Chapter Four
The reeve and moral discourse on secular authority

The reeve, as an administrative official, attracted a not insignificant amount of attention in late Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical texts. These included saints’ lives, homilies, and of course the writings of Archbishop Wulfstan of York. This chapter will aim to show that despite the plethora of references to reeves in these texts – many in a moralizing fashion – the manner in which Wulfstan deals with this official is different. In fact, not only is Wulfstan’s use of the reeve a departure from previous literary trends, but it also encompasses Alfredian mores as well as Wulfstan’s own political and moral thought. The reeve will emerge as a key player in Wulfstan’s passionate campaign to reform English society into a good Christian kingdom, thereby preserving the English from God’s wrath.

It has been shown that in late Anglo-Saxon England, despite the viking devastation, concurrently there were increasing trends in aristocratic conspicuous display and consumption.¹ The late tenth and early eleventh centuries were a very dynamic period in Anglo-Saxon England—not only economically, but politically and socially as well. Already under Edgar England was seeing the development of a very complex administrative and political landscape. The conspicuous consumption taking place at the upper echelons of society was fueled in part by the rise to thegnhood and the lower ranks of the aristocracy by middling men and royal officials, which was in turn facilitated by the cash flow created in the tenth century as a result of intensified agricultural exploitation. Alongside this development we can also see an increase in urbanization in late Anglo-Saxon England. Royal officials in general, and reeves in particular, were among those who benefitted from the opening of the lower ranks of the aristocracy. Indeed, it seems that many of these men were able to achieve thegnhood and the perks that such a status offered (traditionally, a hall, a church and a seat in the king’s hall).

¹ Discussed in Chapter Three, above.
The infiltration of the upper social ranks made possible by the increased agricultural production now taking place on the new, smaller estates occasioned great anxiety in those occupying positions at or near the top of the social ladder. This is plainly evident in tracts on status generated at and around this time. One prominent author of such tracts was Wulfstan, archbishop of York and Worcester. The trigger for this anxiety may in part have stemmed from the fact that the position of the thegn was not necessarily easily recognizable. Pauline Stafford notes that the term “thegn” was rather a vague sort of term, indicating merely that an individual was a royal servant of some persuasion.² This presents rather a sharp contrast to the position of the ealdorman, whose status and role would have easily and readily identified him.³ Due to the somewhat blurred and adaptable role of the thegn, Stafford argues that Wulfstan sought to impress a specific and clearly visible marker upon this particular status – that of a specific lifestyle, which included a quantifiable element, which was of course the five hides of land.⁴ Whether a man was a thegn or not was (at least in theory) easily determined, according to Wulfstan’s requirements. It is important to bear in mind that social mobility was not a new occurrence in late Anglo-Saxon England; however, Stafford remarks that various indicators such as place-name evidence show that social mobility was occurring at a more rapid rate towards the end of this period.⁵ It has been shown that Wulfstan viewed the relentless viking attacks as divine punishment wrought by God upon the English for their failure to maintain a good Christian society, as well as to adhere to the proper social order.

---

⁵ Stafford, *Unification and Conquest: A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*, 156.
Alfredian precedent

It has been established that Wulfstan had a great preoccupation with status and the ordering of society. The tract *Geþyncðu* is a set of clauses that prescribe the parameters for membership within various social ranks. These carefully laid out prescriptions highlight real concerns surrounding social strata and order. It seems noteworthy that *Geþyncðu* opens with the regretful phrase “hit wæs hwilum on Engla lagum...” ⁶ immediately indicating Wulfstan’s displeasure with the current situation in England. This of course recalls us to Chapter Three, and the heightened estate exploitation and, accordingly, ever-increasing aristocratic display seen in the tenth and eleventh centuries. It has been shown that the increasing availability and accessibility to cash in the late Anglo-Saxon period made it possible for many to advance socially and move up the aristocratic ladder. Fleming and Senecal have illustrated that this social advancement troubled those at the top of the aristocracy, pushing them towards ever-more extravagant display and consumption in an effort to distinguish themselves.⁷ After emphasizing the importance of adhering to society’s social ranks, *Geþyncðu* goes on to describe the requirements of thegnothood:

7 gif ceorl geþeah, þæt he hæfde fullice fif hida agenes landes, cirican 7 kycenan, bellhus 7 burhgeat, setl 7 sundernote on cynges healle, þonne wæs he þanon forð þegenrihtes weorðe.⁸

This clause makes it clear that there were more requirements to achieving thegnohood than solely having access to cash. This is clarified and underlined in

---

⁶ Liebermann, ed., trans., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 456. The *Textus Roffensis* text is referenced here. The manuscript variations of *Geþyncðu* need further treatment and consideration here.

“Once it used to be...” (Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents, volume I: c. 500 – 1042*, 468).

⁷ Fleming, "The New Wealth, the New Rich and the New Political Style in Late Anglo-Saxon England," 1-22 and Senecal, "Keeping up with the Godwinesons: In pursuit of aristocratic status in Late Anglo-Saxon England", 251 – 266.

⁸ Liebermann, ed., trans., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 456. The *Textus Roffensis* text is referenced here because in this case it seems to be the fullest version of the text.

“And if a ceorl prospered, that he possessed fully five hides of land of his own, a bell and a castle-gate, a seat and special office in the king’s hall, then he was thenceforth entitled to the rights of a thegn” (Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents, volume I: c. 500 – 1042*, 468).
Norðleoda Laga:” 7 þeah he geþeo, þæt he hæbbe helm 7 byrnan 7 goldfæted swerord, gif he þæt land nafaþ, he byþ ceorl swa þeah.” The bulk of Norðleoda Laga is comprised of prescriptions for various wergelds in the north, and the rulings on ceors come close to the end of the text. This assertion certainly seems to echo and complement that made in Geþyncðu concerning the requirements for thegnhood. Both of these statements on status reflect the unease building in the tenth and eleventh centuries surrounding the maintenance of social order. These texts not only represent concerns circulating in tenth- and eleventh-century society regarding social mobility, but they also demonstrate Wulfstan’s own deep anxiety concerning the state of the English. It is clear that he believed that status boundaries were becoming too blurred and thus required clarification in his campaign to restore social order. Wormald refers to Geþyncðu and Norðleoda Laga as part of a group of status tracts that Wulfstan compiled and rewrote. Citing Bethurum’s convincing argument, Wormald contends that Wulfstan did author Geþyncðu, while Norðleoda Laga was an existing text that he added to and revised, using the two together to illustrate proper social ordering and its rules. This represented a significant thread in the archbishop’s campaign to reform the English people and nation. The ideas expressed in Geþyncðu on concerns revolving around status were not new – these stemmed in large part from ideas circulating on the continent (and in England from Alfred onward), relating to the “three orders” of society. Geþyncðu represents a slight departure from this literary tradition, reflecting not only the unique situation in late Anglo-Saxon England, but also Wulfstan’s particular concerns and aims. Wulfstan was particularly anxious about the wave of social mobility in the late Anglo-Saxon period, and its disruption of the ordering of society as it had been in the past – especially against the backdrop of the upheaval in tenth- and eleventh-

"And even if he prospers so that he possesses a helmet and a coat of mail and a gold-plated sword, if he has not the land, he is a ceorl all the same” (Whitelock, ed., English Historical Documents, volume I: c. 500 – 1042, 469).
To combat this, Wulfstan underlined the established requirement of five hides: even if a man managed to secure the necessary wealth – and even the military service, thegnhood would still elude those who did not hold the land.

Numerous sections of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* graphically illustrate what could (and perhaps, did) happen in English society when these rules were not observed:

For þam her syn on lande unȝetryþa micle for 3ode 7 for porolde, 7 eac her syn on earde on mistlice pisan hlafordspican maneȝe. 7 ealra mæst hlafordspic se bið on porolde þæt man his hlafordes saule bespic; 7 ful micel hlafordspic eac bið on porolde þæt man his hlaford of life forræðe, oddon of lande lifiende drife; 7 æȝber is þeporden on þysan earde.

and

Þeh þræla hþylc hlaforde æþleape 7 of cristendome to picinȝe þeopȝe, 7 hit æfter þam eft þeþeopȝe þæt þærþesþeprixl þeopȝe æþmaen þþæne þþæne 7 þræle, ȝif þþæl þþæne þþæn fullice afylle, liȝe æȝylde ealre his mæȝðe; 7, ȝif se þþæn þþæne þþæl þæ he ær ahte fullice afylle, ȝylde þþænȝylde.

Wulfstan rails passionately in his *Sermo Lupi* against these deviations from the proper social order—which he clearly sees as not only a grievous injury to the

---

15 Whitelock ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, 41 – 42.
16 Whitelock ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, 44.
"For there are here in the land great disloyalties towards God and towards the state, and there are also many here in the country who are betayers of their lords in various ways. And the greatest betrayal in the world of one's lord is that a man betray his lord's soul; and it is also a very great betrayal of one's lord in the world, that a man plot against his lord's life or, living, drive him from the land; and both have happened in this country" (Swanton, ed., trans., *Anglo-Saxon Prose*, 180).
"If any slave escape from his lord, and, leaving Christendom, becomes a Viking, and after that it happens that an armed encounter occurs between thegn and slave; if the slave should slay the thegn outright he will lie without payment to any of his family; and if the thegn should slay outright the slave whom he previously owned, he will pay the price of a thegn" (Swanton, ed., trans., *Anglo-Saxon Prose*, 181).
state, but also to God—and what horrors can befall the English when a moral
Christian social order is not maintained. The first passage occurs among many
ardent exclamations on the disintegration of loyalty among men, as well as
apparent widespread disregard for both the law of God and that of men.
Wulfstan’s distress and disappointment are almost palpable. This disrespect for
both spiritual and secular authority is a major contributor, according to Wulfstan,
to the dire circumstances in which the English found themselves in the early
eleventh century. At the outset of the first passage, Wulfstan again joins spiritual
and worldly matters, when he says “Forþam her syn on lande unȝetryƿþa micle
for Ȝode 7 for þorolde...”\(^{17}\) What is noteworthy here is the term unȝetryƿþa:
which can be translated “disloyalty”, or the breaking of a pledge or treaty, it can
also be rendered as “breaking of a covenant or faith” or “infidelity”.\(^{18}\) This is
significant because the latter rendering lends a spiritual overtone to the
sentiment expressed here. Herein lies another indicator of the deep connection
Wulfstan perceived between secular and spiritual matters. Indeed, he goes on to
say: “7 ealra mêst hlafordsþice se bið on þorolde þæt man his hlafordes saule
bespice...”\(^{19}\) He argues that the most grievous act one can commit against one’s
lord is to betray his soul, again underlining the interconnectedness of secular and
spiritual authority. Wulfstan goes on to lament the murder of Edward the Martyr,
and further failings of English society. One of these is highlighted in the second
excerpt above. Here he bemoans the breakdown of the social order, to such a
degree that slaves could conceivably merit the wergeld of a thegn, should they
manage to escape their masters and find opportunity by becoming heathen
vikings. If it should happen that this slave should then encounter his master in
battle and slay him, then that Christian man may, in a role reversal of sorts, lie
dead without a wergeld or tribute payment, in the manner of a slave. Wulfstan
uses this graphic illustration to clearly indicate that England’s social structure
was in ruins. It is clear from Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi* that the archbishop viewed

\(^{17}\) Whitelock ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, 41.

\(^{18}\) Bosworth, *Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, “ge-trýwþp”:

\(^{19}\) Whitelock ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, 41.
the upheaval of the ordering of society as a grave concern and as both a contributor to and symptom of the failings of English society and God’s displeasure with them.

Napier homily 50, or “Larspell”, represents another important strand in Wulfstan’s efforts to repair English society. It has been noted that this homily may have been preached to the witan assembled at the 1018 meeting in Oxford.\(^{20}\) Napier 50 employs an eschatological tone, honing in on issues such as the appropriate behavior of the clergy and the laity, and additionally the need for the English to be prepared for the coming of the Antichrist and the end of the world.\(^{21}\) It is the homily’s focus on the duties and responsibilities of the secular officials that is of interest here, particularly in light of its connections with Cnut’s code of 1018 and that it may well have been preached to the witan assembled in Oxford. The 1018 code of Cnut is largely made up of clauses from V – VIII Æthelred and I – II Cnut, and is transmitted in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201, a manuscript with Wulfstan connections.\(^{22}\) The laws of Cnut encompassed legislation from the laws of Edgar and Æthelred, and the meeting of 1018 was instigated, in part, in order to smooth relations between the Danes and the English.\(^{23}\) Wulfstan apparently made use of this meeting as not only an opportunity to preach to the assembled witan and to admonish them for their sins, but also to remind the various clerics and officials of their duties to the nation.\(^{24}\) Lines 267/25 – 268/1 from Napier 50 contain the address to numerous officials:

And we cyðað eac eorlan and heretogan, dêman and gerefan,
þæt hig ágan þearfe, þæt hi georne unrihtes geswîcan and

\(^{20}\) Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study*, 7, 34. Lionarons argues that Napier 50, along with 51, was closely connected with the promulgation of Cnut’s 1018 code. See also Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, 355 – 360.


rihtwisynsse lufjan for gode and for worlde and nahwar þurh ùndom for feo ne for freondscipe forgyman heora wisdom, swa þæt hig wendan unriht to riht oððon undðom gedêman earmum to yrmôe...25

This address bears similarities to elements of section nine of *Institutes of Polity* entitled “concerning earls”, discussed below. Wulfstan’s emphasis on and repetition of this particular content may be an indicator of the importance the archbishop placed on it; however it must be remembered that Wulfstan often reused and recycled his own work. In any case, in view of what seem to be strong concerns regarding the conduct of royal officials, it is plausible that Wulfstan found this important enough to reproduce from a sermon into *Institutes of Polity*. What seems noteworthy here, is that aside from the general exhortations to royal officials to judge justly and fairly and to avoid corruption, Wulfstan is instructing them to “nowhere neglect their wisdom”. This seems to be reminiscent of the type of “wisdom” that Asser discusses in his *Life of King Alfred*, and that which Alfred himself famously ordered his officials to learn, lest they lose their positions. One of the apparent goals of this instruction was to educate the people as to how to live in the manner of good Christians.26 Asser’s *Life of King Alfred* contains a chapter (106) on reeves and ealdormen in their capacity as judges:

Studebat <is> quoque in iudiciis etiam propter nobilium et ignobilium suorum utilitatem, qui saepissime in contionibus comitum et praepositorum pertinacissime inter se dissentiebant, ita ut pene nullus eorum, quicquid a comitibus et praepositis iudicatum fuisset, verum esse concederet.27

---


"And we proclaim also [to] earls and generals, judges and reeves that they need to go [and] that they zealously stop injustices and righteously for [the] love of God and the world nowhere neglect their wisdom through unjust judgment, for money or for friendship, so that unright is turned to right, injustice into justice and the wretched from poverty" [my translation].


Furthermore, in order to improve his officials’ ability to carry out their official duties, Alfred commanded them to:

Nimium admiror vestram hanc insolentiam, eo quid, Dei dono et meo, sapientium ministerium et gradus usurpastis, sapientiae autem studium et operam neglexistis.\(^{28}\)

For Alfred, it seems that wisdom, in the biblical sense discussed by Wormald, was indivisible from an official’s ability to carry out his role, and judge fairly and wisely.\(^{29}\) It is perhaps important then, to consider the relationship between Wisdom and Mode in Alfred’s Old English Boethius. Susan Irvine argues that in the Old English Boethius, the foster parent/child relationship is paralleled in the relationship between Wisdom (parent) and Mode (fosterling).\(^{30}\) This is significant because Mode is later chosen as a judge as a result of Wisdom’s teachings, and according to Irvine, this seems to reflect the idea that the author/reader relationship is paralleled by the parent/foster-child relationship, particularly with respect to teaching.\(^{31}\) This analogy becomes particularly powerful if we are talking about Alfred as the author (or even, Irvine argues, if he were behind the production of the translation): in essence he has set himself up here as one who is actively teaching and dispensing wisdom to the reader(s), as...

"King Alfred used to sit at judicial hearings for the benefit both of his nobles and of the common people, since they frequently disagreed amongst themselves at assemblies of ealdormen or reeves, to the point where virtually none of them could agree that any judgement reached by the ealdormen or reeves in question was just" (Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, ed., trans., Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 109).

Stevenson, ed. Asser’s Life of Alfred, together with the Annals of Saint Neots, erroneously ascribed to Asser, 93.

"For that reason, I command you either to relinquish immediately the offices of worldly power that you possess, or else to apply yourselves much more attentively to the pursuit of wisdom" (Keynes and Lapidge, ed., trans., Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources, 110).


Irvine, “The art of foster-parenting in Old English literature".
would a foster parent to a child.32 Malcolm Godden has raised big questions as to whether Alfred can be seen as the personal author of the translations linked to him. However, he has pointed out that the actual fact of Alfred's authorship may not in fact be the most important element here – what arguably matters more is the Anglo-Saxons' perception that he did so, and this seems to have been the case in learned circles.33 Furthermore, this authorship in itself could be seen as a method of mirroring Solomon and as the royal expression of biblical wisdom.34 Therefore here again, albeit in a more nuanced fashion, we may have Alfred setting himself up as the good Christian king, dispensing wisdom to his people – particularly to ealdormen and reeves, those would were or would/could become judges. Alfred viewed the traditions of wisdom and good and just judgment as stretching through the ages from the time of Moses to his own domboc.35 Solomonic wisdom was enacted through royal judgment and this was envisaged as a responsibility the king held toward his subjects, both ecclesiastic and secular.36 The appointment of just judges, Pratt contends, was an element of royal ministerium, and the importance of this is underlined in the Bible, with numerous Old Testament exemplars.37 This in turn secured a place for Alfred's laws in a tradition of "divine law-giving", which would have lent his law the same authority as that of his biblical sources.38 Alfred was preoccupied with the concept/notion of good Christian kingship – he consciously worked to present himself as a "thoughtful and learned king".39 Furthermore, Donald Scragg has suggested that Alfred's Boethius should perhaps be viewed as more of a personal statement, as opposed to the work of Ælfric and Wulfstan, which operates along
more theoretical lines. Accordingly, it is important to remember that early medieval kings viewed the Old Testament as a prescriptive guide for kingship.

This idea was taken further during the ninth century, when kingship became viewed as “a ministry (ministerium), as an office (officium) which was charged with responsibility for the spiritual and material well-being of the people within its care (cura).” Solomon was viewed as the ultimate example of such kingship, and Alfred embraced this Old Testament model and took it to heart, evidenced in the combination of God’s law and secular law in his dombic. Significantly, Matthew Kempshall highlights Alfred’s acknowledgment of Gregory the Great’s Regula Pastoralis, with its heavy emphasis on the importance of wisdom – Gregory presented Ezekiel as a model “for all those in authority (praepositi)” Kempshall argues that Alfred viewed Gregory’s Regula Pastoralis as the medium through which one could achieve reform of both “ecclesiastical and secular mores”, and thus in doing so, assuage God’s anger and alleviate divine punishment. This therefore would have been seen by the Anglo-Saxons as a method by which to aid in relieving the viking menace overshadowing England in the ninth century, and Kempshall equates Alfred’s translation of Gregory’s text into English in the 890s as a type of pastoral care. Gregory’s text highlights the necessity of wisdom in those in power, and their ability to provide advice and

46 Kempshall, “No Bishop, No King: The Ministerial Ideology of Kingship and Asser’s Res Gestae Aelfredi”, 112. For as a result of this translation, along with Alfred’s program of education, Gregory’s text would be (in theory) more widely available.
correction as a key feature of their office; indeed, Alfred is shown doing just that with the judgments of his ealdormen and reeves in the end of Asser’s Life.47

Napier 50 seems to incorporate a deliberate echo from Asser’s Life of King Alfred in its directive to royal officials. Pratt argues that regular contact between the king and bishops, ealdormen and reeves “sustained the active force of royal leadership.”48 Institutes of Polity also includes “scholars and lawyers” in its section on the nation’s councilors;49 possibly hearkening back to “better times”, such as those enjoyed under Alfred’s famed program of education? Perhaps Wulfstan, in his exhortations to the royal Officials – perhaps specifically those to reeves, to whom he dedicates a chapter in Institutes of Polity – was reaching back to the reign of Alfred: to a king who not only was dedicated to learning and the pursuit of wisdom, but who was also able to successfully hold off the viking onslaught of his day.

Another aspect of Alfred’s legacy in Anglo-Saxon England was his presumed introduction of the “Three Orders” of society.50 Timothy Powell maintains that Alfred, in his translation of Boethius’s De Consolatione Philosophiae, may have even been the first to employ the concept in early medieval Europe, let alone in Anglo-Saxon England.51 However, there is another strand to this thread: Thomas Hill argues convincingly that in fact the three orders may have first appeared in a Latin riddle in the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae.52 Hill reprints the riddle: “Vidi bipedem super tripodem sedentem, cecedit bipes, corruit tripes”,53 and he also offers a solution wherein the bipes represents the king, and the tripes his throne, upon which he is seated.54 The editors of the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae suggest an early ninth-century date for the portion of

48 Pratt, The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great, 122.
the text in which the riddle appears; of course the fact that the collection itself only survives in a sixteenth-century edition makes pinning down a date difficult.\textsuperscript{55} Nevertheless, Hill does offer some interesting food for thought here. Significantly, he notes that Alfred refers to the Three Orders as “tools (OE tol) which the king needs to perform his \textit{crafte}, whereas although Ælfric and Wulfstan make use of the Three Orders in a similar manner, they reference them specifically as supporters of the throne, rather than as tools of the king himself.\textsuperscript{56} Arguably, this suggests that not only might Wulfstan and Ælfric possibly had another continental exemplar in addition to Alfred’s \textit{Boethius}, Hill contends that the concept of the Three Orders may even be older than historians currently suspect.\textsuperscript{57} However, it is important to note that Alfred’s use of the Three Orders was the first reference in English to this concept.\textsuperscript{58}

Alfred’s use of the idea appears in a dialogue which took place between “Mind” and “Wisdom” on the responsibilities of kingship; significantly, this passage does not occur in the original Latin Boethius.\textsuperscript{59} Alfred regarded these three orders – \textit{gebedmen, fyrdmen} and \textit{weorcmen} – as vital for the functioning of the kingdom, but significantly, Powell notes that Alfred apparently regarded it as \textit{his} (i.e., the king’s) duty to ensure that each of the Three Orders could carry out its role, as opposed to the later interpretation of the Three Orders acting as pillars whose duty it was to uphold the throne.\textsuperscript{60} Pratt too notes the emphasis upon the resources and “provisions” (\textit{biwist}) that the Three Orders required for their own maintenance, to enable them to then act effectively as “tools” for the king.\textsuperscript{61} This interpretation fits in nicely with Hill’s reading that Alfred regarded the three orders as tools, which enabled him to carry out the duties associated with kingship. In looking at how Alfred viewed kingship and his role as a king

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Hill, “A Riddle on the Three Orders in the \textit{Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae}?” 209.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Hill, “A Riddle on the Three Orders in the \textit{Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae}?” 210.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Hill, “A Riddle on the Three Orders in the \textit{Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae}?” 210.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Jay Paul Gates, “The Politics of Building the Holy Society: Wulfstan’s Later Writings” (Paper presented at the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Studies Colloquium}, Columbia University, October 11\textsuperscript{th} 2012).
\item \textsuperscript{60} Powell, “The ‘Three Orders’ of society in Anglo-Saxon England”, 104, 113.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Pratt, \textit{The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great}, 290.
\end{itemize}
and how he presented himself in that role, this interpretation of the Three Orders is significant. Alfred’s usage of the Three Orders would serve as further signposts that Alfred was not only a wise king, but also one who cared for his kingdom and people (or at least, this was how he portrayed himself and wished to be seen). The Three Orders concept was later taken up by Ælfric, who put it to use in three different works. Ælfric uses the Three Orders in a homily, a letter to Wulfstan and in a commentary on the Old and New Testaments addressed to a layman by the name of Sigewead. It is in the commentary addressed to Sigewead that Ælfric introduces the concept of the Three Orders acting as three legs “of a stool” functioning to support the throne.

What is significant is that the evolution of the idea of the Three Pillars/Orders is largely unknown to us – it does not appear in the Bible, the texts of the “early fathers” or in Classical works; nor can a Frankish source for Ælfric be pinned down. Powell concludes that the most likely answer is that Ælfric’s source is no longer extant. This is significant because Ælfric’s commentary addressed to Sigewead is the example that Powell contends influenced Wulfstan, who accordingly developed his own interpretation and use of the concept. Though it is important to bear in mind a potential exemplar in the Latin riddle Collectanea Pseudo-Bede – Ælfric may indeed have drawn upon this text as well as Alfred’s, particularly if the ninth-century date for the collection is correct. Powell argues that although Ælfric probably knew of Alfred’s Boethius, because Ælfric uses Latin terms for the Three Orders, where Alfred had employed Old English, it is likely that Ælfric had had before him a Latin (Frankish) source. Wulfstan’s commentary on the Three Orders owes something to both Alfred and Ælfric; his conception of the Three Orders, or the Three Pillars as he calls them, draws on the writings of both Ælfric and Alfred. In his Institutes of Polity,

Wulfstan stresses the importance of the Three Pillars and that upholding them would aid in maintaining the strength and unity of the kingdom.69

Ælcr riht cynestol stent on þrym stapelum, þe fullice ariht stent: án is Oratores, and ðær is Laboratores, and ðrídde is Bellatores. Oratores sindon gebedmen, þe Gode sculan þeowian and dæges and nihtes for ealne þeodscipe þingian georne. Laboratores sindon weorcmen, þe tilian sculan, þæs ðe eall þeodscype big sceall libban. Bellatores syndon wigmen, þe eard sculan werian wiglice mid wæpnum. On þyssum ðrym stapelum sceall ælc cynestol standan mid rihte on cristenre peode.70

Powell maintains that in this sentiment, Wulfstan echoes elements of the works and models of both Ælfric and Alfred.71 Furthermore, he argues for Wulfstan’s direct access to Alfred’s Boethius, citing Wulfstan’s use of certain Old English terms utilized by Alfred but significantly, not Ælfric.72 Wulfstan utilizes both the Latin and the Old English here, emphasizing the debt to both his exemplars. He also goes further to articulate that the nation’s success is deeply connected with and dependent upon the strength and stability of these three pillars. Indeed, Wulfstan asserts that these three pillars require “mid wislicre Godes lare and mid rihtlicre woruldage...”73 in order to remain strong and useful to the nation. This notion of divine wisdom and justice returns us to Alfred and his legacy of good Christian kingship. It is clear that Alfred was very much preoccupied with the ideals of good Christian kingship and all that this entailed, particularly the

“Every lawful throne which stands perfectly upright, stands on three pillars: one is oratores, and the second is laboratores, and the third is bellatores. ‘Oratores’ are prayer-men, who must serve God and earnestly intercede both day and night for the entire nation. ‘Laboratores’ are workmen, who must supply that by which the entire nation shall live. ‘Bellatores’ are soldiers, who must defend the land by fighting with weapons. Every throne in a Christian nation must stand upright on these three pillars” (Swanton, Anglo-Saxon Prose, 189).
“the wise teaching of God and worldly justice...” (Swanton, Anglo-Saxon Prose, 190).
concern that his officials operated on the basis of wisdom, in order to enact fair and just judgments among the English people. Not only did Alfred embark on the pursuit of personal wisdom and the translation of numerous works, but he also launched a campaign for the education of his officials. This work, Asser’s *Life of King Alfred*, and Alfred’s use of the three orders points convincingly toward a desire to leave a legacy as a good, wise and just Christian king to the English people. And it is in the work of Ælfric and Wulfstan, and indeed in the role of the reeve in late Anglo-Saxon England, that we can see Alfred’s efforts and legacy bearing fruit.

*The reeve and late Anglo-Saxon homiletic discourse*

Before embarking on an analysis of the reeve in Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity*, it is worthwhile to consider what other late Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical texts had to say about the reeve. This exercise will aim to provide a bit more context for Wulfstan’s thought on the reeve in light of what others have said. The reeve emerges in surprising frequency in late Anglo-Saxon texts. The majority of these are ecclesiastical, but the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was also investigated in this study. The term *gerefa* appears about 240 times in 55 late Anglo-Saxon texts. Twenty-six of these texts are the work of Ælfric, and sixty-nine of these references to the reeve occur in his material.74 These texts are all primarily confined to the tenth and eleventh centuries, with a few outliers in the late ninth century, such as the Old English *Bede* and the Old English *Martyrology*. In general, the occurrences of *gerefa* in Old English texts involve the reeve as a negative influence, such as the reeve in the role of an administrative official responsible for the judicial proceedings and carrying out of harsh judicial pronouncements against Christian saints. However, it is important to bear in mind that many of

74 Please see the Appendix following this text for a table with this data laid out. This element of the research was made possible through use of the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*: http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/
the late Anglo-Saxon references to reeves are simply translations of the Latin praefectus in Old English renderings of late antique Latin texts, and therefore are likely reflective of the usefulness of the term gerefa in order to represent an administrative official (which is surely what praefectus was intended to indicate in a late antique context). Old English translators most likely sought the most convenient and recognizable term in order to flag “administrator” to their audiences. Gerefa would have been an appealing choice, since these officials dotted the late Anglo-Saxon landscape and their role would have been known amongst the people.

Often, these references to the reeve are accompanied by the term deman, or judge, and indeed this connection is made bluntly evident in the lives of St Agnes and St Denis, in Ælfric's Lives of the Saints. In the Natale Sancte Agnetis Uirginis, the gerefa Sempronius, berating the saint for not wishing to marry his son, is described as presiding from a dom-setl (lit. “judgment seat”), and is called a sceandlica dema (“shameful judge”). In the Passio Sancti Dionisii et Sociorum Eius, the gerefa is a man named Sisinnius, who was sent by Caesar to the kingdom of the Franks to kill St Denis; the gerefa and his companions bound the saint and a priest and tortured them. The text refers to the reeve here as a dema wælhreowa (“bloodthirsty or cruel judge”). These portrayals of reeves in late antique texts are interesting in the context of the increasing judicial role of reeves in tenth- and eleventh-century England, and perhaps the Anglo-Saxon audience would have connected with them.

The literary trope of the “bad” or immoral judge is not a new one. We can see this theme emerging in late antique ecclesiastical texts and continuing in Frankish tradition. The Frankish administrative official – the count – operated in the localities and wielded much judicial power and responsibility among the

---

75 Walter Skeat, Ælfric’s Lives of Saints: Being a Set of Sermons on Saints’ Days formerly observed by the English Church (Oxford: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford University Press, reprinted 1966), 170, 174 & 176.
76 Skeat, Ælfric’s Lives of Saints: Being a Set of Sermons on Saints’ Days formerly observed by the English Church, 284.
local population. It is evident that these men could hold considerable power, and they could be difficult to bring to justice; consequently the figure of the count stood out as an obvious target for ecclesiastical reformers who wished to see improvements — namely judges’ imitation of the wisdom of Solomon.\textsuperscript{78} Additionally, it has been shown that judges among the Franks were expected to pass judgments “according to the written law”, and although it has been argued that there was no existing “official” textual edition of laws available to Frankish officials (or at their disposal), Fouracre does mention a “report” in the \textit{Lorsch Annals} which indicates that Charlemagne required that his officials had knowledge of the written law.\textsuperscript{79} Of course it is entirely possible that this stipulation was merely in place to demonstrate that Charlemagne was fulfilling his role as “a good Christian king” — and indeed it has been shown that the popes expected that Frankish kings would defend the \textit{iustitia} of St Peter.\textsuperscript{80} This was, of course, justice in a biblical sense, but as we have seen, in the early medieval period, biblical justice and the administration of Christian states were deeply intertwined. The counts’ role in the localities and involvement in judicial proceedings made them an ideal target for calls for reform—their failure (or perceived failure) to adjudicate became associated with abuse of justice.\textsuperscript{81} Therefore, we can see a trope emerging — which stretches back to late antiquity — in which the local administrative official characterizes abuses of justice and judicial power. It is clear from the references in myriad saints’ lives that the reeve was likely the Anglo-Saxon counterpart of the Frankish count, in that he is the local administrator branded as the immoral judge. This association not only reflects the Anglo-Saxons’ taking up of a literary tradition and clerical concerns for administrators’ moral wisdom, but also the fact that the reeve was likely an easily recognized administrative figure in the local landscape by the late Anglo-Saxon period.

\textsuperscript{78} Fouracre, “Carolingian justice: The rhetoric of improvement and contexts of abuse”, 789, 790 and 793.
\textsuperscript{79} Fouracre, “Carolingian justice: The rhetoric of improvement and contexts of abuse”, 795.
\textsuperscript{80} Fouracre, “Carolingian justice: The rhetoric of improvement and contexts of abuse”, 800.
\textsuperscript{81} Fouracre, “Carolingian justice: The rhetoric of improvement and contexts of abuse”, 803.
An examination of the Latin where possible indicates that in translation, the majority of these sources were (most likely) supplying the closest Old English equivalent to the Latin original. The Latin term most often employed is *praefectus*, along with the term *praepositus*, but used also are: *uilicus, praefectus operum, dispensator, proconsul, nobilis decurio* and *procurator*. Thus it is difficult to determine when Old English translators intended to specify a certain royal official – in this case, a reeve- or to simply indicate some administrator in an official capacity or role. However, there is a handful of texts where it appears that the use of the term *gerefa* was a deliberate choice. Those texts are the following: Blickling Homily V (Dominica V in Quadragesima), Ælfric’s Pastoral Letter for Wulfsige, Ælfric’s First Old English Letter to Wulfstan, the anonymous Old English *Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, Napier Homilies 40, 47, 50, and 57 (of which 50 will be dealt with here), and of course Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity*. It is evident that the reeve features in these and many other Old English ecclesiastical texts. While the facility of translation from Latin surely must have played a role in Old English writers’ selection of the term *gerefa*, the plethora of references to this figure in late Anglo-Saxon writings is striking. Is this simply the effect of survival, with the *gerefa* also maintaining a presence in early, lost texts? Or is it possible that with the reeve gaining in power and visibility in late Anglo-Saxon England, Old English writers seized upon a contemporary figure whom audiences would be likely to immediately recognize with a negative association? These are weighty questions, and yet they may be unanswerable. It is hoped that a consideration of some of these texts may offer illumination here, and reveal something of Anglo-Saxon moral attitudes towards the reeve; particularly the attitudes behind the moral and political thought of Archbishop Wulfstan of York. These texts will be considered here – and juxtaposed against other contemporary texts which seem to simply use the term *gerefa* to fill a necessary “official” role – and it will be shown that not only were *gerefan* the specific targets of some late Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical energies, but also that Wulfstan’s vision for and treatment of these men was something altogether new.
The Anglo-Saxon homilies known as the Blickling Homilies are contained within the Blickling Manuscript, or Princeton University, Scheide Library, MS 71. This manuscript contains, in addition to the homilies, a calendar and a group of Gospel passages for use in administering oaths, dating to the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries, respectively.\textsuperscript{82} The Anglo-Saxon material dates to roughly the late tenth century, and Richard Kelly highlights its importance, along with the Vercelli Homilies, in contributing to our understanding of homilies and preaching in Anglo-Saxon England in the period before Ælfric and Wulfstan took the stage.\textsuperscript{83} In fact, Kelly contends that the Blickling homilies were geared towards both secular and ecclesiastical audiences, a feature that would have been particularly relevant in the period after the monastic reform in England.\textsuperscript{84} Due to their status as one of the two principal collections of preaching material of the tenth century, the Blickling homilies are important for what they can reveal about ecclesiastical attitudes towards the reeve in the period before Wulfstan and Ælfric. Not only can these texts (along with the Vercelli Homilies) provide an impression of these attitudes, but they can also aid in determining what may have helped to shape Wulfstan’s views and how he further developed homiletic and exhortatory prose on the reeve.

The reeve makes an appearance in three of the Blickling homilies: Homily V, \textit{Dominica V in Quadragesima} (The Fifth Sunday in Lent),\textsuperscript{85} Homily XIII, \textit{Sancta Maria Mater Domini Nostri} \textit{CRist} (Assumption of the Virgin Mary)\textsuperscript{86} and Homily XV, \textit{Spel Be Petrus ond Paulus} (The Passion of Peter and


\textsuperscript{83} Kelly, \textit{The Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation (with General Introduction, Textual Notes, Tables and Appendices, and Select Bibliography)}, xxix, xlvii.

\textsuperscript{84} Kelly, \textit{The Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation (with General Introduction, Textual Notes, Tables and Appendices, and Select Bibliography)}, xlvii.

\textsuperscript{85} R. Morris, ed., \textit{The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses} (London and New York: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford University Press, reprint 1967), 54 – 65.

\textsuperscript{86} Morris, ed., \textit{The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses}, 136 – 159.
Homily V, *Dominica V in Quadragesima*, is a very interesting text for a number of reasons. It has been described as “unique”, and as not occurring elsewhere in the corpus of Old English, except for a few lines at the end, which Scragg notes appear also in Napier 29. Homily V’s sources are essentially unknown, though Milton McC Gatch does suggest a monastic text, the *Admonitio ad filium Spiritualem*, of pseudo-Basil, as a possibility. This text, unlike the others, contains a long passage dedicated to the reeve and elaborating why reeves are among those who will suffer torment in hell. However, Homilies XIII and XV involve the reeve more generally in a negative way, in a manner much like the majority of the Old English texts which employ the term *gerefa*. As such, these two homilies will provide a good example of this type of treatment.

Homily V reminds its audience of the fleeting nature of life on earth, and urges careful thought and attention towards one’s mortality and the necessity of having a pure heart and good spiritual relationship with God. Accordingly, it was important to avoid sin and the devil’s teaching, showcased particularly through the activities of murderers, perjurers, thieves, and adulterers, among others. The text instructs that those guilty of such behavior must repent through “fasting, prayers and shedding of tears” (*mid fæstenum, ond gebedum, ond mid teara gytum*). Not to do so would be risking torment in hell, and the homily goes on to enumerate various types of unsavory people who populate it. Singled out amongst these unfortunates is the reeve (*gerefan*). The homilist devotes a lengthy paragraph to detailing the reeves’ failings in their capacity as judges (*deman*):

\[þær beoþ eac yfele gerefan þa þe nu on wôh demaþ, 7 rihte domas sopfæstra manna onwendæþ þa þe ær rihtlice gesette wærôn. Be\]

---

90 Morris, ed., *The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses*, 61.
This extract is noteworthy for several reasons. Firstly, we see that the reeves role as a judge is emphasized: only once is the term gerefa utilized; for the remainder of the passage the reeves are referred to as deman, or judges. This seems to be a specific attempt to flag the role of reeves as judges. This text zeroes in unrelentingly on the “bad judge”, and while the homilist clearly links the character of the immoral judge with the reeve, this text may also arguably reflect the literary tradition of the corrupt judge. This is not insignificant. While the homilist may be using the reeve as his vehicle to vent his strong feelings about the abuses of justice with an existing literary trope, it is noteworthy that the reeve, not the ealdorman or some other official, was the royal agent whom the homilist selected. This in itself may be indicative of more than simply a literary convention at work. It is likely that the reeve’s identifiable presence in the

---

91 Morris, ed., The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses, 61 & 63.

"There are also evil reeves who now give wrong judgments, and pervert the right laws of just men, which aforetime were rightly instituted. Concerning these judges Christ himself hath spoken. He said, ‘Judge now, as ye will that ye should be judged again at the Last Day of this world.’ Verily, the evil judge receiveth a paltry reward, and perverteth the righteous judgment for sake of the reward. It is said, then, that he shall receive eternal condemnation along with the devils, because he previously, in this world, performed his own will; and then shall he abide endlessly in eternal torments, where he shall then have boiling flames, and anon the severest cold; all grief, strife, hunger, thirst, weeping, wailing and miseries exist there, more than is possible for any man’s invention to recount. There need never be hope for any light, nor for a friend who may ever deliver him from the power of the grim devil, because of the opposition he made against God and because he would not believe in the teaching of God’s books” (Morris, ed., The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses, 60 & 62).
localities flagged him as an official who would be recognized by the homilist’s audience.

Furthermore, although “the law of men” (rihte domas sobfæstra manna) is initially highlighted, it is evident that the author is primarily concerned with reeves’ perversion of God’s law – he invokes eternal divine punishment for reeves’ false judgments and failure to adhere to God’s law. Invoking both secular and divine law in the same passage may also be intended as a reminder that the two are intertwined and therefore must operate together. However, the text does provide a sense that this corruption is perceived as relatively new, and that in the past reeves dutifully upheld justice and the law was “previously correctly instituted” (onwendap þa þe ær rihtlice gesette wæron). This may reflect a new development in the view towards reeves, as well as perhaps their behavior, possibly seen as being brought on with the onset of greater power and visibility for the reeve in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.

Significantly, this section ends with the author despairing at reeves’ failure to “believe in the teaching of God’s books” (wan ond Godes boca lare gelyfan nolde). It is likely that this is simply a reference to the Bible, and the wisdom believed to be contained therein. A search for the phrase godes boca in the Dictionary of Old English web corpus shows it to appear in only two extant sources: Blickling Homily V, and the Nativity of Mary the Virgin, in Bodleian Library, Hatton 114. The context of both of these references underlines the weighty significance and importance of the perceived wisdom of godes boca, or, the Bible. Accordingly, it is important to remember that early medieval kings viewed the Old Testament as a prescriptive guide for kingship. This idea was taken further during the ninth century, when kingship became viewed as “a ministry (ministerium), as an office (officium) which was charged with responsibility for the spiritual and material well-being of the people within its

---

92 MS Hatton 114 dates to the third quarter of the eleventh century. Reference from the Nativity of Mary the Virgin: “Ac hyre word wæron godes gyfe full and heo wæs on hyre heortan smeagende þone wisdom godes boca.”

care (cura).” Solomon was viewed as the ultimate example of such kingship, and Alfred embraced this Old Testament model and took it to heart, evidenced in the combination of God's law and secular law in his domboc. Significantly, Kempshall highlights Alfred's acknowledgment of Gregory the Great's Regula Pastoralis, with its heavy emphasis on the importance of wisdom – Gregory presented Ezekiel as a model “for all those in authority (praepositi”). Kempshall argues that Alfred viewed Gregory's Regula Pastoralis as the medium through which one could achieve reform of both “ecclesiastical and secular mores”, and thus in doing so, assuage God's anger and alleviate divine punishment. This therefore would have been seen by the Anglo-Saxons as a method by which to aid in relieving the viking menace overshadowing England in the ninth century, and Kempshall equates Alfred's translation of Gregory's text into English in the 890s as a type of pastoral care. Gregory's text highlights the necessity of wisdom in those in power, and their ability to provide advice and correction as a key feature of their office; indeed, Alfred is shown doing just that with the judgments of his ealdormen and reeves in the end of Asser's Life.

Kelly refers to this section on gerefan as being “conventional in content but not in emphasis”, and suggests the possibility of “an audience of rulers”. However, another significance seems plausible. This focus may have been an

---


For as a result of this translation, along with Alfred's program of education, Gregory's text would be (in theory) more widely available.
100 Kelly, The Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation (with General Introduction, Textual Notes, Tables and Appendices, and Select Bibliography), 173. See also: Gatch, “The unknowable audience of the Blickling Homilies”, 108. I would argue that the “conventional” aspect of this text is the emphasis on reeves as “bad judges” at least partially as part of the existing literary tradition on “the corrupt or evil judge”, stretching from late antiquity through to Frankish texts.
aspect of a relatively new emphasis upon the roles of secular officials, beginning with Alfred's insistence on the importance of divine wisdom at the close of the ninth century. This attention can also (as demonstrated above) be seen in the law codes and the various injunctions and directives addressed to reeves, as well as its increasing presence/focus in ecclesiastical material, seeming to reach fruition in the works of Wulfstan at the beginning of the eleventh century.

The nature of the intended audience for Blickling Homily V is a thorny question indeed. While the text does incorporate many familiar themes from other homiletic writings of late Anglo-Saxon England, our lacking knowledge of its sources unfortunately serves to largely obscure the homilist's intent. However, Gatch does consider the one possible source which may be known, the *Admonitio ad filium Spiritualem*, and posits that the homilist perhaps had a monastic audience in mind. In spite of this, it might be worthwhile to entertain the possibility of a secular, or partially secular audience. As has been noted, Homily V is singular in Old English homiletic discourse in its substantial and weighty stress upon reeves and judges, and its scathing reminder for them to adhere to the teaching in God's books. Bearing in mind the emphasis under Alfred upon divine wisdom and God's law as essential to secular administration in a Christian kingdom, one can perhaps see the possibility of reeves and judges having their ears blistered by this evocative discourse. It is of course not possible to know with any certainty whether reeves and judges were among the targeted audience for this text – and if so, whether the words even ever reached them – but judging from not only the singularity of this passage dealing with reeves, but also the use of the term *godes boca*, and the significance of ideas of divine wisdom in this period, then it at least seems as likely a possibility as a monastic audience.

Two other Blickling homilies also contain references to the reeve; these texts are both in more of a narrative style, detailing the Assumption of the Virgin Mary and the Passion of Peter and Paul. These texts involve the reeve in the

103 Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity* is of course set aside for the moment. It also does not fit neatly into any prescribed category, and accordingly, will be considered in full, on its own, below.
more “general” fashion mentioned above. They are included here to illustrate this more common type of reference to and use of the term *gerefa* in late Old English ecclesiastical texts. This use of the reeve in narrative discourse suggests the likelihood that the notion of the bad judge strikes a chord in the Anglo-Saxon people. This may be in part due to the Christian literary tradition of “the evil judge”, but it is arguably also the result of the actions of some corrupt adjudicators at work in the late Anglo-Saxon landscape. The reeve appears in both of these texts in the guise of an official who was in the position to persecute early Christians, though in the *Assumption of the Virgin Mary*, the reeve becomes a Christian and subsequently converts many others. As its title indicates, Blickling Homily XIII details the Virgin Mary’s ascent into heaven. Once she is deceased and the apostles are carrying her corpse on a bier, they are approached by a group of Jews, with weapons, who are intent upon derailing the procession. The angels retaliate and strike the attackers blind; their leader approached the bier in anger, with the intent of causing damage:

Ond þa sona se árleasa gerefa cleopode mid mycelre stefne 7 wæs cweþende, ‘Ic me wille nu onhwryfan to þisse bære, ond þonne gegripan þæt palmtwig, 7 hit þonne to eorþan afyllan, 7 forsearedum him begen dælas forbrecan 7 forbærnan.’

Blickling Homily XIII is a translation of a combination of the Latin *Transitus W* and *Transitus B* (or *Transitus of Pseudo-Melito*), resulting in the description of both the spiritual and bodily assumption of the Virgin. Clayton argues that the Old English translator was “incompetent” and a poor Latinist, causing Homily XIII

104 Morris, ed., *The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses*, 136 – 159.

105 Morris, ed., *The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses*, 151.

to often be confusing, and with numerous missed Biblical allusions.\(^{107}\) Accordingly, analysis of Homily XIII has proven to be difficult. A study of the homily’s Latin exemplars has revealed that that term applied to the leader of the Jews in the Latin texts was *princeps*, “leader” or “chief”\(^{108}\).

What is of interest here is that the “ruler” is, throughout the text, referred to in the Old English as *ealdorman*, and it is only when the titled is paired with *árleasa*, a term with connotations of honorless, disgraceful, wicked and impious\(^{109}\) that the term *gerefa* is employed. This seems to be a rather deliberate word choice, and further along in the text, when this ruler affirms his belief in Christ and goes on to convert many of his fellow Jews, he is again referred to as *ealdorman*. The Latin original indicates that there was no suggestion of the *princeps* as wicked or evil; he was merely described as the chief or leader of the priests. Thus the likelihood arises that the Old English translator specifically applied the term *gerefa* and felt the necessity to quantify it with *árleasa*. It seems unlikely that this detail was the result of the work of a poor Latinist, and more like it was precise, deliberate usage of the term *gerefa*, particularly because the Latin word used throughout *Transitus W* and *B\(^2\)* is the same – *princeps*. While noteworthy, this use of the term *gerefa* is not as emphatic as that seen in Homily V, and may simply reflect the author’s desire to strike a chord in his audience through the example of an official familiar in their daily lives. This bears more significance in light of the increasing power, importance and visibility of reeves in the localities in late Anglo-Saxon England, as well as later, in terms of Cnut’s laws, where he set out to correct past abuses of royal power.

The reeve can be seen in a similar vein in Blickling Homily XV, *The Passion of Peter and Paul*. This text, which Kelly refers to as “essentially hagiographical”,


The corresponding Latin section in *Transitus W* is as follows:


details the passion of saints Peter and Paul during the reign of the Emperor Nero. The saints were summoned before Nero as a result of the many conversions that were taking place (the emperor’s wife apparently among them) and insistence from Simon the sorcerer (dry), that he himself was the Son of God and that the apostle Peter was in fact the evil sorcerer.110 The text goes on to describe a series of contests between Peter and Paul and Simon, as the sorcerer attempts to convince Nero that he is the Son of God. When this ends in Simon’s death, Nero angrily decides to punish the saints, and directs Agrippa, his burhgerefan, to choose suitable punishments and see them carried out: “Þa cwæþ Neron; ‘On ða betstan wisan þu dem[est].’”111 What is interesting here is that the burhgerefa, Agrippa, was introduced at the beginning of the text, not as a reeve, but as his geongran,112 a term indicating someone who was a vassal, subject, attendant or servant,113 rather than the more specific title of reeve. The Latin used to describe Agrippa in the Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli114 is praefectus, which is one of the Latin terms more commonly rendered as gerefa in Old English. Yet when Agrippa is addressed in the capacity of an official who meets out punishment – significantly, again on the side of wrong – he is assigned the title of burhgerefa, specifically a reeve in a city or town. We again see the reeve placed in a (negative) position of making judgments and meting out punishments.

While the reeve’s appearances in Blickling Homilies XIII and XV do not carry the same harsh and weighty emphasis as the exhortation in Blickling Homily V, these texts seem to indicate a “trend”, beginning in late Anglo-Saxon England towards placing focus on the reeve and viewing him in a negative light – or at the least, as an instantly recognizable local official in preaching texts. It

110 Morris, ed., The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses, 173, 175.
111 Morris, ed., The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses, 189.
112 Morris, ed., The Blickling Homilies, with a translation and Index of words, together with the Blickling Glosses, 171.
seems unlikely that the increasing prominence of these men in late Anglo-Saxon England was a coincidence.

As mentioned above, the Vercelli Homilies also contain references to the reeve. These texts form an original collection and are considered to be the “earliest extant collection of homiletic texts in English”. The base manuscript for Donald Scragg’s 1992 edition is “A”: Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII, The Vercelli Book, and it is dated to around the mid-tenth century. The homilies contained therein do not form a unified collection, and are the work of numerous individuals at various times and places; as such it is not possible to date them too closely, though Scragg contends that they can likely be assigned to the mid-tenth century. Significantly, a multitude of extant Anglo-Saxon manuscripts have been shown to display some amount of “overlap of content with A”, underlining the influence these texts carried in late Anglo-Saxon England. The reeve appears in Vercelli Homily I and Homily V. Scragg regards Homily I as primarily a narrative piece and V as a sermon. Homily I is an Easter narrative describing the Passion, while Homily V is a sermon for Christmas. The Latin sources for Homily I are the Gospels of John (18 and 19) and Matthew (26 and 27). The Latin sources behind Homily V are Luke (2.1 – 14) and Gregory the Great’s *Homilia VIII in euangelia*, though Scragg states that these were supplemented by other sources. Scragg also raises the possibility that Vercelli Homily V could be a translation of a lost or yet unknown Latin homily, or compiled in the vernacular from material traditional of Latin Nativity homilies. The significance of Homily I in terms of the reeve is that one of the most infamous of judges himself,

---

120 Scragg contends that Christmas homilies are rare in Old English, with two occurring among the Vercelli texts and the other four composed by Ælfric (Scragg, ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, 109 – 110).
Pontious Pilate, is referred to as a reeve: Þa sægde sanctus Iohannes euangelista þætte hi hine læddon swiðe ær on morgen to Pilatus domerne, ðæs gerefan.124 This reference, together with that in Vercelli Homily V, of Cyrinus, the reeve of the province of Syria,125 places the reeve in the role of a judge erroneous and lacking in divine wisdom, of which Pilate is the ultimate example. The Latin term in Homily I for which the Old English scribe translated gerefæ was praetor, or “official elected by the Romans to be a judge”. The Latin term in Homily V describing Cyrinus of Syria was praeside, “guard, chief or governor”. It is perhaps not surprising that praeside was translated in the vernacular as gerefæ, but it is interesting that gerefæ was chosen to represent praetor, instead of the Old English word for judge, dema.

It is now of interest to turn momentarily away from homiletic discourse, and to consider another area of ecclesiastical writing, some of Ælfric’s letters. Ælfric’s Pastoral Letter for Wulfsege III, Bishop of Sherborne (993 x ca. 995) and Ælfric’s First Old English Letter for Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (c. 1006), both contain intriguing comments regarding reeves.126 Unlike the content of Blickling V, these letters in no way address reeves; rather, they stipulate that priests are stepping dangerously close to reevish activity and that they must avoid such behavior. In his letter to Wulfsege, Ælfric despairs of ecclesiastics falling away from the Benedictine Rule, and he states in no uncertain terms that “ac ge luufiað woruld-spræca 7 wyllað beon gerefæn 7 forlætað eowre cyrcan 7 þa gesettnyssa mid ealle.”127 This concern of Ælfric’s that priests may wish to be reeves at first

seems somewhat puzzling; a little clarity may be gained in turning to Ælfric's letter to Wulfstan. Here, Ælfric states "Ne mot nan preost beon mangere òphe gerefa..." 128 These two statements may perhaps be considered to be complementary, in light of Victoria Thompson's discussion of the church and executions. She highlights the differences in thought regarding the death penalty between Ælfric and Wulfstan. Wulfstan displays concern for the condemned—a reasonable attitude for one who spent years involved in drafting secular legislation—while Ælfric is primarily preoccupied with bishops and priests “keeping their hands clean”.129 Furthermore, Thompson notes that in his first Pastoral Letter to Wulfstan, Ælfric forbids priests to bear weapons, to go to battle, to go to winehouses, to get drunk, or, as mentioned, to be a reeve.130 Thompson argues that what binds these activities together is the possibility of an associated violent death, and accordingly, argues that Ælfric forbade priests’ involvement in them in order to avoid ecclesiastics’ entanglement in violent death.131 Thus Ælfric's warning in the earlier letter to Wulfsige may indeed have been issued along these same lines: that ecclesiastics must avoid certain roles and activities in order to protect themselves and to maintain appropriate clerical behavior. Moreover, Thompson suggests that Ælfric’s attention to this matter might be an indication that it was a current issue in ecclesiastical circles at the time he was working.132 This seems to indicate that Ælfric saw secular justice and the dispensing of judgment as the preserve of the reeve and not the clergy. It is evident (as illustrated by Thompson) that Wulfstan felt differently, as a result of

“...but you love secular concerns and wish to be reeves and desert your churches and the ordinances entirely” (Ibid, 217).
128 Whitelock, Brett and Brooke, eds., Councils & Synods, with Other Documents Relating to The English Church. Volume I: AD 871 – 1204, Part I: 871 – 1066, 296. "No priest may be a trader or a reeve..." (Ibid, 296).
130 Ne mot nan preost beon mangere òphe gerefa, ne drincan øt wynhuse, ne druncengeorne beon ... ne mot he wæpnu werian ne to gefeehite faran ...
“No priest may be a trader or a reeve, or drink at a winehouse, or be a drunkard, ... he may not bear weapons nor go into battle...” (Whitelock, Brett and Brooke, eds., Councils & Synods, with Other Documents Relating to The English Church. Volume I: AD 871 – 1204, Part I: 871 – 1066, 296). See also: Thompson, Death and Dying in Later Anglo-Saxon England, 185.
his experience in politics and secular courts. Indeed, Allen Frantzen observes that Wulfstan “lamented” the fact that public penance was not as widespread or well known in England as it should have been. This lament, driven by both the viking attacks and Wulfstan’s subsequent quest to reform English society, may have helped to fuel Wulfstan’s drive to reform the reeve into a royal official imbued with secular power, who could help to implement this practice across England’s localities. This effort is particularly apparent in Æthelred’s 1009 law calling for “general penance” and authorizing village reeves to witness this penance and almsgiving. Wulfstan’s view of the role of the reeve, and indeed, of the overlap between secular and divine law, can be seen to reach back to Alfredian mores. Institutes of Polity displays further development of this thinking, where we can see that Wulfstan expected the reeve to shoulder a heavy burden of responsibility: not only for administrative justice and judgment, but for the people’s care and well-being.

Wulfstan’s moral discourse on secular authority: the reeve

Wulfstan was deeply concerned for the state and well being of the English people in the face of the viking attacks he viewed as a result of their having fallen away from God and Christian conduct. In the face of disaster, Wulfstan believed it necessary to reform English society if it were to endure and regain God’s favor. Indeed, Wulfstan believed that restoring order to society was the key to solving the crises that had befallen England. The archbishop attempted, in his homiletic and legal works, to create prescriptions for an ordered, holy, Christian society in order to redeem the English in the eyes of God, and to ensure that such devastation never happened again. Wulfstan first makes an appearance in the

133 Thompson, Death and Dying in Later Anglo-Saxon England, 184 – 185.
historical record in 996, when he was appointed as the bishop of London, though nothing about him prior to that year is known.

While bishop of London, he composed a few homilies and penitential letters.\textsuperscript{137} As suggested by his dual appointment at both York and Worcester it is likely that Wulfstan had already begun to distinguish himself by this period; his skill with words is highlighted in an anonymous ecclesiastic’s refusal to translate some of Wulfstan’s Old English work into Latin because of the archbishop’s eloquence.\textsuperscript{138} In 1002, Wulfstan was appointed archbishop of York and bishop of Worcester. The early years of his tenure as archbishop saw the compilation of tracts on status and many homilies – Wulfstan’s Old English homiletic writings number around forty, and of course he also composed legislation for Æthelred and Cnut.\textsuperscript{139} Institutes of Polity, which is difficult to categorize in terms of genre, is a text that Wulfstan appears to have been working on and refining for much of his career as archbishop.\textsuperscript{140} Wulfstan did not often sign his name on his work; yet it has been possible to ascribe to the archbishop such a wide body of writings as a result not only of his distinctive style, but also the presence of his hand in myriad manuscripts associated with him.\textsuperscript{141} Studying and understanding Wulfstan’s


\textsuperscript{141} Whitelock, ed., Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 17 – 19; Whitelock, “Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman”, 44 – 45; Stanley, “Wulfstan and Ælfric: ‘the true Difference between the Law and the
works is made significantly more challenging and complicated because most of them survive only in manuscripts associated with him in some manner.\footnote{142} Wulfstan was archbishop of York during an incredibly tumultuous time in English history. Beginning in the 980s and continuing intermittently until the reign of Cnut in 1016, England suffered serious devastation at the hands of the vikings.\footnote{143} These attacks had reached their pinnacle of destruction and brutality during the last decade of Æthelred’s reign, and with the English resistance
amounting to something altogether ineffective, enormous sums of money were paid to the Danes in tribute on several occasions.\textsuperscript{144} It is clear that this was a period when the people of England were plunged deep into despair and fear, with diminishing faith in their state and the ability of the king to defend it and its people.\textsuperscript{145} As archbishop of York and close advisor to the king, Wulfstan was well positioned to put into effect measures to improve England’s dire situation.\textsuperscript{146}

Wulfstan was dedicated to saving his country and people from what he presumed to be God’s wrath at their failure to be a good Christian nation, and it is clear from his writings that he saw the path to this through re-establishing an ordered Christian kingdom. We can see a precedent for this type of reaction in IV Edgar 1, which dates to 962, and references a plague which has befallen the country, and the belief of the king and his councilors that it was the result of God’s displeasure with the people and their sins.\textsuperscript{147} The clauses under IV Edgar 1 are aimed at reforming the people’s actions and returning them to God’s favor. Therefore, part of this goal was, in Wulfstan’s mind, to be achieved through reinstating and revitalizing the appropriate ordering of society, without which the nation could not function. This failure of the kingdom to function properly may perhaps be illustrated in the sharp contrast between the reigns of Edgar and Æthelred. Edgar’s reign was viewed by many (including and particularly Wulfstan) as a “golden age” in England, perhaps especially for the church. Æthelred’s reign, in a marked divergence, was plagued by viking attacks, payments of tribute, and in the early years, royal pillaging of lands from church hands. It seems highly likely that Wulfstan, seeing his nation on its knees all around him (perhaps even having a front row seat, as archbishop of the northern see), looked back at the peaceful, golden era of Edgar’s reign as the ideal to strive for, and that the nation fell apart under Æthelred as a result of weaknesses in the social order.

\textsuperscript{144} Keynes, “An abbot, an archbishop, and the viking raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12,” 154, 156.
\textsuperscript{146} Wormald, “Æthelred the Lawmaker,” 55.
Based on a phrase employed by Wulfstan in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* of 1014, Stanley argues that the Anglo-Saxons and especially Wulfstan, viewed law and justice as linked with God.\(^{148}\) The phrase Wulfstan used, “Godes gериhta mid rihte gelæste” indicates, according to Stanley, that God was regarded as the supreme judge in all matters and as such was deserving of the people’s “rightful service”.\(^{149}\) Wulfstan’s zeal for this concept is further revealed in his *Institutes of Polity*, wherein he states one should “riht lufian for Gode and for worulde” (love justice for the sake of God and the state).\(^{150}\) This reiterates his attitude regarding secular law’s irretrievable connection with God’s law and divine justice.

Wulfstan believed that the only way in which England would be delivered of the shadow cast by the vikings was if the people as a whole respected and observed both the laws of God and of the king. The drafting of Cnut’s legislation signaled an attempt to eradicate royal abuses of power and to return the nation to the “better days” of King Edgar’s reign. To that end, Stafford highlights Cnut’s code of 1018,\(^{151}\) arising from a meeting of the Danes and the English at Oxford in 1018, wherein at the outset, the code establishes the intent to return to and observe the laws of King Edgar.\(^{152}\) II Cnut takes this further, with its clauses 69 – 83, which pledge to eliminate abuses of royal power.\(^{153}\) All of this legislation – Cnut’s 1018 code and I and II Cnut – was the work of Wulfstan, with the ultimate goal of promoting and establishing good Christian kingship. Stafford contends that the adoption of the laws of a “good” king (Edgar), by a conqueror – Cnut – was in effect “guaranteeing the good laws of the past”, while at the same time making royal rights and prerogatives clearly known, which was an important element of good Christian kingship.\(^{154}\) I and II Cnut articulate the laws of good

---


Christian kingship, laid out comprehensively. Institutes of Polity takes this one step further, acting as a guide of sorts not only for the king, but for all ranks and levels of society.155

A major thread running through much of Wulfstan’s works is the need to combat injustice in all matters; he details the failings of particular groups in both his homilies and his Institutes of Polity. Wulfstan’s famous Sermo Lupi ad Anglos of 1014 reinforces this concept by entreatting the English people to not only recognize their past sins, but to repent for them as well:

7 þy us is þearf micel þæt pe us beþencan 7 pið God sylfne þingian georne. 7 utan don spa us þearf is, gebugan to rihtæ, 7 be suman dæle unriht forlætan, 7 betan spyþe georne þæt pe ær bræcan;156

From this sermon and the legislation of Æthelred and Cnut it is clear that Wulfstan wished to impress upon the English people that their past failures to properly observe the laws of God and the king was what caused the country’s great misfortune of the past decades. Wulfstan also stated that in essence, the laws of God and the king held the same aims, since he referred to the king in one of Æthelred’s codes as “Christ’s deputy,” and as being ready to “avenge God’s anger very eagerly.”157 Furthermore, Wormald notes that the primary aim of Æthelred’s laws was to imbue God’s law with the same force as secular law.158 Secular law and God’s law were both, in essence, striving towards the same goal: a good Christian society. In this sentiment, Wulfstan was operating to some

---

155 Stafford, ”The laws of Cnut and the history of Anglo-Saxon royal promises”, 188.
156 Whitelock, ed., Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 52. Translated: Swanton, ed., trans., Anglo-Saxon Prose, 184: “And therefore it is very necessary for us to reflect about ourselves and earnestly plead with God himself. And let us do as is necessary for us – bow to justice and in some part to leave off injustice, and to compensate very carefully for what we previously broke.”
Keynes highlights this in: “An abbot, an archbishop, and the viking raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12,” 204.
157 Wormald, “Æthelred the Lawmaker,” 76.
This was perhaps a conscious echo of the term Æthelred’s father Edgar used to describe himself: “vicar of Christ” (Wormald, “Æthelred the Lawmaker,” 76).
158 Wormald, “Æthelred the Lawmaker,” 75.
degree under Carolingian precedent,\textsuperscript{159} wherein the ecclesiastics of the realm (particularly the bishops) were considered to be the king’s servants, as well as those of God.\textsuperscript{160} It is evident that Wulfstan believed that English society brought down its troubles upon its own head and that the viking devastation was God’s admonition to his erring people. Much of Wulfstan’s substantial output of work was geared towards reinstating a morally good Christian society. Wormald takes this further, in looking back to Alfred the Great’s seminal legislation, stating that it is difficult to overstate “the impact of the Old Testament as a prescriptive mirror for early medieval societies.”\textsuperscript{161} He goes on to establish that Asser, in his \textit{Life of Alfred}, cast his subject in the light of an “Anglo-Saxon Solomon” of sorts, promoting the notion that the king attempted to dispense justice through \textit{wisdom} from God.\textsuperscript{162}

It has already been established that Wulfstan was a prolific writer and rewriter, and that a handful of his works bear interest in particular for his campaign to reform English society. As we have seen above, two of these texts, \textit{Gēlynccōu} and \textit{Nōrdleoda Laga}, are concerned with status and social hierarchy; for example, both of these works clearly stipulate what is required for a man to achieve the status of thegn. This concern for the appropriate ordering of society can also be seen in Wulfstan’s impassioned \textit{Sermo Lupi ad Anglos}, wherein he details myriad failings of Anglo-Saxon society, particularly what he views as a breakdown of the social order. Here, in illustration, Wulfstan highlights the betrayal of lords by their men, and instances where slaves have essentially risen to the rank of thegn.\textsuperscript{163} Napier Homily 50, or “Larspell”, functions in a similar vein; this text may have been preached to the witan assembled at the 1018

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{159 Which he would have had exposure to, especially though the works of Alcuin (Keynes, “An abbot, an archbishop, and the viking raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12,” 184).}
\footnote{160 Wormald, “Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-Builder,” 21.}
\footnote{161 Wormald, \textit{The Making of English Law}, 122.}
\footnote{162 Wormald, \textit{The Making of English Law}, 121-2. Wisdom in this sense makes a frequent appearance in Wulfstan’s homiletic writings, and does indeed crop up when he is referring to royal officials and their duties and actions.}
\end{footnotesize}
meeting at Oxford. Napier 50 employs an eschatological tone, focusing on issues such as the proper and correct behavior of the clergy and the laity, as well as the need for the English to be prepared for the coming of the Antichrist and the end of the world.

However, the culmination of all of Wulfstan’s efforts to return the English to a good Christian society was his *Institutes of Polity*. This text offers a mode of governance for what it envisages to be a Christian nation. This text would have been the embodiment of what Wulfstan (among others) believed was the ecclesiastical role “to admonish and guide kings”, and Stafford argues that the turmoil of the years 1014 – 1020 would have prepared and educated Wulfstan in what elements were necessary for good Christian kingship. *Institutes of Polity* is heavily moralizing, and it focuses (primarily) upon the roles of the bishops, ealdormen and administrative officials in establishing and maintaining an ordered Christian kingdom. It is argued that this text was unfinished at the time of Wulfstan’s death in 1023. It will be shown not only that this text was the culmination of Wulfstan’s thought on status and also law making, but also that it bore the influence of the Alfredian program of (moral) education and its mores. Arguably, Alfred the Great’s program of education, with its emphasis on moral wisdom, bore fruit in the tenth and eleventh centuries, in the form of some homiletic works – some of which were aimed at the laity – as well as within strands of the work of Ælfric and Wulfstan. Furthermore, it will be shown that the reeve not only fits into this moral framework envisaged by Wulfstan (borne out of his earlier meditations and work on status, the law and Alfredian precedent), but also that the reeve was allocated a new and important position as a “shepherd” working on behalf of the people.

Wulfstan’s intimate understanding of Anglo-Saxon law, as a legislator for both Æthelred and Cnut, put him in a unique position, enabling him to come to

---


166 Stafford, “The laws of Cnut and the history of Anglo-Saxon royal promises”, 188.
the aid of the English through not just a spiritual position, but also from a viewpoint borne out of a deep understanding of the workings of the Anglo-Saxon administrative framework. Therefore, recalling Alfred and his legacy of good Christian kingship, Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity* was aimed at the creation of a good Christian state, addressing both secular and spiritual concerns. This text represents the culmination of his writing career, and it provides a framework not only for the proper ordering and functioning of society but it was also a “guide” for the building of a good Christian kingdom. *Institutes of Polity* is a text that incorporates both homiletic and legal tones, and as such, does not fit into any genre.\(^{167}\) *Institutes of Polity* has a complicated textual background. Parts of the text are transmitted in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, London, British Library, Cotton Nero A.i and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121.\(^{168}\) What makes matters difficult is that there is no extant “complete” version of the text.\(^{169}\) The modern editor of *Institutes of Polity*, Karl Jost, published the text as two versions, *I Polity* and *II Polity*, collating the scattered material and wading through various elements of Wulfstan’s editorial work.\(^{170}\) *I Polity* is the shorter text and is thought to represent an earlier version, while *II Polity* is the “final” rendition of the text, compiled from material in Junius 121 and Nero A.i.\(^{171}\)

Renée Trilling refers to *Institutes of Polity* as a text compiling a collection of related ideas, concerned with the linked well being of the church and the Christian community.\(^{172}\) *Institutes of Polity’s* Chapter Four focuses upon the Three Pillars of society – *oratores, laboratores* and *bellatores* – as essential

---


\(^{171}\) Trilling, “Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the *Institutes of Polity*”, 63.

support for a successful throne. These are presented as non-negotiable factors, and of course, they reinforce Wulfstan’s picture of an ordered society. The text imbues bishops and royal officials with a sort of social responsibility – bishops, priests and reeves are all referred to in the context of shepherds here. The place of the bishops at the head of the nation’s councilors (ðeodwitan) is underlined, with emphasis that the “justice” which concerned the nation’s councilors was that of the king’s law and God’s law – in fact, Trilling argues that Institutes of Polity places royal power below that of God’s. Institutes of Polity offers a mode of governance for what it envisages as a Christian nation. This text would have been the embodiment of what Wulfstan (among others) believed was the ecclesiastical role to “admonish and guide kings”, and Stafford argues that the turmoil of the years 1014 – 1020 would have prepared and educated Wulfstan in what elements were necessary for good Christian kingship.

Two major strands in Wulfstan’s campaign to reform English society were tracts on status, which were ringing reminders of the correct social stratifications, as well as moralizing texts, exhorting those in power – bishops, ealdormen and administrative officials – to be just and good and to obey God’s law and thus do right by the English people and nation. We can see reeves coming into this picture from both sides: not only were some of these men major players on the political stage, but they were among the middling men (discussed above, in Chapter Three) that were rising up the social ranks – some achieving thegnhood – during the tenth and eleventh centuries. One reason for reeves’ particular prominence in this period would have been the increasing importance and necessity of their roles as estate managers at a time when the great estates were fragmenting and agricultural exploitation increased on the resulting many smaller estates across late Anglo-Saxon England. A second manner in which
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176 Stafford, “The laws of Cnut and the history of Anglo-Saxon royal promises”, 188.
reeves seem to be becoming more important was in their capacity as royal officials. These were the royal agents “on the ground” who would have had the most contact with the people in the localities, active in the hundred and shire courts, collecting dues and tithes and in the eleventh century, ensuring that the people participated in the mandated fasting. Royal reeves begin to feature more prominently in the diplomatic during the reign of Æthelred, some of whom are referenced in the charters as not necessarily acting in accordance with law and custom, or in the state’s (that is, the king’s) best interest.

Stafford makes the important point that in the late Anglo-Saxon period, royal power and the exercise of *cynerihta* was very much in the hands of royal officials, and the effectiveness of this power was “only as effective as the men on the ground were prepared to make it.” This underlines the importance of royal officials in the localities, particularly as the agents of royal power and influence. These are the men who dealt and interacted with the people on a personal level. As discussed above in Chapter Two, Baxter and Blair argue convincingly for the existence of “ministerial land”, or estates held by royal officials as a function of their royal office. Possession of these lands would have been a benefit of holding a royal office; furthermore Baxter and Blair view it as an enticement to ensure the proper collection of royal revenue. This is demonstrated, for example, by *Domesday Book*’s record that earls could collect the “third penny” attached to some ministerial estates. Thus not only did
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178 Of course, as discussed in Chapter Three above, *RSP* and *Gerefa* appear to be reminders to the reeve of his duties and responsibilities (with *Gerefa* having a decidedly moralizing tone), albeit on an estate, as opposed to the environs of the royal official.


possession of such estates help to make royal office more attractive, but also the third penny from tax revenue help to vest a royal official’s interests in justice and secular administration in his locality. Of course, much of this applies primarily to earls, though Baxter and Blair have shown that other royal officials enjoyed this perquisite as well, often in the form of royal lænland. 183 This lænland seems to have moved with royal offices, affording royal agents with a “base”, as well as landed interests in their dedicated administrative area. 184 Recalling the texts RSP and Geðyncðu, it is important to bear in mind that thegny status was defined not just by holding the requisite land (five hides), but also by service to the king. 185 RSP and Geðyncðu both underline the importance of these factors, though Baxter and Blair are careful to highlight the fact that not all thegns held royal lænland. 186 It is unclear, though, whether five hides of ministerial land would have fulfilled the land requirement outlined in Geðyncðu, because in theory this property was lænland, not the bookland specified in the status tract. However, this may not have posed a significant obstacle for enterprising individuals; Baxter and Blair note that the lessor of this lænland often encountered difficulty in regaining the property at the end of a lease. 187 The effect of this would have been to invest royal officials in the localities with (some level of) interest in administering their local “zone.”

Bearing this in mind, Wulfstan’s heavy emphasis in his moral discourse on royal officials seems almost natural. These are the men who on a daily basis took the administration of justice into their hands, as is indicated by the law codes and the diplomatic evidence. Wulfstan, as a lawmaker, astute politician and one of the leading ecclesiastics in late Anglo-Saxon England, would have been well

aware of royal officials’ prescribed role in the localities, and thus it makes sense that he targeted them in his moral discourse in his effort to save the English nation from God’s wrath and the viking onslaught. Looking back to Bede, bishops were long viewed as bearing responsibilities towards the pastoral care of the people in their localities. In fact, in Bede’s letter to Ecgberht, he complains bitterly about the Northumbrian bishops’ neglect of their flocks, despite their continued collection of the people’s tribute money.\textsuperscript{188} Indeed, Blair argues that bishops and priests were envisaged to have not only the responsibility of pastoral care towards their flocks, but also to monitor the moral conduct of the people, enforcing just behavior, and even regulating weights and measurements.\textsuperscript{189} This suggests that, whether it was always carried out or not, priests and bishops were viewed as bearing the burden of the moral and spiritual wellbeing of the people in their territories.

However, Wulfstan, in his multifaceted attempt to retrieve the English from the brink of destruction, took the view that some royal officials – particularly reeves – were in a sense “shepherds” of the people and responsible for “pastoral care” in a secular sense. Reeves were perhaps targeted for this particular role as a result of their operation at many levels of society in Anglo-Saxon England. As we have seen, these officials were found not only at the royal court, directly under the king, but also in villages, towns and shires. They were associated with justice and the local courts, and also taxes and tithes, and as such they could wield considerable influence. Wulfstan, with his comprehensive knowledge and experience with royal law making and legislation, would have been aware of reeves’ spheres of activity, as well as their potential great influence among the English people. These royal officials would have been the ideal bearers of Wulfstan’s initiative, which earned them a significant amount of Wulfstan’s attention in his writing. He must have viewed them as the ideal vehicle for enacting the secular element of his efforts to reform the English. Furthermore, the laws demonstrate that reeves often worked alongside bishops

\textsuperscript{188} Blair, \textit{The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society}, 155.
\textsuperscript{189} Blair, \textit{The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society}, 497.
and priests in the localities (or were expected to do so). The Old English *Legend of the Seven Sleepers* depicts the portgerefa and the bishop together questioning in an official capacity a man suspected of a crime.\textsuperscript{190} This would have been an additional factor making them more attractive as the natural secular counterpart to the bishops, who appear from *Institutes of Polity* to be spearheading the ecclesiastical efforts to redeem the English people.

The section of *Institutes of Polity* dedicated to reeves is heavily moralizing and admonishes them for many types of rapacious behavior.\textsuperscript{191} It is necessary to note that the section on reeves was not included in the text of *I Polity*. Jay Gates regards the changes implemented to Wulfstan’s text in order to generate *II Polity* as a reflection of the changes to the perceived role of the king and whom he should correct; that is, in *II Polity* the king’s roles and responsibilities became more specific and expanded.\textsuperscript{192} Therefore, the addition of the section on reeves to *Institutes of Polity* may well exemplify the results of Wulfstan’s thinking and his changing views on the reeve and how the reeve’s role fit in with Wulfstan’s picture of Christian kingship. Wulfstan accuses the reeves outright for robbery, the rise of unjust laws and the negligence and betrayal of the flock they are supposed to guard:

\begin{quote}
Ac nu hit is geworden ealles to swyðe, syððan Eadgar geendode, swa swa God wolde, þæt ma is þæra rypera þonne rihtwisra, and is earmlic ðing, þæt ða syndon ryperas, þe sceoldan beon hyrdas cristenes folces. Hy rypað þa earman butan ælceræ scylde oðre hwile and hynad þa heorde, þe hi sceoldan healden, // and mid yfelan holan earmu halmon earme men beswicad and unlagad rærað on æghwylc wisan earmum to hynþe and wydewan bestrypado of and gelome.\textsuperscript{193}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{190} Cubitt, “‘As the Lawbook Teaches’: Reeves, Lawbooks and Urban Life in the Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers”, 1028.

\textsuperscript{191} Jost, ed., *Die “Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical”: Ein werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, 81 – 82.

\textsuperscript{192} Gates, “The Politics of Building the Holy Society: Wulfstan’s Later Writings”.

\textsuperscript{193} Jost, ed., *Die “Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical”: Ein werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, 81 – 82.

"But now it has happened all too greatly that since Edgar died, even as God willed, there are more robbers than righteous men; and it is a wretched thing that those who should be shepherds of the
This text points to the reeves’ deviation from their official roles as royal agents into avaricious grasping and jostling for money and position under Æthelred. Wulfstan goes on to reminisce about the days when reeves respected and observed God’s law, remaining devoid of deceit and foul behavior. Wulfstan returns to the present, bemoaning the descent of the reeves into treachery and greed for riches; his distaste is almost palpable here. The section ends with the emphasis that the reeves have angered God repeatedly and that atonement “for Gode and for worulde” was necessary in order to fully repent. This passage concerning reeves paints a picture of a group of thuggish, rapacious officials, combing the localities for opportunities to lie and cheat innocents out of their money, and jostling for riches and status. This is juxtaposed against the expectation that the reeve is to be a “shepherd” of the Christian people, helping to guide the people towards a holy society, committed to justice, right and God’s law. There is an interesting correlation here, between Wulfstan’s passionate discourse against “bad” reeves, and the literary convention of the “corrupt judge”. It is perhaps possible that Wulfstan intended to underline a familiar tradition in order to strike a chord within the Anglo-Saxon people.

It is significant that Wulfstan uses the term hyrdas, or “shepherd”, with its Biblical and homiletic connotations of Christ to describe the role which the reeve ought to fulfill on behalf of the people. This analogy is used not once but twice (the second time referencing the people as the “flock” – heorde), emphasizing the importance Wulfstan attributed to this facet of the reeve’s role. We can also see that bishops and priests are referred to as shepherds, with a responsibility towards the people, but no other secular officials are referenced in Christian people are robbers. At times they rob the blameless poor and abuse the flock they should guard, and betray poor men with evil slanders, and give rise to unjust laws in all sorts of ways to the injury of the poor, and rob widows over and over again” (Swanton, ed., trans., Anglo-Saxon Prose, 193).

194 Jost, ed., Die “Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical”: Ein werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York, 82.
195 Jost, ed., Die “Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical”: Ein werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York, 82.
this manner. Why are reeves singled out in this way? As suggested above, it seems that Wulfstan believed that the reeve was responsible for a secular “pastoral care” of sorts, for the people in his local district. The reeve, as a powerful (in some instances) royal official, was active and recognizable in the localities – often in a judicial capacity alongside the bishop – and as such may have been an ideal “secular counterpart” to the spiritual and moral guidance provided by the bishops. Wulfstan emphasizes the reeve’s role in judicial proceedings, not only in this section of *Institutes of Polity*, but also in the homily “Larspell”, and in a more general sense, in the laws of Æthelred and Cnut, wherein the reeve is responsible for ensuring the correct collection of tithes and that minting is done fairly and honestly.\(^{197}\) Furthermore, significantly, VII Æthelred 6.3 states that the penalty for a reeve’s theft would be double that of any other person, which indicates that as the protectors and enforcers of the law and people under it, the reeves’ transgression would be far more grievous and less tolerated than that of an ordinary individual.\(^{198}\) Finally II Cnut 69\(^{199}\) states that the king’s reeves are to supply him solely from his own property, and that no one is required to give the reeve “anything as purveyance”, which strongly suggests that reeves had been guilty of rapacious and greedy behavior in the past.

---

\(^{197}\) VII Æthelred 8, I Cnut 8.2 and II Cnut 8.2.

\(^{198}\) *Et si quis praepositus eam fecerit duppliciter emendet quod alii iudicaretur.* Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 261.

[And if any reeve has committed theft, the compensation paid by him shall be double that prescribed to any other person.]


\(^{199}\) 1. *Ðæt is ðonne ærost, þæt ic bebeode eallum minan gerefan þæt hig on minon agenan rihtlice tilian 7 me mid ðam feormian, 7 þæt him nan man ne ðearf to feormfultume nan ðingc syllan, butan he sylf wille.*


[The first provision is: I command all my reeves to provide for me in accordance with the law from my own property and support me thereby, and [declare] that no man need give them anything as purveyance, unless he himself is willing to do so. And if anyone [of my reeves] shall demand a fine [in such a case], he shall forfeit his wergeld to the king.]

– under Æthelred. The role outlined for reeves in *Institutes of Polity* provides a sharp contrast to this past behavior and activity, placing the reeve in an important position in the localities, providing for the secular welfare of the people in the same manner in which the bishops and priests attended to the people’s moral and spiritual wellbeing.

*Conclusions*

Despite the relative frequency in which the reeve begins to appear in late Anglo-Saxon religious discourse, the image of the reeve as a “shepherd” (*hyrdas*) of the Christian people appears to have been solely Wulfstan’s creation. Therefore, although Wulfstan’s negative railings against the reeve do not seem to be at all unusual in late Anglo-Saxon religious writings, what is new is Wulfstan’s particularly weighty focus on the reeve, as well as his view of the reeve as bearing the responsibility as a shepherd to the Christian people. It seems clear that in the decades since Alfred the Great’s reign and his promotion of the importance of education and spiritual wisdom, the reeve became a more prominent official, particularly within the localities (as has been shown above), and simultaneously, began to attract more attention in ecclesiastical texts and law codes. This thread was taken up by both Ælfric and Wulfstan, albeit in slightly differing ways. Ælfric appears to have continued in much the same vein as earlier texts, though perhaps with a greater emphasis on the reeve (and a belief that secular justice was their domain and not that of the clergy), while Wulfstan pulled the thread in a different direction. Wulfstan has utilized *Institutes of Polity* to give full expression to the new niche he has carved out for the reeve, building the official into an integral position in his mission to create and uphold the Christian kingdom he envisaged for the Anglo-Saxons. This was almost certainly driven by Wulfstan’s deep

---

interest in social structure and the strata of society, and accordingly, what he saw as the foundation of a good Christian nation.
Conclusion

The Anglo-Saxon reeve is a figure whose role in Anglo-Saxon society and government has long been in the dark. Apart from the loosely applied, vague title of “administrator”, scholars have generally said little about the nature of his activities and contributions. This is perhaps unsurprising – the evidence most revealing in terms of the reeve is rather disparate, and can at times be difficult to interpret. The Anglo-Saxon law codes in particular offer valuable insight into the complexities of the reeve’s role as an agent of the late Anglo-Saxon administration. However, the much-debated question as to the extent of the ideological nature (versus the practical applicability) of the law codes has often made evaluation of this resource in terms of the activity of royal officials difficult. Significantly, through the work of numerous historians and a study of the reeve across a number of sources – law codes, charters, dispute settlements and various prose pieces – it can be argued that the law codes were in fact practical texts utilized on the ground. This of course has important implications for our picture of not just the reeve as a royal official, but of the workings of the late Anglo-Saxon administration as a whole.

This study sought to provide a more three-dimensional image of a royal agent: his activities on behalf of the administration, his interactions with other officials, the king and the church, his place in society, his work in the “private sector” under aristocratic lords, and finally, how he was perceived by others, particularly moralizing ecclesiastics. What has emerged is a rich tapestry of detail, offering some illumination on the lives and work of men who, by the tenth and eleventh centuries, occupied a pivotal, if not always high profile, role in English society. The lion’s share of material on the reeve deals with his activities as a royal administrator. Here he is revealed as an agent who, by the late Anglo-Saxon period, could be found at every level of the Old English state: from a judicial official operating courts in villages and shire, all the way to an agent who worked at the king’s side. Various case studies indicate that even reeves who ran courts in the localities bore a degree of power which made them a force to
content with – Eadric of Calne exemplifies this: saintly intervention was required to overturn his judicial pronouncement. These brief accounts of individuals also provide a glimpse of the growing royal favor and influence reeves apparently began to enjoy, particularly during the reign of Æthelred II. By the tenth and eleventh centuries, the reeve as a royal agent was an important mechanism in the functioning of the Anglo-Saxon state. Arguably it was through his efforts that royal power was made felt in the localities, and that the influence of the powerful ealdormen could be tempered. Of course, the sources make it plain that this was not without pitfalls. Whether they always enforced royal will as the king envisaged is unlikely: the plethora of moralizing discourse condemning reeves as corrupt suggests that kings in some cases had trouble impressing their desires upon their men. Charter evidence such as that found in S 883 points toward the king using land grants to try to bind these officials to him. The law codes too, bear strong indicators that kings sought to “manage” these men and their power over them, with clauses establishing the reeve as a tool to be utilized by the king in his governance of the kingdom. This research into the nature of the reeve’s work as a royal agent carries another significant implication. It arguably both tests and contributes to the maximal model for the operation of the late Anglo-Saxon state. The reeve was one of those key officials on the ground in the localities who made it possible for royal power and justice to permeate the kingdom.

In addition to the reeve’s growing visibility on the political stage in late Anglo-Saxon England, the charters reveal him as gaining in social status – not only did some reeves acquire land in compensation for their services, but the increasing wealth and accessibility to cash in late Anglo-Saxon England enabled some individuals to move up the social ranks. Arguably, the reeve’s role as a royal agent positioned him to take advantage of this opening of the lower aristocracy. An examination of the reeve’s work on late Anglo-Saxon estates demonstrates that although reeves were becoming ever more important in terms of the state, private, lordly reeves were concurrently gaining in visibility. These men became increasingly more necessary as estate managers in the wake of the
tenth-century estate fragmentation and the need of aristocrats to squeeze more out of smaller holdings. Estate reeves emerge as pivotal figures in the running of an estate and the detailed management of all of its people and components. These men too could rise in status and fortune as a result of their service. Chapter Three’s examination of the private estate reeve throws some much-needed light upon the workings of the late Anglo-Saxon estate, and the responsibilities of the reeve on that estate.

This study of the reeve culminates with an analysis of the reeve as he appears in the homiletic discourse of the tenth and eleventh centuries. The plethora of negative and unappealing references to and about the reeve in these texts supports our picture of the reeve as growing in visibility and prominence in late Anglo-Saxon England. Tracts on status also emphasize the building anxiety surrounding the opening of the lower ranks of the aristocracy. Amidst all of this, one voice emerges with great passion, determined not only to restore society to its proper ranks and ordering, but also to build a holy Christian kingdom in England, in order to pull the state and its people from the turmoil of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. This was the distinctive voice of Archbishop Wulfstan, and it has been shown that his attempt to restore English society to God’s favor was multifaceted, involving the drafting and redrafting of law codes, status tracts, homilies and of course his Institutes of Polity. One innovative concept that materialized was a new role for a familiar official. Wulfstan uniquely envisaged the reeve as an official who bore the responsibility for a secular “pastoral care” of sorts, referring to the reeve as a “shepherd” (hyrdas) – a term which is only otherwise applied to bishops and priests, and certainly not to any other secular officials. The reeve as a royal official was ideally placed to help realize Wulfstan’s vision: he was based amongst the people throughout the localities, responsible for the enactment of justice, the protection of the church and preservation of its rights, and perhaps most importantly, shaped by the law codes and Wulfstan’s prose as an agent of the king, subject to his will (in theory, at least) in a way other officials, such as ealdormen, were not. Therefore, a three-dimensional picture of the reeve becomes clear, in which he was not only an
essential royal official, but he was also an integral element in Archbishop Wulfstan's impassioned attempt to reform (and thus to his mind, save) English society and bring it under the aegis of a good, holy, Christian kingdom.
## Appendix

### Table 1. References to the Reeve in Late Anglo-Saxon Old English Prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies**  
First Series:  
- *Assumptio Sancti Iohannis Apostoli* (Assumption of St John) | The First Series of the Catholic Homilies was Ælfric’s earliest work, sent to Sigeric ca. 994.  
A = ca. 1st half of 990  
D = one hand beginning 11th c.  
E = mainly 4 hands of first half 11th c.  
K = end of 10th c. or beginning 11th c.  
L = ca. 2nd half 12th c.  
O = end 11th c./beginning 12th c.  
Q = 1st half 11th c.  
| **Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies**  
First Series:  
- *Dominica IIII post Pentecosten* (Fourth Sunday After Pentecost) | The First Series of the Catholic Homilies was Ælfric’s earliest work, sent to Sigeric ca. 994.  
B = 2nd half 12th c.  
C = 1st half 12th c.  
D = one hand beginning 11th c.  
(“let us say the holy gospel as the reeve and sinful men approach the saint.”) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th c. H = end 10th c./beginning 11th c. and 1st half 11th c. K = end of 10th c. or beginning 11th c. Q = 1st half 11th c. R = 1st half 11th c. U = mid-11th c.</td>
<td>University Library Gg.3.28 (&quot;K&quot;); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 188 (&quot;Q&quot;); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 &amp; 162 (&quot;R&quot;); Cambridge, Trinity College B.15.34 (&quot;U&quot;).</td>
<td>ANON.PSAVG., Sermon 196, 197, 199; Beda, Hom. 2.19 &amp; 2.20; Greg.Mag., Hom.euang. 20 &amp; 7; Haymo Hom.sanct. 2; HRAB.MAVR. Hom.fest.. 102. (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici)</td>
<td>gerefan – referred to as being under the king’s command, along with the ealdormen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies**

First Series:

- **Nativitas Sancti Iohannis Baptistae (John the Baptist)**

  The First Series of the Catholic Homilies was Ælfric’s earliest work, sent to Sigeric ca. 994.

  A = ca. 1st half of 990
  B = 2nd half 12th c.
  C = 1st half 12th c.
  D = one hand beginning 11th c.
  E = mainly 4 hands of first half 11th c.
  H = end 10th c./beginning 11th c. and 1st half 11th c. K = end of 10th c. or beginning 11th c. Q = 1st half 11th c. S = 1st half 12th c. T = 3rd quarter 11th c. | British Library, Royal 7 c. xii ("A"); Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 ("B"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303 ("C"); Bodleian Library, Bodley 342 ("D"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 ("E"); British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. v ("H"); Cambridge, University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 188 ("Q"); Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 ("S"); Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("T"). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ælfric's Catholic Homilies First Series:  
• Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli (Peter and Paul) | The First Series of the Catholic Homilies was Ælfric's earliest work, sent to Sigeric ca. 994.  
A = ca. 1st half of 990  
B = 2nd half 12th c.  
C = 1st half 12th c.  
D = one hand beginning 11th c.  
E = mainly 4 hands of first half 11th c.  
K = end of 10th c. or beginning 11th c.  
L = ca. 2nd half 12th c.  
Q = 1st half 11th c.  
T = 3rd quarter 11th c. | British Library, Royal 7 c. xii ("A"); Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 ("B"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303 ("C"); Bodleian Library, Bodley 342 ("D"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 ("E"); Cambridge, University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"); Cambridge, University Library li.1.33 ("L"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 188 ("Q"); Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("T"). | Anon., Resc.Marc. (BHL 6060); Anon., Pass.Pet.Paul. (BHL 6657); Beda Hom. 1.20; Heir Avt., Hom.circ., 2.23; Heir, Vir.inlustr. and Isid, Ort.ob.patr. (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici) | heahgerefan – the high reeve’s wife believed in God; Nero bade his high reeve Agrippa to behead Paul and to put Peter on the cross. |
| Ælfric's Catholic Homilies First Series:  
• Passio Sancti Laurentii (Saint Laurence) | The First Series of the Catholic Homilies was Ælfric’s earliest work, sent to Sigeric ca. 994.  
A = ca. 1st half of 990  
B = 2nd half 12th c.  
C = 1st half 12th c.  
E = mainly 4 hands of first half 11th c.  
K = end of 10th c. or beginning 11th c. | British Library, Royal 7 c. xii ("A"); Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 ("B"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303 ("C"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 ("E"); Cambridge, University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"); Cambridge, University Library li.1.33 ("L"); Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("T"). | Anon., Pass.Poloc.et.al. (BHL 6884). (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici) | tungerefa, heahgerefa, gerefa – the reeve features prominently here (in capacity as interrogator & persecutor of the saint (tool of the emperor). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ælfric's Catholic Homilies Second Series:  
• In Aepiphania Domini (Epiphany) | The Second Series of Catholic Homilies dates to ca. 995 (sent to Sigeric in that year).  
B = 2nd half 12th c.  
K = end of 10th/beginning 11th c.  
R = 1st half 11th c. | British Library, Bodley 343 ("B"); Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 ("R"). | AMALAR.METT., Eccl.offic.; ANON Brev.Ps.; ANON.PS.AVG. Serm. 197; AVG. Tract.euang.Ioan.; BEDA Hom. 1.12; GREG.MAG. Hom.euang. 20 & 30; HAYMO Hom.temp. 108; THEODVLF Ord.bapt. (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici) | geréfan – Pa comon eac to his fulluhte. Geréfan. and. tolleras. ("each come to his baptism. Reeves and taxcollectors.") |
| Ælfric's Catholic Homilies Second Series:  
• Dominica II post Aepiphania Domini (Second Sunday After Epiphany) | The Second Series of Catholic Homilies dates to ca. 995 (sent to Sigeric in that year).  
B = 2nd half 12th c.  
E = 1st half 11th c.  
F = beginning 11th c.  
K = end of 10th/beginning 11th c.  
M = mid-11th c.  
N = 1st half 12th c. | British Library, Bodley 343 ("B"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 ("F"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162 ("F"); Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"); Cambridge University Library li.4.6 ("M"); British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix ("N"). | AVG. Catech.rud.; BEDA Hom. 1.14; HAYMO Hom.temp. 18; SMARAGD. Exp.Lib.comitis (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici). | weorcgerefan (lit. "overseer of work" ... possibly comes from Latin "praefecti operum"). only appears 3x in the OE corpus, in two different texts. This and The Old English Version of the Heptateuch (chapter 5/verses 10 & 13). |
| Ælfric's Catholic Homilies Second Series:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D = beginning 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
E = 1<sup>st</sup> half 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
K = end of 10<sup>th</sup>/beginning 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
L = ca. 2<sup>nd</sup> half 12<sup>th</sup> c.  
T = 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 11<sup>th</sup> c. | Library Gg.3.28 ("K");  
Cambridge, University Library li.1.33 ("L");  
Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("T"). | | |  

**Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies**  
Second Series:  
- *Apostolorum Philippi et Iacobi (Philip and James)*  

The Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* dates to ca. 995 (sent to Sigeric in that year).  

D = beginning 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
E = 1<sup>st</sup> half 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
K = end of 10<sup>th</sup>/beginning 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
L = ca. 2<sup>nd</sup> half 12<sup>th</sup> c.  
T = 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 11<sup>th</sup> c.  

Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 ("D");  
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 ("E");  
Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28 ("K");  
Cambridge, University Library li.1.33 ("L");  
Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("T").  

ANON Pass.Phil. (BHL 6814);  
HAYMO Hist.Sacr.Epit.;  
RVF. Hist.eccl. (BHL 4093).  
(Fontes Anglo-Saxonici)  

**Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies**  
Second Series:  
- *Natale Sancti Mathei  
Apostoli et Evangelistae Passio Eiusdem (Matthew)*  

The Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* dates to ca. 995 (sent to Sigeric in that year).  

B = 2<sup>nd</sup> half 12<sup>th</sup> c.  
G = mid-12<sup>th</sup> c.  
K = end of 10<sup>th</sup>/beginning 11<sup>th</sup> c.  
L = ca. 2<sup>nd</sup> half 12<sup>th</sup> c.  

British Library, Bodley 343 ("B");  
British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv ("G");  
Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28 ("K");  
Cambridge, University Library li.1.33 ("L").  

ANON Pass.Math. (BHL 5690);  
BEDA Hom. 1.21.  
(Fontes Anglo-Saxonici).  

gerefan - “the dragon killed two reeves in the same shire...”  
gerefan - “then came many reeves and sinful men...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*  
Second Series:  
  • *Depositio Sancti Martini Episcopi* (Martin) | The Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* dates to ca. 995 (sent to Sigeric in that year).  
E = 1st half 11th c.  
K = end of 10th/beginning 11th c. | Corpus Christi College 198 ("E"); Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28 ("K"). | ALCVIN Vit.Mart. (BHL 5625); GREG.TVRON. Hist.Franc. (BHL 5619-20); SVLP.SEV. Dial. (BHL 5615-6); SVLP.SEV. Epist.tert.Bas. (BHL 5613); SVLP.SEV. Vit.Mart. (BHL 5610). (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici). | *geref*an - *he [the saint] rescued some reeve's daughter from a fever...* |
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
  • St Thomas | Ælfric's work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c. | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J"). | Anonymous Pass.Thom (BHL 8136) and AVG's Serm.Dom.monte. Fontes Anglo-Saxonici. | The *gerefa* in this life was sent by the king of India to the city of Caesarea (Syria) in search of workmen to build a palace in the Roman fashion. Christ spoke to the *gerefa* and Thomas ends up going back to India with him. |
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
  • Sts Julian & Basilissa | Ælfric's work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c.  
O = 11th c.  
N = late 11th c. | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J") and fragments in damaged British Library, Cotton Otho B. x ("O"). | Ælfric used the version of the *passio: Biblioteca Hagiographica Latina* 4532. A text of this version (ed. Upchurch) used in comparison with the OE is in British Library, Cotton Nero E.i ("N"). The legends were originally written between the 5th and 7th c. | *Gerefa* [line 241] is the OE term Ælfric chose for an official carrying out judicial pronouncements (on the side of wrong). The Latin term used to describe the corresponding official in the *passio* is *assessor*, or "aide". |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
• *St Cecilia & St Valerian* | Ælfric’s work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c.  
V = mid-11th c.  
H = mid-12th c. | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J") and fragments in damaged British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xvi ("V"). | Upchurch regards Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS P.VII.6 ("H"), as the closest extant work to the Latin version that Ælfric worked from. The legends were originally written between the 5th and 7th c. | Here, Ælfric uses *heahgerefa* to describe the Latin *prefectus*. This OE *life* places the reeve in the central role as a "cruel executioner", who actively seeks out Christians to martyr. |
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
• *St Chrysanthus & St Daria* | Ælfric’s work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c.  
P = 10th c. | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J")—the only copy of the legend. | Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin MS 13764 ("P"). This text is not Ælfric's exact source but it is contemporary with him & "it also preserves a set of texts that suggest an exemplar from a site with a special interest in Chrysanthus and Daria. The legends were originally written between the 5th and 7th c. | Here, Ælfric uses *heahgerefa* to describe the Latin *prefectus*. The *heahgerefa* here was identified by name (and thus accorded a larger role than in Julian & Basilissa), made responsible by the emperor for torturing the saints. |
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
• *St Eugenia* | Ælfric’s work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c. | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J"). | Anonymous *passio* of St Eugenia (BHL 2666). Also author BS/title Is. (*Fontes db*). | Again, gerefa is employed with a negative connotation, to denote an official who dispenses justice. |
| Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*  
• *St Sebastian* | Ælfric’s work on the *Lives of the Saints* dates to ca. the 990s.  
J = early 11th c.  
C = early and | British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii ("J") and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198 ("C") and British Library, Anonymous *passio* of St Sebastian (BHL 7543). | *gerefa* is employed here with a negative connotation, to denote an official who dispenses justice. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ælfric's Lives of the Saints</strong> • <em>St Agnes</em></td>
<td>mid-11th c. V = mid-11th c.</td>
<td>Cotton Vitellius D.xvii (&quot;V&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td>However, the main reeve in the text, Chromatius, eventually converted to Christianity when he was struck with a serious illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric’s work on the <em>Lives of the Saints</em> dates to ca. the 990s.</td>
<td>British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii (&quot;J&quot;) and fragments in British Library, Cotton Otho B. x (&quot;O&quot;).</td>
<td>Anonymous <em>passio of St Agnes</em> (BHL 156) and anonymous <em>Pass.Gallic.Ioh.Paul</em> (BHL 3236, 3238). (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Again, the official in charge of the city and persecuting Christians was a <em>gerefa</em>. In this case, the <em>gerefa</em> (Sempronius) had a son who wanted to marry Agnes; she refused (bride of Christ) and so Sempronius questioned her &amp; berated her … significantly, here he is also referenced as a <em>dema</em> and as sitting in a <em>dom-setl</em> (lit. judgment seat). He is also referenced as a <em>sceandlica dema</em> (shameful judge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ælfric's Lives of the Saints</strong> • <em>Forty Soldiers</em></td>
<td>Ælfric’s work on the <em>Lives of the Saints</em> dates to ca. the 990s.</td>
<td>British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii (&quot;J&quot;).</td>
<td>Anonymous <em>Pass.quad.Seb.</em> (BHL 7539). <em>Fontes Anglo-Saxonici.</em></td>
<td>The reeve and the judge together persecute the Christians; however, the reeve is initially (and more frequently) referred to as <em>heretoga</em> (lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric’s <em>Lives of the Saints</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii (“J”)</td>
<td>Pass.Dion., author HILDVIN (BHL 2175). Fontes Anglo-Saxonici.</td>
<td>Gerefa is a man named Sisinnius, who was sent by Caesar to the kingdom of the Franks to kill Denis. Ælfric refers to him here as dema and vælthreowadema (lit. bloodthirsty, cruel judge), line 252. Dema and gerefa seem to be used fairly interchangeably here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Passion of St Denis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J = early 11th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Dominica X Post Pentecosten</em></td>
<td>ca. 992 – 998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U = mid-11th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homilies of Ælfric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (“T”).</td>
<td>ANON Act.Alex.pap (BHL 266); ANON Mart.Alex.pap. (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici).</td>
<td>gerefa and heahgerefa – the reeve Hermes was converted by Pope Alexander. Hermes received baptism immediately and was subsequently martyred (his saint’s day is August 28th).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Sanctorum Alexandri, Eventii, et Theodoli: Pars Prima, Addition to the Catholic Homilies II no. 20: De Populo Israel</em></td>
<td>ca. 992 – 998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T = 3rd quarter 11th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homilies of Ælfric</td>
<td>ca. 992 – 998</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (“B”); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303 (“C”); Bodleian Library, Bodley 342 (“D”); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 (“E”); University Library, Cambridge Gg.3.28 (“K”).</td>
<td>EPIPH.(PS.CASSIOD.) Hist.ecl.trip.; RVF. Hist.ecl. <em>(Fontes Anglo-Saxonici).</em></td>
<td>Caesar’s men were mistreated in Thesalonica; the reeve in this text was killed by stones cast at him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric’s Grammatik und Glossar</td>
<td>ca. 998</td>
<td>Extant in numerous MSS, some of which are: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 449 (“C”); British Museum, Cotton Faustina A. x (“F”); British Museum, Harley 107 (“H”); British Museum Cotton Julius A. ii (“J”); Oxford, St John’s College 154 (“O”); Cambridge, University Library Hh.1.10 (“U”); Worcester Cathedral F.174 (“W”).</td>
<td>Ælfric’s translation of the Latin grammar into English; first vernacular Latin grammar in medieval Europe.</td>
<td>Ælfric lists Latin words equivalent to <em>portgerefa</em> Gyf se nama byð gefeged of NOMINATIVO CASV and of oðrum gebigedum case, þonne bið se nama decliniendlic on ða healfe, þe se NOMINATIVVS byð: hic praefectus urbis ōððe burhealdor, huius &lt;praefecti&gt; urbis, huiic praefecto urbis, hunc praefectum urbis, o praefecte urbis, ab hoc praefecto urbis ET CETERA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vercelli Homilies</td>
<td>mid-10th c.</td>
<td>Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII, The</td>
<td>Scragg describes the Vercelli homilies (as they appear in A) as Pontius Pilate is referenced as a reeve in Hom. I, and Hom. V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vercelli Homily V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vercelli Book (&quot;A&quot;).</td>
<td>&quot;...a uniform collection of pious reading, although one for which no exact parallel has been found either in English or Latin&quot; (xix).</td>
<td>features a reeve of Syria named Cyrinus. Both reeves in positions as judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Blickling Manuscript</td>
<td>Gatch refers to V as “conventional in content”. It does not occur elsewhere in OE and its sources are essentially unknown. One possible source for V is a monastic test, the <em>Admonitio ad filium Spiritualem</em> of pseudo-Basil. Scragg states that V is unique except for a few lines at the end, which appear also in Napier XXIX (in MSS Bodleian Library, Junius 121 and Hatton 113 &amp; 114). Both XIII and XV are more &quot;narrative&quot; type sources, as opposed to the &quot;sermon&quot; style of V. Scragg states that XV is among the eight items in the Blickling MS that are unique. Blickling XIII is a translation of a combination of the Latin <em>Transitus C</em> and <em>D</em>, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Blickling Homilies

• Homily V: *Dominica V in Quadragesima*
• Homily XIII: *Sanctaja Maria Mater Domini nostri Iesu Christi*
• Homily XV: *Spel Be Petrus and Paulus*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Old English Lives of St Margaret</td>
<td>Christ Church, Canterbury, mid 11th c. and Rochester, 1st half of 12th c.</td>
<td>London, BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303</td>
<td><em>Transitus</em> B2, resulting in the description of “the spiritual and corporal assumption of the Virgin…” (Clayton 232). Clayton argues that the OE translator was “incompetent” and a poor Latinist, causing XIII to often be confusing, “with Biblical allusions unrecognized…” (232/3).</td>
<td>Olibrius, the persecutor of Margaret (and many other Christians), is identified in OE as <em>gerefa</em>. The Latin <em>Passio</em> uses <em>prefectus</em> to describe him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old English Life of St Nicholas</td>
<td>MS: Rochester, 1st half of 12th c. Earliest dating for the OE translation is the 11th c.</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303</td>
<td><em>Passio Sancte Margaretae Martyris Quod Est XIII. Kalendas Augusti</em></td>
<td><em>burh gerefan</em> described as men who are “always eager to kill”. The Latin has <em>huius insignes Urbis</em> (distinguished men of the city), though the slander on their character is still present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old English Apollonius of Tyre</td>
<td>MS dates to the 11th century</td>
<td>CCCC 201 Corruptions in OE translation from Latin… derivations due to (sloppy?) translation, yet Goolden</td>
<td><em>Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri</em> (ca. 3rd century translation of an original Greek text). pp ix – xi)</td>
<td>Reeve (<em>gerefa</em>) instructed to commit murder… the corresponding Latin = <em>villicus</em> (farm overseer; estate manager; grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>args</strong> that the OE is relatively close to the Latin (xvii – xx). <strong>However</strong>, he notes that: “translator skillful in adapting the external things of the classical world to an English climate” (xxiv – xxv).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of imperial/public servant). pp 40 – 41.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The Old English version of the Heptateuch**  
- **Genesis**  
- **Exodus** | **MS date:**  
Ker: s. x/xi  
Dumville: ca. 997 – ca. 1016 | British Museum, Cotton, Claudius B. iv (“B”); Bodleian, Laud Misc. 509 (“L”); Cambridge University Library, i. i. 33 (“C”); British Museum, Cotton, Otho B. 10 (“O”); and “fragments of Exodus given by Nicholson to Gibson (“N”). | The Latin text of the Vulgate | **Reeve** appears in **Genesis** and **Exodus** in the OE Heptateuch. The OE used to denote the reeve is as follows: gerefa(n) and weorcgerefan ("overseer of work"). The Latin used to describe the reeve in the Vulgate varies: praefecti, praefectus operum, dispensatore (steward, attendant), praepositos, seruum and seruum seniorem. |
| **Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle** | **MS date:**  
Ker: s. x/xi  
Dumville: ca. 997 – ca. 1016 | **Beowulf**-manuscript  
(London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv) | Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem | gerefan referenced as those who were left in charge of conquered eastern nations. The Latin has praeposuimus (verb seems to imply the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napier Homilies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>praepositus...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 30</td>
<td>A = 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 421 (&quot;A&quot;);</td>
<td>Naper 30 is an anonymous homily &amp; extant in &quot;E&quot;, which is the companion to &quot;F&quot; and from Worcester; majority of texts in &quot;E&quot; are Wulfstan &amp; Ælfric homilies.</td>
<td>30: Hwaer syndon þa ealdormen and ða ofermodigan and ða rican gerefan, þe þa laga and bebodu gesetton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 40</td>
<td>B = 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 (&quot;C&quot;); Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (&quot;F&quot;); Bodleian Library Hatton 113 (&quot;E&quot;); Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (&quot;G&quot;); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190 (&quot;W&quot;).</td>
<td>Naper 40 is &quot;Wulfstanized&quot; but not a Wulfstan homily; focused on Day of Judgment and based on Vercelli Homily 2; extant in &quot;F&quot;.</td>
<td>40: and unrihtwise deman and gerefan and ealle þa wohgeornan woruldrican mid heora golde and seolfre and godwebbum and eallum ungestreounum þonne forweordæð.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 46</td>
<td>C = 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 419 (&quot;B&quot;);</td>
<td>Naper 46 not Wulfstan's work; extant in G, C &amp; W.</td>
<td>46: Be ðæm we magon niman bysne be wonuldþingum; se man, þe bringð medsecat þam gerefan, se geærendað bet, þonne se, þe nænne ne bringð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 47</td>
<td>D = 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half</td>
<td>Extant only in B. Contains abridged version of Sermo Lupi and a passage from Byrhtferth's <em>Enchiridion</em>. Most likely Wulfstan's work; either unfinished or &quot;a fragment of a longer text.&quot;</td>
<td>Naper 47 rubricated Larspel and sc riftboc &amp; extant only in B.</td>
<td>47: Ðus bið eall þæt &lt;pusendfeald&gt; getæl geendod and ealle þa deopan ping and þa bradnessa and þa langsunnnessa and þara cyninga rice and þara gerefen unriht and reaflac and deopnessa and woge domas and prættas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 50</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. (same hand as &quot;A&quot;)</td>
<td>The copy of Napier 30 in Bodleian Library, Junius 121 and Hatton 133 &amp; 114 has the closest extracts from four Vercelli homilies as they are in the Vercelli Book.</td>
<td></td>
<td>50: And we cyðað eac eorlan and heretogan, deman and gerefena unriht and reaflac and deopnessa and woge domas and prættas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Napier 57</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. (Worcester? York?)</td>
<td>Extant only in &quot;A&quot;. Likely preached at the 1018 meeting of the witan in Oxford.</td>
<td></td>
<td>57: And we cyðað eac eorlan and heretogan, deman and gerefena unriht and reaflac and deopnessa and woge domas and prættas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 421 ("A"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 ("C"); Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 ("F"); Bodleian Library Hatton 113 ("E"); Bodleian Library, Junius 121 ("G"); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190 ("W").
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aelfric’s Pastoral Letter for Wulfsige                                 |      | Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg 3.28 (“Gg”); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 190 (“O”); Bodleian MS Junius 121 (“X”). | One of the main sources is a Carolingian capitulary of Aachen (ca. 802), called “lura quae sacerdotes debent habare”. “It forms the first chapters of the collection Excerptiones” | [103] ac ge lufiað woruldspræca 7 willað beon gerefan 7 forlætæ eowre cyrcan 7 þa gesettnyssa mid ealle (p217). “but you love
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Text</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Manuscript</strong></th>
<th><strong>Latin Source?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reference to the Reeve</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric's First Letter to Wulfstan</td>
<td>Latin letters ca. 1005 and OE letters ca. 1006. 0 = late 11th c. Oz = 2nd half 12th c. V = 2nd half 12th c. D = mid 11th c. (revised by Wulfstan)</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 190 (&quot;O&quot;); Bodleian MS Bodley 343 (&quot;Oz&quot;); British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (&quot;V&quot;); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201 (&quot;D&quot;).</td>
<td>Translation of a Latin letter from Ælfric to Wulfstan; however, the letters only survive in MSS assoc. w/Wulfstan and so may have been edited by him (pp256 – 257). Wulfstan revised this letter in his own style (p 258).</td>
<td>[185] Ne mot nan preost beon mangere oþ þere gerefa, ... (p 296) &quot;No priest may be a trader or a reeve...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old English Rogation-tide Homilies</td>
<td>MS dates to the mid-12th c. This is the only place where this homily survives.</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303</td>
<td>Possibly the Visio S. Pauli (Apocalypse of Paul)</td>
<td>Þonne is þær seofode stow seo is mid fyre onælæð; þær sceal ælc þara manna þe oðres mannas cotan bærmeð for ænigre frace and þe oðerne berepað rihtes gestreones, and ælc þæra manna þe gerefa byð and oðre men repeð and reafad; ælc byð deofles þegen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anonymous <em>Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers</em></td>
<td>No certain date for the OE translation; Magennis contends that &quot;...this work...&quot;</td>
<td>OE: British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii (&quot;J&quot;) and British Library, Cotton Otho B. x (&quot;O&quot;).</td>
<td>Earliest version of the legend is a 6th c. prose Syriac version. It has been argued that this was predated by a Greek</td>
<td>The reeve (portgerefa) occupies a central position in the legend. He is a city official who,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may be seen as fitting appropriately into the context of the flourishing of vernacular religious literature in late ASE, a period in which OE writings were stimulated by the Benedictine revival and the leadership of such figures as Æthelwold bishop of Winchester” (7).</td>
<td>Latin: British Library, Egerton 2797 (“E”), the Latin MS most closely related to the OE MS.</td>
<td>version, dating to the 5th c. (arguably about the time of the miracle itself). The earliest Greek MS dates to the 9th c. Gregory of Tours wrote a summary of the legend in his Liber in Gloria Martyrum. The longer Latin version (which the OE text is based upon) dates to ca. the 9th c. Latin version = the anonymous Latin Passio Septem Dormientium.</td>
<td>along with the bishop, is in charge of justice (and punishment). The corresponding Latin term used is <em>proconsul</em>, or “governor of a province”. It seems (and as Cubitt has argued) that the OE translator made a deliberate decision to employ the term <em>portgerefa</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old English Orosius</td>
<td>MSS date to the 10th c. and the 11th c. The text is likely late 9th c (ca. 889 – 899).</td>
<td>British Library, Additional 47967 (the Lauderdale or Tolleramach MS) 10th c., British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.i. mid-11th c., Bodleian, Eng. Hist. e.49 (30481- “Bodley fragment”), 11th c. and Vatican City Reg. Lat. 497, f.71 (“Vatican fragment”), 11th c.</td>
<td>Paulus Orosius, Historiarum adversum Paganos Libri septem, 2nd decade, 5th c.</td>
<td>Reeve mentioned in conjunction with <em>gafole</em> (tribute, tax, etc), Bately p153.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions*  
  - Matthew  
  - Mark  
  - Luke | CCCC 140 = ca. 1000  
  Bod. Lib. Hatton 38 = ca. mid 12th c.  
  Cotton Nero A.iv: Latin = ca. 700  
  OE gloss = ca. 950 | Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38; British Museum, Cotton Nero D.iv (Lindisfarne MS/The Durham Book).  
  Skeat attributes the OE translation of the Gospels to no later than the 9th c. | Some Latin terms used to denote reeve: *pro-curato* (p161), *nobilis decurio* (p131), *procuratoris* (p83), *uilicus/um* (p161), *decurio* (p227).  
  Sometimes the OE gloss of the Latin has a different term to translate the official than does the OE in CCCC 140.  
  In Mark and Luke the OE references Joseph of Arimathia as being the reeve of Arimathia (Latin = *decurio*). In Luke (23.50), he is called *gerefa göd wer 7 rihtwis* (Latin: *decurio uir bonus et iustus*), and subsequently asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. | |

| The Old English Bede (OEHE) | The OEHE dates to ca. end of the 9th or beginning of the 10th c. MSS:  
  B = s.xi  
  C = s.xemed.s.xi  
  Ca = s.xi  
  N = 1542  
  O = s.xi | Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (“B”); British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (“C”); Cambridge, University Library, Kk 3.18 (“Ca”);  
  OE translation made of Bede’s Latin *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*.  
  Rowley contends that the translation was not “word for word”: “Bede’s terms *gerefa* and *tungerefa* utilized. Often, but not always in a negative context. The corresponding Latin uses the terms *praefectus* and *uilicus*. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Text</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Manuscript</strong></th>
<th><strong>Latin Source?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reference to the Reeve</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan’s <em>Institutes of Polity</em> (II Polity)</td>
<td>It is argued that the text of <em>Institutes of Polity</em> was unfinished at the time of Wulfstan’s death in 1023. MSS: C = 1st half 11th c. (Worcester? York?) I = Wulfstan material dates to the 1st quarter of the 11th c. (annotations in his hand). (Worcester or York?) G = 11th c. (Worcester)</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201 (“C’); British Library, Cotton Nero A.i (“I’); Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (“G”).</td>
<td><em>Institutes of Polity</em> does not really fall into any specific genre. Much of Wulfstan’s work on moral discourse had in its background Carolingian sources, the legislation and Life of Alfred and the Old Testament, among others (discussed more fully in Ch. 4).</td>
<td>Reeves (gerefan) are addressed in: section 5: <em>be deodwitan</em>, section 9: <em>be eorlum</em> and section 10: <em>Be Gerefan</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anglo-Saxon <em>Chronicle</em> (MSS A, C, D, E)</td>
<td>MS A = late 9th; 10th &amp; 11th c. (Winchester?) MS C = mid-11th c. with some additions of the late 12th c. MS D = 2nd half 11th c. or early 12th c. MS E = copy of the ASC made</td>
<td>MS A = Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173 (the “Parker Manuscript”). MS C = British Museum, Cotton Tiberius B.i MS D = British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv MS E =</td>
<td>MS A: <em>gerefan</em> mentioned in 5 instances: involvement in battle, responsibility for towns, and their deaths. MS C: <em>gerefan</em> mentioned in 9 instances: the same as above for MS A and also: reeve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1121 &amp; continuing to 1154 (Peterborough)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Laud Misc 636</td>
<td></td>
<td>listed among “distinguished” men who died of plague (897), the murder of royal reeve Æfic (1002), and reference to Hugh, [French] reeve of Exeter—traitor? (1003). MS D = <em>gerefan</em> mentioned in 13 instances: the same references are in A &amp; C, but also: in 779 high reeves in Northumbria burned an ealdorman and the entry for 897 mentions Wulfric, the king’s “horse-thegn”, as also the “Welsh-reeve” <em>(Wealhgrega)</em>. This reference is the only extant one for this term. MS E: <em>gerefan</em> mentioned in 8 instances; since this is a later copy of the <em>ASC</em>, these references are all contained within the earlier MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“An Account of King Edgar’s Establishment of the Monasteries”</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Library, Cotton Faustina A.x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gif cinges gerefena hwylc gyltig bip wip Gode oþþe wip men, hwa is manna to þam ungescead and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The text is likely the work of Æthelwold; Whitelock proposes a date range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Latin Source?</td>
<td>Reference to the Reeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964/965 x 984, though she suggests it might best fit the period following Edgar’s death (142-143). MS: early 12th c.</td>
<td>British Museum, Additional 23211 (“A”); British Museum, Cotton Julius A.x (“B”); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 196 (“C”); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (“D”).</td>
<td>The “Pseudo-Jerome” (said to be based on an earlier work by Eusebius which is said to be lost); the lesser Roman Martyrology (Martyrologium Romanum parvum), composed ca. beginning of the 8th c.; and the work of Bede and Florus (subdeacon at Lyons in ca. 830).</td>
<td>ungewittig þæt he þæm cyninge his are ætrecce forþi þe his gerefa &lt;forwyrt&gt; bibe? (p154) (“If any of the king’s reeves is convicted of crime against God or men, what man is so foolish or senseless as to deprive the king of his property because his reeve is convicted?”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Old English Martyrology

Herzfeld states that the OE Martyrology is “one of the oldest monuments of the Mercian dialect.” Herzfeld surmises the date range: ca. 850 x 900. Clayton suggests the range of 2nd half of the 8th c. – end of the 9th c.

MSS: A = 2nd half 9th c.; B = 2nd half 10th c.; C = beginning 10th c.; D = end 11th c.

The reeve features in 28 of the martyrlogies, almost always as persecutor (and usually the torturer) of the Christian martyr. In three instances, the reeve converts to Christianity and was himself martyred. Finally, the Martyrology places St Matthew in the role of “tax collector” (gafoles moniend) and “village reeve” (wicgerefa) among the Jews before he became a follower of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Latin Source?</th>
<th>Reference to the Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Die Heiligen Englands</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 (&quot;C&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ŝunor hatte his gerefa, þe hig acwellan het, and he hig bebirigede under þæs cynges heahsete on Eastrege innon his healle, and hi þa wurdon þurh Godes naman wundorlice gecydde, swa þæt þurh Godes mihte se leoma astod ymbe midderniht up þurh þære healle hrof, swilce þar sunne scine; and þæt se cyningc him sifl geseah, and he wæs swiðe afyrht and he þa be þam wiste, þæt he hæfde þam hælende abolgen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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