

ABSTRACT

Lār and Doctrina: Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England, c. 990-c.1140

Natalie R. Randall

Director: Davide M. Zori, PhD

Pastoral figures' care of their people, particularly through preaching or other communication with those under their authority, shifted in language, focus, and scope through the late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman periods in three main stages, which this thesis analyzes through translation and study of four sermons and homilies by Aelfric of Eynsham and Wulfstan of York, a series of letters by Lanfranc of Bec, and a letter and a sermon by Osbert of Clare, as well as secondary research. It especially explores pastoral figures' treatment of "right learning," or "doctrine," through the decades, which is particularly salient as it intersects with questions of language and audience, source and priority, and view of previous generations. It finds that the replacement of bishops after the Norman Conquest marked a turning point in leading figures' vision of pastoral care, away from such reverence for vernacular exegetical and catechetical sermons and homilies with universal applicability and toward Latin writings on liturgical and ecclesiastic, or even political, concerns; yet a concern that their audience abide in "right learning" endured.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. Davide Zori, Baylor Interdisciplinary Core

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

LĀR AND DOCTRINA: PASTORAL CARE IN ANGLO-SAXON AND ANGLO-
NORMAN ENGLAND, C. 990-C. 1140

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Baylor University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Honors Program

By
Natalie R. Randall

Waco, Texas

May 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iii
Epigraph	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Aelfric and Wulfstan, 990-1023	7
Chapter 3: The Intervening Period, 1023-1070	29
Chapter 4: The Conquest and Beyond, 1070-1140	56
Chapter 5: Conclusion	78
Bibliography	81

I would like to thank my family, especially my parents, for nurturing and directing my curiosity and love of learning throughout life and for teaching me to seek the knowledge of God through the fear of the Lord. Many thanks as well to my fiancé Briar, who has encouraged and prayed for me throughout the completion of this project.

Since arriving at Baylor, many professors and friends have supported me as a student, a Christian, and an adult. I am especially grateful to Drs. Whitt, Hejduk, Sweet, E. Corey, D. Corey, Donnelly, and Gackle for their feedback, inspiration, and desire for my good that has been evident over the years. I would also like to thank the Honors College for giving me the opportunity to write this thesis, and Baylor University as a whole for providing me with the resources to attend and participate in the educational environment from which I have been so blessed.

My thesis advisor Dr. Davide Zori and readers Dr. Marsh and Dr. Nodes have shaped my interests and ambitions and enabled many of them to become realities, while also exposing me to new and exciting learning opportunities. Thank you all for being excellent teachers and scholars as well as mentors in my academic career.

And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?

And how shall they hear without a preacher?

So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

Romans 10:14b; 17

Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,

Nor standeth in the way of sinners,

Nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night.

Psalms 1:1-2

Oh, teach me, Lord, that I may teach

The precious things thou dost impart;

And wing my words, that they may reach

The hidden depths of many a heart.

Francis Riley Havergal

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Late Anglo-Saxon England's impressive corpus of pastoral literature is in all likelihood the result of a combination of supply and demand: a deep need for spiritual education and shepherding that certain figures observed and addressed, as well as an educational passion coming out of the monastic Benedictine Reform that entered England in the mid-tenth century. After the Norman Conquest of 1066, both the perceived needs of the people and the pastoral concerns of Church leaders changed, and the diversity of problems involved in combining traditions of worship and church-state relations only multiplied. This too is clear through the extant body of evidence. All the writings in this thesis, in fact, can be considered both as responses to a need – sometimes on multiple levels, if a writing is personally addressed to a recipient or certain congregation¹ as well as intended for a later wide reception – and as expressions of the figures' personal convictions on Christian life, doctrine, and holiness. Therefore, it is instructive to view this world of pastoral care not only from the perspective of the laypeople who may have felt themselves in need of care but also from that of the pastoral figures who had a heart to help them. These men, of course, knew that they themselves had no way to speak to every Christian in England. But their decisions to commit to parchment their writings expounding on Biblical passages and Christian teaching and behavior, often with the

¹ Although questions of patronage and funding are often also quite relevant to medieval writing and questions of audience, this thesis did not find significant evidence of those concerns within the specific homilies, sermons, and letters selected. More relevant seemed the general relations of the pastoral figures to the state at different times, so that question is more explored.

intent that through them other pastoral figures might spread sound doctrine to their flocks, have reverberated continually throughout the centuries since their deaths.²

This thesis will explore the pastoral writings of Aelfric of Eynsham, Wulfstan of York, Lanfranc of Bec, and Osbert of Clare as exempla of the attitudes of the Anglo-Saxon and the Anglo-Norman church toward the spiritual needs of laypeople and clergy. These attitudes were often not expressed directly to the laypeople but addressed to other teachers. Homilies, sermons, and pastoral letters form the body of work this thesis will examine. A sermon in this thesis may be defined from Beverly Kienzle's monumental, directed work *The Sermon*: "An oral discourse, spoken in the voice of a preacher who addresses an audience to instruct and exhort them on a topic concerned with faith and morals and based on a sacred text."³ A homily may be defined from J.E. Cross's essay on "Vernacular Sermons in Old English" in the same work: "A progressive explanation (exegesis) of the gospel-reading (lection, pericope) for a feast-day within the liturgical year."⁴ It seems that the homily is a kind of sub-type of the sermon: specifically concerned with explicating in detail a Biblical text; not all sermons may be homilies, but all homilies fall under Kienzle's definition of sermons.

² A distinction between preaching and teaching as the medieval church might have seen it is addressed by B. M. Kienzle in her "Introduction" to her edited volume *The Sermon*, p. 155. Following Francois Boyon and referencing C.H. Dodd, she suggests that "teaching" may only refer to ethical instruction while "preaching" is 'a public proclamation of Christianity to the non-Christian world.' As the sermons, homilies, and letters discussed here all are addressed to Christians, such a distinction seems heavily obscured in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman writings and thus will not be applicable here; "preaching" and "teaching" will be used essentially synonymously.

³ Beverly Kienzle, "Introduction," in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Kienzle, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 155.

⁴ J.E. Cross, "Vernacular Sermons in Old English," in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 562.

Pastoral letters may be defined as communication from a figure of more senior wisdom to a figure who is a suppliant for said wisdom in some way. Although the Biblical pastoral epistles could include the criterion of both sender and recipient being in active pastoral roles at the time of writing, this will not be necessary in observing the evolution of pastoral care in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England; it is sufficient that the recipient is in need of spiritual guidance – the same guidance that preachers from Aelfric to Osbert hoped to equip their audiences to provide and to provide personally. As J.E. Cross again notes, “the varied application of nomenclature...suggests that Anglo-Saxon authors were more concerned about the effectiveness of their writings for the faith than about echoing models or conforming to strict rules of genre;”⁵ while questions of sermon or homily genre may not have been uppermost in the minds of the original speakers or hearers, at least offering a differentiation here is helpful simply in order to preserve clarity.

Finally and most importantly, we may begin the definition of pastoral care following Peter Clarke and Sarah James in *Pastoral Care in Medieval England*: “the religious mission of the church to minister to the laity and provide for their spiritual welfare.”⁶ It is vital to note, however, that within this thesis pastoral care should be understood as also containing the aspect mentioned above: ministering to the laity through the medium of instructing their teachers. While this thesis does consider works that were directly addressed to laypeople, several sermons and homilies examined in Old English and two in Latin seem in fact to have been composed by clergymen to

⁵ Cross, 565.

⁶ Peter Clarke and Sarah James, “Introduction,” in *Pastoral Care in Medieval England*, eds. Peter Clarke and Sarah James (London: Routledge, 2019), 1.

clergymen. Latin, for several reasons, became the language of newly produced pastoral materials after the Conquest, but in the Anglo-Saxon period as well, despite the famously elevated position of the vernacular in the tenth and eleventh centuries and its importance to pastoral care, Joseph McGowan reminds readers that “the far better-known and better-studied vernacular literature of Anglo-Saxon England is only part of the picture (and constitutes a smaller surviving corpus).”⁷ The fact that the supermajority of pre-Conquest pastoral writings this thesis examines are in Old English is not meant to obscure this observation.

This thesis aims ultimately to demonstrate that the Church in England shifted its priorities and postures within pastoral care from c. 990 to c. 1140, especially following a theme of teaching – commonly *lare* in Old English and *doctrina* in Latin – as a deeply felt calling by preachers in all periods, but undergoing particularly strong pressures and societal changes in the turmoil surrounding the Norman Conquest. In the Anglo-Saxon period ‘right’ learning in a positive framing from the Bible very strongly existed in contrast to negative, ‘evil learning’ from the Devil. But in the Anglo-Norman period the presentation of negative learning as rhetorical contrast to true doctrine ceased in favor of stronger exhortation to holiness in and of itself. Furthermore, the role and responsibility of priests declined in importance over time in pastoral literature, while personal and emotional persuasion coupled with simple ecclesiastical power became more widely used in the newly important letter genre. Simple linguistic shift from predominantly Old English to predominantly Latin, at least at the highest levels, also demonstrate the

⁷ Joseph McGowan, “Anglo-Latin Literature,” in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, eds. Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 43.

narrowing and personalizing in scope during this period. These changes occur in context of the ebb and flow of royal power, to which pastoral figures over time were increasingly closely connected.

These figures were selected not in order to be the subjects of chapter-length biographies, nor in order to stand as islands of intention and mission, but precisely because they and their works were situated in a way that makes them and their output a window into priorities, struggles, and impulses of their society. Milton McC. Gatch, in *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England*, contests the extent of the Aelfric and Wulfstan's impact on subsequent generations, citing "the fate of the works of Aelfric as a coherent corpus...the evidence that Aelfric's effort to reform preaching never gained general acceptance...the fact that Aelfric and Wulfstan are without peers or even followers."⁸ "At the same time as one must acknowledge [Aelfric's] celebrity," Gatch states, "he must also observe that his standards, his principles, and his directives were not followed."⁹ While such statements may sound grim for the validity of taking Aelfric's or Wulfstan's works as partial exemplars for the priorities of the Anglo-Saxon church, they by no means invalidate the legacy of the preachers or their importance in the texture of preaching in Anglo-Saxon England. Aelfric's personal writings, and schematic output, despite the imperfections of their transmission, have in the end come down in a form memorably categorized by Peter Clemoes in his *Chronology*,¹⁰ while Wulfstan's materials

⁸ Milton McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 121.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Peter Clemoes, "The Chronology of Aelfric's Works," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of the History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickens*, ed. Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959), 212-247.

were so often adapted and reused by later generations that much of his output has become difficult to organize and, indeed, ascribe to him. Although Lanfranc of Bec and Osbert of Clare undisputedly are not the era-shaping figures that Aelfric and Wulfstan were in terms of their output of pastoral literature, they were enormously influential in shaping the Church of their lifetimes and afterwards and their concerns as pastoral figures affected many more than the individuals to whom they usually personally administered pastoral care through writing. The concerns that they portray on behalf of their people are illuminating in their own right as well as in the contrasts they display with earlier literature.

The texts used for the works of Aelfric are from the 1997 edition of Peter Clemoes and the 1967 edition of John Pope; those for all works of Wulfstan are from the 1953 edition of Dorothy Bethurum. Lanfranc's letters are from *The Letters of Lanfranc*, edited by Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson in 1979; Osbert's letter is from E.W. Williamson's 1929 edition of *The Letters of Osbert of Clare*; and Osbert's sermon is printed as an appendix in *De conceptione sancte Marie*, edited by H. Thurston and T. Slater in 1904.

CHAPTER 2

Aelfric and Wulfstan, 990-1023

Aelfric of Eynsham and Wulfstan of York, whose lives fell in the last half of the tenth century and the first quarter of the eleventh, expressed an important strain of concern for the people of England in their writings. Although other traditions of pastoral literature that will be explored in Chapter 3 existed during their lifetimes, their work has survived in a nearly complete corpus; such impressive valuation of their output speaks highly of their influence within and beyond the tenth and eleventh centuries. The works' discernable schemes of instruction, intentions for wide dissemination, and obvious importance to contemporary and following generations make Aelfric and Wulfstan excellent authors to give insight into the pre-Conquest world of preaching and pastoral care.

Through analysis of two homilies of Aelfric and two sermons of Wulfstan (one in both a Latin and an Old English version), this chapter will argue that the vision of pastoral care actuated by these figures of the 990s-1020s centered on basic Biblical and catechetical instruction meant for a wide audience. The works in this chapter also emphasize the role and responsibility of the priest to shepherd people, addressing priests more commonly in their pastoral and relational capacity than in their institutional capacity. To do this, the works often use a 'positive' approach to teaching (exposing their audience to sound doctrine) combined with a 'negative' approach (consistent reminders about incorrect doctrine, repeatedly referred to as 'the devil's *lare*'). These three aspects of pastoral care, within the writings examined here, also were not strongly tied to the political sphere, nor to the Church hierarchy, as would be the case for later figures.

Rather, Aelfric and Wulfstan responded to the deficit in learning and liturgical devotion that they perceived with almost universally applicable, Biblically rooted doctrine. This chapter begins with a survey of the contexts in which Aelfric and Wulfstan wrote, examining their major influences and linguistic abilities, before moving to examination of the chosen works, situating them not only as isolated output of these specific writers but hopefully as lenses through which certain pastoral concerns of the period at large will appear.

Both authors, but more directly Aelfric, interacted with the international monastic movement of the tenth and eleventh centuries known as the Benedictine Reform, which shaped their perception of the needs of English people and of how best to minister to them. St. Dunstan (924-88) introduced the Benedictine Rule to England, and one of his students, Aethelwold of Winchester, who himself compiled the influential *Regulis Concordia* (a work that attempted to standardize English liturgical practice), became Aelfric's teacher and mentor. The specifically Reform, newly vigorous, deeply pedagogical tradition of learning reached an apogee in Aelfric that would be manifest in his writing.¹

Wulfstan as a member of the secular rather than the monastic clergy did not most likely live out the devotion to the Benedictine Rule and the *Regulis Concordia* in his education or career as pervasively as Aelfric. Yet his ability to share in the purposes of the Reform is supported by, for example, Francesca Tinti's intertwined view of pastoral purpose in the period. In a 2015 article she challenges the "traditional assumption" that the Reform caused "a clear demarcation between secular and monastic communities in

¹ McGowan, 38.

late Anglo-Saxon England and, consequently, between, on one side, those who had pastoral responsibilities towards the laity and, on the other, those characterized by monastic seclusion.”² The differences between secular clergy such as Wulfstan and monastic clergy such as Aelfric, real as they were, do not seem to have arisen with relevance toward the Benedictine Reform and associated pastoral missions. Certainly, the writings of Wulfstan address many of the same concerns for the education of the people in the Creed, prayers, and Biblical doctrine which the first figures of the Reform sought to establish first of all in monks, whether or not their vocation lay in preaching.

Both Aelfric and Wulfstan wrote in Old English or Latin depending on their audience, genre, and general purpose. The vernacular in tenth- and eleventh-century England seems to have occupied a somewhat prestigious position even in relation to Latin. George Younge writes that before the Conquest, “Old English was being used with confidence in roles that were, in other parts of western Christendom, the exclusive preserve of Latin,” citing secular poetry, legal codes, biblical translation, and and chronicles as well as pastoral texts.³ Undoubtedly, however, Latin as the language of the Church and the most prestigious choice was not in danger. Besides Joseph McGowan’s statements about the centrality of Latin to pastoral care we have, as another example of Latin’s position in the process of learning, the statement beginning Aelfric’s *Colloquy*, in which students wish to speak Latin that they might not be *idiote* and speak *corrupte*.⁴

² Frnacesta Tinti, “Benedictine Reform and Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Early Medieval Europe* 23:2 (2015), 229-51. This quote from p. 229

³ George Younge, “Old English Literary Culture and the Circle of Saint Anselm,” In Margaret Healy-Varley, Giles Gasper, and George Younge, eds., *Anselm of Canterbury: Communities, Contemporaries and Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 174.

⁴ George Garmonsway, ed., *Aelfric’s Colloquy* (London: Methuen, 1939), 18.

While obviously neither neutral on the issue nor objective, given its purpose as a pedagogical text for boys in monastic schools, a few of the *Colloquy*'s characterizations are relevant. Latin – *speaking* Latin, not even writing – is described as both “proper” and “useful” (*recta* and *utilis*), while their incipient vernacular state is “old-womanly” and “disgraceful” (*anilis aut turpis*).⁵

Lack of ‘right learning’ in a wider sense than mere knowledge of Latin seems to have been a concern for both authors as well. Both Dorothy Bethurum and Joyce Tally Lionarons note the reservations of Wulfstan concerning the rudimentary education that not only laypeople but also their priests with the responsibility of providing all their teaching possessed.⁶ Indeed, his sermons even explicitly address and reproach priests who are unlearned, as does Aelfric’s pastoral letter for Wulfsig III.⁷ In this question it is important to remember that during the period, as Clare Lees writes, “The only institution for vernacular education and the only conception of its necessity occurs within the vernacular homilies themselves.”⁸ The picture we receive is thus necessarily incomplete since only one genre records it. Nevertheless, the very fact that vernacular homilies among all other Old English sources are systematically concerned for the spiritual well-being of laypeople is illustrative of the unique heart for teaching that the most prominent teachers possessed in the pre-Conquest period. In fact, every author examined in this thesis sees a need for spiritual ‘learning,’ but the nuances of the need vary.

⁵ Garmonsway, 18.

⁶ Bethurum 103, Lionarons 76.

⁷ D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C.N.L. Brooke, *Councils and Synods of the English Church, vol. I*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 196-226.

⁸ Clare Lees, *Tradition and Belief* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 110, qtd. in Lionarons, 76.

Aelfric and Wulfstan in their pastoral writings may, finally, have utilized sources of secular learning – rhetoric – as well as Biblical and patristic texts. They were almost certainly not using *Artes praedicandi*, or preaching handbooks, which had not emerged before c. 1100. Still less was the full flowering of Scholastic sermons out of the Continental university structure occurring, with stacked tripartite sections, dividing and subdividing, and heavy emphasis on Latin and rhetorical structure in the Roman heritage. Yet scholars have discerned a different potential connection between classical rhetoric and Anglo-Saxon pastoral literature, which Gabriele Knappe terms “rhetoric within grammar.”⁹ It seems that, even if Anglo-Saxon authors did not fully take up the mantle of rhetoric that would come to fruition in Anselm or Eadmer of Canterbury a century later, in Knappe’s words “they expressed themselves ‘rhetorically,’ that is, in a good and effective manner.”¹⁰ While not adhering perhaps as strictly as later authors to certain rules of composition, Aelfric and Wulfstan certainly employ many literary devices to build rhetorically compelling arguments regarding their audiences’ responsibility, history, and ultimate relation to God and to each other.

The works of Aelfric chosen for this chapter, the homilies for *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost* and *Second Sunday After Easter* (usually rubricated *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*.¹¹), stand out from his large corpus of pastoral literature because they contain particularly strong references to pastoral care, from which Aelfric’s concerns for exposition of both positive and negative teaching emerge particularly clearly. As part of

⁹ See Gabriele Knappe, “Classical Rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), 5-29.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹¹ This thesis will use the latter name.

Aelfric's corpus, however, which carries a remarkably consistent authorial vision throughout, both treat the Biblical passages on which they are based in similar ways to most of his works and both partake in his 'rhythmical prose' style. As homilies, these works provide the pericopes or assigned readings for the day, then supply exegesis on them in an effort to instruct both lay and clerical audiences. The 'rhythmical prose' style is one manifestation of this effort. It combines components of rhythm and alliteration from Old English poetry with prose vocabulary and word order in order to grip the attention of the listeners who, almost certainly used to such rhythm and word-play from the popular poetic mode of the period, would have heard such homilies read aloud during Mass.¹² Through their continuities with as well as through their distinctions from the rest of Aelfric's corpus, these two homilies exhibit Aelfric's passion for pastoral care as expressed through Biblical instruction.

Fifth Sunday After Pentecost, dating from the latest stage of Aelfric's compositional period and intended to 'fill in' one of the few days of the liturgical year that the Catholic Homilies had left vacant,¹³ communicates the importance of authoritative pastoral figures as well as the necessity for Christians to internalize and live out the counterintuitive Biblical messages from the pericope. Its exhortations apply to both clergy and laypeople and we may infer from its wide applicability that Aelfric intended it to be given to a wide audience. Although there is no extant explicit record (for either this homily or *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*) of the group to which he himself may have given this homily, it is reasonable to suppose that the monks of Eynsham, where he relocated in 1005, would

¹³ Peter Clemoes, *Aelfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 89; Clemoes 1959: 244.

have heard *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost* between c. 1006, when Clemoes's "Chronology of Aelfric's Works" places its composition on paleographical and internal evidence, and c. 1010, when Aelfric died.

Clemoes's "Introduction" to *Aelfric's Catholic Homilies* notes "an increasing emphasis on the exposition of pericopes" in Aelfric's later homilies, which tendency *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost* certainly bears out in order to explicate to its audience every countercultural phrase from Luke 6:36-42.¹⁴ "Be ye therefore merciful, just as your Father also is merciful,"¹⁵ the pericope begins, with the first phrase given by Aelfric in Latin, and the rest of the passage in Old English as he moves through its explanation.¹⁶ Verses 36-42 are in fact the culmination of sixteen verses (including the Beatitudes) encouraging Christians to, for example, "Bless them that curse you...of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again...love ye your enemies."¹⁷ Aelfric chose this pericope in particular to return to and exposit at this late stage of his career, seemingly burdened to communicate to his people that they needed to approach the world in ways that seem deeply counterintuitive to its values, despite the acknowledged inconveniences and struggles of living in a holy way. Indeed, immediately a contrast between the values under which his audience lived every day and the values contained in Luke 6 become clear. On one hand is a Biblical passage that is the source of the saying "turn the other

¹⁴ Clemoes 1997, 89. The Roman Lectionary has since omitted this reading from the list of the Gospel reading propers.

¹⁵ Luke 6:36. All English Biblical translations from Latin are taken from the Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition, unless otherwise noted.

¹⁶ "*Estote ergo misericordes, et reliqua.*" John Pope, *Homilies of Aelfric: A Supplementary Collection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 500.

¹⁷ Luke 6:28, 30, 35.

cheek.” On the other is a society wrestling in literature and life with a heroic age built on honor, boasts, secular loyalty, and swift and personal justice – a system of values, furthermore, with which Aelfric’s rhythmical prose is intentionally engaging, recalling subtly through every line.

From the beginning of the sermon, Aelfric’s desire for his non-Latinate audience to understand the positive teaching of the homily as it relates to both laymen and clergy is open. “These are strange words to half-learned (*sam-læred*) men;” he admits concerning the pericope; “now we will open to you [the] meaning thereto.”¹⁸ By explaining his own pastoral role, Aelfric bolsters his authority – or that of any subsequent preacher giving the homily – while laying out how and through whom his audience can ascend from “half-learned” men to figures who can understand the meaning of the Gospel fully. Questions of audience to a man who wrote his sermons in knowledge and hope that they would be used by diverse other pastoral figures, not only in a short-sighted view towards personal use, were paramount.

The figure of the ungodly man, who has accepted evil learning and sets an evil example, with whom both Aelfric and Wulfstan are concerned, also appears throughout as the personification of ‘negative’ teaching. The ungodly man “oppresses other men, and heaps heavy burdens on his back shamelessly, with cruelty ever...and does not want to consider how he oppresses the poor.”¹⁹ Oppression of the poor especially is a strong theme in both homilies in this chapter as a characteristic of a follower of the ‘devil’s

¹⁸ “*Her syndon syllice word samlæredun mannum; nu wylle we eow geopenian þæt andgit þærto.*” Pope, 498.

¹⁹ “[*opre*] men geswenceþ, and hefge byrbene him on bæc behypp, unforwandodlice, mid wælreownysse æfre...and nyle gepencan hu he geswnceþ þa earman.” Pope, 499.

lare.' Caution against being ungodly in this way was something that Aelfric felt men needed to hear often; it appears also in his pastoral letter to Wulfsige specifically directed at priests.²⁰ Yet not all authority is oppression, for Aelfric; he does not include people who exercise authority on account of righteousness and Godly fear in his condemnations.²¹ Only the person who does not accept right authority and instead usurps the fear of God in presuming to oppress others becomes a follower of evil learning.

As Aelfric sets oppressors in opposition to the meek and merciful Christians of the text, authority both within and without the church occupies his thought, but he firmly qualifies the prerequisites for a pastoral figure in particular to have authority that can be respected. After discussing the parable of the blind leading the blind, he interprets it with a reference toward pastoral care: "Now never is any teacher able, unless he has the learning, to correct the laymen toward the righteousness of God, nor is the vicious man at all able to forbid vices, nor to direct the foolish man, unless he first direct his own faults away from all errors."²² For Aelfric as for Aethelwold and Dunstan, leading laymen into holiness began with calling out and addressing the sin in the lives of the people who would care for them.

The last Biblical *exemplum* of the homily, out of many that Aelfric includes in order to enrich his explanation of Luke 6:36-42, exhibits the realistic, basically catechetical, but universally applicable response Aelfric expects from hearers. It is the

²⁰ "Pastoral Letter to Wulfsige," in Whitelock et. al., 261.

²¹ Pope, 500

²² "Nu ne mæg nan læreow, butan he þa lare hæbbe, þa læwedan men ge rihtlæcan to Godes rihtwisnysses, ne se leahterfulla man ne mæg leahtras forbeodan, ne þam dysigan styran, buton he store ærest." Pope, 503.

story of the woman caught in adultery, whose would-be executioners Jesus sends away by reminding of their own sin before turning to the woman herself. Aelfric addresses to his own audience the reminder that whoever “has no sin in him, he [should] cast the first stone onto her,” then begins his dismissal with the words that were originally spoken by Jesus to the woman: “Now go thou away, and thou henceforth do not sin.”²³ He preempts the hypocrisy of Christians whose tendency would be only to point out the sin in others’ lives – even if they themselves are in positions of authority – as well as commanding the penitent. *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, then, by using a tapestry of memorable yet countercultural Biblical teachings, strongly demonstrates Aelfric’s concern for the spiritual well-being of the laity, but does not forget to address its prerequisite, the spiritual well-being of their pastoral figures, through ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ exempla.

If possible, *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* relates even more closely to Aelfric’s vision for pastoral care by framing its lessons with the most famous Biblical and early Christian type of the Christian ‘pastoral’ figure and, indeed, its etymological source: that of the shepherd, *pastor*, or *hyrde*. In contrast to *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, this homily dates from Aelfric’s earliest period of composition; its earliest manuscript witness dates from, as lifelong Aelfric scholar Peter Clemoes asserts “with some confidence,” the first half of 990.²⁴ As part of his First Series of Catholic Homilies, which aimed to provide sermons for most services conducted throughout the liturgical year, it contains ideas to

²³ “*næfþ nane synne on him, awyrpe se ærest ænne stan on hy...Gang þu nu aweg, and þu heonan forþ ne synga.*” Pope, 507.

²⁴ Clemoes 1997, 65, 160-61; 1959, 244. This manuscript contains autograph alterations by Aelfric that make changes to which every other witness to the homily adheres, causing Clemoes to surmise that the extant manuscript is a copy of Aelfric’s original.

which Aelfric would return again and again through his career in other pastoral letters, homilies, and sermons to convey his idea of the ideal and the unideal pastoral figure.

This homily is extremely consonant with the theme on which this thesis endeavors to focus, for its text is John 10:11-12: “I am [the] good shepherd. The good shepherd gives his own life for his sheep; the hireling, that is not the right shepherd, he sees that the wolf comes and he forsakes the sheep and flees, and the wolf seizes some, and scatters others.”²⁵ Perhaps nowhere more clearly in the Gospels does pastoral concern for righteous and unrighteous teaching, well- and evilly intentioned as well as apathetic actors come into play. As Aelfric’s sermons are almost always meant to be read from the pulpit, he speaks to the pastoral figures themselves but also for laypeople, for them to have a clearly explained rubric to tell when their priest was a good shepherd in line with the example of Christ or a “hireling.”

While only quoting the beginning of the Latin text (“*ego sum pastor bonus, et reliqua*”),²⁶ Aelfric puts the entire pericope into Old English virtually word-for-word and then explains it all in only 254 lines, differently from how he approaches the longer text in *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, which translates phrase-by-phrase, expositing each phrase as it goes. He quickly draws concrete instructions for how the contemporary shepherd (/pastor/hyrde) should protect his sheep: “Then shall the shepherd, that is the bishop of other teacher, withstand the fierce wolf: with teaching and with prayers; with

²⁵ “*Ic eom god hyrde: Se goda hyrde sylþ his age lif for his sceapum; se hyra, se þe nys riht hyrde, he gesihþ þone wulf cumin, 7 he forlæt þa sceap 7 flihþ; 7 se wulf sum gelæcþ, 7 þa opre tostencþ.*” Clemoes 1997: 313. The direct Biblical translation (from the Vulgate) is “I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep. But the hireling, and he that is not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and flieth: and the wolf catcheth, and scattereth the sheep.”

²⁶ Clemoes 1997: 313.

teaching he shall teach them [so] that they know what the devil teaches to men for [their] destruction.”²⁷ This negative framing of theology and behavior – an urgent desire that people know what is antithetical to God’s teaching so that they can more fully appreciate and follow what concords with it – is apparent in both Aelfric, as noted for *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, and Wulfstan. It speaks to the depth these teachers hoped to see in their congregations, whether of clergymen or laypeople, of theological knowledge and ability to apply it to life.

Aelfric goes on to admonish teachers not to be prideful or complacent, but to uphold their roles and responsibilities well. First, he reminds them reminiscently of St. Paul that they are not effective or godly in their own right, but only insofar as “their goodness was from the head, that is Christ, that is our head.”²⁸ Aelfric here makes a strong theological statement concerning the source of goodness in and of itself that is not always the focus of the many sermons from the period that teach on the good shepherd.²⁹ As he moves to the human realm, critically, the hireling is not the man who actively attacks the sheep, but he who passively seeks his own good and allows them to fall: Aelfric explicitly says that the hireling in his own day “neither flees [with] body but with mind” (50). He then refers obliquely back to the *exemplum* of the woman caught in adultery from *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*; the hireling, he says, “flees because he sees unrighteousness, and keeps silent.” If a lesson of *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost* is to hold oneself and others continually accountable for sin or to endeavor painstakingly to live out

²⁷ “Ponne sceal se hyrde þæt is se bishop oððe oðer læow wiðstandan þam reðan wulfe, Mid lare ond mid gebedum, Mid lare he sceal him tæcan þæt hi cunnon hwæt deoful tæhð mannum to forwyrde.” Clemoes 1997, 314.

²⁸ “Heora godnys wæs of ðam heafde þæt is crist þæt is heora heafod.” Clemoes 1997, 315.

²⁹ Dr. Daniel Nodes, private communication, 26 April 2023.

counterintuitive teachings of mercy and humility, the contrast provided here is of a person, specifically in a pastoral role, who does not care to guide or teach his people but keeps silent for his own convenience.

A critical view and knowledge of human nature appears here as it does in *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*. After all Aelfric's exhortation to teachers to be like the good shepherd, his castigation of the hireling, and his reminder that God will call all people to account for their deeds, he turns back to those in the receiving role of a pastoral relationship, whether laypeople or more junior clergymen, and reminds them that their teachers will not always be perfect. "If a preacher teaches well," Aelfric writes, "and does evil, do just as he teaches, and not according to what he does."³⁰

A vision of pastoral care as directly exhortative to Biblical and catechetical knowledge, as encompassing the explanation and comparison of both right learning and evil learning, and as focused on the priest as administrator if not necessarily as powerful actor in the ecclesiastical hierarchy emerges from consideration of these two homilies of Aelfric of Eynsham. Although they are only a small sample from one writer, the widespread, nearly immediate copying of Aelfric's work and the relative faithfulness to his texts that Chapter 3 will examine in more detail speak to the resonance of Aelfric's message to ministers in monastic and secular roles throughout England, beginning in his own lifetime. It does seem fair to say that these writings (certainly Aelfric more generally) do provide the desired window into the concerns of pre-Conquest England regarding pastoral care, as the height of the Benedictine Reform swept over the land. Chapter 3 will follow Aelfric's impact on subsequent generations through examining the

³⁰ "Gif se lareow wel tæce one yfele bysnige, doð swa swa he tæhð ond na be ðam þe he bysnað." Clemoes 1997, 315.

manuscript transmission of his work, but in a broad sense, the themes discovered here would remain salient and relevant to pastoral figures of the 1020s-70s as well. The questions of direct and indirect audiences, both laypeople and clergy, considered here, are also significant, and will reappear throughout the thesis's analysis of other authors and their works.

Wulfstan of York (d. 1023) continued treating pastoral care provided through writing as a vehicle primarily to communicate fundamental Christian learning to priests and laypeople and with which to educate his people regarding the deceptions of the devil as well as the wisdom of God. However, his more secular context and varied output give his writings a less organized, less constantly Biblically referential, and slightly less universally applicable cast than those of Aelfric. His conception of audience becomes relevant especially because two of the works on which this chapter will focus are the Latin and the Old English versions of his *De Anticristo* (Concerning the Antichrist), which seem to address different audiences and reveal that he provided more explicit learned sources and fewer 'traditional' homiletic rhetorical devices to the Latinate clergy than to the mixed audience of the Old English version. The last work in this chapter is his sermon usually rubricated *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi* (The Sermons of the Bishop Wulf Begin), which offers salvation history with the clearest framing of learning as a series of contrasts between '*Godes lare*' and '*deofles lare*' in the thesis.

Wulfstan's resources and perspective from which to communicate his vision to his people differed at least slightly at the outset from Aelfric's, if only because of his background as a member of the secular clergy and politically connected man.³¹ Even if he

³¹ One of his favorite (and characteristic) paired, alliterative phrases is '*lage 7 lare*' (law and learning), as Bethurum, 285 states; although of course in pastoral literature it often refers to the Law of God

and Aelfric experienced the effects of the Benedictine Reform similarly, as posited above following Tinti, his position as a public figure and a writer of many genres influenced him to approach pastoral writing from a more variegated and less intertextually Scriptural perspective than Aelfric. His scheme of composition, furthermore, was not a lifelong project filling out the liturgical year but roughly fell into several categories of pastoral writing: eschatological, catechetical, historical, and sacramental texts, as scholars have defined them.³² This writing nearly kept pace with Aelfric in popularity and impact among subsequent generations, but while appreciating the two writers' similarities, we should also respect the differences in style and content that allowed their works to reach such a wide population in Anglo-Saxon England.

Although there is scholarly disagreement regarding whether the Latin *De Anticristo* was intended for public performance, its robust transmission evidence supports the view that it was meant for performance, in order to warn audiences about the dangers of many Antichrists in the world – perhaps even themselves.³³ Within the Latin text Wulfstan keeps his sources transparent, quoting freely from homilies by Gregory the Great and St. Augustine of Hippo as well as a work by Adso Dervensia and the Biblical books of Daniel and Revelation; it is this nature of compilation which has led some scholars to doubt its standalone homiletic worth.³⁴ Yet Wulfstan does not compile lazily,

and the teaching of the Gospel or other lessons, it is also a helpful way to remember Wulfstan's extra-pastoral concerns.

³² Joyce Tally Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2010), v.

³³ Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 283; Lionarons, 55.

³⁴ Lionarons, 55. The treatise of Adso was actually translated into Old English around this time and may have been actually commissioned by Wulfstan himself.

but shapes his sources with characteristic vigor into a clear picture of what an Antichrist in the flesh looks like and how he behaves. By beginning the sermon with the striking statement “Everyone who either does not live according to the uprightness of the Christian profession or teaches differently than is right, he is the Antichrist,”³⁵ he makes apparent that everyone, not only the future apocalyptic Antichrist, is accountable to God for their response to good teaching.

Wulfstan accompanies this warning with an exhortation to teachers in this sermon that they should inform people about the perilous times to come. The knowledge needed for such times, following the Biblical teaching on the subject, includes how to recognize the falseness of the Antichrist and his followers and how to be prepared for persecution, relating the narrative that Christians will be killed, a beast will arise from the abyss, and that there will be widespread persecution.³⁶ The following exhortation, however, is movingly framed as the duty of those who have access to privileged information to share it with those who do not: “Therefore it is necessary for each priest, or whoever read sacred scripture, to teach them who do not know the ruin of this danger.”³⁷ The acknowledgement of the linguistic (as much as the educational) diversity pastoral figures were navigating in the Anglo-Saxon period is less common in Wulfstan than in Aelfric, but reveals both figures’ sensitivity to the tensions of the period and their conviction that all should be taught. In common with Aelfric, Wulfstan preserves not only concern for those ignorant of God’s law and learning but also “unprepared faithful people” who may

³⁵ “*Omnis qui secundum cristiane professionis rectitudinem aut non vivit aut aliter docet quam oportet, Antichristus est.*” Bethurum, 113.

³⁶ Bethurum, 114.

³⁷ “*Necesse est ergo unicuique sacerdoti, vel quicumque sacram scripturam legunt, ut doceant eos qui huius periculi ruinam nesciunt.*” Bethurum, 114.

be found lacking in the end; faith for neither Aelfric nor Wulfstan should equate to complacency.³⁸ The sermon ends with the prayer that when the historical Antichrist arrives, “he may find the Christian people prepared, in which manner they may be strong to resist him and his followers through the faith of Christ, amen.”³⁹

Overall, the Latin *De Anticristo* appears as a text from the learned to the learned. Wulfstan’s liberal incorporation of revered sources, transitions from eschatological narration to practical application, and lack of traditional homiletic opening and closing speak to a different purpose from the overall picture of orthodox pastoral literature extant from before the Conquest – even other of his own output – that nevertheless stood the test of time, highly valued by people during and after his death for its usefulness to teach the teachers.

The Old English *De Anticristo*, more surely accepted to be given in performance by Wulfstan and following preachers, re-examines rather than translates the same message, surrounding it in Wulfstan’s engaging homiletical language and focusing less on the narrative of the apocalypse than on defining the everyday Antichrists and teaching Christians how to resist them.⁴⁰ Opening with Wulfstan’s most characteristic sermon introduction, “Dear people” (*Leofan men*), it makes its intent to be performed clear throughout, also including certain stylistic signatures of Wulfstan that made him

³⁸ “*Inparatos fideles populos*” Bethurum 114.

³⁹ “*paratam inueniat plebem cristianam, qualiter contra eum et eius sectatores resistere per fidem Cristi valeat, amen.*” Bethurum, 115.

⁴⁰ Wulfstan also composed four other longer Old English homilies dealing with the Antichrist: two probably written before these versions, and two after. Lionarons, 49.

popular⁴¹ such as alliterative pairs (*lage ond lare*) and repeated intensifiers (*swa mycel; swyþe georne*). His characterization of the Antichrist in Old English is in the same thought-provoking double nature, as a historical figure and as “God’s adversary, who forsakes God’s law and teaching.”⁴² Christians in this view, particularly priests, ought to warn and help others regarding the time of the Antichrist, and most importantly must “understand very earnestly that...for you the most need is for the preserving, that is, for Christianity rightly.”⁴³ The positive as well as the negative side of ‘right learning’ persists in *De Anticristo*, but reaches its height in the last sermon included in this chapter.

The sermon normally rubricated *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*, summarizes Biblical salvation history, continually pointing it toward both the fallenness of man and the light of Christ, and focuses much on the agency of the devil and his followers. It represents a rewriting of Aelfric’s *De Initio Creature* (not intended for a specific Sunday) and also draws significantly from a tract by Abbot Pirmin of Reichenau.⁴⁴ Addressed to the clergy in the introduction, which Lionarons notes is heavily sourced from Pirman, the sermon would be a fascinating text to analyze stylistically and rhetorically if only because it has several parallel texts by the same author; insights might appear concerning the differences in the audience’s need and the speaker’s vision of it via the text itself. Indeed, in this work particularly, the theme of teaching appears almost exclusively as

⁴¹ And easy to imitate; this is one of the factors that complicates Wulfstan’s pastoral and manuscript legacy. See Lionarons, 23-42.

⁴² “*Se biþ Godes wiðersaca þe Godes lage 7 lare forlæt...*” Bethurum, 116.

⁴³ “*Understandað swyðe georn...þæt eow mæst þearf is to gehealdenne, þæt is, to rihtne cristendom.*” Bethurum, 116.

⁴⁴ Bethurum, 293-94.

appropriated by the devil from God, rather than emphasized as the purview of God alone as in other works.

The introduction makes two notable references to the wide audience for this sermon. It calls preachers strongly to responsibility for the people in their care: “Dear men, we are deeply bidden that we earnestly exhort and should teach [so] that we bring each man to God and turn [him] from sins.”⁴⁵ If they do not, Wulfstan warns that every soul lost must be explained to God on doomsday. It also highlights the double audience of the work, referring to “listening” to his sermon, but “reading” the word of God, in an interesting departure from Aelfric’s zeal to expose as much as possible of the word of God in his sermons themselves.⁴⁶

The “devil’s teaching” (*deofles lare*) appears first as that which tempted Cain, but extends in pastoral significance as ‘negative’ teaching through the Bible and to many people of Wulfstan’s own day throughout the rest of the sermon. In keeping with Wulfstan’s darkened interpretation of Aelfric’s *De Initio Creature*, Cain is a Wulfstanian addition to *De initio creaturae*, while Wulfstan omits the perfect creation of the world, Adam’s obedience to God in naming the animals, and God’s mercy in clothing Adam and Eve in animal skins that Aelfric narrated.⁴⁷ The great flood is also due to the devil “seducing” men away from the truth until “they so greatly provoked God that he finally

⁴⁵ “*Leofan men, us is deope beboden þæt we geornlice mynegian ond læran sculan þæt manna gehwylc to Gode buge ond fram synnum gecyrre.*” Bethurum, 142.

⁴⁶ Bethurum, 143.

⁴⁷ Lionarons, 83.

let the flood come over all the earth.”⁴⁸ *Deofles lare* appears again in line 181, applied to the source of the Jewish people’s decision to reject Christ, and elsewhere.

Human desire for sin instead of the things of God and their free will in choosing it echoes throughout the pre-Christ narration of *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*.

Wulfstan, facing at least in York a fractious people under pressure from very tangible and morally charged threats of Danish invasion,⁴⁹ emphasizes still the decisions made in the secret hearts of Christians whether or not to obey God’s law, focusing here not only on the Babylonian invasions or the changes of kings or the prophecy that take up much of the Old Testament but also on the insidiousness of sin throughout one’s life, not only in one area of temptation and not fixed by one simple solution. The people to whom Christ became incarnate continued the traditions of their fathers, as Wulfstan prefigures in his discussion of David’s genealogy and the eventual Incarnation: “they never had for God neither love nor fear as they ought, and through the devil’s unrighteous teaching loved all things such.”⁵⁰ The tragic yet chosen state of Christ’s direct audience, juxtaposed directly with the miraculous instant of his birth, had the power to jolt his audience into action.

Bringing the history of salvation to its applications in pastoral care of his day, Wulfstan also directly cautions the clergy regarding people prone to heresy concerning the nature of Christ and calls them directly “unlearned”⁵¹ (*ungelaered*) (134). On the contrary to their doubts, Christ “was ever true God and is and always is.”⁵² He

⁴⁸ Bethurum’s translation; Bethurum, 295.

⁴⁹ See, for example, his Pastoral Letter and *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.

⁵⁰ “*Hi næfdon to Gode naðer ne life ne ege swa swa hy scoldan, ac ðurh deofles lare unriht lufedon ealles to swyðe.*” Bethurum, 149.

⁵¹ “*Ungelaered.*” Bethurum, 151.

⁵² “*He wæs æfre soð Godd ond is ond aa bið.*” Bethurum 151.

characteristically repeats the idea in a later section, but here is finally revealing the climax of God's power as the antidote to the deception and wrong teaching of the devil in a beautiful passage concerning God's eternality and perfection: "He was ever almighty, and he is, and he from such shall be without any end."⁵³ Lionarons insightfully notices, in Wulfstan's decision to make the God of the beginning of the sermon a colder, harsher judge, a rhetorical technique for more powerfully impressing this audience with the goodness and miraculous quality of his Incarnation, death, and resurrection.⁵⁴ Recognizing the power of God, for Wulfstan, partially represents the universalized response expected of the Christian, also present in Aelfric: to recognize good from bad teaching and become more learned through Biblical and catechetical instruction on the part of a good teacher, in order to transform one's entire mind and life in relation to God.

Multiple fundamental strands of concern for his people's spiritual well-being intersect in this sermon beginning as it does in several manuscripts an entire series of *Sermones* – the catechetical group, as Bethurum and others have called them, on baptism, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and more. Lionarons describes *Incipiunt Sermones*'s place within the corpus and his situation well, calling it "a transitional work that maintains Wulfstan's focus, established in the eschatological homilies, on the moral imperatives of the impending end of the world;" further, she connects it to "an awareness on Wulfstan's part of his newly assumed episcopal and archiepiscopal responsibility to instruct the clergy and the faithful in the Christian faith."⁵⁵ Clearly, Wulfstan's sees and the ministry

⁵³ "He wæs æfre efenmihtig ond he gyt is, ond he a swa byð buton ælcum ende." Bethurum, 152.

⁵⁴ Lionarons, 84-85.

⁵⁵ Lionarons, 85.

areas of his clerical audience needed not only exhortation not to sin but also memorable narration of the pitfalls of earlier generations, the sacrifice of Christ, and the need for continued vigilance until the end of the age.

In all these works, Aelfric's and Wulfstan's shared concerns for the holiness of individual priests as a condition for their ability to provide pastoral care effectively, for every swath of society to be provided with strong exegetical and catechetical instruction, and for the framing of both 'right' and 'evil' learning in contrast are evident and were manifestly shared by their contemporaries, as evidenced in the works' robust survival. Both of them also prefigure post-Conquest writers, whose involvement in such threads would shift to a more institutional vision of holiness for priests and the loss of emphasis on 'negative' framing of learning among other trends that Chapter 4 will explore. These writings also enjoyed a rich afterlife and reevaluation but overall reaffirmation in value after their period of composition during the decades from Wulfstan's death to the Conquest, on which Chapter 3 focuses. But although it will consider such aspects of transmission in detail, it is the goal of none of these chapters to investigate and evaluate solely the manuscripts and receptive texts of Aelfric nor of Wulfstan, although their dispersal into myriad manuscripts and centers throughout the medieval period is fascinating. Rather, throughout it is seeking to dig into the writings of both Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England to discover wider pastoral priorities and to understand contexts of the pastoral literature of the time.

CHAPTER 3

The Intervening Period, 1023-1070

After the death of Wulfstan in 1023, there exists a prominent gap in the evidence for pastoral writings whose authors' names are known.¹ Until after the Conquest, in fact, with the subsequent rise of Lanfranc of Bec, Anselm of Canterbury, Osbert of Clare, and other figures who leave letters and sermons, the evidence points rather to a practice by Church centers of copying and recopying Aelfric's and Wulfstan's work for pastoral use.² "St. Wulfstan's Homiliary," which represents the homiletic literature that St. Wulfstan of Worcester (1062-95) probably commissioned and used, exemplifies this in its inclusion of and indeed dominance by sermons of Aelfric and Wulfstan.³

The primary insights emerging from this chapter's consideration of the evidence from the chosen literature are these: that, despite what the most zealous Benedictine Reformers would have said, devotion to pastoral literature (at least, revealed by volume) endured strongly from 1023-1070; that communicating the crucial nature of right learning in the vernacular as pastoral care to clergy and laymen did not abruptly end after the Conquest; and that the political involvement of several prominent religious figures was

¹ Lack of evidence in Ker and correspondence with professors of Cambridge University's Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic Studies (Drs. Rosalind Love, 7 July 2022; Francesca Tinti, 21 September 2022; Rory Naismith, 14 September 2022; Richard Dance, 16 September 2022; Simon Keynes, 26 December 2022).

² Other authors and sources were used by the Church during this period as well, such as anonymous sermons; the question of such sources is dealt with below.

³ "MS Hatton 113-14," Medieval Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries (May 2020).

becoming more volatile, in keeping with the volatility of the period and setting the stage for even stronger political players in the post-Conquest generations.

Studying a period completely informed by manuscript evidence entails certain challenges. Elaine Treharne, in her 2003 article “Producing a Library in Anglo-Saxon England,” summarizes the obstacles to garnering meaningful insights concerning Old English pastoral care from this period:

“Without having an informed judgement of the reasons behind a manuscript’s compilation; without having a clearer picture of why these particular manuscripts or groups of manuscripts were produced and, as specifically as possible, for whom, scholars working on the production of the vernacular will be working in a culturally unknown context.”⁴

The reasons behind compilation, the reasons for the choice of particular manuscripts, and the intended audience of said manuscripts, with a particular eye toward the vision of pastoral teaching, will all be focuses of the chapter, to the extent that they can be discovered from the extant evidence.

Despite the limitations of the evidence and gaps in many areas that the data reveals, the chapter will avoid making too strong of an argument from lack. Primarily, this is meant to be sensitive to the fact that an unknowable number of manuscripts have been destroyed or lost from each center examined here. Thus, answering “why these particular manuscript or groups of manuscripts were produced” risks anachronistic argument. Ascribing great significance to the presence of a certain manuscript in Winchester that is absent from Canterbury, for example, is unwise, as it may certainly have once survived in Canterbury but have perished in any number of intentional or unintentional ways in the following ten centuries. This chapter endeavors rather to use

⁴ Elaine Treharne, “Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050-72,” *The Review of English Studies* 54: 214 (2003), 171.

positive evidence, such as the accompanying texts, known circumstances of production, and contextual information about Church centers. It is in service to the exploration of precisely how learning and teaching continued to be deep concerns of monastic and secular pastoral figures all the way until the Conquest and subsequent ecclesiastical reform and upheaval.

The methodology of this chapter differs considerably from that of Chapters 2 and 4. While they focus largely on the substance of Anglo-Saxon pastoral writing, and the authorial and cultural contexts of their contemporary reception, Chapter 3 dives into the manuscript evidence for each homily and sermon from Chapter 2: *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*, *De Anticristo* (Latin and Old English), and *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*. Through examining the origins and provenances of the relevant extant manuscripts, the chapter hopes to explore how clergymen in the late Anglo-Saxon period ministered both to laity and other clergymen in their community.

To form the structure of this chapter, all the manuscript witnesses for the four homilies examined in Chapter 2 were ascertained and researched. Those which scholars mostly consider to have been written after the third quarter of the eleventh century were eliminated from extensive consideration, as were those for which an origin cannot be reasonably guessed. The former group strays from the temporal focus of this chapter, and the latter struggles to reveal meaningful information beyond the most general concerns of English bishops and priests. Such a process leaves seven witnesses to the selected Aelfric homilies and four to the selected Wulfstan homilies. Notably, 1066 has not been treated as an absolute cutoff date; certainly, there are manuscripts produced and used after October 14, 1066 that were equally as relevant as materials produced and used ten years

before to the pre-Conquest concerns of churchmen such as Wulfstan of Worcester whose ministries endured through the Conquest. In the cases of manuscripts produced very near the time of the Conquest, this chapter will note and explore the transitional nature of the society and the Church into which they arrived.

The political context of the period 1023-1070 is relevant to the production of these manuscripts, especially as it sets the stage for the extremely politically involved role of Lanfranc of Bec, one of the major figures of post-Conquest pastoral writing. The kings of England of the period, from whom both religious and secular policy would largely emanate, were Cnut, Harold I, and Harthacnut from the Danish kings, also holding power in Scandinavia; Edward the Confessor from the restored House of Wessex that had produced much of the tradition enabling the Benedictine Reform and concomitant flourishing of vernacular pastoral literature; Harold II Godwinson, the disputed successor of Edward who fell in battle after ten months; and William I the Conqueror, under whose rule the Church and, indeed, all of England, underwent its most systemic intentional change for many years before and after. Lower-level secular officials also played a role in the production and transmission of manuscripts. But in a large sense, the king and his associates' conceptualization of their own and their bishops' priorities and responsibilities speak particularly powerfully to the transmission output of the time. Therefore, manuscripts or other artistic output produced near centers of royal power or with known origins connected to powerful political figures may exemplify certain ideas that the elite desired the country to adopt. Edward the Confessor, especially, emphasized his international connections and, as Lynn Jones states, "during his lifetime, Edward appropriated foreign iconography and ideology in order to equate his rule with that of his

imperial counterparts in Germany and Byzantium.”⁵ The king’s desire to portray himself as powerful in certain ways went beyond edicts he himself may have written; artwork he patronized, coins whose designs he approved, and perhaps even homilies of whose copying he approved could all be components of the politics of the time. Edward’s connection with Continental counterparts also prefigures the subsequent ecclesiastical connection that was both in image and fact.

But despite the points of connection between regal priorities and ecclesiastical influence, which connection Leofric of Exeter exemplifies (he served as Edward’s chancellor and witnessed multiple charters in England while also zealously collecting Old English homiletic materials at Exeter⁶), an image of constant mutual feedback between the crown and the cathedral would be too extreme. The majority of extant manuscripts written in Old English from 1050-1100 do originate in monastic cathedrals, rather than secular ones: to use the imagery of the previous chapter, a context more similar to that of Aelfric than that of Wulfstan.⁷

This informs our view of the different political connection between the church and the state than in later periods. Not only were pre-Conquest English kings and their bishops not entering a newly conquered kingdom with largely separate cultural traditions from their own, requiring firm and concerted secular and ecclesiastic rule, but also many figures coming out of strong Anglo-Saxon monastic traditions were, in accordance with the intent of the system, largely occupied with things other than connection with Rome.

⁵ Lynn Jones, “From Anglorum Basileus to Norman Saint: The Transformation of Edward the Confessor” *The Haskins Society Journal* 12 (2003), 99.

⁶ Treharne 2003, 163.

⁷ Treharne 2003, 171.

The leaders of monastic cathedrals were not public figures in the same way as Lanfranc or even Osbert of Clare were in both aspiration and fact. It is then, perhaps, not surprising that we see less involvement by ministers of pastoral care in this period than later, although their work carries on the concerns for the spiritual well-being of their constituents in an international context (viz., e.g. the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*) that particularly Wulfstan, as a member of the secular clergy, had held, and that Edward the Confessor and Emma, his mother, promoted through the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*.

There are extant fourteen witnesses for *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*, and two of these also include the two witnesses for *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*. Of the fourteen manuscripts, one is fragmentary and four are from after 1100 or before 1000; of the ten remaining, only six have a reasonably surmised origin. The communities associated with the manuscripts, from which meaningful connections between their content and their situation of transmission can be drawn, are Cerne Abbas, Rochester, Worcester, Canterbury, and Exeter; each community was placed differently relative to the throne, had a different level of pastoral need (as much as it can be demonstrated by obvious challenges the community faced), and contained different leaders who would powerfully shape their traditions of which pastoral manuscripts reached the reading-desk and the pulpit.

Helpfully for the purposes of analysis, Aelfric wrote quite clearly regarding his intentions for transmission of his texts, such that examining the departures from such intentions can be valuable for determining how the concerns of pastoral figures may have been shifting and how the figures of the time conceptualized spiritual teaching and learning. The first observation that seems clear is that Aelfric's vision, exegetical

teaching, meant to reach both clergy and (particularly unlearned) laypeople and instruct them systematically in Biblical and patristic learning, did not fully find resonance in later generations. His plea concerning any future copyist of any of his writings in the Old English Preface to the Catholic Homilies – that he “zealously correct it according to the exemplar”⁸ – was routinely unfollowed and occasionally roundly contramanded, as in manuscript Bodley 340’s inclusion of homilies for days of the liturgical year he had intentionally left silent.⁹ As will appear below, his careful arrangement of homilies throughout the liturgical year became mixed in many manuscripts with homilies of which he probably would have disapproved of in and of themselves, such as the Vercelli homilies.

But despite departures from Aelfric’s holistic pastoral vision as communicated through his writings, the actual content of Aelfric’s homilies, particularly the two considered in this thesis, is very well followed. Although *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* is from the First Series of *Catholic Homilies*, Aelfric’s revisions to these, as will appear below, often had authoritative and effectual force, and the vision of their arrangement that he preserved within his life, among manuscripts he himself sent to friends and colleagues, testifies to his commitment to their uniformity.¹⁰ *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, by contrast, as noted in Chapter 2, dates from his latest compositional period, during which he filled in certain gaps in the liturgical year he had left – from 1006 or

⁸ *Ʒæt ge hi geornlice gehrite be ðære bysene*. Clemoes 1997, 177.

⁹ Jonathan Wilcox, “Transmission of Literature and Learning: Anglo-Saxon Scribal Culture,” in Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 65.

¹⁰ See Clemoes 1997, “Introduction,” “The Manuscripts.”

afterwards.¹¹ It may not have given him much time to revise it in a way that would not have been followed by subsequent copiers (such as there were, viz., the 2:14 ratio of witnesses compared with *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*). Such a case contrasts with the unequivocally messy picture of Wulfstan's writings that Lionarons painstakingly tracks in *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*.¹² Lionarons finds it necessary to take an entire excursus into how much of a homily must be his original words before it can be called his, as so much of his writing is composite, gutted and reused.

The relatively faithful preservation of even only the wording of Aelfric's homilies required concentrated effort. Such an effort appears to have been somehow centrally directed; Jonathan Wilcox demonstrates a link between Cerne Abbas with "pattern manuscripts" produced there during Aelfric's lifetime, and Canterbury, whence such manuscripts could have been sent.¹³ Their posited dissemination from Canterbury allows us to see, according to Clemoes, "a reflection of the "official" status accorded Aelfric's work,"¹⁴ which status becomes clear in consideration of the manuscripts associated with the two homilies.

The first manuscript relevant to change and continuity in pastoral needs during the eleventh century is Cambridge, University Library Gg 3.28.¹⁵ Peter Clemoes and other manuscript scholars refer to it as witness "K" and use a parallel letter system for other

¹¹ Clemoes 1959, 244-5.

¹² Lionarons, 24-42.

¹³ Wilcox 2001, 64.

¹⁴ Clemoes 1997, 162-3.

¹⁵ Ker, #15.

manuscripts, which will be followed here. K, likely produced at Cerne Abbas and potentially under Aelfric personally, is the only copy of his homilies extant containing the Prefaces and a final prayer.¹⁶ It contains occasional alterations from the eleventh and twelfth century and seems to have been possessed by the famous Exeter cleric and collector Leofric in the mid-eleventh century, more fully considered below, but likely had migrated north to Durham before 1083, appearing in two of its Cathedral Priory catalogues.¹⁷

Wide reception of Aelfric's texts, as is also evident in the next manuscript, clearly did not produce slavish reproduction when those texts were copied at their subsequent homes. It is somewhat of an open question as to precisely why Exeter or Durham copyists did not desire to include Aelfric's earnest prefaces and prayer. But the sheer number of copies with which to compare K seems to indicate that the material not intended to be given from the pulpit simply was not as useful to other centers as he had envisioned it would be. The rhetorical content of the prefaces, meant to anchor the homilies in a coherent vision, lost its attractiveness to, at the least, the figures with whom we can associate other extant copies of the work, who preferred simply the content of the homilies for church or personal use. This trend is even more obvious in later manuscripts, where not only would the opinionated prefaces be silently omitted, but also material probably directly contradicting Aelfric's vision would be scattered among his liturgical year.

¹⁶ Wilcox 2001, 63.

¹⁷ Anne Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts in Northumbria in the 11th and 12th Centuries* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), 22-23. Clemoes 1997, 21.

The second manuscript is in fact the only pre-Conquest witness to survive of *Fifth Sunday After Pentecost*, and also includes *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*: Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 15. 34, or “U.”¹⁸ It is reliably placed at mid-eleventh-century Canterbury in origin, although some alterations of the twelfth century indicate that it had left Canterbury no more than a hundred years after its creation.¹⁹ Alfred Pope considers that “for careful arrangement and faithfulness to Aelfric this manuscript has no rivals,” except for K; London, British Library, Royal 7 c. xii, ff. 4-218, which was too early for this chapter;²⁰ and Cambridge Corpus Christi College 188, whose origin and provenance are so uncertain until so late (the sixteenth century) that it did not make the cut for inclusion.²¹ In a nearly unique case among the manuscripts here considered, additionally, this volume exclusively contains Aelfric’s writings, and is probably the second volume of a once-extant two-volume set, as it begins at Easter.²²

As both manuscripts show, copying large amounts of Aelfric’s work was a priority at Canterbury. They are evidence for the process Wilcox suggests of many manuscripts’ production at Cerne Abbas under Aelfric in a “cottage industry,” collection and recopying at Canterbury, and dissemination away from southeastern England; the

¹⁸ Ker, #86.

¹⁹ Ker, 132.

²⁰ Addressed in the previous chapter, p. 16.

²¹ Pope 1968, 77. Notably, the Parker Library web page “Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 188: Old English Homilies, mostly from Ælfric’s First Series” follows the suggestion that CCCC 188 may also have been prepared under Aelfric’s supervision, but it would be difficult to make substantive observations about how it was used or thought of, since it is not connected to any specific center.

²² Clemoes 1997. 46, 88.

annotations of K and U would suggest just such a pattern.²³ Even homilies from such different compositional stages were carefully placed into a volume whose only purpose was to communicate Aelfric's biblical exegesis. Clearly, certain highly placed churchmen at Canterbury in the period directly leading up to the Conquest still perceived a need for the full sweep of Aelfric's work throughout England and saw no reason to modify it in significant ways in this particular volume; even the missing prefaces and prayer could once have been in the first volume of U whose existence Clemoes posits.²⁴

An interesting comparison is the Aelfrician manuscript of Oxford, Bodleian Library 340, or "D," dating from between 1000 and 1050.²⁵ Clemoes thinks it likely to have been written at Canterbury from one of the 'official' copies from Cerne Abbas referred to above, yet fascinatingly, it along with the next manuscript (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 162) includes homilies over apocryphal passages for the days that Aelfric wished to be kept silent from preaching.²⁶ However, it contains many alterations and additions by a Rochester scribe from around 1050, as well as others from the mid-twelfth century.²⁷ It appears that, although Lanfranc replaced the bishop of Rochester upon the bishop's death in 1075, the manuscripts did not themselves fall from

²³ Wilcox 2001, 63.

²⁴ Clemoes 1997, 88.

²⁵ Ker, #309.

²⁶ Clemoes 1997: 138. *Ibid.*, 9, 14.

²⁷ Ker, 361, 367.

favor post-Conquest, as they are also described in Rochester's 1123 and 1202 catalogues.²⁸

Cambridge Corpus Christi College 162, "F," was also almost certainly, according to Clemoes, written at St. Augustine's, and dates from between 1000 and 1050.²⁹ Brandon Hawk, in fact, follows other scholars in dating it to within Aelfric's lifetime.³⁰ As N.R. Ker points out, as a collection of homiletical material it is similar to "U" and a few others, but is less "exclusively Aelfrician."³¹ It contains rather numerous alterations and additions in later eleventh-century hands, indicating its vigorous continued study and use up to the Conquest, and such alterations preserve southeastern spellings, suggesting that F, unlike some other manuscripts sent to faraway places such as Durham, remained an 'in-house' copy at its place of creation.³²

Most saliently, however, F as well as D contain many anonymous homilies scattered among the Aelfrician works, notably the homilies most famous from the Vercelli Book, many of which are based not on Biblical pericopes but rather apocryphal texts. As Elaine Treharne and Philip Pulsiano put it, "While Aelfric was determined that his collections of Catholic Homilies remain intact, thereby preserving the authority and

²⁸ "Houses of Benedictine monks: The cathedral priory of St Andrew, Rochester," in *A History of the County of Kent: Volume 2*, ed. William Page (London: Victoria County History, 1926), 121-126. Ker 1957, 367. "MSS Bodl. 340, 342," in *Medieval Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries*, 21 June 2022.

²⁹ Clemoes 1997, 41. Ker #38.

³⁰ Hawk, 121.

³¹ Ker, 51

³² Ker, 51.

orthodoxy of his works, within a decade or so his texts were copied with apocryphal or non-orthodox material.”³³

The traditional view exemplified by the above scholars as well as many others is that Aelfric completely opposed the use of apocrypha in preaching, and his Old English Preface to the Catholic Homilies certainly seem to bear out a narrower view of right learning than what he saw as the usual: “I have seen and heard much error [or “heresy”] in many English books, that unlearned men through their simplicity have reckoned unto great wisdom.”³⁴ Brandon Hawk’s book, *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*, challenges this view.³⁵ Hawk highlights the precedent of a letter of St. Jerome that does not totally prohibit reading apocrypha and analyzes seven of Aelfric’s homilies for saints’ days that in fact make use of anecdotes from apocryphal acts “as ways of expressing core doctrinal concerns.”³⁶ He also cogently remarks that there is no direct evidence that Aelfric knew of the Vercelli homilies’ existence to comment condemning them.³⁷ Hawk views the interspersing of apocryphal with non-apocryphal homilies, among other practices from the period, as evidence that the “canonical/orthodox” versus “apocryphal/heterodox” binary is false,³⁸ arguing that Aelfric’s adoption of some

³³ Elaine Treharne and Philip Pulsiano, “An Introduction to the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Literature,” in Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 5.

³⁴ “*Ic geseah gehyrde mycel gedwld on manefum engliscum bocum. Ðe ungelærede men þurh heora bilewitnysse to micclum wisdom tealdon.*” Clemoes 1997, 176.

³⁵ Many thanks to Professor Hawk for allowing me to use an electronic copy of his book.

³⁶ Brandon Hawk, *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 14.

³⁷ Hawk 2018, 10.

³⁸ Hawk 2018, 10, 13.

apocryphal narratives paved the way for later compilers' lack of compunction in mixing his works with others.

Hawk's perspective is valuable but, as a reaction to the general slant of scholarship, is necessarily somewhat one-sided. His addition of nuance and gray area surrounding Aelfric's and Wulfstan's original pastoral mindset concerning their homiletic material and the shift in how their works were treated once they left their hands should be appreciated. It is an antidote to an intellectually lazy perception of Aelfric and Wulfstan as always being opposed to apocrypha, with apocrypha defined just as modern Christians define it. But the fact remains that there are many apocryphal works, considered as apocrypha in their own time, that Aelfric in particular specifically rejected.³⁹

Additionally, whether or not the First Preface is condemning the older Vercelli homilies specifically when it states that there "much error (*gedwyld*) in many English books,"⁴⁰ the context of the statement – Aelfric introducing his Catholic Homilies as bastions of pastoral writing in English and bemoaning the existing landscape of pastoral care – makes the association of error and apocrypha compelling to this author. Furthermore, elsewhere in the Old English Preface he uses "deceitful error" (*leasum gedwyld*) specifically as something into which careless copiers may turn "true teaching" (*sopan lare*),⁴¹ setting *gedwyld* if not specifically as heresy or as apocrypha, certainly something to which he is opposed in a direct sense. Whatever Aelfric's evaluation of certain

³⁹ Hawk 2018, 106 points to Marian apocrypha, the Apocalypse of Paul, and the Martyrdom of Thomas.

⁴⁰"*mycel gedwyld on manegum engliscum bocum.*" Clemoes 1997, 174.

⁴¹ Clemoes 1997, 177.

apostolic acts, his overall veneration for the integrity of the Biblical narrative as applicable for teaching is inarguable.

The changed context of the 1020s-1060s from that of the 990s-1020s – particularly the decreasing fervor of the pastoral writing output of the Benedictine Reform – helps to explain the difference, as well as certain continuity, between Aelfric’s program as originally conceived and as utilized by others. One point that Hawk makes astutely is that Aelfric and Wulfstan’s emphases on *godes lare*, correct teaching, and setting ‘true,’ Biblically and patristically grounded writings – and their performance as homilies and sermons – was especially “rhetorically meaningful to the Benedictine reformers, as they sought to separate themselves from the past.”⁴² The zeal that so imbued the Benedictine reformers whose tradition Aelfric inherited and brought to great flowering did not endure as intensely in others, however great was their desire to continue assisting their flock in learning via public preaching that we see preserved in these large collections of homilies.

Aelfric personally remembered interacting with priests who had defects in learning that he saw as prohibitive for ministering to the people, so he was acutely aware of potential deficits in priests and endeavored, as Chapter 2 has detailed, to remedy them. His Preface to Genesis mentions “a certain priest, who was my teacher at [one] time, had the book of Genesis, and could understand Latin in part...unlearned priests, if they understand only a little of Latin books...do not know the spiritual meaning of them.”⁴³ He may well have had Romans 10:14 in mind upon writing the Preface: “How then shall they [unbelievers] call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they

⁴² Hawk 2018, 110.

⁴³ Brandon Hawk, “Aelfric’s Preface to Genesis: A Translation,” *Brandon W. Hawk*, 30 July 2014.

believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher?”⁴⁴ *Praedicans* is, of course, precisely what the Catholic Homilies and many other writings of Aelfric and Wulfstan were endeavoring to give Englishmen, in both Latin and Old English for clergymen and in Old English for laypeople. Joyce Hill notes that, for example, Aelfric’s “refusal to treat Marian apocrypha” or the “sensational elements” in stories of St. Thomas and St. George takes a more severe stand than that of Aethelwold in the Benedictine Reform legendary he used extensively.⁴⁵

To be clear, the shift in severity as regards preservation of anonymous with non-anonymous homilies in the period directly before the Conquest does not need to imply a declension narrative, despite the lack of extant new homiletic material. Powerful churchmen clearly still cared about seeing people educated, and a strong concept of right versus wrong learning (no Vercelli homily is challenging the salvation story or asserting that priests are evil) existed. But they were approaching the issue from a context at least one generation and as many as three generations after the birth of Aelfric, in a period of rapid growth in Old English religious material: it seems that the need for such fiery injunctions, characterizations like those in Wulfstan’s *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*, and massive exegetical and catechetical output was no longer primary in their minds.

Exeter, one of the most important centers of pastoral care, is the place of origin for London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii “J.”⁴⁶ Although Ker dates J to the

⁴⁴ “*Quomodo ergo invocabunt, in quem non crediderunt? aut quomodo credent ei, quem non audierunt? quomodo autem audient sine praedicante?*”

⁴⁵ Joyce Hill, “The Benedictine Reform and Beyond,” in Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 162.

⁴⁶ Ker #144.

third quarter of the eleventh century, it in fact should be seen as slightly earlier, due to its association with Leofric, bishop of Exeter from 1050-1072. Leofric pursued the collecting of Old English homiletical material fiercely and effectively and, through him, Exeter intentionally became a prominent center of learning and copying.⁴⁷ The “coherent plan of vernacular copying by staff working specifically for the bishop, who, on his death, effectively disbanded,” for whose existence Elaine Treharne argues, agrees with the evidence of the virtual hard stop of copying that we see after 1072.⁴⁸ Further, Treharne suggests that a large amount of the copying done at Exeter was between 1050 and 1060,⁴⁹ and posits in a different article that J was Leofric’s personal homiliary.⁵⁰

J, then, and *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* within it, should certainly be seen as a manuscript associated with Exeter and with Leofric’s pastoral mission. Robert Upchurch analyzes Leofric’s priorities as a pastor in reference to his energetic and reverent use of liturgical materials; his zeal to personalize, promulgate, and perform very reasonably would have extended all the writings in his homiliary.⁵¹ In light of these concerns, it is not so mysterious that *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* is one of only two *Catholic Homilies* chosen for inclusion among J’s extant contents, as it contains distinct harmonies

⁴⁷ See Elaine Treharne, “Scribal Connections in late Anglo-Saxon England” in Cate Gunn and Catherine Innes-Parker, eds., *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett* (Boydell and Brewer, November 2009), 29-46.

⁴⁸ Treharne 2003, 159.

⁴⁹ Treharne 2003, 160.

⁵⁰ Treharne 2009, 43.

⁵¹ Robert Upchurch, ““An Anglo-Saxon bishop, his book, and two battles: Leofric of Exeter and liturgical performance as pastoral care,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 48 (2019), 209-70.

in tone and in place within the liturgical year with the Lenten and Easter liturgical materials to which, as Upchurch shows, Leofric was particularly devoted.⁵²

The witnesses from Wulfstan's corpus that contain *De Anticristo* and *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi* are more inclusive of both texts than are the witnesses for Aelfric. This chapter considers two manuscripts that contain all three of the relevant sermons, one more containing only *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*, and one containing only the Old English *De Anticristo*. All are localized at, respectively, either Exeter or Worcester. There exists another twelfth-century witness and one partial witness to *Incipiunt Sermones*, as well as three other witnesses to the Latin *De Anticristo*,⁵³ one of which manuscripts also contains the other witness to the Old English version. In all but one case, the rejected manuscripts were simply too late (produced in the twelfth century or later) to be relevant to the chapter's concerns. The remaining manuscript is an interesting case because, although housed in Denmark, it appears to be from the eleventh century and to bear Wulfstan's autograph in one short section.⁵⁴ Unfortunately, however, its history between being copied (probably at Worcester or York) and its migration to Denmark is mysterious and its use in ministry by later eleventh-century Englishmen cannot be ascertained.

Regarding the manuscripts of Wulfstan, a clear yet difficulty-inducing divide exists between him and Aelfric that makes the two great homiletic writers of Anglo-Saxon England difficult to compare exactly. He did not write programmatic prefaces. We

⁵² Upchurch, 209.

⁵³ Lionarons, 49.

⁵⁴ Bethurum, 3.

do not have his autograph copies of homilies, forbidding certain passages to stand in later copies. There are few versions of his writings that are usually called “authoritative;” as noted at the beginning of the chapter and in the previous chapter, there are tens of sermons that go in and out of probability as his compositions and more, though conceded to be definitely his, that are disputed in their intent for performance as sermons.⁵⁵ He did not have a clear overarching program of composition, departure from which would be obvious or clearly in defiance of his wishes for some arguable reason. Additionally, a large portion of his legacy lies in his contributions to non-homiletical areas such as law and politics, and Emma Mason finds that he was seemingly disliked by the local priests of every see he held, leaving no *Vita* as did many of his contemporaries.⁵⁶ There is simply less that is certain regarding his corpus, and less scholarship done on his writings and on himself.

However, Wulfstan’s writings in their messages of catechetical instruction as well as apocalyptic warnings were certainly valued highly and transmitted (in individual content) faithfully by prominent figures in the Church of the 1020s-1060s period. The eleventh-century Latin manuscripts for *De Anticristo* are extremely close in virtually all readings, and the manuscripts for the Old English version concord only slightly less.⁵⁷ There are occasional discrepancies among the witnesses to *Incipiunt Sermones*, possibly representing two stages of revision by Wulfstan, but they are in the Biblical references

⁵⁵ Cf. Jonathan Wilcox, “The Dissemination of Wulfstan’s Homilies: The Wulfstan tradition in eleventh-century vernacular,” in *England in the Eleventh Century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton symposium*, Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992.

⁵⁶ Emma Mason, *St. Wulfstan of Worcester: c. 1008-1095* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1990), 25.

⁵⁷ Bethurum, 12.

rather than in the main body of the text. Clearly the copiers of the manuscripts were, even without an overarching plan to follow or flout, meticulous in preserving these teachings by Wulfstan, and the manuscripts' uniform association with the carefully gathered collections of devotees to vernacular learning – Leofric and St. Wulfstan of Worcester – bears this out.⁵⁸ In fact, Wulfstan of York carries excellently into the discussion of the intra- and post-Conquest period, as he is himself, similarly to Ealdred of York, St. Wulfstan, Osbert of Clare, and Lanfranc of Bec, a liminal figure between secular and religious life, who wrestled with harmonizing the law of man and the law of God.

The first manuscript, which out of this chapter's sermons contains only *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi*, is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 419, "B."⁵⁹ It has a companion volume, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421, both of which were probably written at Canterbury between 1000 and 1050, but clearly mostly used at Exeter during Leofric's tenure, where they were annotated and expanded. Dorothy Bethurum points out that *Incipiunt Sermones* in fact does not begin anything in this case – it is the sixth item in the table of contents of mostly Aelfrician works⁶⁰ and the third out of six Wulfstanian sermons within the collection.⁶¹ She also, noting that *Incipiunt Sermones*'s translations of its Biblical references are at variance with those in other major Wulfstanian manuscripts, posits that B may have come from a revision of the sermon's

⁵⁸ Throughout this thesis, "St. Wulfstan" refers to the bishop of Worcester from 1062-1093, distinguishing him from Wulfstan, bishop of London, later of Worcester, later archbishop of York, who has been and will continue to be simply referred to as "Wulfstan" or "Wulfstan of York."

⁵⁹ Ker #68.

⁶⁰ Treharne 2009, 42.

⁶¹ Bethurum, 1.

original form that Wulfstan would have completed in his lifetime.⁶² This may be an interesting window onto the compositional process of the archbishop and the potential more frequent contact between Wulfstan and Canterbury than between him and other copying centers that preserve only the ‘first’ version. Elaine Treharne enriches the picture by further putting forward that perhaps B and its companion volume were produced as, themselves, companion volumes for other homilaries likely produced at Exeter: specifically J, discussed above, for which she believes these were the model manuscript!⁶³ Finally, we may note that although the two short sermons on the Antichrist do not appear in this manuscript, what Lionarons considers to be Wulfstan’s more developed version of them (*De temporibus anticristi*) does, actually beginning the manuscript.⁶⁴ Thus, in every extant manuscript of *Incipiunt Sermones*, Wulfstan’s salvation history narrative and exhortation was thought to require pairing with warnings about the incarnate culmination of all the Devil’s deceitful *lare*.

Leofric clearly saw the value not only in exegetical instruction through preaching but also catechetical: his eagerness to include this masterful primer in Christian history, not to mention Aelfric’s own catechetical works in B such as *De die iudicii* and *De fide catholica*, bear this out. Leofric’s passion for making understandable the practices of the church that Upchurch examines with respect to the liturgy carried over, then, not only into desire for vernacular understanding of each week’s pericope but also into telling his people the story of their own faith – and through Wulfstan’s words couching it, just as

⁶² Bethurum, 15.

⁶³ Treharne 2009, 42, 43.

⁶⁴ Lionarons, 49; Ker, 115.

Dominica Secunda Post Pasca does, in terms of teachers' responsibility to pass on right learning.

Cambridge Corpus Christi College 201, or "C,"⁶⁵ begins this chapter's analysis of what may be termed the Worcester manuscripts containing Wulfstan's works: all are associated with Worcester, the see which Wulfstan of York held in plurality with his archbishopric, and all with, interestingly enough, his namesake: the resilient and pastorally inclined Wulfstan of Worcester. It dates from the mid-eleventh century, and its placement at Worcester is less certain than those considered below, but Bethurum draws on its close textual parallels with those manuscripts to tentatively assign it the Worcester origin.⁶⁶ It contains a concentration of twenty Wulfstanian homilies, including every one of his writings on eschatological themes as well as *Incipiunt Sermones*, which in fact does begin the sermons here as well as in the next manuscript.⁶⁷

The last two manuscripts of this chapter, Hatton 113 and Junius 121, were also created as companion volumes (along with Hatton 114) probably by the same scribe.⁶⁸ They are much more firmly placed at Worcester during the tenure of St. Wulfstan (1062-95), almost certainly copied for and used by him – the volumes' association with St. Wulfstan is so strong that Hatton 113 is called "St' Wulfstan's Homiliary," and they bear additions in the hand of his protégé Coleman from the 1080s.⁶⁹ Treharne believes that

⁶⁵ Ker #49b.

⁶⁶ For another educated guess see Treharne 2009: 37: "Corpus 201 may have originated in Winchester, although the localization is not certain, by any means."

⁶⁷ Bethurum, 2. Lionarons, 49.

⁶⁸ Christine Franzen, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile* (Tempe, AZ.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), vol. 6: Worcester Manuscripts, 28, 35.

⁶⁹ Ker #331, #338.

Hatton 113 is approximately contemporary with J, it would be from quite early in St. Wulfstan's tenure, as she dates J probably between 1050 and 1060; the Bodleian Library online entry for Hatton 113 confirms this.⁷⁰ It appears to have stayed at Worcester, as it is annotated throughout by the Tremulous Hand in the thirteenth century.⁷¹ Hatton 113 is a special case, in that, although created contemporaneously with Junius 121, it contains all three Wulfstan sermons, while Junius 121 repeats the inclusion of the Old English *De Anticristo*.⁷² It is interesting to wonder why it repeats (and, in fact, only that sermon) from its companion volume, if as seems apparent they were meant to be used in the same place at the same time, but a solution is obvious neither from the sermon's placement vis-à-vis neighboring items nor from any significant variation in the text itself.⁷³

Worcester and St. Wulfstan continued Wulfstan of York's mission not only in the preservation of his works but in their use; Emma Mason calls attention to a passage in the *Vita Wulfstani*, compiled by St. Wulfstan's protégé shortly after his death, that extols his eagerness to seize every opportunity to preach.⁷⁴ Francesca Tinti collates this with a contemporary account of a foreign visitor who thought, indeed, that St. Wulfstan was devoted to preaching inappropriately much for a bishop.⁷⁵ If he was preaching from his extant homiliary in Hatton 113 or related, lost texts, that would have been largely in Old

⁷⁰ Treharne 2003, 168. "Bodleian Library MS. Hatton 113," *Digital Bodleian* (8 March 2020).

⁷¹ Ker, 391.

⁷² Ker, 415.

⁷³ Bethurum, 11.

⁷⁴ Mason, 95

⁷⁵ Francesca Tinti, *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c. 870 to c. 1100* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 246.

English.⁷⁶ However, this is not to forget the survival of the Latin *De Anticristo*, surely intended for the ears and eyes of other clergy members, in two eleventh-century and three later manuscripts: teaching laymen had to begin with teaching their teachers, evidenced in writings for clergymen specifically as well as in writings like *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* with admonitions for both.

The ability to navigate an unsure political landscape skillfully in order to continue holding the power to administer pastoral care – at least, as a prominent figure – was becoming more and more necessary in this period, as seen in the lives of the men associated with Aelfric’s and Wulfstan’s manuscripts. St. Wulfstan was an advisor to Harold Godwinson in his short, ill-fated reign, yet remained in his seat for almost thirty years after the Conquest, through the mass replacements initiated by Lanfranc of Bec.⁷⁷ Emma Mason draws a continuity between Wulfstan of York’s desire to see the law of man fulfilled in conformity with the law of God, and St. Wulfstan’s decision to accompany Archbishop Ealdred of York on the mission to surrender to William I in late autumn 1066; she sees that cooperation was, for him, the way to minister to his people.⁷⁸ Mason states that “By the early 1090s [St. Wulfstan’s] was the one voice which could pronounce authoritatively on traditional [ecclesiastical] rights for the benefit of the newcomers...it was self-evident to the Canterbury historian [Eadmer] that Wulfstan was “the unique survivor of the ancient fathers of the English.””⁷⁹ While surely other figures

⁷⁶ Bethurum, 4.

⁷⁷ Mason, 100.

⁷⁸ Mason, 106.

⁷⁹ Mason, 229-30.

on smaller stages continued a very similar mission, the documented evidence for at least St. Wulfstan doing so is valuable. Leofric, too, was a scribe at the court of Edward the Confessor,⁸⁰ yet continued to minister actively in revolution-beset Exeter until his death.⁸¹ Treharne notes these parallel practices with regards to Worcester and Exeter: “Leofric and his contemporary bishops at Worcester seemed to share a similar pastoral agenda, one that included the vernacular at its heart.”⁸² In Worcester as in Canterbury, Durham, Cerne Abbas, and Exeter, then, Old English homilies and sermons visibly retained their position as vital to teaching and learning at least until the Conquest, and even afterwards.

Through the manuscripts examined in this chapter, we gain insight into the passionate concerns of pastoral figures to express the theme of learning in the literature they transmitted to their people, both lay and clergy. Yet it is worthwhile to remember that, unfortunately, knowing in detail the priorities and exceptional devotion to teaching of specific figures examined may be a mixed blessing. This chapter purposefully focuses on the figures whose backgrounds and careers can shed more accurate light on their priorities in order to reveal a truer picture of choice, use, and intended function of the manuscripts of homiletical literature. The original writers explicitly considered not only themselves but also all the clergy to whom they preached and who preached their works after them as equally to be “set as a shepherd for God’s people...[in order] to shield that

⁸⁰ Elaine Treharne, “The bishop’s book: Leofric’s homiliary and eleventh-century Exeter,” in Stephen David Baxter, ed., *Early medieval studies in memory of Patrick Wormald* (Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2016), 521.

⁸¹ Upchurch, 237.

⁸² Treharne 2009, 44.

people against the wolf.”⁸³ However, the other side of this is that anomalous, exceptional figures such as Leofric and St. Wulfstan engender extraordinary feats, that necessarily cannot speak entirely for the entire society, or even for their own sees through the entire pre-Conquest period. In the case of Exeter, Treharne goes so far as to say: “It is not possible [to] extrapolate an ‘Old English tradition’ at Exeter in the late Anglo-Saxon period, because the production of vernacular manuscripts was entirely due to one person – Leofric himself.”⁸⁴ Of course, a uniform, complete devotion to pastoral care as embodied in homiletical materials had never been a reality in or before Aelfric’s or Wulfstan’s lifetimes either: hence part of the motivations underlying the Benedictine Reform and the great homilists’ response to it. In short, although prominent figures’ pastoral responses to the spiritual need they perceived are influential for the whole of society, they could not be programmatic.

As highlighted in this chapter’s introduction, it seems that in this period, pastoral figures’ conception of ‘right learning’ was broadening, but not weakening; that the Conquest did not end high-profile ongoing pastoral missions to exhort both lay and clergy in the basic tenants of Aelfric’s and Wulfstan’s work; and that Old English was retaining its high position in the world of pastoral care intended for the masses. The departures from Aelfric’s organizational, liturgical mission through pragmatism in copying do represent a shift in pastoral priority since his lifetime, but the continuation of his material’s dissemination is in the end more relevant to the substance and the intended universal applicability of his work. As the idea of right learning was perhaps becoming

⁸³ “*to hyrde geset Godes folce...þæt folc wið þam wulfe gescyldan*” Clemoes 1997, 314.

⁸⁴ Treharne 2003, 169.

less strictly defined from what it was in the urgent, concentrated period of the Benedictine reform, the changes that the idea understandably went through throughout the seven decades since Aelfric first committed his homilies do not need to denote an abandonment of the more general mission to communicate Biblical and traditional truth. Namely, these changes were an openness to juxtaposing homilies on apocrypha with those on canonical texts, a general disregard for strict organizational practices, and a process of more widespread dissemination than the ‘cottage industry’ extant during Aelfric’s or Wulfstan’s lifetimes allowed.

Despite the achievements and continuities in the ministries of Wulfstan of Worcester or Leofric of Exeter, the resilient careers of a few churchmen in the decades after the conquest do not a continuous landscape of pastoral care make. As will be apparent in the next chapter, the mechanics, genre, language, relationship to the state, and even content of pastoral literature truly underwent grave changes, not with the date of 1066 itself but with the emergence of a new generation of Church leaders. This happened upon either the death or the deposition of the vast majority of Anglo-Saxon bishops, in the years following not only the Conquest itself but also the influential synods at which Lanfranc initiated long-lasting changes to the Church.

To return to Elaine Treharne’s caution concerning the study of manuscript transmission in Anglo-Saxon England – how are we to know “why these particular manuscripts or groups of manuscripts were produced and, as specifically as possible, for whom?”⁸⁵ – in this period, the places of origin of a large percentage of witnesses to these four sermons and homilies and for several, the people who stimulated their creation are in

⁸⁵ Treharne 2003, 171.

fact knowable. We do not, thankfully, have to work in a “culturally unknown context” at all.⁸⁶ important shifts in political involvement, conception of right learning, and valuation of the vernacular emerge out of careful overview of data that may at first seem obscure, but in fact communicate illuminating information.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

CHAPTER 4

The Conquest and Beyond, 1070-1140

The few years immediately following the Norman Conquest in England saw widespread upheaval most obviously, for the purposes of examining pastoral care, in the overwhelming replacement of archbishops and bishops – although not priests in general – with men close to the court or simply churchmen transplanted straight from Normandy. A few Anglo-Saxon bishops remained in their positions, yet their perspective, let alone that of the little-known parish priests or monks who administered pastoral care to so many, can be difficult to grasp.

Instead, the clearest extant evidence regarding pastoral care in the decades after the Conquest comes from the letters and sermons of figures who first came to power in a Norman or Anglo-Norman context, in which their assessment of the needs of their people emerges. Pastoral writings in this period, seen through the lens of three letters of Lanfranc of Bec and a letter and sermon by Osbert of Clare, seem no longer to prioritize several Anglo-Saxon concerns. They choose not to contrast ‘right’ and ‘evil’ learning, in favor of emphasizing only positive points, and only Lanfranc preserves a focus on priests, and even that is weighted toward consideration of their institutional and authoritative, rather than pastoral, teaching role. And perhaps most interestingly, all the writings considered here involve a significant personal, emotional component, either in the attitude of the pastoral figure or in the response they intend to elicit from their audience. Pastoral care was conceived of and administered with largely different methods, scopes, and focuses in the post-Conquest period, at least by two influential men of their time.

The Conquest did not affect the English Church all at once, but several major changes following it provide important context for the landscape of pastoral care in the last decades covered by this thesis: c. 1070-c.1140. For example, Ealdred of York (1060-69) may be one of the consummate transitional figures: He may have crowned Harold Godwinson;¹ he supported the cause of Edgar Aetheling in late 1066;² he led a group of clerics to William directly after the Conquest to capitulate; he crowned William the Conqueror in Westminster Abbey and retained his position at York until his death in 1069, replaced by Thomas of Bayeux.³ But none of his writings survive. The same lack of extant writings exists in the case of ‘the last Anglo-Saxon bishop,’ St. Wulfstan of Worcester. A similar situation exists for Leofwine of Lichfield, Stigand of Canterbury, or Ethelric of Selsey; they are all important figures of the Anglo-Saxon church who fell from favor shortly after the Conquest, whose perspectives would be valuable, but whose pastoral writings, if they wrote any, are lost. Leofric of Exeter joined St. Wulfstan as an exception in resilience just as in pastoral care: as described in Chapter 3, he continued his ministry until his death in 1072, in fact playing a vital role in navigating two post-Conquest revolts; Robert Upchurch suggests that his Continental upbringing and training may have made him “politically unobjectionable” but this impossible to know explicitly.⁴

¹ "Ealdred , archbishop of York." In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*.

² Emily Joan Ward, “Child Kings and the Norman Conquest: Representations of Association and Succession,” In Laura Ashe and Emily Joan Ward, eds., *Conquests in Eleventh-Century England: 1016, 1066* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2020), 350.

³ Francesca Tinti, “The Pallium Privilege of Pope Nicholas II for Archbishop Ealdred of York,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70:4 (2019), 726.

⁴ Upchurch 2019: 240.

The landscape of the Church created by the 1080s and 1090s, certainly, did not much resemble that of the 1050s or 1060s, let alone that of the 990s and 1010s. The vigorous exchange of clerics between England and Normandy, with the first generation born in England but educated by Normans being sent back to Normandy, and established leaders in Normandy being called upon to fill gaps in the English Church, was such that David Spear sees the English church as “unsevered from its Norman counterpart” in the decades following the Conquest and calls for the English and Norman churches to be considered as a single entity during the period.⁵

Yet the picture of pastoral care as expressed through pastoral literature is not necessarily equivalent to this picture of the political shifts in the Church; respect for past teachers, for one, remained. George Younge and other scholars have cautioned strongly against viewing Old English as completely suppressed after the Conquest and have uncovered relatively large quantities of Old English literature created often at the epicenters of Norman power. Younge points to the “flourishing Old English literary culture that we now know existed in Kent in the century after the Conquest” that in the majority produced “late versions of works composed during the ‘Benedictine Reform’ of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, with the best represented author being Aelfric of Eynsham.”⁶ He also, based on the existence of a bilingual Rule of St. Benedict, shows the Durham community (established in 1083) to have been bilingual; we may remember that the Old English manuscript Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 3. 28 that contains

⁵ David S. Spear, “The Norman Empire and the Secular Clergy, 1066-1204,” *Journal of British Studies* 12:2 (1982), 3.

⁶ Younge, 3, 4.

Dominica Secunda Post Pasca, produced in Cerne Abbas and held for a time by Exeter, was part of the inaugural Durham library.⁷ It is fascinating to wonder how wide the reach of these texts could have been and if they could have inspired bilingual or trilingual writers of homilies or sermons, but unfortunately is outside the scope of this thesis, which aims when possible to analyze the concerns of figures of different periods through what they said themselves. Looking at the issue from Younge's perspective, one could almost say with Jay Rubenstein that in the period, it is "more likely to see continuities between the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman worlds than sudden ruptures."⁸ Furthermore, continuity would have persisted more strongly among the lower levels of the Church, whose priests had not been exchanged (especially in the first years after the Conquest).

Given the opposing views of either complete identification of the Anglo-Norman and the Norman Churches, or minor shift to the Anglo-Norman from the Anglo-Saxon church, it may seem difficult to know how to view the world in which these heavily politically involved yet, at least in Osbert's case, intentionally historically aware men and their contemporaries wrote. It seems best to take both views under consideration provisionally, acknowledging the directly opposite historical tensions towards rebirth or continuity that were probably puzzling even to people living in the period itself. As will be clear, Lanfranc and Osbert definitely seem to have been influenced more by post-Conquest strands of thought, yet they engaged robustly with the Anglo-Saxon period and its legacy in their pastoral care as well.

⁷ Younge, 5.

⁸ Jay Rubenstein, "Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury," *Speculum* 74:2 (1999), 280.

Of course, one manifest difference between pastoral care before and after the Conquest comes in the primary extant materials with which it was conducted – the newly generated materials are letters, in large part, rather than sermons or homilies. This engenders a few distinctions from homilies or sermons, the first of which may be painfully obvious: they are more personal. Even if an intention to share them with others after one's own reading of them can be supposed⁹, originally they were meant to communicate pastoral learning and authority to a specific person in their time of need. Aelfric's letters to Wulfsig or to Wulfstan suggest that this was an impulse also present in the Anglo-Saxon period, but secondary to the more general catechetical and exegetical goals. Perhaps even more relevantly for this thesis's examination of pastoral care as a societal phenomenon, hopefully illuminated by certain people's writings but not intended only to catalog their personal concerns, is the fact that it does not seem that Osbert's or Lanfranc's works circulated very widely. It is very obscure whether either man's correspondence or Osbert's sermon was able to give wisdom to the wide audience for which certainly the sermon but probably also the letters were intended. These men were neither Aelfrics nor Wulfstans in ubiquity; in fact, their writings do not appear to have been particularly popular for pastoral figures in the generations after them, amid the dynamic period of Scholastic thought on the cusp of which Osbert and Lanfranc hovered.

Is it impossible, then, to gain insight of any even conjecturally societal reach from these materials? This chapter posits that it is possible; that the threads of how these men interpreted Scripture, what concerns they had for their influential recipients, and how

⁹ Walter Frohlich asserts this purpose, for example, as regard to the letters of Lanfranc's pupil, St. Anselm of Canterbury: "even personal letters might be widely circulated." Walter Frohlich, transl. and ed., *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1990), 25.

they conceived of learning, or doctrine, exhibit concerns that ran through many others' minds at the time and truly did shape how the Church interacted with laypeople for this period and long afterwards.

Lanfranc of Bec was well over fifty years old when he stepped foot in England for the first time.¹⁰ He had grown up and worked for decades in contexts quite different than those of the Anglo-Saxon figures who preceded him in high places of the Church – even near-contemporaries such as St. Wulfstan of Worcester, who a foreign monk had seen as gauche for his love of preaching, or Leofric of Exeter, who had almost alone gathered one of the largest collections of Anglo-Saxon pastoral writing that survives. Sally Vaughn writes regarding Lanfranc's close proximity to William I, establishing that he had been tied to the duke as well as to Rome and to the concerns of the central Church for decades before arriving in England, and that partially against his will.¹¹

As the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc was very active in affairs of state and dealings with international representatives,¹² yet his communication with laymen to administer pastoral care seems to have been limited to letters. No homilies or record of him preaching survive,¹³ but Thomas of Bayeux sought his support to fulfill his duties in York, as Wulfsgie had sought Aelfric's, and he apparently ordered a subordinate, Osbern, to preach to the people about two miracles of St. Dunstan that he enjoyed.¹⁴ More

¹⁰ Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson, transl., and eds., *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 2.

¹¹ Sally N. Vaughn, "Lanfranc of Bec: A Reinterpretation," *A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 17: 2. (1985), 135, 142. Clover and Gibson, 10.

¹² Clover and Gibson, 2.

¹³ Clover and Gibson, 21.

¹⁴ Rubenstein, 293.

information survives about his more famous successor, former student, and close personal friend St. Anselm of Bec, later of Canterbury. George Younge states that Anselm had a “strong sense of pastoral purpose, coupled with a flexible approach to instruction and communication.”¹⁵ Illuminatingly, he also surmises that Anselm “would not have been unaware of, or opposed to,” the recopying of Old English works in Canterbury after the Conquest – a culture that also thrived under Leofric.¹⁶ Lanfranc was also an arbitrator and source for English men of canon law disputes, advising most often on foundational issues such as clerical discipline, lay customs, and most of all good order within the monasteries. Fifty-nine of his letters survive, all dating from his archiepiscopate of Canterbury,¹⁷ addressed to a variety of clergy and laymen. They survive in a small number of manuscripts and were collected as they are now “by the 1100s, at the very latest.”¹⁸

Roger, the earl of Hereford, is the recipient of the series of three short letters selected for this chapter. Roger, the son of a man who had been a patron of Lanfranc’s educational center in Bec, would have seemed to be a special responsibility to Lanfranc and was engaging, in 1070, in a rebellion with several earls against the authority of William I that warranted Lanfranc’s immediate attention.¹⁹ The content and tone of the letters convey well two of the tendencies of Lanfranc to which his background and his

¹⁵ Younge, 2.

¹⁶ Younge, 3.

¹⁷ Clover and Gibson, 10.

¹⁸ Clover and Gibson, 11.

¹⁹ Clover and Gibson, 118.

actions in England that affected so many speak: a deep confidence in the power and authority of the institutional Church, and a corresponding sureness in his own personal authority as an experienced leader used to holding the answers concerning right behavior and doctrine.

The first letter begins with an address to Roger on terms of intimacy, but this seems to be more than polite epistolary convention. The references to Roger as a “most delightful son,” “dearest friend,”²⁰ and other terms of reiterating the expressions of dearness more than one would expect in a purely businesslike, much less a politically urgent series of letters, culminate in, as Clover and Gibson point out, “Lanfranc’s exercise of jurisdiction” as a spiritual father even more than a political superior.²¹ He does not bring the king against whom Roger is rebelling to bear as a major rhetorical force until the last letter informing Roger of his excommunication, and even then, his stern exhortation to “on account of God and your own honor, if you hold the fault of such a thing, return to your senses” is immediately preceded by more language of friendship, with the comparison to Lanfranc’s son again first and foremost.²²

Lanfranc clearly sees himself in a pastoral role to Roger on multiple levels, and endeavors to place his personal relationship with him in the foreground; interestingly, throughout the three letters, he does not stress his position as Archbishop of Canterbury, under whose formal jurisdiction Roger would have been, until the third conveying his excommunication. Even if the reason Lanfranc endeavored to send messengers

²⁰ “*Dulcissime fili et carissime amice.*” Clover and Gibson, 120.

²¹ Clover and Gibson, 119.

²² “*Propter Deum et honorem tuum si culpam de tali re habes, resipiscas.*” Clover and Gibson, 120.

summoning Roger to London was to bring him to justice in the legal arena (the messengers were rudely rebuffed, contributing to Roger's excommunication), he claims that his desire for Roger was "that you might accept counsel for your soul from me, just as from a spiritual father and a sincere friend."²³ Even within Lanfranc's deeply institutional position, the impulse toward providing spiritual guidance on the basis of a relationship both personal and pastoral abided in him.

Lanfranc considers, in the tradition of *Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi* the reason for Roger's rebellion as the Devil's coordinated attempt to lead him astray both spiritually and physically. As he notifies Roger of his excommunication, he opines that it has happened "because by the inspiration of the devil and by the counsel of perverse men, you have undertaken things you ought never at all to have undertaken."²⁴ If the problem is the Devil's work in Roger's life, the solution of spiritual counsel, even if such wording is a veiled representation of the more worldly political consequences in which Lanfranc, judging by his decades of partnership with William I, surely would have acquiesced, makes sense.

These letters reveal that the importance of listening to spiritual authority, persisted in materials of pastoral care in the Anglo-Norman period at the highest levels. However, it seems that that concern was increasingly heavily couched in terms of institutional power, and that basic catechetical or Biblical instruction was not what Lanfranc believed this particular correspondent needed. The accountability of pastoral figures themselves

²³ "ut...consilium animas tuae a me sicut a patre spirituali et amico sincero acciperes." Clover and Gibson, 122.

²⁴ "Quia instinctu demonis et consilio prauorum hominum ea molitus es quae te moliri minime orortuerat." Clover and Gibson, 122.

that appeared in *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca* or *De Anticristo* is obviously not something Lanfranc would mention in a stern letter to a subordinate layman, but it is interesting that he does not even refer to his learning, his own devotion to God, or to Biblical exempla in his persuasion but only to emotion-centered statements about Roger and about their friendship. The needs of one recipient surely should not be extrapolated to the needs of an entire country. Yet perhaps we should notice that in none of the letters of the most influential man of the first post-Norman decades (which collection, as noted above, we seem to have almost in full) appears the intense concern for which books a priest should own, how the chrism or water of baptism should be given, how the people should hear preaching, or many of the pastoral concerns centered on priests' own spiritual development and maturity to administer the sacraments that so occupied Aelfric and Wulfstan.

In the letters, Lanfranc mentions the Devil's and his servants' opposition to God, but there does not appear the same focus on the Devil as possessing his own teaching through which he deceives men. Instead, he characterizes the Devil's involvement in Roger's life as an "*instinctus*" – an inspiration, prompting, or instigation. The inward response of Osbert to both the subtle instigation of the devil as well as human counsel, rather than to any concept of a different system of teaching, is what concerns Lanfranc, just as the inward, emotional response of his recipients concerns Osbert of Clare. For Lanfranc (and, at least in the examined materials, for Osbert), negative teaching was not a helpful idea within the larger mission of exhortation of laymen to right teaching.

Osbert of Clare, as the latest figure considered, represents the culmination of the landscape of pastoral care engendered by the Conquest. Born likely about ten years after

Lanfranc died, probably of a noble family that had benefitted from the Conquest, and “at least partially of Norman descent,” as Brian Briggs relates, he inherited a world shaped by both the reforms and mass dismissals of Lanfranc and the beginnings of an ecclesiastical resistance against them.²⁵ Osbert did not share the international prestige of Lanfranc nor the era-shaping popularity of Aelfric or Wulfstan, despite his career as the Prior of Westminster and several other posts. All his letters survive in one manuscript (British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xvii) that based on paleographical evidence was, as Briggs notes, “probably made either while Osbert was living or shortly after his death.”²⁶ Where Briggs believes that Osbert shone was “the diversity of his accomplishments” more than his prowess at any one of them: writing hagiographical, epistolary, or homiletic literature; forging charters; promoting energetically the rights and privileges of his beloved Westminster Abbey and other centers.²⁷ Yet his pastoral output is significant, as he was an influential participant through both letters and a sermon in one of the most significant theological and liturgical debates of the twelfth century: that of the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. That sermon, as well as one of the personal pastoral letters he wrote to his nieces, reveal that Osbert retained the deep respect for Scripture and desire to use it to craft a coherent piece of pastoral rhetoric that had occupied earlier figures. Yet his emphasis had shifted in its liturgical complexity and heightened in its elevation of Church hierarchy from the emphases of Aelfric and Wulfstan; furthermore, Osbert and some of his contemporaries held an interpretation of

²⁵ Brian Briggs, “The Life and Works of Osbert of Clare” (PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2004), 6.

²⁶ Briggs, 2.

²⁷ Briggs, 193.

the Anglo-Saxon feast of the Conception that saw it as much more important to the Anglo-Saxon Church than, according to the extant evidence, it was.

The letter of Osbert to his niece Cecilia is accompanied in his corpus by one to her sister, his other niece, Margaret, both of whom were nuns at Barking Abbey, and dates from about 1140, or relatively in the middle of Osbert's monastic life.²⁸ Through its appeals on behalf of virginity, reliance on divine protection, and the value of true learning, the letter provides the only example in this thesis and one of the few extant of pastoral care intended specifically for a female audience. Osbert's personal connection to this recipient, similarly to that of Lanfranc's to Roger, earl of Hereford, seems to give a cast of vulnerability to the letter that is absent in, say, his more generalized sermon on the Conception, which makes this letter particularly interesting as a window on Anglo-Norman priorities in pastoral care.

Right learning, for Osbert, is connected most definitively to "prophetic and apostolic doctrine."²⁹ It is notable that he does not mention Scripture specifically, but enumerates rather that purpose of the wisdom that doctrine conveys: through it, "both the pattern of virtue is imprinted and the radiance of virginity is more splendidly marked in [Cecilia]."³⁰ The prophetic and apostolic doctrine are "windows" through which God looks, imparting virtue and virginity.³¹ In this letter Osbert does not mention any office through which one is to receive guidance toward such doctrine; perhaps, as Cecilia was already within the

²⁸ Briggs, 5; E.W. Williamson, ed., *The Letters of Osbert of Clare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), 91.

²⁹ "*Propheticam et apostolicam doctrinam.*" Williamson, 92.

³⁰ "*tibi et forma virtutis imprimitur et candor virginitatis splendidius insignitur.*" Ibid.

³¹ "*per fenestras respicit.*" Ibid.

monastic life, such guidance was already part of her life, along with the more personal devotional practices through which the Holy Spirit might impart learning.

Osbert more specifically directs Cecilia's attention to Biblical and Christian exempla as conveyors of truth that she should "venerate" and "love."³² Jeremiah, John the Evangelist, and, of course, the Virgin Mary, represent the beauty of virginity. He stresses the allegorical interpretation of the Bible, as "the things which were hidden under the shadow of the old testament, have been made manifest in the mystery of his incarnation."³³

The response to exposure to true doctrine is centered for Osbert on individual, inward, emotional expressions of devotion that are linked to his view of women as Christians. He calls Cecilia to "consider therefore, dearest to me, how great are the protections of the blessed martyr Lawrence, and keep him as an advocate"³⁴ and to "look also to those [women] who with intact virginity have birthed offspring for [their] heavenly groom."³⁵ He hopes that "that holy spirit who wished to inflame her [i.e., St. Cecilia] in love, may think your mind worthy to kindle with his heat, so that...you may process with the martyrs."³⁶ Cecilia's aspirational inflamed love of Christ in virginity, deep consideration of Christian exempla, and devotion to prayer reflect Osbert's

³² "*haec venerare, haec dilige.*" Williamson, 92.

³³ "*quia quae erant occulta sub umbra testamenti veteris, manifesta facta sunt in eius mysterio incarnationis.*" Ibid.

³⁴ "*Considera ergo, dilectissima mihi, quanta sint patrocina beati martyris Laurentii, et illum advocatum.*" Ibid., 95.

³⁵ "*respice etiam ad illas quae integra virginitate sponso caelesti pepererunt sobolem.*" Ibid., 96.

³⁶ "*spiritus ille sanctus, qui eam voluit in amore suo inflammare, mentem tuam calore suo dignetur accendere, ut per vestigia beatae Ceciliae virginis et martyris incedas*" Ibid.

conception of women as pervasively tied to the example of Mary.³⁷ The theme of virginity in particular is a distinct and strong feature in all of Osbert's five writings to women that he does not mention at all in all his other writings to men.³⁸

Clearly Osbert cared much for his niece, but his desire to see her flourishing seems to arise quite strongly if not exclusively from his pastoral duty to her. His encouragements and exhortations, while fitted for her monastic life more than the life of a layperson, contain windows of their own into his priorities as a ministerial figure: that his people understand the Old Testament in light of the Incarnation; that they venerate Mary appropriately, even if they do not live out her example of physical virginity; and that they learn to see in Biblical and Christian figures examples for them to follow personally.

Osbert's only surviving piece that was without doubt intended as a vehicle of pastoral care and as the transmission of right learning to a group is the *Sermo de Conceptione Sanctae Mariae*, or Sermon on the Conception of Holy Mary. Far from being composed simply in praise of a figure of the faith whom Osbert personally revered, his sermon on the Conception participated in an ecclesiastical controversy that strikes at the root of a conflict, as its participants saw it, between how the Anglo-Saxon and the Anglo-Norman churches envisioned pastoral care.

As Osbert's career began, a change instituted by Lanfranc had begun to rankle in the hearts of certain churchmen of the generation after the mass dismissals and replacements: he had, they contested, purged the liturgical calendar of many Anglo-Saxon saints' feast days, including that of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

³⁷ Briggs, 152.

³⁸ Briggs, 151.

Such a priority shift in the Church, away from revering saints who were intimately tied to the people of England, was distasteful to many, but it found its strongest attacker in Eadmer of Canterbury, who composed a treatise “On the Conception of holy Mary,” in 1124. He articulated passionately the theological grounding for Mary’s immaculate conception; indeed, he was the first to do so. Osbert and others, such as Anselm of Bury St. Edmunds, took up the cause of reinstating the feast of Mary’s conception in their respective areas, and it was at the request of Warin of Worcester that Osbert composed his sermon. However, in its prefatory letter he says that “I dare not say what I hold in my heart about this holy begetting,”³⁹ and it is notable that Osbert nowhere refers to the immaculate nature of the conception, seeming to prefer to leave such sensitive theological topics to Eadmer in service of ministering to a wider audience who would accept the newly articulated doctrine up to a point. His approach may also have been influenced by his connection with Continental theology, represented first of all for him in Anselm, and the rise in secular learning in the period, just as monasticism and the Benedictine Reform were so influential on the approaches of Aelfric and Wulfstan. The sermon was written first for the monastic community at Worcester, but also was expected to make its way to a “general audience,” according to Briggs.⁴⁰

As Briggs points out, the sermon “does not address the philosophical arguments for the Immaculate Conception...[it] was meant to be a liturgical and instructional piece.”⁴¹ In this way it somewhat resembles the catechetical sermons of Aelfric and

³⁹ Williamson, 79, qtd. and transl. in Briggs, 138.

⁴⁰ Briggs, 136, 21

⁴¹ Briggs, 21

Wulfstan, but is participating in a specific and theologically oriented controversy, rather than the more wide-reaching Benedictine Reform. At its core it aims to retell salvation history, but through the lens of Mary: motifs and exempla from the Old Testament point to Jesus, the sermon relates, insofar as they point to Mary, who brought forth Christ. Thus, of course, the feast of Mary's Conception should be celebrated and respected.

Osbert employs many images from the Old Testament which he believes point to Mary as various types – even the passage from Isaiah 11 that is often understood as referring to Christ Himself. He points to characters such as Abraham, Melchizedek, Moses, Ruth, Zachariah, Ezekiel, David, Solomon, and Nathan, as well as quoting and interpreting the Isaiah passages. In Isaiah 11, he equates the “rod [*virga*] out of the root of Jesse”⁴² with “the blessed virgin [*virgo*] Mary.”⁴³ Second is from Isaiah 19⁴⁴ – “The Lord comes into Egypt upon a swift cloud and will shatter the idols of Egypt”⁴⁵ – about which Osbert says “in the name of that cloud, the prophet seems to me to signify the holy virgin Mary.”⁴⁶ Osbert clearly desires to engage actively with prophetic writings and to bring them to bear upon his doctrinal exposition and persuasion.

Instead of framing his teaching as something which one receives through the preaching of priests and through which one gains understanding with which to combat

⁴² Isaiah 11:1

⁴³ H. Thurston and T. Slater, eds., *De conception sanctae Mariae* (Freiburg: Breisgau, 1904), 73.

⁴⁴ Isaiah 19:1 is the text that most closely matches what Osbert gives, but in the *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* the text differs in several words: *Dominus ascendet super nubem levem, et ingreditur Aegyptum, et commovebuntur simulacra Aegypti*

⁴⁵ “*Dominus venit in aegyptum super nubem levem et confringentur idola aegypti.*” Thurston and Slater, 77.

⁴⁶ “*Nubis autem istius nomine videtur mihi propheta sanctam virginem Mariam significare.*” Ibid.

diabolic teaching, Osbert seems to emphasize again, as in his letter to Cecilia, a more personal and emotional response to the doctrine of the Conception. Let us, he exhorts, rejoice; venerate the feast day; offer prayers and a sacrifice of praise.⁴⁷ For him, the Devil's stumbling-block to the Christian is not twisting of the words of God into bad teaching, as it was for Wulfstan but "infinite temptations of the diabolical whirlpool"⁴⁸ – temptations to bad actions, given the righteous actions that he suggests to combat them, more clearly than to a bad mindset. Additionally, it is not generally the knowledge of God and His law that will save the Christian in this case but specifically the remembrance of Mary as a star "fixed in the highest point of heaven"⁴⁹

Osbert clearly conceived of learning and doctrine communicated in pastoral materials differently both from Aelfric and Wulfstan and from Lanfranc. One tendency seen in his writings on the Conception in particular is interestingly distinct from any other writer examined in this thesis: his self-conscious reticence to say all he believes about a subject. Such a concept would be almost laughable to apply to Wulfstan's castigation of evil practices and the Devil's teaching. Yet Kati Inhat connects this very impulse with earlier writers, writing that "such caution in extrapolating on the apocrypha seems to have been symptomatic of the age"⁵⁰ and citing Mary Clayton's article about Aelfric's hesitation to use apocrypha, which issue the previous chapter examined. This comparison seems to go too far given the vastly shifted context of Osbert and the lack of certainty

⁴⁷ Thurston and Slater, 82-83.

⁴⁸ "*Diabolicae caribdis nfinitas temtationes.*" Thurston and Slater, 82.

⁴⁹ "*Stellam in summon coeli cardine fixam.*" Ibid.

⁵⁰ Kati Inhat, "Early Evidence for the Cult of Anne in Twelfth-Century England," *Traditio* 69 (2014), 29.

that he had familiarity with Aelfric or Old English. Aelfric may have followed Jerome in thinking the apocrypha useful for reading and used certain apocryphal acts in his sermons on relevant apostles. But he manifestly disagreed with using Marian apocrypha in particular⁵¹ and, given his lifelong, sustained, articulated concern for right learning that was centered on Biblical and patristic sources, he did not have in as much common with Osbert's approach to apocrypha as Inhat's equivalency asserts.

The entire issue into which Osbert sent his sermon on the Conception, however, is a fascinating study of pastoral care in the Anglo-Norman period that was endeavoring to be acutely aware of their Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical heritage. For the feast of the Conception of Mary, on the defense of which Eadmer wrote his magisterial treatise and Osbert and Anselm of Bury composed their own persuasive materials, was not the deeply rooted Anglo-Saxon celebration that they perceived it as. It had been introduced to Anglo-Saxon England only around 1030, possibly by a Greek monk at Winchester, from the Eastern Church, and was not celebrated widely elsewhere in the West.⁵² Even in Anglo-Saxon England, the feast does not appear to have been celebrated very widely, only appearing via prayers for the feast in four locations after having spread from Winchester. Edmund Bishop sees the English adoption of the Conception to have been centered on piety only, rather than a care for the doctrinal underpinnings of the concept.⁵³ Lanfranc's removal of it from the calendar, as a feast with which he was, of course, unfamiliar, as well as the slow disappearance in the decades afterwards to which Osbert

⁵¹ Hawk 2018: 110.

⁵² Mary Clayton, "Feasts of the Virgin in the Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church," *Anglo-Saxon England* 13 (1984), 225.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 229.

and Eadmer were responding, come into focus not necessarily as an intended slight on ancient Anglo-Saxon customs. The controversy may have arisen, as Briggs puts it, simply from via a “reexamination of [Anglo-Saxon saints’] relevance by the outside and objective eyes of the Norman invaders”⁵⁴ who had no reason to feel one way or the other about the Conception. The replacement or death of the figures who had presided over and, however casually, championed the Conception’s introduction to England, like Leofric and Aelfsige, and the general disruption of the Church calendar caused the feast of the Conception to slip away. It should be noted, in summary, that the feast Eadmer and Osbert were defending and setting in contrast to the vision of the liturgical year of the Normans had probably been unknown in England as lately as thirty-five years before the Conquest and had not been adopted widely even then. Jay Rubenstein remarks that even in Eadmer’s case of inventing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, “the *effect* (emphasis added) of Eadmer’s historical vision was not and never could have been a revival of the Anglo-Saxon past...as is often the case when one seeks to re-create a golden age, Eadmer ended up inventing something new.”⁵⁵

Anglo-Norman pastoral figures, then, seem to have respected the history of pastoral care in England in the field of preaching and liturgical communal celebration, just as in the field of literary output which George Younge surveys. Why, however, would two men born in Norman England, probably connected to the Norman elite, choose a feast that Lanfranc had seen as, at the very least, irrelevant, to justify Biblically and philosophically and to instruct people corporately? In the case of Osbert it seems to

⁵⁴ Briggs, 126.

⁵⁵ Rubenstein, 305.

have been grounded in personal devotion to the Virgin Mary, which devotion appears again and again in his letters: the letter to Cecilia provides only one example. His desire that the monks at Worcester and then potentially a wider audience should know and care about this doctrine was not something he could have gained from his education, as the feast was no longer or never celebrated among those with whom he was raised; he could only have learned about it through a contemporary and then felt personally moved to write on it. This returns to the combination of supply and demand from Chapter 1: on one level, Warin personally requested that Osbert write this sermon, but as regards the broader audience, Osbert was not responding to “*mycel gedwyld*” or a deep and broad demand for catechetical instruction but expounding on a certain liturgical issue that gripped him. Osbert’s personal devotion exemplified through his writing of this sermon certainly informs the individual holiness he expected from his niece, his correspondents, and his wider audience to whom he desired to provide pastoral care.

From examining these works of Osbert of Clare and Lanfranc of Bec, it appears that the most fundamental emerging differences in pastoral care by 1140, in a world that also by no means utterly discarded the writers that had come before, are connected to pastoral figures’ intended scope of their writing, their perception of right learning, and their desired response in their audience. The turn to the letter genre as a primary vehicle of pastoral care – we do not know that Lanfranc preached at all – and the writers’ concern to establish their personal relationship with their recipient as a foundation for pastoral authority, rather than their teaching, is a definite shift. Even in the letters from pastoral figures that survive from the Anglo-Saxon period (and it may be meaningful that the preserved letters from pastoral figures are almost all if not all addressed to other pastoral

figures), questions of right behavior and relation to Christian teaching, not personal relationship, are foremost. Right learning, too, had by this point lost its primary meaning as instruction in Biblical and general Christian belief and in these writings, its purpose to inspire specific actions (such as venerating the Virgin Mary or St. Lawrence) motivated its discussion more.

Lanfranc and Osbert entered a world of English pastoral care that was changing rapidly both around them and as a result of their own actions. While the Norman minority and the international community with which Lanfranc was connected used and needed Latin materials, throughout the period covered by this chapter a culture of Old English copying continued, and obviously the vast majority of the population did not simply cease to speak or to hunger for pastoral instruction in Old English. The audiences to whom Lanfranc and Osbert were speaking, then, were more limited than those for whom the works of Aelfric and Wulfstan were intended; neither man aspired to create a collection of tens of fiery sermons on many aspects of the Christian life, still less to execute entire series of homilies for throughout the year, to reasonably reach populations from the king to country-wide parishoners. Unlike the figures of the immediately pre-Conquest period, Osbert and Lanfranc preferred to write their own materials, as might be expected when considered in light of their largely individual missions. Osbert in particular – in his rewriting of the saint's life of Edward the Confessor, forging of charters that bolstered Westminster's primacy and independence from London, and participation in the transformation of the feast of the Conception of Mary from simple, regionally celebrated devotional occasion to theologically developed, widely accepted

doctrine – was, in this period, engaging with materials of pastoral care in an idiosyncratic, very updated way.

Despite the differences in generation, relation to the throne, and practical life experience between Lanfranc and Osbert, both exhibit important characteristics and interesting commonalities that help to reveal the priorities and practices of pastoral care during the seventy-five years after the Conquest, just as Aelfric and Wulfstan and their inheritors illuminated the pastoral care of the seventy years before. Their works may not have been distributed widely in the Middle Ages (that we know of),⁵⁶ but they offer still a fascinating view into the deepest concerns of the prior of the house closest to royal power and the archbishop closest to ultimate Church power in Anglo-Norman England.

⁵⁶ Briggs, 133.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

All four figures whose writings this thesis has examined, as well as the multiple figures associated with the transmission and reuse of their works, held differing views on how best to teach their people. ‘Right learning,’ as conceived of by Aelfric, held connotations of Biblical and liturgical rigor that may not have been shared even by his contemporary Wulfstan outside of the monastic context, let alone by individuals after their lifetimes. The understanding of right learning was broadening as the Benedictine Reform continued, and the way in which to communicate it was becoming more and more positive and less negative. Lanfranc or Osbert, in turn, communicated the importance of right learning differently to their people between sermon and letter writings in a more personal, emotional way. The intimacy of their works makes sense, just as the rigor of Aelfric’s works does, considering the context of the Anglo-Norman period: their challenges within pastoral care were less centered on catechetical or exegetical instruction and more on correct interpretation of certain doctrine and right relation to Church authority in a tumultuous time.

The overarching concerns about Christian truth from Aelfric and Wulfstan that the pre-Conquest period took and applied to their own contexts, however, despite great departure from the mechanics of pastoral care by leading figures of the post-Conquest period did not disappear. Emphases on correct doctrine tied more specifically to ecclesiastical hierarchy, in the case of Lanfranc and Roger, and to emotional response and constant remembrance of how to act rightly, in the case of Osbert to Cecilia and the monks of Worcester, emerged most strongly during the later period. Yet they did not do

away with simple concerns that people should allow the Lord to direct their life in righteousness and appreciate the truth of Scripture through learning. None of these men equated their preaching with the Word of God, useful “to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice,” but as students of that Scripture they inarguably did desire “that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.”¹ As every pastoral writing that this thesis has analyzed demonstrates, pastoral figures of the late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman period were constantly engaging with, learning from, and teaching directly out of the Scriptures, often through the lens of earlier Church figures and their writings, in order to lead their people toward salvation and holy living.

Following and analyzing the thread of concern for right learning or right doctrine that persisted from c. 990-1140 in pastoral writing ought to inform our view of the Norman Conquest as more than a political, social, linguistic, or religious phenomenon. Studying pastoral care synthesizes all of these currents and disciplines. Analysis of these texts gives meaning to the comparison of Lanfranc of Bec’s word choice concerning the Devil’s influence on his audience’s life with Aelfric of Eynsham’s word choice for the same thing, or to the quite varied pastoral – not exclusively social, political, etc. – concerns that would lead Wulfstan of York or Osbert of Clare to write a sermon in Latin addressed to clergymen. Pastoral care, “the religious mission of the church to minister to the laity and provide for their spiritual welfare,”² was a heavily multidisciplinary pursuit through which Aelfric, Wulfstan, St. Wulfstan, Leofric, Osbert, Lanfranc, and others sought to address the concerns they saw and to bring the Word of God and the support of

¹ 2 Timothy 3:16-17.

² Clarke and James, 1.

the Church to the people to whom they had access. In every sermon, homily, and letter considered in this thesis, we see the pastoral figures interacting with the challenges inherent in their societies. Osbert's impassioned and prophetically grounded defense of the feast of the Conception is a response to a crisis of his time, just as the writings emerging from the Benedictine Reform were responses to crises of their times.

The figures of this thesis give us a window into how people in England before, on the brink of, and dealing with the new world created by the Norman Conquest saw themselves in relation to God, to others, and to their own pasts. Their choices to spend precious resources copying these homilies and sermons, to prune the liturgical calendar in an effort to simplify unfamiliar practices, or to react against that pruning with an impassioned defense of a concept that was both old and new are impactful to our understanding of how the people whom we now categorize as Anglo-Saxons or Anglo-Normans saw themselves as actors in an endeavor with eternal proportions. Taking a moment to investigate what in these sermons, homilies, and letters was so relevant and valuable to people of this age, and what they saw as the proper way to communicate God's law and teaching to others, helps us to enter into the minds of individuals from the past more deeply, and to perceive the efforts of servants of God across the ages more truly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bethurum, Dorothy. *The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957.
- Briggs, Brian. "The Life and Works of Osbert of Clare." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 2004.
- Clarke, Peter and Sarah James. "Introduction." In *Pastoral Care in Medieval England: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. London: Routledge, 2019.
- Clayton, Mary. "Feasts of the Virgin in the Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church." *Anglo-Saxon England* 13. 1984.
- Clemoes, Peter. *Aelfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1997.
- "The Chronology of Aelfric's Works. In Peter Clemoes, ed. *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins*. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959.
- Clover, Helen and Margaret Gibson, eds. and transl., *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Cross, J.E. "Vernacular Sermons in Old English." In Beverly Kienzle, ed. *The Sermon*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- "Ealdred , archbishop of York." In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Franzen, Christine. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, vol. 6*. Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998.
- Frohlich, Walter, transl, and ed. *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*. Kalamazoo, MI: 1990.
- Garmonsway, George, ed. *Aelfric's Colloquy*. London: Methuen, 1939.
- Gatch, Milton McC. *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric and Wulfstan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Hawk, Brandon. *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2018.
- . "Aelfric's Preface to Genesis: A Translation." Brandon W. Hawk. 30 July 2014.

- Hill, Joyce. "The Benedictine Reform and Beyond." In Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001.
- "Houses of Benedictine Monks: The cathedral priory of St. Andrew, Rochester." In William Page, ed., *A History of the County of Kent, Volume 2*. London: Victoria County History, 1926. 121-26.
- Ihnat, Kati. "Early Evidence for the Cult of Anne in Twelfth-Century England." *Traditio* 69. 2014.
- Ker, N.R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957.
- Kienzle, Beverly. "Introduction." In Beverly Kienzle, ed. *The Sermon*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Knappe, Gabriele. "Classical Rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon England." *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), 5-29.
- Lawrence-Mathers, Anne. *Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2003.
- Lees, Clare. *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Lionarons, Joyce Tally. *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2010.
- Jones, Lynn. "From *Anglorum basileus* to Norman Saint: The Transformation of Edward the Confessor." In Stephen Morillo, ed., *The Haskins Society Journal 12 2002: Studies in Medieval History*, 2003.
- Mason, Emma. *St. Wulfstan of Worcester, c. 1008-1095*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd. 1990.
- McGowan, Joseph. "Anglo-Latin Literature." In Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Companion to Anglo-Latin Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- "MS Hatton 113-14." Medieval Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries. May 2020.
- "MSS Bodl. 430, 342." In Medieval Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries, 21 June 2022.
- Pope, John. *Homilies of Aelfric: A Supplementary Collection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967-8.

- Pulsiano, Philip and Elaine Treharne. "An Introduction to the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Literature." In Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.
- Rubenstein, Jay. "Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury." *Speculum* 74:2. 1999.
- Spear, David S. "The Norman Empire and the Secular Clergy, 1066-1204." *Journal of British Studies* 21: 2. 1982.
- Thurston, H and T. Slater, eds. *De conceptione sanctae Mariae*. Freiburg im Breisgau. 1904.
- Tinti, Francesca. *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c. 870 to c. 1100*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd. 2010.
- . "The Pallium Privilege of Pope Nicholas II for Archbishop Ealdred of York." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70:4 (2019).
- . "Benedictine Reform and Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Early Medieval Europe* 23:2 (2015), 229-51.
- Treharne, Elaine M. "Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050-1072." *The Review of English Studies* 54: 214. 2003.
- "Scribal Connections in late Anglo-Saxon England." In Cate Gunn and Catherine Innes-Parker, ed., *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer. 2009.
- "The bishop's book: Leofric's homiliary and eleventh-century Exeter." In Stephen David Baxter, ed., *Early medieval studies in memory of Patrick Wormald*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge. 2016.
- Upchurch, Robert. "An Anglo-Saxon bishop, his book, and two battles: Leofric of Exeter and liturgical performance as pastoral care." *Anglo-Saxon England* 48 (2019). 209-70.
- Vaughn, Sally N. "Lanfranc of Bec: A Reinterpretation." *A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 17: 2. 1985
- Ward, Emily Joan. "Child Kings and the Norman Conquest: Representations of Association and Succession." In Laura Ashe and Emily Joan Ward, eds., *Conquests in Eleventh-Century England: 1016, 1066*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2020.

Whitelock, D., M. Brett, and C.N.L. Brooke, eds. *Councils and Synods of the English Church, vol. I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Wilcox, Jonathan. 2001. "Transmission of Literature and Learning: Anglo-Saxon Scribal Culture." In Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, eds., *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

Williamson, E.W., ed. *The Letters of Osbert of Clare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929.

-- "The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies: The Wulfstan tradition in eleventh-century vernacular." In *England in the Eleventh Century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton symposium*. Stamford: Paul Watkins. 1992.

Younge, George. "Old English Literary Culture and the Circle of Saint Anselm." In Margaret Healy-Varley, Giles Gasper, and George Younge, eds., *Anselm of Canterbury: Communities, Contemporaries and Criticism*. Leiden: Brill, 2021, pp. 173-196.