seamless. Unlike its bulk which discusses

³³ Fowler, *Canons*, 15: “amuse himself with his books, as befits his position.” I cite *II Canons* here. *I Canons* is verbatim, and is printed on p. 14 of Fowler’s edition.

³⁴ Fowler, *Canons*, 15.

³⁵ For Canon 59 see Fowler, *Canons*, 14 (*I Canons*) and 15 (*II Canons*); for Canon 66 see p. 15.

³⁶ The presence of these Canons in I Cnut is discussed briefly in Mary P. Richards, “I-II Cnut: Wulfstan’s *Summa*?” in *English Law before the Magna Carta: Felix Liebermann and Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, ed. Stefan Jurasinski, Lisi Oliver, and Andrew Rabin, *Medieval Law and its Practice* 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 137-56, at 143.

³⁷ The primary audience for both versions of the *Canons* is presumably members of the secular clergy, as most of the material in these texts is applicable to them. That said, however, both versions contain material far more general in its scope. *I Canons* 21, for example, admonishes against men having concubines and

spiritual responsibilities and instructions, the focus of these Canons is exceptionally procedural in the legislative sense. Given that Wulfstan is unquestionably the author of both lawcodes with the same material, however, their presence in *II Canons* cannot be explained away through attribution to an over-zealous interpolator. They are genuine Wulfstanian revisions, though admittedly they are a little puzzling. They are probably intended to remind the secular clergy that they are accountable to both the kingdom and—more importantly—to God. It must be remembered that the *Canons* did not spring from a vacuum; the text was written in order to combat the disorder and poor performance of the secular clergy as a whole. The inclusion of Canons 68e-i reminds this group that their position—one that is hugely important to the spiritual health of the kingdom—does not place them outside legal jurisdiction. That it seems to be an obvious point does not detract from its importance or necessity. The secular clergy had long been largely unregulated—the Benedictine Reform, for example, busied itself with the regular clergy rather than with those in direct contact with the laity—and by the early eleventh century corruption was rather likely widespread among its ranks. These Canons in the second version of the work thus react to the imperfect situation at hand and attempt to remedy it by invoking legal authority.

That *II Canons* is not a complete overhaul of *I Canons* is rather easily explained. The basic message of *I Canons* was a good one, and it did not need much alteration. *I Canons* provided the secular clergy with a host of instructions that applied regardless of Anglo-Saxon England's political situation—they were in no way dependent on the

instructs them to love their wives. Canons 22-9, extant in *I* and *II Canons*, moreover, also touch on issues related to the laity. It is possible that Wulfstan envisioned a wider audience for the text, or, what seems more likely, that he thought the secular clergy should be aware of instructions for the laity which they could pass on to their individual flocks. On this latter point see Fowler, *Canons*, liii.

throne, and, as such, they were essentially timeless. That these were carried over into *II Canons* is thus no surprise. Canons 30-7, for example, offer instructions for priests on their duties concerning the celebration of mass.³⁸ Moreover, 42 notes that anything kept near the altar should be kept clean,³⁹ while 53 forbids Christians from consuming blood.⁴⁰ These and other similar canons in *I Canons* provide priests with basic and valuable guidelines concerning their position. The major additions made in *II Canons* stress to priests the importance of their position to Anglo-Saxon society by mapping out their social standing and the applicable legislation which came with it. That they are thane-equivalent marks priests as a central group in England. This legislative emphasis in the additions effectively casts priests as agents of the Anglo-Saxon Church; they are not cast as mere priests, but rather as spiritual officials whose duties were integral to the kingdom as a whole. Granted, and as noted above, some of this material was present in Wulfstan's lawcodes. Their further inclusion in *II Canons* was very likely a practical measure. Most, if not all, priests would not have had access to codified law. *II Canons*, a text surely designed for distribution throughout the kingdom, provided priests with these important extracts from law which applied to them, as well as Wulfstan's instructions concerning their day-to-day tasks and duties. From *II Canons* priests formally learned their position in society after being reminded of their pastoral responsibilities, in other words.

Another revision from Cnut's reign, *II Polity*, reveals that the archbishop's thoughts on the organization of society adopted a decidedly pragmatic and critical streak. In Chapter Two I suggested that *Polity* is a piece of Christian political theory which

³⁸ Fowler, *Canons*, 8-9.

³⁹ Fowler, *Canons*, 10-11.

⁴⁰ Fowler, *Canons*, 12-13.

essentially forms an idealized blueprint for the future of Anglo-Saxon England. *I Polity* very much fits such a description. This earlier version of the text organizes society's parts by position or condition, and its scope is extensive. The king, kingship, throne, counselors, bishops, earls, priests, men in orders, abbots, monks, female monks, nuns, the laity, widows, the Church, and Christians in general are all covered in varying degrees of detail.⁴¹ The style of the comments on each group or institution fits the text's theoretical nature. These discussions are not rooted primarily in Wulfstan's eleventh-century reality, but rather in ideal qualities and actions which Wulfstan wanted to encourage, often introduced by *riht is þæt* or some variation of it. Two illustrative examples are the material on priests and monks in *I Polity*:

Be sacerdam

Riht is, þæt sacerdas on heora scriftscirum willice and wærlice læran and ledan þa godcundan heorda, þe hig healdan sculon. And ægðer hi sculon, ge wel bodian ge wel bisnian and Godes circan geornlice lufian and for eal cristen folc geornlice bebiddan.⁴²

Be munecum

Riht is, þæt munecas dægnes and nihtes inweardre heortan a to Gode þencan and geornlice clypian and mid eallum eadmedum regollice libban.⁴³

I Polity's material on priests and monks is brief and to the point. Nothing is explicitly mentioned of contemporary conditions, and the consequences for failing to live up to the responsibilities are not stated. Criticisms are also absent. The force of the passages is

⁴¹ For a chart which illustrates the contents and order of the various manuscripts of *Polity* see Renée R. Trilling, "Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the *Institutes of Polity*," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones, Church, Faith, and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 58-85, at 74-5.

⁴² Jost, *Polity*, 84: "It is right that priests willingly and prudently lead and instruct the spiritual flocks in their dioceses that they must keep. And they must both preach well and set an example well and eagerly love God's church and eagerly pray for all Christian people."

⁴³ Jost, *Polity*, 123: "It is right that monks always think about God with their inner hearts, and eagerly think on and call out to God and live according to monastic rules with complete humility."

rooted in their simplicity and in the implication of the ease with which their conditions can be met—the sections list few responsibilities, and none of them are particularly detailed or onerous. In other words, the material on priests and monks in *I Polity* is optimistic; it presents an idealized description of these roles that is very much attainable.

Though some positions of society receive more comment and detail than priests and monks in *I Polity*, the rest of the text is quite similar in its overall tenor. That the text does not comment on the events and issues of the time is, on the one hand, rather surprising given the nature of Wulfstan's other works from the same period and what had happened in recent history. By the time that *I Polity* was begun Wulfstan had a firm position as a member of the *witan*, and he had started to be responsible for Anglo-Saxon legislation and to dabble in the drafting of political homilies.⁴⁴ The current state of Anglo-Saxon England was on his mind. Moreover, by c. 1008 the Danish incursions were well underway,⁴⁵ and Æthelred had practically run a clinic on the poor administration of a kingdom. And yet, criticism of or commentary on England and its population is far from explicit. *I Polity*, thus, is not “a harsh commentary on the debility of royal authority in the reign of Æthelred II”⁴⁶ or of the other sectors of society. While some veiled criticism might be inferred—Wulfstan's comments on the value of a wise king⁴⁷ might very well be a shot at Æthelred's poor performance—it is far from the rule. In fact, in that case, when Wulfstan returned to the text he made it more severe by adding in a passage on the tribulations the people will suffer because of an unwise king in *II Polity*.⁴⁸ Contemporary

⁴⁴ Wormald, “State-Builder,” 26.

⁴⁵ These are summarized in relation to *Polity* in Trilling, “Sovereignty,” 78-81.

⁴⁶ Trilling, “Sovereignty,” 78.

⁴⁷ Jost, *Polity*, 47.

⁴⁸ Jost, *Polity*, 47.

conditions do not receive the attention one would expect in *I Polity* because the point of Wulfstan's political theory is to present the means to attain a different and improved Anglo-Saxon England. The ideal did not include events and problems current in Wulfstan's present—the inclusion of those would have detracted from the message—it looked ahead, beyond the contemporary situation, to a more amenable future divorced from the then-current problems. The contents of the document suggest that the archbishop was confident that the kingdom could easily move itself closer to the ideal he presents in *I Polity*.

Wulfstan's revision, *II Polity*, is rather different. I chose Wulfstan's comments on priests and monks for discussion above because, not only are their contents apt representatives of *I Polity* in general, they are also the subject of extensive revision in *II Polity*.⁴⁹ These and other similar changes to the text effectively move the very nature of the document from the realm of political theory and into something far more difficult to categorize generically. The result is practically a composite text; it is in the main a blend of political theory and *Sermo Lupi*-style homiletic expression. Though generically problematic—it is tempting, for example, to simply call the text a “political tract”⁵⁰—the overarching nature of the revisions present in *II Polity* is relatively straightforward. *II Polity* tempers *I Polity*'s optimism and idealism with criticism and pragmatism, while its scope is largely the present.

⁴⁹ In fact, Jost says that each of these two passages in *II Polity* is an “erweiterte Fassung” (“extended version”); see Jost, *Polity*, 11.

⁵⁰ Though just as general this identification is, I think, more fitting than Wormald's designation of the text as one of Wulfstan's “Social prescriptions” (Wormald, “State-Builder, 26-7) since, as will be seen, the weight of the revisions present in *II Polity* discuss the roles of political positions.

To begin with, it has been pointed out that Wulfstan actually deemphasized the role of the king in the ordering of society and opted, instead, to emphasize the importance of bishops, especially, but also priests.⁵¹ Dorothy Bethurum Loomis has noted that

Wulfstan was faced with the central problem of early medieval life: what authority will keep the peace and encourage the pursuit of righteousness in all citizens? The answer provided by the Carolingian sources is clear—the king. The answer given at the end of the eleventh century by the triumphant papal party was equally clear—the pope. Neither answer was possible for England in the first two decades of the eleventh century.⁵²

Recent history had shown that Æthelred could not be counted on, while Napier 50 indicates that Cnut's reign had been ineffective in this regard as well. The shift in emphasis away from the king in *II Polity* was accomplished in a couple of ways. First, in a passage not present in *I Polity*, the opening of the text assigns ultimate authority to God rather than individual kings:

The text opens with a distinctly homiletic tone, and its rhythm and alliteration are characteristic of Wulfstan's work. By reiterating the most basic of tenets of Christian belief as the foundation of his code, Wulfstan establishes both the stakes of his text and the legal force of its authority. The emphasis is on unity and oneness: the singularity of the one true God, the rectitude of his supremacy, and the duty and honor owed to him. . . . Wulfstan clearly grounds the authority of his text, as his own authority is grounded, in a power beyond the human sphere.⁵³

⁵¹ Bethurum Loomis, "Regnum and Sacerdotium," 136-45; and Trilling, "Sovereignty," 71-8.

⁵² Bethurum Loomis, "Regnum and Sacerdotium," 130.

⁵³ Trilling, "Sovereignty," 69.

A section on the earthly king, also present in *I Polity*, follows, though this section in *II Polity* openly downplays the Carolingian notion of the worldly king's divine connections: "[t]he later version has lost whatever divine aura surrounded the king in the first form."⁵⁴ In *II Polity* the position of king is therefore reimagined as a far more secular position—one that is separated from the authority which backs Wulfstan's text, God. The king is still in the picture, in other words, but there is more to that picture than the king.

If the king is no longer directly connected with God in *II Polity*, then something of a vacuum was created which needed to be filled by a position of religious significance. The emphasizing of bishops over the king to fill this void is thus the second way in which the importance of the king is demoted in *II Polity*.⁵⁵ Bishops were integral to a Holy Society since they could do all that priests could accomplish, but also ordain priests and perform confirmation—because of this importance, "Wulfstan gave to bishops what amounts to the highest position in the secular-ecclesiastical hierarchy."⁵⁶ Wulfstan had long highlighted the importance of bishops and their duties, and in *II Polity* he finally went far enough to suggest that they were of the utmost importance to Anglo-Saxon society.

While the work of Bethurum Loomis and Trilling regarding the position of bishops in *II Polity* is illuminating, it only provides a glimpse of the whole picture. While neither scholar attributes to bishops the sole role in keeping the kingdom in order, their primary focus on the roles of bishops (Trilling more so than Bethurum Loomis) depicted

⁵⁴ Bethurum Loomis, "*Regnum and Sacerdotium*," 137.

⁵⁵ Bethurum Loomis, "*Regnum and Sacerdotium*," 138-9: "If the king could not be relied upon as a source of authority to keep the state in order, who could? Wulfstan's answer is pretty clear: the church and especially her highest officers, the bishops."

⁵⁶ Bethurum Loomis, "*Regnum and Sacerdotium*," 142. See also Trilling, "Sovereignty," 71: "it becomes evident throughout *Polity* that the most concretely defined and, in Wulfstan's mind, most important duties fall to the English clergy—in particular to the bishop."

in *Polity* obscures the true nature of Wulfstan's organization of society. While the role of bishops is, indeed, greatly emphasized, that of priests, monks, and reeves is depicted as essential to the kingdom as well, for example. Each station has important roles and responsibilities in the "bureaucracy" that *II Polity* outlines.

The sections on priests and monks start off with what made up their entire entries in *I Polity*, quoted above. Lengthy additions are tacked on, however. In both cases the duties of priests and monks are expanded on, complaints about the present state of each group make an appearance, and Wulfstan's language becomes far more judgmental and fiery than it was in *I Polity*. To begin with the expansions on the role of priests, which are more extensive, many of Wulfstan's additions emphasize that priests fill an important role in society "since he realized that it is upon the priesthood that the honour of the church depends"⁵⁷—a point made clear in *II Canons*. That they hold a prime role is especially evident in one passage that the text shares with *I Cnut* "which state[s] with awe the unique power of the priesthood".⁵⁸

Forðam understand, se þe cunne: Mycel is and mære, þæt sacerd ah to donne folce to þearfe, gif he his drihtne gecwemð mid rihte. Mycel is seo halsung and mære seo halgung, þe se deofla afyrsað and on fleame gebringað, swa oft swa fullað oðþon husel halgað. And englas þær hwearfiað and ða dæda beweardiað and þurh Godes mihta þam sacerdum fylstað, swa oft swa Criste þeniað mid rihte. And swa hi doð symle, swa oft swa hi geornlice innewardre heortan clypiað to Criste and

⁵⁷ Bethurum Loomis, "Regnum and Sacerdotium," 140.

⁵⁸ Bethurum Loomis, "Regnum and Sacerdotium," 129-45, at 141. See also *I Cn* 4.1-4.3 for the passage in that lawcode.

for folces neode þingiað georne. and þi man sceall for Godes ege mæþe in hade
gecnawan mid gesceade.⁵⁹

Wulfstan clearly took his time when drafting this passage. The repetitions of *mycel* . . . *.mære* and *swa oft swa* reinforce both the importance of the priestly position—the sacraments its members can perform are wonderful and powerful—as well as their spiritual responsibilities—priests must serve God rightly if their works are to be effective. As Bethurum Loomis puts it, “[a]n interesting point about this statement is the fact that it does not speak of the indelible character of the sacraments but twice implies that their efficacy is bound up with the priest’s own character.”⁶⁰ Effective priests are conscientious priests. Moreover, there is much inflectional rhyme present in the passage, dependent on either *-að* or *-iað*, and it contains internal rhyme (*hwearfiað* and *bewardiað*, for example) as well. All of these aesthetic features heighten the force of the passage—the text’s developed style reflects its important message to priests that their conduct and service are of the utmost importance to the kingdom. Priests are in a position which pits them in a spiritual battle, with angels as their allies, against devils.

While the importance of priestly conduct is touched on in the passage above, it receives more comment elsewhere in the text. Wulfstan notes, for example, that on Judgement Day it is not only their own deeds which will come under divine examination, but also those of their flock: “and ægðer hy scylon æt Godes dome gescead agyldan, ge

⁵⁹ Jost, *Polity*, 104-5: “Therefore, understand he who can: great and illustrious is that which a priest can do as a benefit to the people, if he pleases his Lord with righteousness. Great is the exorcising and illustrious the hallowing with which he drives away devils and urges them into flight, as often as one is baptized or the host is consecrated. And angels move about there and protect those deeds and, through the might of God, aid the priests as long as they serve Christ with righteousness. And so they always do, as long as they eagerly call out to Christ with their inner hearts and fervently intercede for the needs of the people. And thus one must understand, for fear of God’s anger, the ranks of holy orders with discretion.”

⁶⁰ Bethurum Loomis, “*Regnum and Sacerdotium*,” 141.

heora sylfra dæda ge ealles þæs folces, þe hi to Godes handa healdan sceolan.”⁶¹ The priest’s responsibility is great, but it is not an unreasonable one; later in the text Wulfstan paraphrases Ezekiel 33:9, a verse which essentially notes that those who do their best to steer the people to righteousness will be spared punishment even if their message falls on deaf ears: “[h]e cwæð, se witega, æfter þam: ‘Gif ðu folce rihte bodast and ðu hit gebigean ne miht to rihte, þonne gebyrhst ðu þeh þinre agenre sawle’; and se þe woh drifð and geswincan nele, he sceal habban þæs ece wite.”⁶² For those who shirk their spiritual duties, however, the stakes are high: “[e]arme gefæreð he, gif þurh his hnescnyse seo heord forwurð, þe he healdan sceall, and he sylf forð mid.”⁶³ This material, however, still falls in the realms of the hypothetical and theoretical, as signaled by the *gif* in most of the examples noted above. Even so, it is still rather different from that in *I Polity*, as it includes the consequences priests can face for failing to perform their duties. Thus, like much of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Wulfstan here uses specific hypotheticals in order to make a broader point: priests must rightly perform their roles so that society as a whole—the other parts of which are described in the rest of the text—can

⁶¹ Jost, *Polity*, 87: “and at God’s judgement they must render a reckoning both of their own deeds and also those of all of the people which they must watch over.” See also pp. 106-7: “Clype hlude and ahefe up ðine stemne swa hlude swa byme and gecyð minum folce, þæt hit fram synnum gecyrre. Gif ðu þonne þæt ne dest, ac forswugast hit and nelt folce his þearf gecyðan, þonne scealt ðu ealra sawla on domesdæg gescead agyldan, þe þurh þæt losiað, þe hi nabbað þa lare and ða mynegunge, þe hi beþorftan” (“Call out loudly and lift up your voice as loud as a trumpet and proclaim to my people that they should turn from sins. Then, if you do not do that, but pass over it in silence and will not make known to the people their duty, then you must render on Judgement Day a reckoning of all the souls which will be lost through that, since they did not have the teaching and the warning which they required.”). Here and elsewhere I quote from the X manuscript, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265.

⁶² Jost, *Polity*, 107: “he said, the prophet, after that: ‘If you preach righteousness to the people and you are not able to move them to righteousness, then you nevertheless save your own soul’; and he who pursues error and will not chasten himself, he shall have everlasting torment.”

⁶³ Jost, *Polity*, 93: “he will fare wretchedly if the flock, which he must protect, should perish through his weakness, and he thence with it, himself.” See also p. 97: “Wa þam witodlice, þe godcunde heorde underfehð and naþer gehealdan ne can, ne hine sylfne ne þa heorde, þe he healdan sceolde, and wyrs þam, þe can and nele” (Truly, woe to them who receive a divine flock and is neither able to govern himself or the flock which he must govern, and worse are those who are able but will not.”

function properly. The hypothetical failures mentioned, in other words, characterize the role of priests as essential to the kingdom at large since they can only benefit the people as a whole if they are on good terms with God.

As in the *Sermo Lupi*, however, Wulfstan did not limit himself to hypotheticals in *II Polity*. Rather, complaints are included in the text which were apparently influenced by actual issues with the priestly class's tendency to engage in activities outside their order. Because of this, it forms a logical expansion of *I Polity* which, as noted above, directed priests to remain within their station. All of these complaints are linked to Wulfstan's claim that "[e]ala, eala, fela is þæra, þe sacerdhades on unriht gyrnað, swa hit þincan mæg, swyþost for idelum gylpe and for gitsunge woroldgestreona and ne cunnon na, þæt hy cunnon scoldan."⁶⁴ Joining the priesthood would have provided numerous opportunities for the unscrupulous, including access to tithes and dues⁶⁵ to spend on their own interests:

Hit is ealles þe wyrse, syððan hy hit ealles habbað; þonne ne ateoð hi hit na, swa swa hi sceoldan, ac glencgað heora wif mid þam, þe hi weofoda sceoldan, and maciað eall heom sylfum to woroldwlence and to idelre rence, þæt hi Gode sceoldan don to weorðunge on cyriclicum þingum oððon on earmra manna hyððum oððon on hernumenra bygenum.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Jost, *Polity*, 97: "alas, alas, there are many of those who seek the priesthood wrongly, as it may seem, very much for idle pride and for greed of worldly riches, and they do not know any of that which they should know."

⁶⁵ Jost, *Polity*, 99: "ac gyrnað þeah heora sceatta on teopungum and on eallum cyricgerihtum" ("but they [bad priests] nevertheless seek their money in tithes and in all Church dues").

⁶⁶ Jost, *Polity*, 101: "It is all the worse, after they have it all, then they do not use it as they should, but they adorn their women/wives with that which should be on altars, and they make all for their own worldly pomp and idle vanity that which should be done for worship in churches or for the benefit of poor people or for the ransoming of captives."

First off, the abuse of collected tithes that is at the core of Wulfstan's other criticisms is an abuse of the procedures that the archbishop had written extensively about in both his homilies and legal codes. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to suggest that the paying of tithes, dues, and other Church fees was among the foremost of his concerns when it came to the administration of Anglo-Saxon society. Such payments were used and distributed in a variety of ways, and in every case they were supposed to benefit the Church and its followers. Embezzlement of Church funds sidetracked them from legitimate Church uses like equipping individual parishes and helping those in need, which Wulfstan highlights here, in addition to other necessary expenditures. Unfit priests, Wulfstan claims, use these monies for personal satisfaction using rather generic terms (*woruldwlence and to idelre rence*), but also with a specific example: these men spend Church funds on their wives or on other women, depending on how one translates the passage. To Wulfstan, priests' (and, indeed, other Church figures') association with women in anything but a pastoral sense was forbidden, as he makes clear in many of his texts.⁶⁷ It is rather likely that Wulfstan here reacted to a contemporary problem, since it appears that his view forbidding priests and others from marrying was not so cut and dried to others. The author⁶⁸ of the *Northumbrian Priests' Law*, for example, in all likelihood someone quite familiar with Wulfstan's texts, and perhaps even a member of his circle, holds a conflicting view: "[g]if preost cwenan forlæte 7 oðre nime, anathema sit!"⁶⁹ His instruction is not for priests to shirk from marriage or female companionship, but rather for them to remain with their current spouse. The transgression committed by

⁶⁷ See, for example, V Atr 9-9.1; VI Atr 5-5.3; I Cn 6a.1-2a.

⁶⁸ It was long thought that Wulfstan was the author of the *Northumbrian Priests' Law*. Wormald, however, has shown that this cannot be the case; for his arguments see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 396-7.

⁶⁹ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:382: "if a priest should leave a woman and take another, let him be anathema!"

contemporary priests regarding tithes and dues was thus two-fold for Wulfstan. Not only were priests misusing Church funds, they were also breaking his previous admonitions against marrying at all. These priestly missteps interfere with their role as an important part of the maintenance of order in the kingdom, as both pull priests away from tending to the needs of the laity.

Though discussed more briefly in *II Polity* than priests, monks receive similar treatment. Following the passage concerning monks from *I Polity*, Wulfstan immediately adds that monks should separate themselves from the worldly (*asyndrian fram woruldbysegan*) and strive to fulfill their various obligations like pleasing God (*Gode gecweman*) and attending to their books and prayers (*filigan heora bocum and gebedum*). Such instruction nicely complements what was already included in *I Polity*, where the responsibilities of monks were stated in more general terms. As in the section concerning priests, however, Wulfstan provides his reader with a view of the contemporary state of monks:

Ac hit is yfel soð, swa hit þincan mæg, þæt sume synd to wlance and ealles to rance and to widscriþole and to unnytte and ealles to idele ælcere goddæde and to mandæde on dyrnlican galscype; inne aidlode and ute awildode.⁷⁰

While Wulfstan acknowledges that such behavior is not universal in this passage (*sume synd*), he soon changes his language so that it includes Anglo-Saxon monks as a whole in order to contrast their current ranks with their predecessors:

⁷⁰ Jost, *Polity*, 125: “But it is an evil truth, as one might think, that some are too proud and all too arrogant and too itinerant and too useless and all too idle for any good deed and too sinful in hidden lasciviousness; on the inside empty and on the outside severe.”

Swa swyðe hit wyrsað wide mid mannum, þæt þæs hades men, þe þurh Godes ege hwylum wæron nyttoste and geswincfulleste on godcundan þeowdome and on boccræfte, þa syndon nu wel forð unnyttaste gewelhwær and ne swincaþ a swiðe ymbe ænige þearfe for God ne for woruld.⁷¹

Such a statement is more general than the one above, where only some (*sume*) monks were at fault. Here monks at large are contrasted with those who came at some time before them. In typical Wulfstan fashion, the archbishop claims those earlier monks were superior to the contemporary crop of monastics. It is possible that Wulfstan had in mind the monks who worked under and followed the Benedictine model of Dunstan, Oswald, and Æthelwold, but it is more likely, as discussed earlier in a similar context, that he made hay of the fogginess of history (ultimately borrowed from Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*) and appealed here to an idealized fictitious past. There was no real need for specifics at the level of time, place, or name as long as it was emphasized that the monks of Wulfstan's day fell well short of the example provided by those who allegedly came before them. The message is that not only are these monks not of the quality that they should be, but also that the actions of Wulfstan's *sume* monks discussed above cast a shadow over the station in its entirety. It must be remembered that the only monks who find favor with Wulfstan in *II Polity* are the hypothetical ones at the section's opening and the earlier, in-all-likelihood idealized, monks who are invoked to shed light on the group's poor contemporary state. The faults of the part blemish the whole.

⁷¹ Jost, *Polity*, 126: "So it worsens very much widely among the people, that those men in orders, who because of [their] fear of God formerly were the most useful and most laborious in religious service and in learning, now they are thoroughly the most useless everywhere and never work much for any benefit for God or for world."

Wulfstan's main concern about the monks of his day is that they are especially useless (*unnyttaste*) in both religious and secular terms since they will not work (*ne swicab*) towards the benefit (*bearfe*) of either, with the implicit consequence that society suffers because of this. Gareth Mann has noted that this is something of a contradiction since Wulfstan had claimed earlier in the tract that monks should remove themselves from worldly issues, but he ultimately concludes that "[t]o Wulfstan, then, the contemplative life should not always be lived in hermetic separation from the world around the *oratores*. The world had to be kept at a distance, indeed; but this was not to be used as an apologetic to retreat from the difficulties that beset society."⁷² Monks had a responsibility to their society, though perhaps not one as active as those of the various classes of the secular clergy. This is not a redefining of the roles of monks on Wulfstan's part. Rather, it is a call to do all that they can within their position to please God and to benefit society. This would certainly include prayer, teaching, and learning, but it could also include other endeavors. Wulfstan's contemporary Ælfric, for example, took an active interest in Anglo-Saxon society and politics.⁷³ Ælfric is, of course, exceptional in many ways—and he should probably not be the metric by which other monks and abbots are measured—but that the scope of his interests included worldly matters shows that others in similar positions could have been expected to do likewise, either textually or through some other means. That Ælfric was incredibly prolific over the course of his career is not the point of using him as an example, here—it would be unreasonable, in

⁷² Gareth Mann, "The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 235-78, at 277.

⁷³ Godden, "Apocalypse and Invasion," 131-42; and Mary Clayton, "Ælfric's Esther: A *Speculum Reginae*?" in *Text and Gloss: Studies in Insular Language and Literature*, ed. Helen Conrad-O'Brien, Anne Marie D'Arcy, and John Scattergood (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 89-101.

fact, to expect other monks to be capable of producing all that he did. The value of the example of Ælfric is that he, unlike those monks Wulfstan rails against in *II Polity*, did not use his position as an excuse to avoid the difficulties of the world—he used it to face them. Ælfric is proof that monks like those whom Wulfstan had in mind existed in eleventh-century England, and *II Polity*'s harsh criticism of monks in general is an attempt to shame them into being of use to their society.

One of the most substantial and important revisions made in *II Polity* is the additions of material concerning reeves in two completely new sections. The first occurs in a passage devoted to the nation's councilors (*Be þeodwitan*)—but which really focuses on bishops for the most part⁷⁴—where Wulfstan mentions reeves alongside kings, bishops, nobles, generals, judges, and the more general categories of educated and learned councilors, respectively, before moving on to focus on bishops only. In the second instance, reeves have an entire category to themselves, *Be gerefan*. These two revisions add to what the text already included on reeves, who were mentioned in *I Polity* as part of Wulfstan's discussion of noblemen (*Be Eorlum*):

Eorlas and heretogan and þas worldeman and swa eac swa gerefan agan
neodþearfe, þæt hi riht lufian for God and for worlde, and nahwar þurh undom for
feo ne for freondscipe forgiman heora wisdom, swa þæt hi wændan unrihte to
rihte oððe undom deman earmon to hynðe.⁷⁵

This passage appears in *II Polity* along with the rest of *I Polity*'s comments on noblemen.

The only changes from *I* to *II Polity* are minor—the most significant being two short

⁷⁴ Trilling, "Sovereignty," 72, also makes this point.

⁷⁵ Jost, *Polity*, 78: "Nobles, generals, secular authorities, and also reeves have the obligation that they love justice for God and for the world, and never through unjust judgement for money or friendship neglect their wisdom so that they turn injustice into justice or reckon unjust judgements harmful to the poor."

intensifying clauses. The first, *ealles to lange*, adds detail to Wulfstan’s warning to those who pursue injustice, while the second, *ac God hit gebete*, adds the hope that God may correct a deficiency—that most people understand too little—in Anglo-Saxon society.⁷⁶ The section thus remains almost completely static across the versions of the text, and it very much fits the overall tenor of *I Polity*. The passage just quoted explains some general responsibilities of these figures, and the rest follows suit. A hypothetical consequence, Hell (*he sceal drefan . . . helleswites grund*), for those who do not act appropriately is included, for example. The one exception is part of the passage’s closing in *I Polity*, which apparently refers to contemporary conditions: “[a]c to lyt is þara nu ða, þe þæt understande, swa swa man scolde.”⁷⁷ This complaint seemingly refers to the preceding statement that those who do not perform their duties rightly will go to Hell—i.e. nobles, judges, secular authorities, and reeves do not comprehend that the punishment for their poor performance is eternal damnation. The text offers this criticism of the current crop of men in these positions—and it is literally damning—but such a statement is an exception in *I Polity*, a text in which Wulfstan overwhelmingly prefers to offer guidelines and hypotheticals rather than comment directly on contemporary issues. That it does contain such a strong grievance suggests that the performance of noblemen in the kingdom was frustrating enough far earlier in Wulfstan’s career for him to break from the general tone of his text to deliver it.

In *II Polity* the attention given to reeves in the *Be þeodwitan* is slight, and it can be discussed briefly. As noted above, most of the passage focuses on bishops, and so the rubric is a bit of a misnomer. Nevertheless, reeves are present: “[c]yningan and

⁷⁶ Both can be seen alongside *I Polity* in Jost, *Polity*, 80.

⁷⁷ Jost, *Polity*, 80: “But there are now too few who understand that as one should.”

bisceopan, eorlan and heretogan, gerefan and deman, larwitan and lahwitan gedafenað mid rihte for Gode and for worulde, þæt hi anræde weorðan and Godes riht lufian.”⁷⁸ The instruction is pretty straightforward: reeves, along with the rest of the groups mentioned, have a responsibility to maintain God’s laws, both to please Him and to benefit the kingdom. In its essentials it is a stripped-down version of the opening to *Be eorlum*, which, in addition to a similar instruction, added a warning against embracing injustice.

The position of a reeve in Anglo-Saxon England was one of tremendous variation,⁷⁹ but Wulfstan’s listing of the position alongside others of both political and religious authority aids in this identification. Wulfstan’s reeves in *Polity* are tied to the administration of both the Church and the kingdom, and Wulfstan’s lawcodes suggest that these reeves are of two main kinds, though there is also a third variety which may be partially under consideration. The first is the king’s reeves, mentioned in VIII Æthelred 8/I Cnut 8.2, VIII Æthelred 32, 1020 Cnut 11,⁸⁰ II Cnut 33, and II Cnut 69-69.2. These men apparently reported directly to the king or one of his agents, as evidenced by VIII Æthelred 32, 1020 Cnut 11, and II Cnut 69, each of which suggests that there is a direct link between the king and his reeves. These reeves had a major hand in the enforcement of especially important laws. VII Æthelred 8/I Cnut 8.2, for example, tasks a king’s reeve and the priest of the church in question (or, apparently depending on available personnel, the landowner’s reeve and the bishop’s reeve) with forcibly collecting those tithes which had not been freely given, along with the handing down of a stiff penalty for that

⁷⁸ Jost, *Polity*, 62: “it behooves kings and bishops, noblemen and generals, reeves and judges, learned men and lawyers that they be one-minded and love the law of God with justice for God and for world.”

⁷⁹ Two very useful discussions of reeves in Anglo-Saxon England are H. Munro Chadwick, *Anglo-Saxon Institutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905; repr. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 228-39; and Pauline Stafford, “Reeve,” in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Michael Lapidge et al. (Maldon, MA: Blackwell, 1999), 387.

⁸⁰ Not from the pen of Wulfstan, but very probably influenced by him.

transgression. Moreover, failure to enforce such important laws had dire consequences—II Cnut 8.2 reveals that if a reeve could not clear himself of an accusation that he permitted counterfeit money to be minted, then he, like the counterfeiter, would lose a hand. The king’s reeves were thus an important arm in the administration of Anglo-Saxon society, and they were held to a standard befitting their position. The second kind of reeves, mentioned in VI Æthelred 2.5 and VIIa Æthelred 2.3, are those of a lesser status who nevertheless performed important duties on behalf of the Church and state. In these texts the village reeve (*tungravius* and *tunesgerefan*, respectively) are to act as witnesses for the collecting and dividing of tithes and dues. These kinds of reeves apparently had an especially bureaucratic function rather than one rooted in the enforcement of the laws of the kingdom, but their role was nevertheless an important one since their presence legitimized important legal procedures. Another type of reeves the lawcodes mention are those hired by lords—the type of reeve Chaucer made (in)famous centuries later. Though not obviously a political position, these reeves performed some important legal tasks. II Cnut 31.1, for example, permits a lord to call on his reeve to swear that one of his men never failed in oath or ordeal in legal proceedings, while VII Æthelred 8/I Cnut 8.2, mentioned above, calls on the lord’s reeve to act as an agent of the law in cases of withholding tithes. *II Polity*’s comments on reeves in all likelihood only apply to these “private” reeves in the most peripheral sense.

The rather general opening to *Be gerefan* in *II Polity* might encompass all three kinds of reeves from Wulfstan’s lawcodes: “[r]iht is, ðæt gerefan geornlice tylian and symle heora hlafordan stryngan mid rihte.”⁸¹ The statement is informed by the ideal, and

⁸¹ Jost, *Polity*, 81: “it is right that reeves eagerly labor and always provide for their lord properly.”

thus in the best case the king's reeves and lower reeves upheld such a responsibility by making sure payments were regulated and laws were enforced, while a lord's reeve—as manager of his estate—had a duty to make sure that any profit earned could be legitimately accounted for. What follows, however, on the contemporary reality, suggests that the former two types of reeves are the true subjects of consideration; Wulfstan notes that in the time since Edgar died “þæt ma is þæra rypera þonne rihtwisra, and is earmlic ðing, þæt ða syndon ryperas, þe sceoldan beon hyrdas cristenes folces.”⁸² Anglo-Saxon England's reeves are corrupt, according to Wulfstan. He goes on to note that “[h]y rypað þa earman butan ælcere scylde,”⁸³ a statement which strongly suggests that reeves abuse their authority regarding tithes and dues for their own financial gain, not unlike priests in *II Polity*. After a few more specific transgressions are mentioned, Wulfstan employs the trope of an idealized past so often found in his writings. “[a]c hwilum man ceas wislice þa men on þeode folce to hyrdum, þe noldan for woruldsceame ne ne dorstan for Godes ege ænig ðing swician ne strynan on unriht, ac stryndan mid rihte.”⁸⁴ I point this passage out not only because this trope is a favorite of Wulfstan's, but also because it, like the passage which opens *Be gerefan*, uses *hydras* (“shepherds”) as a metaphor for reeves. This is the very same term Wulfstan used to describe ideal priests and bishops at various points in *II Polity*.⁸⁵ All three of these groups have a responsibility to guide and protect the Anglo-Saxon populace in the manner of a shepherd, and all three have fallen well short of this model. That the same metaphor is used for these three positions is striking.

⁸² Jost, *Polity*, 81: “more of them are robbers than righteous, and it is a shameful thing, that they are robbers who should be shepherds of the Christian people.”

⁸³ Jost, *Polity*, 81: “they rob the poor without any guilt.”

⁸⁴ Jost, *Polity*, 82: “but formerly one wisely chose from the people to be shepherds those men in the nation who did not want on account of worldly shame nor dared because of [their] fear of God to offend or acquire anything unjustly, but they gained justly.”

⁸⁵ The language is ultimately borrowed, of course, from the Bible.

While bishops and priests fit rather seamlessly into the comparison with shepherds—both were in charge of tending to the Anglo-Saxon laity, for example, by guiding its members through the minutiae of their faith—reeves were in a different situation. While enforcement and regulation were certainly a part of bishops’ and priests’ pastoral care, these did not define their duties as they did for reeves. Reeves’ responsibilities were thoroughly political and pragmatic—they were a mostly secular⁸⁶ part of the kingdom’s machinery through which it maintained order. The effect of Wulfstan’s referring to reeves as shepherds is that it enhances their importance to Anglo-Saxon society. On the level of the metaphor they are of the same significance as priests and bishops, to put it another way. As agents of secular and ecclesiastical administration and legislation, reeves were exceptionally important to the kingdom as a whole.

This equating of the mere occupation of reeve with priests and bishops is a good indication of Wulfstan’s thoughts on the organization of the kingdom at the end of his life. The maintaining of order was not solely the responsibility of the Church and its agents—competent and strong reeves were required as well, for they were tasked with the enforcement of both secular and ecclesiastical regulation and legislation. In anachronistic terms, reeves were the police force of the Church and kingdom in Anglo-Saxon England. Their inclusion in *II Polity* reveals that the idealism of *I Polity* was simply no longer a viable means of plotting out the workings of society. What was needed was a more practical and “bureaucratic”—and very often critical—approach to the task at hand.

⁸⁶ The exceptions, of course, are those reeves who are tasked with enforcing ecclesiastical regulation such as the payment of tithes and dues, discussed above.

This sort of approach was institutionalized by the end of Wulfstan's career, in one of his most important texts from Cnut's reign, I-II Cnut.⁸⁷ This text practically defines late Anglo-Saxon politics since it was the last major piece of legislation from the period. It is also the most substantial code from all of Anglo-Saxon England, both literally and figuratively. In this massive code Wulfstan covers more legal ground than any previous legislator had by selecting and combining portions of earlier legislation and other texts to assemble I-II Cnut.⁸⁸ The sources for the code reveal that the archbishop was a well-learned student of Anglo-Saxon law by this time—according to Patrick Wormald, almost 75% of the code is indebted to earlier material.⁸⁹ As a royal code, I-II Cnut does not necessarily deemphasize Cnut's role in the governance of the kingdom—it would have been difficult to do so, in fact, in a code written in the king's name. The strength of the code came from its association with Cnut, which the code's prologue acknowledges: “Dis is seo gerædnys þe Cnut ciningc, ealles Englalandes ciningc 7 Dena cining, mid his witena gepeahte gerædde, Gode to lofe 7 him sylfum to cynescipe 7 folce to þearf.”⁹⁰ Cnut is cast here not only as a king, but also as an emperor with two distinct realms under his control. His code carries with it the authority of that position. Furthermore, the

⁸⁷ I-II Cnut is a single piece of legislation. I Cnut is the ecclesiastical portion of the code, and II Cnut forms the secular part.

⁸⁸ A good example of this is II Cn 50-55, which discuss various sexual transgressions. While some of this material had been mentioned in Wulfstan's earlier codes for Æthelred, there they formed parts of long lists of transgressions not so dissimilar from the catalogs of sin in the *Sermo Lupi*. In II Cnut, however, they received an entire section all to themselves. Moreover, Wulfstan was the only legislator since Edmund who provided legislation on these matters, and his material on sexual transgressions was more detailed. For an example see II Cn 50 (on adultery). Wulfstan had written previous legislation on adultery in V Atr 25 and VI Atr 28.2. In both cases adultery is listed alongside numerous other transgressions, sexual and otherwise. The closest non-Wulfstanian antecedent is I Edm 4, a clause on intercourse with a nun along with adultery. This is more detailed than the Atr clauses, but adultery still receives less attention than in II Cn 50. See also Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 353.

⁸⁹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 355.

⁹⁰ Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 154: “This is the ordinance which King Cnut, king of all England and king of the Danes, arranged with the advice of his counsellors, for praise to God and for the benefit of his own kingship and the people.”

prologue admits that this legislation is multifaceted—it was issued for benefit of Cnut’s position as king as well as for society at large. It was issued to strengthen Cnut’s own position.

If the muscle of the code is rooted in Cnut and his position, though, its limbs are often found elsewhere. I-II Cnut makes it clear, as do the other texts so far, that other positions in society hold a high level of importance to the kingdom’s regulation and efficiency in governance that existed in earlier kings’ codes but is never before seen in Wulfstan’s extant legislation. One particular block of clauses borrowed from earlier codes will illustrate this point. Wormald has shown that II Cnut 16-36.1 is a part of Wulfstan’s legislation for the king that is largely taken from I Æthelred and III Edgar, with additional material borrowed and/or reworked from II and IV Æthelstan, I Edward, and the anonymous *Swerian*.⁹¹ Much of this material is noteworthy because it reveals that, late in his career, Wulfstan recognized far more than he had in his earlier codes the efficacy of the distribution of governmental authority to various administrators throughout the kingdom. Many of these borrowed codes give explicit instructions for the handling of matters by people other than Cnut (and often even by those not in the king’s immediate circle). At times these procedures resulted in payments made to the king as punishment,⁹² but it is important to note that up until receiving these fines the throne had no direct involvement in these cases. Most of the applicable clauses from this portion of II Cnut provide instructions regarding the Hundred Court, an institution for local administration and regulation.⁹³ II Cn 17, for example, instructs people not to appeal to

⁹¹ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 358 (part of his Table 5.4).

⁹² See II Cn 25a.2, 29.1, 30.6, 30.9, 31a.1, 31a.2, and 33.2.

⁹³ See II Cn 17, 17.1, 19, 19.2 (also mentions the shire court), 20, 22, 22.1, 22.1a, 22.2, 22.3, 27, 30, 30.1, 30.2, 30.3, 30.4, 30.5, 30.6, 30.7, 31.a, 31a.1, and 31a.2.

the king unless the hundred has failed to administer justice. Borough courts, shire courts, and unspecified courts are also mentioned,⁹⁴ and in an apparent effort to maintain consistency in the rulings of these courts, II Cnut 34 notes that localities should have the same laws to determine that one is free of guilt (*ladunge*). Thus, while II Cnut does not necessarily deemphasize Cnut's role as king, it does emphasize the importance of other aspects of governmental machinery in the administration of the kingdom which appear to have operated more or less free from royal oversight.⁹⁵

By way of closing, the three homilies, Napier 59, 60, and 61, and Cnut's 1020 letter inserted on their own gathering at the end of the York Gospels deserve mention in light of Wulfstan's largely novel approach to the management of the kingdom found in *II Canons*, *II Polity*, and I-II Cnut. These four texts are written in York, Minster Library, Additional 1, potentially Wulfstan's own Gospel Book,⁹⁶ alongside some other Old English texts. Every Old English document included in the manuscript is unique. The homilies, moreover, feature additions and corrections in Wulfstan's hand, and they are the only texts by the archbishop that are preserved in such an illustrious manuscript. These four texts are further noteworthy because they appear to have been written specifically for inclusion in the York Gospels.⁹⁷ The effect of doing so was two-fold—their inclusion in such an important book ensured that they would survive and, moreover,

⁹⁴ Shire courts are noted in II Cn 19.1 and 19.2, the latter of which also discusses the hundred. Borough courts are found in II Cn 18 and 18.1. Unspecified courts are mentioned in II Cn 25, 25a, and 25a.1.

⁹⁵ The potential exception here are the borough courts. II Cn 18.1 notes that a bishop and ealdorman must attend these proceedings to direct ecclesiastical and secular law (*ægðer tæcan ge Godes riht ge woruldriht*). If either of these men were part of the *witan*, as is rather probable, then royal opinion would probably have been voiced by them at these proceedings.

⁹⁶ As argued in T. A. Heslop, "Art and the Man: Archbishop Wulfstan and the York Gospelbook," in Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 279-308.

⁹⁷ Keynes, "Additions," 92.

it imbued the texts with the authority of the Gospels.⁹⁸ Though composed as homilies, the texts are heavily legislative⁹⁹—so much so, in fact, that I am inclined to believe their primary purpose was not to be delivered to a congregation or some other audience. Instead, these texts were written to be included in the York Gospels in order to provide subsequent Anglo-Saxon Church authorities with a record of the rules and regulations Wulfstan had found to be most important during his tenure as archbishop of York.¹⁰⁰

All three texts homilies are brief, and their contents are thus easy to summarize. Napier 59 is the most obviously homiletic of the three, as it contains an opening and closing typical of Wulfstan's homilies. The text consists of a number of instructions mostly for the laity, though some for the secular clergy are also present. On the laity, the text emphasizes, for example, the necessity of learning the Pater Noster and the Creed with “he ne byð wel cristen, þe ðæt geleornian nele.”¹⁰¹ Injunctions against incest and other forms of sexual and marital transgressions follow before the text ends with a lengthy exposition on the various responsibilities of Christians—they are to eagerly turn from sin (*fram synnum georne gecyrre*) and listen to spiritual advisors (*godcundan lareowan geornlice hyran*), for example. For their part, the clergy are advised among other things to love purity (*lufian clænnesse*) and attend to their studies and prayers (*bocum and gebedum geornlice fylgean*). Napier 60 is a text which equates heathenism

⁹⁸ Keynes, “Additions,” 92. See also Treharne, “Politics of Early English,” 114; and Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 69-70.

⁹⁹ This is usefully illustrated in Wormald, “Holiness of Society,” 204-6.

¹⁰⁰ See Keynes, “Additions,” 92: “they [the homilies] represent a considered summary of Wulfstan's views on the proper ordering of a Christian society”; and Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, 66: “[i]t is possible that the *Sermo Lupi*, *Be Hæðendome*, and *Be Cristendome* with the Bidding Prayers and Cnut's *Letter to the English of 1020* form a set of five short texts exemplifying Wulfstan's own final thoughts in the early 1020s on the state of the nation, perhaps deliberately providing his successor, Ælfric Puttoc (d. 1051) with a set of work that is itself a snapshot of major archiepiscopal duties and concerns.”

¹⁰¹ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 307 (ll. 25-6): “he is not a good Christian, who will not learn those.”

with behavior that is inappropriate for Christians, which Meaney has shown was a common move for the archbishop: “Wulfstan’s mindset included as ‘heathenism’ not only elements of the occult, but also what we would consider either as the worst of crimes or merely as sexual misconduct.”¹⁰² One of Wulfstan’s lists of offenders from the text is illustrative of this point:

godcundnessæ wiðersacan and godes lage oferhogan, manslagan and mægslagan, cyrichatan and sacerdbanan, hadbreacan and æwbreacan, myltestran and bearnmyrðran, þeofas and þeodscaðan, ryperas and reaferas, leogeras and liceteras and leodhatan hetele ealles to manege, þe ðurh mansylene bariað þas þeode, and wedlogan and wærlogan.¹⁰³

Regardless of the severity of the offense, individuals like those listed act in ways that are contrary to their faith and are thus heathens, according to Wulfstan’s conception of the term. Napier 61 rounds out the group by discussing the necessity of tithes and dues: “and þæt is an ærest, þæt man geteoðige æghwylce geara þæt, þæt god sende þonne on geara folce to þearf on corne and on flexe and on gewelhwylcon wæstmæ.”¹⁰⁴ The text provides a schedule for the payments of tithes and dues along with legal procedures for the punishment of those who fail to either pay them at all or pay them on time.

Cnut’s 1020 Letter follows Napier 61 in the manuscript. The text is exceptional for a couple of reasons. First, it is the first letter of its kind from a ruler to his subjects in

¹⁰² Meaney, “Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse ‘Heathenism,’” 483.

¹⁰³ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 309 (l. 28)-10 (ll. 1-6): “enemies of the sacred and despisers of God’s law, murderers and kin-killers, Church-haters and priest-killers, violators of holy orders and adulterers, prostitutes and child-killers, thieves and enemies of the people, robbers and plunderers, liars and hypocrites, and all too many malignant tyrants who make the land bare through human trafficking, and pledge-breakers and trust-breakers.”

¹⁰⁴ Napier, *Wulfstan*, 310 (ll.21-2): “and this is first: that one tithes every year so that God may provide for the needs of the people during the year in grain and in flax and in every kind of produce.”

English history. Additionally, and more important to the present discussion, Wulfstan appears to have tacked his own ending onto Cnut's letter: Keynes has shown that §§14-20 of the document are written in Wulfstan's language and style.¹⁰⁵ These clauses include material taken from Wulfstan-authored lawcodes and some other texts, and their combined messages are rather basic. §14 notes that bishops must call for penance in the cases of broken oaths and pledges, §15 instructs the people to love God and reject wrongdoing, §16 forbids wedding a nun or a woman under monastic vows, §17 notes punishments for doing so, §18 proclaims the sanctity of the Sabbath, §19 lists some responsibilities for Christians, and §20 claims that if all the preceding instructions are followed then one will go to Heaven.¹⁰⁶

Though each of these texts date to late in Wulfstan's career—they were probably written (or amended, in the case of Cnut's letter) in c. 1020—and though each was apparently written specifically for inclusion in the York Gospels, none of them contains anything new. These texts are assembled with passages from Wulfstan's legislation, though excerpts from his other texts, mostly from the homilies, make appearances as well. Napier 61 serves as a good example. Keynes and Rabin have shown that this text is indebted in various ways to a variety of Wulfstan's texts. Even if one limits the scope of these texts to legislation and homilies, the list remains substantial: Bethurum VIIIbc, Bethurum XVIII, "Edward and Guthrum," V Æthelred, VI Æthelred, VIII Æthelred, and I Cnut all must be included.¹⁰⁷ Napier 59 and 60 and Wulfstan's additions to Cnut's letter are in a similar situation. These texts of the York Gospels are thus the result of

¹⁰⁵ Keynes, "Additions," 96.

¹⁰⁶ For an edition of the Letter see Robertson, *Laws of the Kings of England*, 140-5.

¹⁰⁷ Keynes, "Additions," 94-5; and Rabin, *Political Writings*, 163-4.

Wulfstan's distillation of the most important aspects of his writings about the ordering of the kingdom that were general enough to be timeless. They form, in fact, the only group of texts of this nature by Wulfstan from Cnut's reign that is meant specifically for posterity. Importantly, these texts are not meant for a royal audience, but, rather, they were for the eyes and ears of those future churchmen who operated out of York—particularly, I suspect, future archbishops. Wulfstan's texts in the York Gospels, in other words, form a manual for the future of Anglo-Saxon England that was placed into the hands of those most suited to seeing it through whatever the coming times had in store, and, as has been seen, Wulfstan no longer trusted whoever was on the throne to navigate these waters. Granted, Wulfstan's additions to Cnut's Letter are imbued with the authority of the king's name, but this added material has practically nothing to do with the responsibilities of future kings. By implicitly ascribing §§14-20 of the Letter to Cnut, however, Wulfstan effectively creates the illusion that the throne, itself, sanctioned the delegation of enforcement of these clauses—and they contain both secular (§14) and ecclesiastical (§§15-20) precepts—to representatives of the Church. The Letter, then, along with Napier 59, 60, and 61, strongly indicates that, at the close of his life, Wulfstan sought to encourage a more active participation in the governance of the kingdom by those with no direct connection to the throne. The future of Anglo-Saxon England was to be held in a major way by those who, up until Cnut's ascension, had only supporting roles in its governance.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This dissertation has shown that Wulfstan had a clear interest in Anglo-Saxon kings. Alfred and Edgar—both of whom had been vetted by history—left a considerable number of texts which Wulfstan mined extensively for material applicable to the kingdom’s situation when he was active. His interaction with these earlier kings reveals that early in Wulfstan’s career the archbishop found the position of king to be of the utmost importance to the governance and stability of the kingdom—so much so, in fact, that he forged the so-called “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” in Alfred’s name and attributed the first version of the *Canons of Edgar* to Edgar. Additionally, the 959DE *Chronicle* poem shows that the archbishop held kings to a high standard by criticizing Edgar’s amicable treatment of the Danes in England.

The reigns of Æthelred and Cnut witnessed Wulfstan’s application of his views on kingship and what the kingdom needed generally in order to improve, both of which changed over the course of his career. For much of his career under Æthelred Wulfstan focused on admonishing and instructing the Anglo-Saxon laity in order to shore up the kingdom in the face of Viking attacks. He had not yet become Æthelred’s legislator, and his approach to the ills of his society very much reflected his position as a churchman. After he drafted V Æthelred in 1008, however, Wulfstan’s view changed. His foray into the political sphere prompted him to change his approach to rectifying England’s problems. Rather than focus on the laity, the texts from the end of Æthelred’s reign were aimed at the king, himself, and his *witan*. They stressed both the essentiality of law and order and the importance of the king to society as a whole.

In 1016 Cnut ascended to the throne, but in the following years society's problems still remained. Wulfstan changed tactics. He had learned from Æthelred and Cnut that kings were simply not up to the task of addressing the core problems of the kingdom and its society. During this period Wulfstan's thoughts on ordering the kingdom became far more multifaceted than they had been before. His texts from Cnut's reign reveal that it is not primarily the king that interested Wulfstan during these years, but, rather, the administration of the kingdom in general. Thus, the archbishop adopted an almost bureaucratic approach to the regulation of Anglo-Saxon society. Cnut's position as king was deemphasized while those in lower positions of authority were magnified. Thus, after his death in 1023, Anglo-Saxon England was left with a new model for the organization and regulation of society.

As discussed in my final chapter, part of this new model was contained in I-II Cnut, Anglo-Saxon England's final lawcode. What this indicates is that the means of government mapped out in I-II Cnut, including its emphasis on the important roles played by local courts and other, non-royal, officials, in all likelihood formed much of the basis for law and order for the rest of the entire period. Wulfstan's influence in Anglo-Saxon England extended long after his death in 1023—it lasted at least up to 1066, in other words. After Cnut's death in 1035,¹ Harold, his son with Ælfgifu of Northampton, was made regent and then king of England, and there is no indication that he changed the laws of the kingdom. In fact, he probably would not have had time to if he had desired to do so—Harold died in 1040. Harthacnut, Cnut's son with Emma, took over after Harold's death and was on the throne for an even shorter amount of time; he died in 1042. Edward

¹ For a fuller account of this and what follows, see Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 419-31 and 579-80.

the Confessor, Æthelred's son by Emma, whom Harthacnut had apparently named as his successor, ascended to the throne after this, and he ruled until 1066. It is rather surprising that he did not issue new legislation during his relatively long stay on the throne, particularly since he had spent many formative years on the continent where he was rather likely exposed to differing means of maintaining law and order. Earl Godwine's son Harold established himself as king following Edward's death in 1066, but he died in the Battle of Hastings in the very same year.

I-II Cnut was apparently inherited and upheld by every one of these kings, whose individual reigns are devoid of legislation. There is, of course, the chance that one or more of the kings who followed Cnut issued legislation, but if this is the case it was probably relatively minor in importance. If anything remotely close in significance to I-II Cnut was drafted then one would suspect that it, too, would have survived. Wulfstan's vision of government found in I-II Cnut, then, essentially defined the method of governance for the rest of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Furthermore, Wulfstan's influence crossed the largely scholarly-established border of 1066, as I-II Cnut was instrumental in post-Conquest legislation, though it is unclear how much of this material actually represents official law.² It is a convenient mistake to assume that 1066 firmly closes the door on the Anglo-Saxon period and that Anglo-Norman England formed an altogether new period of history, as it certainly did not. Recent studies, such as those by Andrew Galloway, Elaine Treharne, and Thomas Gobbitt, among others, have shown that this is not the case.³ Further studies such as these

² See Wormald, *Making of English Law*, 398-415.

³ Andrew Galloway, "Lazamon's Gift," *PMLA* 121 (2006): 717-34; Treharne, *Living through Conquest*; and Thomas Gobbitt, "(Old) English, Anglo-Saxon Legal Texts in the Later 11th to Mid-12th Centuries," *Literature Compass* 10 (2013): 618-30.

which cross the border of 1066 are needed to fully flesh out I-II Cnut's influence in the years following the Conquest, for it undoubtedly had an effect on later legislation.

In a sense, then, those well-meaning figures at Ely missed the mark when they unsuccessfully attempted to set Wulfstan up as a saint with their claims of miracles performed at his tomb.⁴ They wanted Wulfstan's legacy to be that of a miraculous churchman forever preserved in the rolls of the Church's catalog of distinguished holy men and women. As it turned out, Wulfstan has been remembered—though perhaps by fewer people than Ely had in mind—not for his alleged saintliness, but, rather, for his important roles in both the religious and secular spheres of late Anglo-Saxon England.

⁴ This move by Ely is discussed briefly in Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, 7-8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abels, Richard. "Paying the Danegeld: Anglo-Saxon Peacemaking with Vikings." In *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History*, edited by Philip De Souza and John France, 173-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Abrams, Lesley. "The Conversion of the Danelaw." In *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, edited by James Graham-Campbell, Richard Hall, and Judith Jesch, 31-44. Oxford: Oxbow, 2001.
- . "King Edgar and the Men of the Danelaw." In Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 171-91.
- Attenborough, F. L., ed. *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922. Reprinted, New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
- Barker, Nicolas, ed. *The York Gospels*. London: The Roxburghe Club, 1986.
- Barlow, Frank. *The English Church 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church*. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Bately, Janet M. "Did King Alfred Actually Translate Anything? The Integrity of the Alfredian Canon Revisited." *Medium Ævum* 78 (2009): 189-215.
- . "Old English Prose Before and During the Reign of Alfred." *Anglo-Saxon England* 17 (1988): 93-138.
- Baxter, Stephen. "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 161-205.
- Becher, Richard. *Wulfstans Homilien*. Leipzig: Sturm, 1910.
- Bethurum, Dorothy. "Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book." *PMLA* 57 (1942): 916-29.

- , ed. *The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- . “A Letter of Protest from the English Bishops to the Pope.” In *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, edited by Thomas Austin Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf, 97-104. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949.
- . “Six Anonymous Old English Codes.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 49 (1950): 449-63.
- Bethurum Loomis, Dorothy. “*Regnum and Sacerdotium* in the Early Eleventh Century.” In Clemoes and Hughes, *England before the Conquest*, 129-45.
- Biggs, Frederick M. “Edgar’s Path to the Throne.” In Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 124-39.
- Bosworth, Joseph. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Edited and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Bredehoft, Thomas A. “Ælfric and Late Old English Verse.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 33 (2004): 77-107.
- . *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- . *Early English Metre*. Toronto Old English Series 15. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- . *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Cable, Thomas. Review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 107 (2008): 394-7.

- Callison, Tolliver Cleveland, III. "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Anglo-Saxon Homilies in MSS. CCCC 302 and Cotton Faustina A. ix." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974.
- Campbell, Alistair, ed. *The Battle of Brunanburh*. London: William Heinemann, 1938.
- , ed. *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*. Medieval Texts. New York: Nelson, 1962.
- . *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Campbell, Miles W. "Queen Emma and Ælfifu of Northampton: Canute the Great's Women." *Medieval Scandinavia* 4 (1971): 66-79.
- Carroll, Jayne. "Engla Waldend, Rex Admirabilis: Poetic Representations of King Edgar." *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 58 (2007): 113-32.
- Chadwick, H. Munro. *Anglo-Saxon Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905. Reprinted, New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
- Clayton, Mary. "Ælfric's Esther: A *Speculum Reginae*?" In *Text and Gloss: Studies in Insular Language and Literature*, edited by Helen Conrad-O'Brien, Anne Marie D'Arcy, and John Scattergood, 89-101. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999.
- Clemons, Peter, ed. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*. Vol. 1, *Text*. EETS s.s. 17. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Clemons, Peter, and Kathleen Hughes, eds. *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Coatsworth, Elizabeth. "Byrhtnoth's Tomb." In *The Battle of Maldon, AD 991*, edited by D. G. Scragg, 279-88. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991.

- Cooper, Janet M. *The Last Four Anglo-Saxon Archbishops of York*. Borthwick Papers 38. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1970.
- Cross, J. E. "Contents of the Manuscript." In Cross and Tunberg, *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection*, 14-23.
- . "A Newly-Identified Manuscript of Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book,' Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 1382 (U. 109), ff. 173r-198v." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992): 63-83.
- . "Some Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature." In *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, edited by Stanley B. Greenfield, 1-22. Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1963.
- . "Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript." *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 203-20.
- Cross, J. E., and Jennifer Morrish Tunberg, eds. *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595*. EEMF 25. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1993.
- . "Introduction," in Cross and Tunberg, *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection*, 1-13.
- Cubbin, G. P., ed. *MS D. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* 6. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1996.
- Dance, Richard. "Sound, Fury, and Signifiers; or Wulfstan's Language." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 29-61.
- Davis, R. H. C. "Alfred the Great: Propaganda and Truth." *History* 56 (1971): 169-82.
- . "Alfred and Guthrum's Frontier." *English Historical Review* 97 (1982): 803-10.

- Davis-Secord, Jonathan. "Rhetoric and Politics in Archbishop Wulfstan's Old English Homilies." *Anglia* 126 (2008): 65-96.
- Dien, Stephanie. "Sermo Lupi ad Anglos: The Order and Date of the Three Versions." *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 76 (1975): 561-70.
- Discenza, Nicole Guenther. "Alfred's Verse Preface to the *Pastoral Care* and the Chain of Authority." *Neophilologus* 85 (2001): 625-33.
- Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*. ASPR 6. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Dobyns, Mabel Falberg. "Wulfstan's Vocabulary: A Glossary of the *Homilies* with Commentary." PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973.
- Dodd, Loring Holmes. *A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies*. Yale Studies in English 35. New York: Henry Holt, 1908. Reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968.
- Duby, Georges. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Fairweather, Janet, trans. *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely, from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005.
- Fehr, Bernhard, ed. *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 4. Hamburg: Henri Grand, 1914. Reprinted with a Supplement to the Introduction by Peter Clemoes, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Fowler, Roger, ed. *Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar*. EETS o.s. 266. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Funke, Otto. "Some Remarks on Wulfstan's Prose Rhythm." *English Studies* 43 (1962): 311-18.

Galloway, Andrew. "Lazamon's Gift." *PMLA* 121 (2006): 717-34.

Gatch, Milton McC. *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

Gerchow, Jan. "Prayers for King Cnut: The Liturgical Commemoration of a Conqueror." In Hicks, *England in the Eleventh Century*, 219-38.

Gneuss, Helmut. *A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts or Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001.

Gobbitt, Thomas. "(Old) English, Anglo-Saxon Legal Texts in the Later 11th to Mid-12th Centuries," *Literature Compass* 10 (2013): 618-30.

Godden, Malcolm. "Ælfric and the Alfredian Precedents." In *A Companion to Ælfric*, edited by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, 139-63. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. "Ælfric and the Vernacular Prose Tradition." In Szarmach and Huppé, *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, 99-117.

———. "The Alfredian Project and its Aftermath: Rethinking the Literary History of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 162 (2009): 93-122.

- . “Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England.” In *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies Presented to E. G. Stanley*, edited by Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad, 130-62. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- . “Did King Alfred Write Anything?” *Medium Ævum* 76 (2007): 1-13.
- . “King Alfred’s Preface and the Teaching of Latin in Anglo-Saxon England.” *English Historical Review* 117 (2002): 596-604.
- . “The Millennium, Time, and History for the Anglo-Saxons.” In *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1000*, edited by Richard Allen Landes, Andrew Colin Gow, and David C. Van Meter, 155-80. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . “The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment.” In Townend, *Archbishop Wulfstan of York, 353-74*.
Godden, Malcolm, and Susan Irvine, eds. *The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius’s De Consolatione Philosophiae*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Graham, Timothy. “The Opening of King Alfred’s Preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care*: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 20.” *Old English Newsletter* 38 (2004): 43-50.
- Griffith, Mark. Review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft. *Notes & Queries* 56 (2009): 98-9.
- Haddan, Arthur West, and William Stubbs, eds. *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-78.

- Hall, Thomas N. "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 93-139.
- Heslop, T. A. "Art and the Man: Archbishop Wulfstan and the York Gospel Book." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 279-308.
- Hicks, Carola, ed. *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*. Harlaxton Medieval Studies 2/Paul Watkins Medieval Studies 12. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992.
- Hill, David, ed. *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*. BAR British Series 59. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1978.
- Hill, Joyce. "Archbishop Wulfstan: Reformer?" In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 309-34.
- Hill, Thomas D. "A Riddle on the Three Orders in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*?" *Philological Quarterly* 80 (2001): 205-12.
- Hohler, C. E. "Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church." In *Tenth Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, edited by David Parsons, 60-86. London: Phillimore, 1975.
- Hollis, Stephanie. "Thematic Structure of the *Sermo Lupi*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977): 175-95.
- Holthausen, F. "Die Gedichte in Ælfred's Übersetzung der *Cura pastoralis*," *Archiv* 106 (1901): 346-7.

- Howe, Nicholas. *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989. Reprinted, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Huppé, Bernard F. "Alfred and Aelfric: A Study of Two Prefaces." In Szarmach and Huppé, *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, 119-37.
- Irvine, Martin. "Medieval Textuality and the Archaeology of Textual Culture." In *Speaking Two Languages: Traditional Disciplines and Contemporary Theory in Medieval Studies*, edited by Allen J. Frantzen, 181-210. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Irvine, Susan, ed. *MS E. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 7*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004.
- Jackson, Elizabeth. "'Not Simply Lists': An Eddic Perspective on Short-Item Lists in Old English Poems." *Speculum* 73 (1998): 338-71.
- Jayakumar, Shashi. "Some Reflections on the 'Foreign Policies' of Edgar 'the Peaceable.'" *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 17-37.
- Jost, Karl. "Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen." *Anglia* 56 (1932): 265-315.
- , ed. *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York*. Swiss Studies in English 47. Bern: Francke, 1959.
- . *Wulfstanstudien*. Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23. Bern: Francke, 1950.
- . "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," *Anglia* 47 (1923): 105-23.
- . "Zu den Handschriften der Cura Pastoralis." *Anglia* 37 (1913): 63-88.
- Karkov, Catherine. *The Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 3. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004.

- Kemble, J. M., ed. *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*. 6 vols. London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1839-48.
- Kennedy, A. G. "Cnut's Law Code of 1018." *Anglo-Saxon England* 11 (1983): 57-81.
- Ker, N. R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- . "The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan." In Clemoes and Hughes, *England before the Conquest*, 315-31.
- . "Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A.xiii." In *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, edited by R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern, 49-75. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.
- , ed. *The Pastoral Care: King Alfred's Translation of St. Gregory's Regula pastoralis; Ms. Hatton 20 in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Ms. Cotton Tiberius B. XI in the British Museum, Ms. Anhang 19 in the Landesbibliothek at Kassel. EEMF 6*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956.
- Kershaw, Paul. "The Alfred-Guthrum Treaty: Scripting Accommodation and Interaction in Viking Age England." In *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, edited by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, 43-64. *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Keynes, Simon. "An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12." *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007): 151-220.
- . "The Additions in Old English." In Barker, *The York Gospels*, 81-99.

- . “Cnut’s Earls.” In *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, edited by Alexander R. Rumble, 43-88. Studies in the Early History of Britain. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.
- . “Crime and Punishment in the Reign of King Æthelred the Unready.” In *People and Places in Northern Europe, 500-1600: Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer*, edited by I. N. Wood and Niels Lund, 67-81. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991.
- . “The Cult of King Alfred the Great.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 28 (1999): 225-356.
- . “The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready.” In Hill, *Ethelred the Unready*, 227-53.
- . *The Diplomas of King Æthelred ‘The Unready,’ 978-1016: A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life & Thought, Third Series 13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- . “The Vikings in England, c. 790-1016.” In *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, edited by Peter Sawyer, 48-82. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Keynes, Simon, and Michael Lapidge, eds. *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources*. London: Penguin, 1983.
- Kinard, J. P. *A Study of Wulfstan’s Homilies: Their Style and Sources*. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1897.
- Lapidge, Michael, ed. *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St. Oswald and St. Ecgbwine*. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.
- , ed. *The Cult of St. Swithun*. Winchester Studies 4.2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Lawson, M. K. *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century*. The Medieval World. New York: Longman, 1993.
- Lees, Clare A. *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England*. Medieval Cultures 19. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Levison, Wilhelm. *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Lewis, C. P. "Edgar, Chester, and the Kingdom of the Mercians, 957-9." In Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 104-23.
- Liebermann, F., ed. *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. 3 vols. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1898-1916.
- Lionarons, Joyce Tally. *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 14. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2010.
- . "Napier Homily L: Wulfstan's Eschatology at the Close of His Career." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 413-28.
- . "Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*." *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 55 (2004): 157-82.
- Lund, Niels. "King Edgar and the Danelaw." *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 9 (1976): 181-95.
- Mann, Gareth. "The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript." In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 235-78.
- Marsden, Richard, ed. *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Novo*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Text*. EETS o. s. 330. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- McIntosh, Angus. "Wulfstan's Prose." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949): 109-42.
- Meaney, Audrey L. "'And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe': Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse 'Heathenism.'" In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, 461-500*.
- Menner, Robert J. "Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary." *Modern Language Notes* 63 (1948): 1-9.
- Minkova, Donka. Review of *Early English Metre*, by Thomas A. Bredehoft. *Speculum* 83 (2008): 673-5.
- Mize, Britt. "Manipulations of the Mind-as-Container Motif in *Beowulf*, *Homiletic Fragment II*, and Alfred's Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 107 (2008): 25-56.
- Morrish, Jennifer. "King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England in the Ninth Century." In *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: Sixteen Original Contributions*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 87-105. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986.
- Napier, Arthur, ed. *Über die Werke des altenglischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan*. Berlin: Hof-Buchdruckerei, 1882.
- , ed. *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*. Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben 4. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883. Reprinted, Dublin: Weidmann, 1967.
- O'Brien O'Keefe, Katherine. "Body and Law in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998): 209-32.

- , ed. *MS C. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 5*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001.
- . *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*. Cambridge Studies in Old English Verse 4. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Orchard, Andy. "On Editing Wulfstan." In *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, edited by Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser, 311-40. Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies 252. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002.
- . "Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter." In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 311-41. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Plummer, Charles, ed. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel with Supplementary Extracts from Others*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
- , ed. *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.
- Pons-Sanz, Sara. *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works, A Case Study*. North Western European Language Evolution, Supplement 22. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007.
- Pope, John C., ed. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*. 2 vols. EETS o.s. 259, 260. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967-8.
- Powell, Timothy E. "The 'Three Orders' of Society in Anglo-Saxon England." *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (1994): 103-32.

- Pratt, David. "Problems of Authorship and Audience in the Writings of King Alfred the Great." In *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World*, edited by Patrick Wormald and Janet L. Nelson, 162-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Rabin, Andrew, trans. *The Political Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan of York*. Manchester Medieval Sources. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015.
- . "The Wolf's Testimony to the English: Law and Witness in the 'Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.'" *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105 (2006): 388-414.
- Richards, Mary P. "I-II Cnut: Wulfstan's *Summa*?" In *English Law before the Magna Carta: Felix Liebermann and Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, edited by Stefan Jurasinski, Lisi Oliver, and Andrew Rabin, 137-56. *Medieval Law and its Practice* 8. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . "Wulfstan and the Millennium." In *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, edited by Michael Frassetto, 41-8. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2002.
- Robertson, A. J., ed. *Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924. Reprinted, New York: AMS Press, 1974.
- Salvador-Bello, Mercedes. "The Edgar Panegyrics in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*." In Scragg, *Edgar, King of the English*, 252-72.
- Sauer, Hans. "The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book.'" In Szarmach, *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, 339-93.
- Sawyer, P. H. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 8. London: Royal Historical Society, 1968.

- Scragg, D. G., ed. *The Battle of Maldon*. Old and Middle English Texts. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.
- , ed. *Edgar, King of the English, 959-975*. Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 8. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008.
- , ed. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. EETS o.s. 300. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Sedgefield, Walter John, ed. *The Battle of Maldon and Short Poems from the Saxon Chronicle*. New York: D. C. Heath, 1904. Reprinted, New York: AMS Press, 1972.
- Shippey, T. A. *Old English Verse*. English Literature. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1972.
- . “Wealth and Wisdom in King Alfred’s *Preface to the Old English Pastoral Care*.” *English Historical Review* 94 (1979): 346-55.
- Sisam, Kenneth. “The Publication of Alfred’s Pastoral Care.” In *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*, 140-7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- . “The Relationship of Æthelred’s Codes V and VI.” In *Studies*, 278-87.
- Skeat, W. W., ed. *Ælfric’s Lives of Saints, being a Set of Sermons on Saints’ Days Formerly Observed by the English Church*. 4 vols. EETS o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114. London: N. Trübner, 1881-1900. Reprinted as 2 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Smith, Scott Thompson. “The Edgar Poems and the Poetics of Failure in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 39 (2011): 105-37.

- Stafford, Pauline. "Reeve." In *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Michael Lapidge, John Blair, Simon Keynes, and Donald Scragg, 387. Maldon, MA: Blackwell, 1999.
- . *Unification and Conquest: A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*. London: Edward Arnold, 1989.
- Stanley, E. G. "The Glorification of Alfred King of Wessex (from the Publication of Sir John Spelman's *Life*, 1678 and 1709, to the Publication of Reinhold Pauli's, 1851)." *Poetica* 12 (1979): 103-33.
- Stenton, Frank. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Stevenson, William Henry, ed. *Asser's Life of King Alfred; Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904. Reprinted, 1959.
- Sweet, Henry, ed. *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. 2 vols. EETS o.s. 45, 50. London: N. Trübner, 1871. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Symons, Thomas, ed. *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation*. Medieval Classics. London: Nelson, 1953.
- Szarmach, Paul E. "The Meaning of Alfred's *Preface to the Pastoral Care*." *Mediaevalia* 6 (1982): 57-96.
- , ed. *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5. New York: Garland, 2000.
- Szarmach, Paul E., and Bernard F. Huppé, eds. *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1978.

- Thormann, Janet. "The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* Poems and the Making of the English Nation." In *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*, edited by Alan J. Frantzen and John D. Niles, 60-85. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997.
- Townend, Matthew. "Pre-Cnut Praise-Poetry in Viking Age England." *Review of English Studies* 51 (2000): 349-70.
- , ed. *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Townsend, Julie. "The Metre of the *Chronicle*-verse." *Studia Neophilologica* 68 (1996): 143-76.
- Thorpe, Benjamin, ed. *Diplomatarium anglicum aevi saxonici*. London: Macmillan, 1865.
- Treharne, Elaine. *Living through Conquest: The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220*. Oxford Textual Perspectives. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . "The Politics of Early English." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 88 (2006): 101-22.
- Trilling, Renée R. *The Aesthetics of Nostalgia: Historical Representation in Old English Verse*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- . "Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the *Institutes of Polity*." In *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones, 58-85. Church, Faith, and Culture in the Medieval West. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

- Ure, James M., ed. *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text*. Edinburgh University Publications, Language & Literature 11. Edinburgh: University Press, 1957.
- Wainwright, F. T. "Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians." In *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*, edited by Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen, 44-55. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. "The Franks and the English in the Ninth Century: Some Common Historical Interests." *History* 35 (1950): 202-18.
- Wanley, Humfrey. *Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium Catalogus*. Vol. 2 of *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus*, edited by George Hickes. Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1705.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. "Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., 24 (1942): 25-45.
- . "The Authorship of the Account of King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries." In *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, edited by James L. Rosier, 125-36. *Janua Linguarum, Series Maior* 37. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- . "The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries." In *The Anglo-Saxons: Some Aspects of Their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickens on His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Peter Clemoes, 7-88. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959.
- , ed. *English Historical Documents: c. 500-1042*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- . *The Importance of the Battle of Edington*. Edington: Friends of Edington

- Priory, 1977.
- . “A Note on the Career of Wulfstan the Homilist.” *English Historical Review* 52 (1937): 460-5.
- , ed. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Methuen’s Old English Library. London: Methuen, 1939.
- , ed. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. 2nd ed. Methuen’s Old English Library. Oxford: Methuen, 1952.
- , ed. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. 3rd ed. Methuen’s Old English Library. London: Methuen, 1963.
- . “Two Notes on Ælfric and Wulfstan.” *Modern Language Review* 38 (1943): 122-6.
- . “Wulfstan’s Authorship of Cnut’s Laws.” *English Historical Review* 70 (1955): 72-85.
- . “Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut.” *English Historical Review* 63 (1948): 433-52.
- . “Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum.” *English Historical Review* 56 (1941): 1-21.
- Whitelock, Dorothy, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, eds. *Councils and Synods with other Documents Relating to the English Church*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Wilcox, Jonathan. “The Dissemination of Wulfstan’s Homilies: The Wulfstan Tradition in Eleventh-Century Vernacular Preaching.” In Hicks, *England in the Eleventh Century*, 199-217.

- . “The St. Brice’s Day Massacre and Archbishop Wulfstan.” In *Peace and Negotiation: Strategies for Coexistence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, edited by Diane Wolfthal, 79-91. Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- . “The Wolf on the Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.” In Szarmach, *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, 395-418.
- . “Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance: 16 February 1014 and Beyond.” In Townend, *Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, 375-96.
- Whorbrey, William T. “King Alfred’s Metrical Epilogue to the ‘Pastoral Care.’” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90 (1991): 175-86.
- Wormald, Patrick. “Æthelred the Lawmaker.” In Hill, *Ethelred the Unready*, 47-80.
- . “Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-BUILDER.” In Townend, *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 9-27.
- . “Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society.” In *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, edited by David A. E. Pelteret, 191-224. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 6. New York: Garland, 2000.
- . *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*. Vol. 1, *Legislation and its Limits*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Wrenn, C. L. *A Study of Old English Literature*. New York: Norton, 1967.