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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The *Rectitudines singularum personarum* (RSP) is a document, probably composed in the early eleventh century, which describes the various classes of tenants and functionaries of an Anglo-Saxon estate, their obligations and their privileges. Sometime in the twelfth century, the RSP was translated into Latin and included in a collection of legal documents from Anglo-Saxon England called the *Quadripartitus*. The importance of this text for our understanding of Anglo-Saxon society is amply illustrated by the fact that the RSP has been discussed in every important scholarly book on Anglo-Saxon England.¹ Utilizing the information gained from the archaeological advances of the past thirty years and integrating it with the documentary evidence we have, I will demonstrate that the RSP was written during a time in which Anglo-Saxon England was going through a major transition in rural settlement patterns and in manorial management structures. I will also propose that it is against this backdrop of change and social upheaval that the RSP must be understood, and that the purpose of its composition was not simply to provide a practical guide to managing an estate, but that it was also written

---

to provide an example of what the author considered to be a socially just arrangement between tenants and lord on a manor.

However, a reevaluation of the RSP’s function necessitates a new reading of the document itself with new interpretations and translations of certain portions of the text. It is, therefore one goal of this thesis to provide a new translation of this text with commentary based solely on the Anglo-Saxon version of the text. The need for a new edition of this text is suggested by the fact that it was not until the 1950s that a full English translation by David C. Douglas of the RSP became available in *English Historical Documents*.

But this translation was included in an anthology of early English texts, and was intended merely to provide the reader with a broad exposure to its content, and to set it within the even broader context of other early English legal texts. For this reason, Douglas’s translation is not always consistent and on occasion fails to translate certain sections of the text. Being mindful of the difficulties involved in translating such a specialized text with a high volume of technical terminology, I hope that this translation will nevertheless provide an accurate rendering of the text’s meaning in light of contemporary research.

---

**The Anglo-Saxon and Latin Versions of the RSP**

---

The Anglo-Saxon Version of the RSP is currently represented by only one manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 383, a twelfth-century copy of the text. It was also during the early twelfth century that the RSP, along with many other Anglo-Saxon laws and legal texts, were translated into Latin and collected in a work called the *Quadripartitus*. This work is represented by 9 extant manuscripts, each of which contains a slightly different collection of Anglo-Saxon legal texts. Of these manuscripts the RSP is contained in four: M, R, T and Hk.\(^3\) While it is instructive to compare the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin versions of the RSP, it should be remembered that the Latin version was composed roughly a century after the Anglo-Saxon version. Significantly, the Latin translation also came after the Norman Conquest, and must be understood as part of an effort to redefine, or at least incorporate, pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon law into the new legal context of post-Conquest England. Since the purpose of this study, however, is to understand the RSP purely within its Anglo-Saxon context, the discussion of this text will be based solely on the Anglo-Saxon version. Further, in order to avoid unintentionally integrating anachronistic social constructs into a pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon context, I will avoid consulting the Latin for the translation and the analysis of the text.

**Outline of Presentation**

The first chapter of the thesis will provide a new edition of the Anglo-Saxon version of the RSP (based on an examination of a photostatic copy of the manuscript) as well as a modern English translation. This is accompanied by a commentary on the various sections of the text citing previous translations and discussions. The third chapter will review the efforts of scholars from the nineteenth century to the present to determine the physical organization and agricultural management of Anglo-Saxon estates. Using the most recent archaeological information and internal evidence from the RSP, I will endeavor to reconstruct the topology, economy and the settlement pattern of the RSP estate. The evidence from archaeological surveys and field walks indicates that England underwent a major shift during the late Anglo-Saxon period from scattered settlements to nucleated villages. These changes within the estate also caused significant changes in its social structure, and seem to have opened the door to certain abuses by lords of their tenants. Chapter Four will examine the evidence for these changes, concentrating in particular on the type of peasant known as the gebur, who apparently was primarily responsible for the cultivation of the lord’s field, and who also seems to have been most affected by these changes. Finally, Chapter Five will draw conclusions from the evidence as to the import of the RSP. Appendices A and B will provide a lexicon for the Anglo-Saxon words of the RSP and an index to the Anglo-Saxon text respectively. Since we will be discussing the physical environment and agricultural practices of early medieval England, it will be necessary to use what is now archaic terminology in both the translation and discussions. Appendix C provides a glossary of these terms. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Anglo-Saxon texts are my own.
Citations of the RSP will use the section numbers (enclosed in square brackets) assigned by the most recent editor of the RSP, Felix Liebermann, in his edition.

**Historiography of the RSP**

Extracts of the *Rectitutdines singularum personarum* were first published in its Latin version by Sir Henry Ellis in 1833 in *A General Introduction to Domesday Book*. These were taken from a thirteenth-century copy of the *Quadripartitus*. He was also the first to mention the existence of an Anglo-Saxon version of the text in the library of Corpus Christi College. The following year, 1834, Johann Martin Lappenberg published the full text of the Latin RSP (under the title *De dignitate hominum*) from a seventeenth-century copy of the *Quadripartitus* that was in the archive of Hamburg. His theory regarding the text was that it was a manual for itinerant Anglo-Saxon or Norman judges to assist them in deciding cases.

It was not until 1840 that the Anglo-Saxon version of the RSP was published by Benjamin Thorpe in his *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*. He published the text under the title *Rectitudines singularum personarum*, by which it has been known ever since. The Anglo-Saxon was published alongside the Latin, but there was no English

---


7Thorpe, vol. 1, 432-441.
translation accompanying the text. This was because, as Thorpe himself admits, there are a lot of technical terms used in the RSP, which scholars at the time did not yet understand.\(^8\) The early nineteenth century was a time when scholars were still discovering and compiling Anglo-Saxon legal texts. Little had, or in fact could have, yet been done to synthesize the information to form a broad picture of Anglo-Saxon manorial structures.

One of the first attempts at such a synthesis was Heinrich Leo’s deceptively titled *Rectitudines singularum personarum.*\(^9\) Despite the books title, the majority of the work is an attempt to reconstruct a kind of *Deutsche Urkultur,* indiscriminately drawing from Scandinavian and old Germanic as well as Anglo-Saxon sources. Ample testimony to the contribution of his work is given by the fact that he is almost never cited in subsequent scholarly literature. Nevertheless, his was the first attempt at a German translation of the RSP, which he published with the Latin and Anglo-Saxon (as well as his improved, “Verbeszerter,” version of the Anglo-Saxon) without commentary at the end of his book.\(^10\)

An important analysis of Anglo-Saxon legal literature was published by John Mitchell Kemble in his work *The Saxons in England.*\(^11\) Among the texts that Kemble

---

\(^8\) Thorpe, yol. 1, xi.

\(^9\) Heinrich Leo, *Rectitudines singularum personarum* (Halle: Eduard Anton, 1842).

\(^10\) Leo, 221-247.

translates in his discussion on *laenland* are portions of the RSP, only those dealing with the *geneat*, the cottager and the *gebur*.\(^\text{12}\) The uncertain understanding of the text’s legal terminology is illustrated by his leaving some terms untranslated, such as *saete* and *landgafol*. Nevertheless, he translates most of them, and the quality of his translation and analysis is very high. He misinterprets “grass-ploughing,” as referring to the plowing of virgin field, but this is understandable given that little had been previously done to integrate information from later medieval manorial practices into an understanding of Anglo-Saxon practices. His interpretation of *werige his hlafordes inland* (section [3,4]) is particularly insightful.\(^\text{13}\)

Nearly a decade later Reinhold Schmid published his collection of Anglo-Saxon legal documents in *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*.\(^\text{14}\) Instead of seeing the RSP as a guide for itinerant Anglo-Norman judges, as Lappenberg had, Schmid regarded it as probably being more a manual for an estate reeve.\(^\text{15}\) He acknowledged the difficulties in translating a text with so much technical terminology, as well as his debt to Leo and Kemble.\(^\text{16}\) His

\(^{12}\text{Kemble, 322-325. Kemble was also the first to call attention to the similarities between the Tidenham and the Hyssbourne charters on pages 319-322.}\)

\(^{13}\text{Kemble, 323, n. 2.}\)

\(^{14}\text{Reinhold Schmid, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1858).}\)

\(^{15}\text{Schmid, lxiii.}\)

\(^{16}\text{Schmid, lxiv.}\)
German translation, was a vast improvement over Leo’s, and one that seems to have influenced Liebermann’s later, definitive edition.

During the course of the nineteenth century interest arose regarding medieval agricultural systems and their origins. One of the most important works on this topic was Frederic Seebohm’s *The English Village Community*. In order to understand the manorial structure described in Ango-Saxon texts Seebohm looked to the pre-enclosure fields of England. He studied many such villages, primarily the township of Hitchen, to gain a clearer picture of the open-field system and the social structure they required. Understandably, the RSP was a vital document for understanding the various types of peasants on an Anglo-Saxon estate and their social standing. He published the RSP in Anglo-Saxon, Latin and modern English in side-by-side columns. Seebohm, however, confined his edition only to the sections dealing with the thegn, the *geneat*, the cottager and the *gebur*. His translation is a highly cautious one, importing many untranslated terms into is translation, such as *fyrd-faereld*, *burh-bot* and *brig-bot*, which by this time had been fairly well understood.

Naturally, the RSP was included in Felix Liebermann’s monumental work, *Die

17Schmid, 370-383.


19Seebohm, 129-133.

20A further example is his translation of *werige* in section [3,4] as “defends,” which is highly conservative. Cf. comment on Kemble’s translation above. Also, see textual
His edition of Anglo-Saxon legal documents, based largely on the *Quadripartitus*, is comprehensive in its scope as well as detailed and erudite in its analysis. His German translation of the RSP is based on careful research of the secondary literature up to that point, and can be very little improved upon. His has been recognized as the definitive edition of this text.

Liebermann had discovered another document, which he entitled *Gerefa*, which describes the duties and itinerary of an estate reeve. The reason this text had received little attention before this was because it had never been translated into Latin or included in the *Quadripartitus*. Liebermann argued, that this document was part II of the RSP.

Liebermann’s linguistic analysis of the Corpus Christi, Cambridge MS 383 concluded that this manuscript was an early twelfth century copy of a manuscript compiled in the second or last third of the eleventh century. This eleventh-century document, however, was not the version of the RSP upon which the Latin translation in the *Quadripartitus* was based. Even though the eleventh-century version of the RSP showed signs of modernization, i.e. the Anglo-Saxon had been updated to reflect the state of the language around 1070 to 1100, certain more archaic elements were still preserved, indicating the existence of the document at the turn of the eleventh century. However, the Latin version provides evidence for an even earlier date of composition. Many of the

commentary on section [3,4].


Anglo-Saxon words had been simply imported into the Latin version untranslated. These untranslated forms reflect the Anglo-Saxon of the mid- to late tenth century, perhaps around 970.23

Because of the definitive nature of Liebermann’ edition, there has been no effort since to re-edit the text, and the only subsequent English translation is the one published by Douglas in *English Historical Documents*, whose most significant contribution is a translation of sections [5] through [21], which until then had never been rendered into English.24 The next important insight into authorship and purpose of the RSP came in 1963 with Dorothy Bethurum’s article, “Episcopal Magnificence in the Eleventh Century.”25 She proposed, based on mostly stylistic considerations, that the RSP and the Gerefa, as we currently have them, were a rewriting of an earlier work by archbishop Wulfstan.26 This earlier document, she surmises, was one dating from the episcopacy of Oswald27 Bethurum argues that primarily the RSP had a practical function, spelling out the customs of his estates in a clear form.28 However, Bethurum hints that another

23Liebermann, vol. 3, 244.

24This translation and its merits have already been discussed above.


26Bethurum, 162. Wulfstan was bishop of London in 996, and then held York and Worcester in plurality from 1002-1016, after which point he was archbishop of York alone until his death in 1023.

27Archbishop of Worcester from 961 until is death in 992. He also held York in plurality from 971 to 992.

28Bethurum, 166.
function of the RSP and the *Gerefa* was to reflect the magnificent wealth and power of the bishop, an appropriate mark of status befitting an earthly representative of the heavenly king.\(^{29}\)

The stylistic features Bethurum cites as evidence of Wulfstan’s hand are the use of two-stress phrases, alliteration, the use of the word *lagu* for “law,” and the formulaic “*he sceal,*” which she remarks, “reminds us of recurring formulas in Wulfstan’s legal writings.”\(^{30}\) The dates and provenience for the RSP assigned by Liebermann are seen as further support for Wulfstan’s ultimate authorship.\(^{31}\) However, as Bethurum herself points out, the use of two-stress phrases and alliteration are a common feature of Anglo-Saxon literature.\(^{32}\) It should also be noted that the use of the *lagu* is hardly unique to Wulfstan, and rather than being seen as a purely stylistic feature, needs to be recognized as having a vital function in the meaning of the text. Though arguably tenuous, the arguments she presents definitely demand consideration, and have received qualified acceptance by some scholars ever since.\(^{33}\)

The most recent discussion of the RSP is in Paul Harvey’s article, “Rectitudines

---

\(^{29}\) Bethurum, 170.

\(^{30}\) Bethurum, 166.

\(^{31}\) Bethurum, 163-165.

\(^{32}\) Bethurum, 164 and 165.

Singularum Personarum and Gerefa,” which, as the title suggests, is primarily about the origin and relationship of these two texts. Harvey argues that while these two documents had been “revised and welded” together early on, that they had different origins and initial purposes.\(^\text{34}\) He regards the Gerefa as a literary work heavily influenced by Latin agricultural treatises more than a practical manual.\(^\text{35}\) He argues that this work is the product of the literary and intellectual milieu of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.\(^\text{36}\) By contrast, the RSP, Harvey suggests, was written in the mid-tenth century and its purpose was, “to guide the local management of a single estate owner, a single hlaford, perhaps to read to them, perhaps to be referred to as a standard rule.”\(^\text{37}\) Based on linguistic considerations, such as the use of the word berebrytta, Harvey proposes the area of Hampshire, Wiltshire and Somerset – particularly east Somerset and west Wiltshire – as the text’s provenience,\(^\text{38}\) and tentatively suggests that it was written for the estates of St. Peter’s, Bath.\(^\text{39}\)

As can be seen from the above presentation, all previous analyses of the RSP assume a practical function of the text. Further, while acknowledging the RSP’s statement, that manorial practices varied, there is still the presumption of a static

\(^{34}\)Harvey, 7.

\(^{35}\)Harvey, 9.

\(^{36}\)Harvey, 11.

\(^{37}\)Harvey, 19.

\(^{38}\)Harvey, 20.

\(^{39}\)Harvey, 21.
agricultural system. Recent information gained from the progress in landscape archaeology has produced a new understanding of manorial structures and their evolution. When the RSP is re-read in light of the agricultural and social transitions that we now know were occurring, one may posit an ideological function coexisting with the practical. As I hope to demonstrate in the following chapters, major changes in the physical configuration of estates produced equally significant changes in manorial society, often resulting in the loss of traditional rights by the peasants. In this context, the RSP may be read as an attempt to reconcile the forces of manorial innovation with customary rights and expectations. Perhaps, then, the greatest value of the RSP is not the information it provides regarding the managing of an estate, but the insight it brings to the ideological values and issues of late Anglo-Saxon England.
CHAPTER II

THE TEXT OF THE \textit{RECTITUDINES SINGULARUM PERSONARUM}

The Manuscript

The RSP is found in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 383, which is now housed in the Parker Library. The manuscript contains a collection of Anglo-Saxon laws and related texts, beginning with Eadgar’s Laws and ending with a note on West Saxon genealogy. Matthew Parker\textsuperscript{40} himself paginated the collection with red pencil, the first 19 pages marked as “a” through “s,” and the following being numbered 1 through 109. However, Parker also seems to have rearranged the quires, and the pages that are currently numbered 13-42 originally came before page 1. In 1991 the manuscript was conserved and rebound. Its current dimensions are 20.2 cm x 13.6 cm.\textsuperscript{41} The RSP is found on pages 96-107.

The calligraphy of the body of the text is a clear insular minuscule. The rubricated headings, however, employ a mixture of uncial and rustic majuscule forms, and occasionally insert minuscule characters. After section [13], however, the headings

\textsuperscript{40}Matthew Parker (1504-1575) was archbishop of Canterbury (1559-1575). After becoming master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1544, he compiled a large collection of statues, which became the foundation for his library.

\textsuperscript{41}My deepest thanks to Gill Cannell, librarian at the Parker Library, who provided not only the photostatic copy of the manuscript, but also took the time to provide a detailed description of the collection.
consistently use minuscule with the exception of the first character, which remains majuscule.

The only punctuation used in the manuscript is the colon, in the technical sense of a medial point. The colon is used consistently to mark a sentence break as well as to offset roman numerals and the abbreviation “p” for paenig. It is used rather inconsistently to mark the boundary between compound sentences or for minor breaks, such as subordinate clauses and lists.

Date

Liebermann notes that the orthography of certain words in MS 383 reflects the stage of the English language between the years 1070 and 1100. The English of the rubrics are of an even later date. Another Anglo-Saxon version of the RSP was used as the source for the Latin translation, which on occasion does not translate words into Latin, but simply transcribes them from the Anglo-Saxon. Many of these words preserve older forms, which seem to represent the English of around 1060. Liebermann, however, finds evidence for still older forms, such as the dative form of wintra and sumera, and notes that there is only one Scandinavian loanword (lagu), while there is no evidence of French influence. For a terminus a quo Liebermann argues that the text was probably not written before 970, though this is based on stylistic observations. Paul Harvey argues


for a pre-eleventh century date, noting that the use of *ealdormann* with the sense of “overseer, manager” would not be possible after the tenth century.\(^{44}\) Mentioning also that the word *pund* is used in the mid-tenth century as a measure of capacity, Harvey believes that a mid-tenth-century date for the text is reasonable.\(^{45}\) MS 383 seems, therefore, to be an early twelfth-century copy of a mid-eleventh-century copy of a text possibly written in the second half of the tenth century.

**Notes on Transcription**

In both my transcription and my translation Liebermann’s enumerated sections have been retained, with the exception of sections [20] and [20,1], where I have moved the clause *hwilces landsticces geann* from [20,1] to [20], because as a dependent clause it is part of the previous sentence. The reason for Liebermann’s choices of where to make sectional divisions was determined by an effort to coordinate the Anglo-Saxon version with the Latin version of the text. It is for this reason that there is no translation given for section [3,1] which occurs only in the Latin.

Liebermann’s transcription of the RSP is extremely reliable, and no improvement can be made on it that would significantly alter the reading of the text. Nevertheless, while he faithfully represents what is in the manuscript, he also inserts into the manuscript elements that are not there. His use of capitalization and punctuation compel the text to conform to our understanding of concept breaks (both major and minor), as


\(^{45}\)Harvey, 19.
well as the import of certain words over others through capitalization. The following transcription uses the punctuation and capitalization that the scribe of the RSP used.

However, Liebermann's word divisions have been retained, as well as the practice of providing a plenary rendering of words that have been abbreviated with the restored portions printed in italics. Liebermann had left the word "penny" abbreviated as "p," which is understandable given the variety of this word’s orthography. However, for the sake of consistency, and to make the text more readable, I provide a plenary form based on the fuller spelling found in heorðpaenig in [3,4].

The headers in the manuscript immediately precede their paragraph without any following punctuation -- the use of a majuscule beginning the body of the paragraph being sufficient to indicate where the rubric ends. The headings have been rendered in capital letters to mark when they are written in an uncial/majuscule script. However, when the heading uses a minuscule, I have left the character in small letters.

**Notes on Translation**

The translation here offered endeavors to be a very close one. While the primary purpose is to communicate the meaning of the text, an effort has also been made to echo the word patterns of the original. A difficulty in translating this text is that there are many technical terms for which there is no simple modern English equivalent. Rather than translate such words with rather long phrases, two alternative approaches have been taken. The first is to simply transcribe the word into the translation. This method is limited to words indicating a social function or status, such as gebur and geneat. These terms will be more fully defined and discussed in Chapter Four. The other approach is to
translate the term literally, which sometimes means using archaic, agricultural technical terms. Since, however, these words will not be readily understandable to the reader, they have been printed in bold to indicate that a fuller definition is provided in a glossary found in appendix C. Finally, words that have no direct correlation in the original Anglo-Saxon, but which are added in the translation to facilitate understanding, are printed in italics.
The Anglo-Saxon Text

[1] ¹Degenlagu is þæt he sy his bocrihtes wyrðe  7 þæt he ðreo ðinc of his lande do fyrdfaereld  7 burhbotre brycgeweorc  [1,1] eac of manegum landum mare landriht arist to cyniges gebanne swilce is  7 deorhege to cyniges hame 7 scorþ to friðscipe  7 saeweard 7 heafodwereard 7 fyrdwereard 7 aelmesfeoh 7 cyricsceat 7 maenige oðere mistlice ðingc. ⁴⁶

Geneatriht is mistlic be ðam ðe on lande staent  7 on sumon he sceal landgafol syllan 7 gaersswyn  7 on geare  7 ridan 7 auerian 7 lade laedan  7 wyrcaen  7 hlaforde feormian  7 ripan 7 mawan  7 deorhege heawan  7 saete haldan  7 bytlia  7 burh hegegian, nigegeare to tune feccan  7 cyricsceat syllan  7 aelmesfeoh  7 heafodwearde healdan  7 horswearde  7 aerendian  7 fyþ swa nyr  7 swa hwyrde swa him mon to taecð. ⁴⁷

[3] Kotesetlan rihta
Kotesetlan riht  7 be ðam ðe on lande stent on sumon he sceal aelce Mondaeg oferb geares fyrst his hlaforde c wyrcaen  7 oðð  7 iiii dagas aelcre wucan on haerfest  ⁴⁸ [3, 2] ne ðearf he landgafol syllan  [3, 3] him gebyriað  7 v³  7 aecere to habbanne  7 mare gyf hit on lande

⁴⁶[1] In his edition Liebermann has "Dégenes lagu" as a header. However, from the photostatic copy available, there is no evidence of a header. Yet, it should be noted that rubrics did not show up well in this copy.

⁴⁷[2] a This header is present, but is too faint on the photostatic copy to read.

⁴⁸[3] a This header is present, but is too faint on the photostatic copy to read. b Ms: ofeh. c Ms: laford.
ðeaw\textsuperscript{b} sy 7 to lytel hit bið beo hit a laesse forðan his weorc sceal beon oftraede \textsuperscript{49} [3, 4] sylle his heorðpaenig on halgan ðunresdaeg ealswa aelcan frigean men gebyreið 7 werge his hlaforde inland gif him man beode aet saewearde 7 aet cyniges deorhege 7 aet swilcan ðingan swilc his maeð sy 7 sylle his cyric sceat 7 to martinus maessen.

[4] Gebures gerihte\textsuperscript{a}

Gebur gerihta syn mislice 7 gehwar hy syn hefige 7 gehwar eac medeme \textsuperscript{50} [4a] On sumen lande is þaet he sceal wyrkan to wicweorce 7 ii 7 dagas swile weorc swilc him man taecð ofer geares fyrst aelcre wucan 7 on haerfest 7 iii 7 dagas to wicweorce 7 of candelmaesse oð eastran 7 iii 7 gif he aferað ne ðearf he wyrkan ða hwile ðe his hors ute bið 7 [4, 1] he sceal syllan on michaesles maessedaeig 7 x 7 gafol 7 paenigas 7 on martinus maessedaeig 7 xxiii 7 systra beres 7 7 ii 7 henfugelas 7 on eastran an geong sceap 7 oðde 7 ii 7 paenigas \textsuperscript{4, 1a} 7 he sceal licgan of martinus maessen oð eastran aet hlaforde falde swa oft swa him to begaeð 7 [4, 1b] 7 of ðam timan ðe man aerest ereð oð martinus maessan he sceal aelcre wucan erian 7 i 7 aecer 7 7 raecan\textsuperscript{a} sylf þaet saed on hlaforde berne \textsuperscript{51} [4, 1c] toeacan ðam 7 iii 7 aecer to bene 7 7 ii 7 to gaersyrðe 7 gyf he maran gaerses beðyrfe ðonne earnige ðaes swa him man ðafige 7 [4, 2] his gauolyðe 7 iii

\textsuperscript{49} [3, 3] \textsuperscript{a} The actual number here is difficult to read. \textsuperscript{b} Ms: ðead. The error can be understood if one presumes that the copies mistook a wynn for a thorn, which he then wrote as an eth.

\textsuperscript{50} [4] \textsuperscript{a} This header is present, but is too faint on the photostatic copy to read.

\textsuperscript{51} [4, 1b] \textsuperscript{a} The raecan is difficult to discern. Liebermann notes, "mit Kreide undeutlich geändert in raefan oder raepan (nicht, wie Edd. lesen, raeden)."
aeceras erige 7 sawe of his aganum berne. [4, 2a] 7 sylle his heorðpaenig. [4, 2b] 7 twegen 7 twegen fedan aenne headorhund. [4, 2c] 7 aelc gebur sylle. vi. hlafas ðam inswa<ne> ðonne he his heorde to maestene drife. [4, 3] On ðam sylfum lande ðe ðeos raeden on staent gebure gebyreð þaet him man to landsetene syllle. ii. oxan. 7. i. cu. 7 vi. sceap. 7 vii. aeceras gesawene on his gyrde landes. [4, 3a] forðige ofer ðaet gear ealle gerihtu ðe him to gebyrigean. [4, 3b] 7 syllle him man tol to his weorce 7 andlaman to his huse. [4, 3c] ðonne him forðsiða gebyrige, gyme his hlaford ðaes he laefe. 52

[4, 4] ðEOS LAND lagu staent on suman lande. gehwar hit is swa ic aer cwaeð hefigre gehwar eac² leohtre. forðam ealle landsida ne syn gelice. 53 [*4, 5] On sumen landa gebur sceal syllan huniggafoł. On suman metegafoł. On suman ealugafoł. [4, 6] hede se ðe scire healde þaet he wite a hwaet ealdlandraeden sy³. 7 hwaet ðeode ðeaw. 54

[5] BE ðAM ðE BEON BEWITADð

Beoceorle gebyrð hit he gafolheorde healt þaet he sylle ðonne¹ lande geraed beo. 55 [5, 1] mid us is geraed þaet he sylle. v. sustras huniges to gafole. On suman landum

52[4, 3c] a Ms: forðsit.


54[4, 6] a At this point the ms inserts 7 hwaet eald land raeden sy, doubtless due to dittography, the eye moving from the second hwaet back to the first.

55[5] a Liebermann's edition has "ðo_" with the note: "bessere þaet on (oder laut Quadr. þanon, swa on oder ähnlich)." However, the simplest reading is to interpret this abbreviation as þonne (the same abbreviation is used in [6,2], thus making the following clause temporal (referring to the time of payments) and not relative (referring to what was paid), as do Douglas and Liebermann.
gebyred mare gafolaedan. [5, 2] Eac he sceal hwiltidum geara beon on manegum weorcum to hlafordes willan · toecan benyrde 7 bedripe 7 maedmaewecte. [5, 3] 7 gyf he wel gelend bið he sceal beon gehorsad þaet he maeg to hlafordes seame þaet syllan · oððe sylf laeden · swæder him man taece. [5, 4] 7 fela ðinga swa gerad man sceal don · eal ic nu atellan ne maeig. [5, 5] ðonne him forðsið gebyrige hede se hlaford ðaes he laeфе bute hwet friges sy.

[6] GAFOLSWANE

Gafolswane gebyred þaet he sylle his slyht be ðam ðe on lande stent. [6, 1] On manigum landum stent þaet he sylle aelce geare · xv · swyn to sticunge · x · ealde · 7 · v · gynge · haebbe sylf þaet he ofer þaet araere. On manegum landum gebyred deopre swanriht. [6, 2] gyme eac swan þaet he aefter sticunge his slyhtswyn wel behweorfē. [6] ðonne bið he ful wel gewyrces wurðe. [56] [6, 3] eac he sceal beon swa ic aer be beocere cwaed · oftraede to gehwilcon weorce · 7 gehorsad to hlafordes neode. [6, 4] ðeow swan · 7 ðeow beocere · aefter forðsið be anre lage wurðe.

[7] BE AeHTESWANE

Aehteswane ðe inheordea healt, gebyred stifearh · 7 his gewirce, ðonne he spic. behworfen haefð · 7 elles ða gerihtu ðe ðeowaman men to gebyriað. [57]

---

56[6, 2] a Leibermann's edition inserts 7 at this point, "ergänzt aus Quadripartitus."

57[7] a Ms: inherode. b Ms seems to have swic. Given the similarity between "p" and wynn, the error is understandable.

Anan esne gebyrð to metsunge xii. pund godes cornes. 7 ii. scapaetere 7 i. god metecu wuduraeden be landside.

[9] be wifmonna metsunge

Deowan wifmen viii. pund cornes to mete i. sceap oððe iii. paenig. to wintersufle i. syster. beana to længtensufle hwæig on sumera oððe i. paenig. [9, 1] eallum aethemannum gebyrð midwintres feorm. 7 eastorfeorm. sulhaecer. 7 haerfesthandful<sup>a</sup>. toecan heora nydrihte.<sup>58</sup>

[10] be folgeran

Folgere gebyrð þæt he on twelf monðum ii. aeceras geearnige oðræne gesawene 7 oðræne unsawene saedige sylf daene 7 his mete 7 scoung 7 glofung him gebyrð [10, 1] gyf he mare geearnian mæig him bið sylfum fremu.


Saedere gebyrð þæt he haebbe aelces saedcynnes aenne leap fulne ðonne he aelc saed wel gesawen haebbe ofer geares fyrst.

[12] Be oxanhyrde

Oxanhyrde mot laeswian ii. oxan oððe ma mid hlafordes heorde on gemaenre laese be his ealdormannes gewitnesse earnian mid þam scos 7 glofa him sylfum [12, 1] 7 his

<sup>58</sup>[9,1] <sup>a</sup> Ms seems to have haerfesthandsul.
metecu mot gan mid hlafordes oxan.


Cuhyrde gebyreð þaet he haebbe ealdre cu meolc · vii · niht syððan heo nige cealfod haefð 7 frymetlinge bystinge · xiii · niht [13, 1] 7 ga his metecu mid hlafordes cu.


Sceaphyrdes riht is þaet he haebbe twelf nihta dingan\(^a\) to middenwintra · 7 · i · lamb of geares geogoðe\(^b\) · 7 i · belflys · 7 his heorde meolc · vii · niht aefter emnihtes daege 7 blede fulle hweges oððe syringe ealne sumor.\(^{59}\)

[15] Be Gathyrde

Gathyrde gebyreð his heorde meolc ofer martinus maessedaeig · 7 aer ðam his dael hwaeges · 7 · i · ticcen · of geares geogoðe gif he his heorde wel begymeð.

[16] Be cyswyrhte.

Cyswyrhtan gebyreð hundred cyse 7 þaet heo of wringhwaegæ\(^a\) buteran macige to hlafordes beode · 7 haebbe hire ða syringe ealle butan ðaes hyrdes daele.\(^{60}\)

[17] Be berebrytte.

---

\(^{59}\)[14] \(^a\) Ms: ðingan. \(^b\) Here the ms was corrected from geogoðe.

\(^{60}\)[16] \(^a\) Ms: wringh paege.
Berebryttan gebyrð corngebrot on haerfeste aet bernes dure · gif him his ealdorman ann
7 he hit mid getrywðan⁶¹ gearnoð.⁶¹

[18] Be bydele ·
Bydele gebyrð þæt he for his wycan sy weorces frigra ðonne oðer man · forðan he sceal
beon oftraede · [18, 1] eac him gebyrð sum landsticce for his geswince ·

[19] Be wudewarde
Wuduwearde gebyrð ælc windfylled treow ·

[20] Haeigwerde gebyrð þæt man his geswinces lean gecnawe on ðam endum ðe to
etenlaese liegan forðam he maeig wenan gyf he þæt aer forgymð þæt him man hwilces
landsticces geann [20, 1] þæt sceal beon mid folcrihte nyhst etenlaese forðam gyf he for
slaewðe his hlafordes forgymð ne bið his agnum wel geborgen gyf hit bið ðus funden ·
[20, 2] gyf he ðonne eal wel gefriðað he healdan sceal ðonne bið he godes leans ful well
wyrðe ·

[21] ⁶¹ LAND LAGA SYN mistlice · swa ic aer beforan saede · [21, 1] ne sette we na ðas
gerihtu offer ealle ðeoda · ðe we aer beforan ymbe spraecon ac we cyðað hwaet ðeaw is
ðæer ðæer us cuð is⁶² [21, 2] gyf we selre geleorniað þæt we willað georne lufian 7


⁶²[21] ⁶² The right portion of this line is blank, but shows signs of having had a rubric,
which seems to have been since erased(?). It is impossible to read from the photostatic
copy.
healdon be ðaere ðed ðewæ, ðe we ðæenne onwuniað · [21, 3] forðam · laga sceal on
leode luflce leornian · lóf se ðe on lande sylf nele leosan · [21, 4] Feola syndon
folcgerihtu · On sumre ðeode gebyrduð winterfeorm · easterfeorm · bendform for ripe ·
gytfeorm for yrðe · maede hreacmete · aet wudulade waentreow · aet cornlade
hreaccopp · 7 fela ðinga ðe ic getellan ne maeig · [21, 5] ðís is ðeah myngung manna
biwiste · 7 eal þaet ic aer beforan ymbe rehte
Modern English Translation

[1] The law regarding the thegn is that he should be worthy of his rights and obligations granted by charter, and that he should do three things from his holding the land: military service, maintenance of fortresses and work on bridges. [1,1] Moreover, concerning many estates more obligations from the land arise at the king's command, such as maintaining the deer fence at the king's residence and providing the fittings for a ship for defense, as well as performing coast-watch, bodyguard duty, and military watch; the giving of alms, church-fee and many other various things.


The obligations of the geneat are various, depending on what custom is in force on an estate. On some he must give a land-payment, a pasturage-swine, as well as ride, provide horses and convey loads; to work and to provide the lord's meals; to reap and mow, to cut deer-fences, to maintain hunting-blinds, to build, and to palisade the lord's fortified dwelling, to conduct strangers to the curtilage, to give the church fee and alms, to perform bodyguard duty, as well as to see to the care of the horses, to run errands far and near, whithersoever one directs him.


The obligations of the cottager depending on what custom is in force on an estate. On some he must work every Monday over a year's time for his lord, or 3 days each week at harvest time. [3, 2] He is not required to give land-payment. [3, 3] For him it is proper to have 5 acres, more if it is the practice on the estate, and it is too little if it ever be less,
because his labor must always be available.  [3, 4] He should give his hearth-penny on Holy Thursday (Ascension Day) as is proper for every free person, and he should secure his lord's field by being at the coast-watch, at the king's deer fence and at such things as is in keeping with his rank. And he should give his church fee on St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11th).


The gebur-obligations might be varied. In one place they might be heavy, in another even middling. [4a] On many an estate the custom is that he must work 2 days as week-work, such work as one directs him over a year's time each week, and at harvest time 3 days as week-work, and from Candlemas (Feb. 2) until Easter 3 days; if he provides horses for the manor's work, he is not required to work while his horses are out. [4, 1] He must give 10 pennies as payment at Michaelmas (Sept. 29), and on St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11) 23 sesters of barley and 2 hens; on Easter a young sheep or 2 pennies. [4, 1a] And he must lie at the lord's fold as often as it comes around to him from St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11) until Easter. [4, 1b] And from the time that one first plows until St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11), he must plow 1 acre each week, and himself procure seed at the lord's barn. [4, 1c] Besides that, 3 acres work-on-demand, and 2 acres as pasturage-plowing. If he needs more grass, then he should earn it, as one might allow him. [4, 2] <For> his payment-plowing; let him plow 3 acres and sow from his own barn. [4, 2a] And he should give his hearth-penny. [4, 2b] And they should provide food for 1 hunting dog in groups of two (lit. "two by two"). [4, 2c] And each gebur should give 6 loaves of bread to the estate-swineherd, when he drives his herd to pasture (mast). [4,
3] On the same estate, on which this arrangement is in force, it befits the gebur that one should give him as the necessities for occupying the land 2 oxen, 1 cow, 6 sheep and 7 acres sown on his strip of land. [4, 3a] After that year he should fulfill all the obligations that apply to him. [4, 3b] And one should give him the tools for his work, and the utensils for his house. [4, 3c] When it is time for him to depart, his lord should take charge of whatever he leaves.

[4, 4] This estate-law is in force on many an estate. In one place it is -- as I have said before -- heavier, in another even lighter, since estate-customs might not all be the same. [*4, 5] On many a land the gebur must give a honey-payment. On some, food-payment. On some, an ale-payment. [4, 6] Let him who holds part of a multiple-estate see to it, that he always knows old estate-arrangements, and what is the practice of the region.


It is proper for the beekeeper, if he holds a swarm subject to payment, that he give payment, whenever it is decided. [5, 1] With us it is decided, that he should give 5 sesters of honey as payment. On some estates greater terms of payment apply. [5, 2] Also he must sometimes be ready for many tasks at the lord's will, as well as plowing-on-demand and requested-reaping and mowing of the meadow. [5, 3] And if he is well furnished with land, he must be provided with a horse, so that he might provide it for the lord's load, or convey it himself, whichever one directs him. [5, 4] And a man so disposed must do many things, all of which I am unable now to enumerate. [5, 5] When it is time for him to depart, the lord should take charge of what he leaves, except
whatever might be free.


It is proper for the tenant-swineherd, that he should give his animal to be slaughtered, depending on what custom is in force on an estate. [6, 1] On many estates the custom is in force, that each year he should give 15 pigs, 10 mature and 5 young, for slaughter (lit. "stabbing"), and that he have for himself whatever he should rear over that. On many estates more severe swineherd-obligations apply. [6, 2] Also, the swineherd should take heed, that he well prepare his slaughter-pig after the slaughter (lit. "stabbing"), that he should singe it; then he will be full well worthy of his perquisites. [6, 3] Also, as I said before regarding the beekeeper, he must be always available for any work, and be provided with a horse for the lord's needs. [6, 4] The bound swineherd and the bound beekeeper after their passing are subject to the one law.


To the property-swineherd, who takes care of the estate-herd, is due a small, sty-pig, and his perquisites, when he has prepared the bacon, as well as the rights, which are due to bound persons.

[8] Regarding the provisioning of people.

12 pounds of good grain, 2 sheep carcasses, 1 good cow for food and an arrangement for wood-gathering are due to one slave-laborer as provisions.

To the bound woman are due 8 pounds of grain as food, 1 sheep or 3 pennies as food-allotment for the winter, 1 sester of legumes as food-allotment for the spring, whey in summer or 1 penny. [9, 1] To all property-men are due a Christmas meal, and an Easter meal, a strip of land for plowing, and a harvest-handful, as well as their right to necessities.

[10] Regarding the “follower.”
To the “follower” it is due that he should earn 2 acres in 12 months, one sown, the other unsown (he should sow it himself), and his allotment of food, and shoes and gloves are due to him. [10, 1] If he can earn more, it will be for his own profit.

To the sower it is due that he should have one leap full of every kind of seed, whenever he has sown every seed well over a year's time.

[12] Regarding the ox-herd.
The ox-herd is allowed to graze 2 or more oxen with the lord's herd on a common pasture with his superior's knowledge, and to earn thereby shoes and gloves for himself. [12, 1] And his cow for food may go with the lord's oxen.

To the cowherd it is due that he should have the milk of a mature cow for 7 nights after she has newly calved, and the beestings of a young cow for 14 nights. [13, 1] And his cow for food should go with the lord's cow.
[14] Regarding the shepherd.

It is the shepherd's right that he have the twelve nights' worth of dung at Christmas and 1 lamb from the year's young and 1 bell-wether's fleece and the milk from his flock for 7 days after the autumnal equinox and a bowl full of whey or buttermilk for the whole summer.


To the goatherd is due the milk of his flock after St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11th) and after that his portion of the whey, and 1 kid from the year's young, if he takes care of his flock well.

[16] Regarding the cheese-maker.

To the cheese-maker is due a hundred cheeses, but she should make butter from the strained whey for the lord's table, and she should have for herself the buttermilk, all except the shepherd's portion.

[17] Regarding the barley-keeper.

To the barley-keeper is due the grain dropped at the barn door at harvest-time, if his superior grants it to him, and he earns it by his diligence.

[18] Regarding the warrant-officer.

To the warrant-officer is due that he should be freer of work than another because of the duties of his office, since he must be always available. [18, 1] Also, some small plot of land is due to him for his labor.
[19] Regarding the woodward.

To the woodward is due every tree felled by the wind.

[20] For the hayward it is appropriate that the field given as compensation for his labor should be recognized as being at the end of the fields that borders on the pasture, because he can expect, if he soon neglects that which one granted to him from any plot of land, (…?) [20, 1] that it (his plot of land) must be next to the pasture in conjunction with the rights and obligations of the people, because if he neglects what is his lord's because of laziness, he will not be protected on his own land, if it is found so. [20, 2] If when he keeps well all that he must take care of, then he will be full well worthy of good compensation.

[21] Estate-laws might be varied, as I have previously said above, [21, 1] and we should not impose in any way these rights and obligations on all regions, of which we have previously spoken above, but we are making known what the practice is there, where it is known to us. [21, 2] If we learn of a better practice, that will we eagerly value and uphold according to the practice of the region, on which we are then living; [21, 3] because one must gladly learn the laws with respect to the people, he who does not himself want to lose good repute on his estate.

[21, 4] There are many rights and obligations on the people. In many a region are due a Christmas meal, an Easter meal, a meal for work-on-demand during the harvest, a drinking feast during the plowing, pay for making hay, food for making a rick, a wagon-log at the time of carting wood, food for (?) the transporting of grain, the topping-off of a
rick, and many other things that I cannot recount. [21, 5] This is, however, an exhortation regarding the provisions of people and all that, about which I have previously discussed above.
Commentary


[1] The translation "law" for *lagu* is helpful not only because it is etymologically related to it, but also because it is sufficiently broad in its semantic range. The term is used mostly for regulations that are decreed from the highest authority, used of either divine laws or those promulgated by the king. Its use here indicates that the duties of the thegn are not dictated by local custom, but by the edict of the kingdom. The term is also used in two other sections of the RSP, [6,4] and [21,3]. For the significance of its use in these sections, refer to the appropriate part of the commentary.

The term *riht* is broader than its modern derivative, originally referring to anything that conformed to the ideal order of the universe. As such, it not only expressed the privileges due to a person's station, but also his or her obligations within the social order, which is well represented by Liebermann's "Recht und Pflicht." Consequently, *riht* can
be, as in this section, translated "rights and obligations," after Liebermann. However, the RSP is divided into two halves, the first dealing with what is due to the estate from the tenants, the second dealing with what the estate owes its workers. Given, then, the particular focus of each section, when riht occurs in the first half of the text (sections [1] through [6]), it is translated as "obligations," whereas in the second half of the text (sections [7] through [21]), it is translated as "rights."

The obligation to military service, the building of fortresses and of bridges has been called by scholars the trimoda necessitas, or less correctly trinoda necessitas. However, this phrase has been found only in a forged charter, and probably does not represent an actual Anglo-Saxon formulation of these duties. Nevertheless, whatever we may call them, these were the fundamental obligations that were laid on those who received bocland, land given by the king to a lord. These obligations also rested on those who owned 5 or more hides of land.

Seebohm in his edition left these services untranslated and renders them as "fyrd-faereld," "burh-bot" and "brig-bot." He also failed to translate head-ward and fyrd-ward. Though his was the first attempt at providing an English translation of the RSP, there seems to be no reason why he could not have translated these terms. The German

---


64 Abels, 61-62.

translations of Leo and Schmid had preceded him, both of whom had translated them.

[1,1] For the word *friðscipe* Seebohm has the curious translation "apparel for the guard." Bosworth suggests that it is to be understood as "a state of peace."\(^{66}\) Schmid’s “Schiffsrüstung” and Liebermann’s “Wehrschiff” fits better in the context, taking -*scipe* as the dative of *scip*, “ship.” *Frið* is more than just "peace" in the sense of "absence of violence," it also includes the force and protection (usually stemming from the king) that makes that peace possible. It is in this latter sense that we must understand the element *frið-* in *friðscip*.

Church-scot (*cyricsceat*) was a tax levied on all free men in proportion to the amount of each man's holding. The rate of payment varied from place to place, and was usually in kind, in grain or perhaps a hen.\(^{67}\) The *cyricsceat* is first encountered in Ine's Law, which seems to have reckoned it on the basis of one's dwelling.\(^{68}\) This stipulates that it should be paid around St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11th) and that if not paid, the crown was given 60 shillings and the *cyricsceat* given at 16 times its usual amount.\(^{69}\)

---


\(^{68}\)Ciricsceat mon sceal agifan to þam healme & to þam heorðe, þe se mon on bid to middum wintra. Ine's Laws c. 61 in *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].

\(^{69}\)Ciricsceattas sin agifene be sancte Martines mæsson; gif hwa ðæt ne gelæste, sie he scyldig LX scillinga be XIIfealdum agife pone ciricsceat. Ine's Law c. 4 in *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].
For discussions regarding the *geneat* see Finberg, Lyon, Maitland, Stenton, and Seebohm.\textsuperscript{70} For the possible military functions of the *geneat* see Hollister.\textsuperscript{71}

The term *gafol* is somewhat problematic. It clearly refers to payments made by an estate’s tenants. However, whether a scholar understands land grants as bestowing to the grantee either dues originally owed to the king, or the actual land itself, will influence how he translates the term *gafol*, According to the former view, *gafol* would be best translated as “tax” or “tribute,” according to the latter, the term “rent” would be more appropriate. For example, see discussions in Abels,\textsuperscript{72} Vinogradoff,\textsuperscript{73} and Seebohm.\textsuperscript{74} Schmid and Liebermann are consistent with their translation of “Zins/Zins-.” In Douglas' translation the word is variously translated as "tax," "tribute," "rent," "payment," and even "gafol." Consequently, I have translated *gafol* as "payment," both in its independent form and as a compound. Both Seebohm and Kemble leave *landgafol* untranslated.


\textsuperscript{71}Hollister, 81-82.

\textsuperscript{72}Abels, 21.


\textsuperscript{74}Seebohm, 140.
The ambiguity of the word saet is illustrated by the fact the Kemble does not try to translate it, though in a footnote suggests, "Help to make park-paling, and perhaps watch for game." Seebohm translated saete haldan oddly as "keep it up." Liebermann takes issue with Toller's translation of saet as "places from which the deer might be shot," and translates it more generally as “Fangvorrichtung.” Yet, he himself notes that saet means “Hinterhalt” and its cognate verb, saetian means “auflauern.” By combining the two definitions, the English "hunting-blind" gives a satisfactory result.

The phrase nigefaran to tune feccan is translated by Kemble and Seebohm as "make new roads to the farm." Leo translated it as "eine neue färe für die ortschaft herbeischaffen," and Schmid its equivalent, "neue Wege zum Ort machen." Liebermann's discussion of nigefara makes it clear, however, that the element -fara was not referring to a street but a traveler, an interpretation that has been accepted since.

"Caring for horses" ("horse-ward" in Kemble and Seebohm) would seem to refer, as Liebermann suggests, to tending to the horses of warriors or messengers of the king who might be coming through the estate.


---


78 Finberg, 510; Maitland, 41 and 328; Stenton, 466-468; Vinogradoff, Growth, 233; and...
[3, 3] The term "acre" must be understood in a relative sense, and not as a "statute acre" (an area of 220 x 22 yards). Lyon mentions that the size of the acre was dependent on the length of rod used to measure the breadth of a strip of land.79 If an acre was a day's worth of plowing for 1 team, the size would depend on the type of soil being plowed and the contour of the land.80

[3, 4] There seems to be uncertainty regarding the meaning of the word inland. Many scholars regard it as being equivalent to the later term demesne.81 Others discern a distinction. Vinogradoff defines inland as covering the whole portion of the estate that personally belonged to the lord, while the term demesne only referred to the home farm, and excluded plots that may have been leased out of the inland.82 In order to avoid any confusion, the term inland is translated as "lord's field," and is here understood as those fields, the whole of whose produce belonged exclusively to the lord.

The verb werian here is difficult. Kemble translates it as "acquit," with the note, "...perform for his lord the duty of coast-guard, and attending the king's hunt: from which it follows that,..., these services could be demanded of the lord."83 Seebohm takes a more cautious approach and translates the word in its primary meaning, "to defend," as did

---

Lyon, 197.

79Lyon, 166.


81For example Seebohm, 128.

82Vinogradoff, Growth, 226. See also Stenton, 477.

83Kemble, 232, n. 2.
Leo. Liebermann, following Schmid, however, disagrees with Leo's translation of *werige his hlafores inland* as "verteidige das Herrngut," and translates "vertrete," i.e. to serve in lieu of the lord for services due from the *inland*. Maitland understands this passage in the same way, meaning that the cottager, "...‘defends' or 'acquits' his lord's inland when there is a summons for seaward or for the king's deer-hedge or the like..." Douglas translates this as "perform services" (on his lord's demesne-land), though I am uncertain as to the justification for that translation. I have translated this verb as "secure," which relates to the primary meaning of *werian*, but is to be understood as insuring and protecting the lord's right over his *inland* by performing the services due from it in his stead.

[4] For discussions regarding the *gebur* see Finburg, Seebohm, Vinogradoff, and Stenton. Maitland states that the *gebur* cannot be equated with the later *villanus* and is actually the *colibertus* of the Domesday Book.

[4a] The work from Candlemas (Feb. 2nd) through Easter no doubt involved the spring plowing in preparation for the planting of spring grain. For the import of this type of labor see the discussion of this section in Chapter Four.

Douglas' translation leaves out *7 on haefest iii dagas to wicweorce*.

---

84Maitland, 328.

85Finberg, 440 and 510; Seebohm, 138-139; Vinogradoff, *Growth*, 233-235; and Stenton, 467.

86Maitland, 59.

Kemble translates *gif he aferad* as "if he carries," and Seebohm "If he do carrying." Douglas in like vein renders "if he perform carrying service." Liebermann's translation "Spanndienst," calls to mind more the act of hitching. Hall's definition, "to provide horses for team work (as service for a lord)"\(^\text{88}\) is here adopted, since, if a *gebur* was actually doing the transporting, he would not be available for other work anyway, and it would be unnecessary to stipulate that he would not be required to work. If, however, only his horses were away, then the need for the stipulation would make more sense.

\[4, 1\] To my knowledge no one knows exactly what a *sester* was. All editions leave the word untranslated. Bosworth simply says that it was, "a measure for liquids and for dry things; its capacity is uncertain."\(^\text{89}\) In bilingual texts it is treated as the equivalent of the *sestarius/sextarius*, which was 1/16 of a *modius*, which in turn was somewhat less than 2 imperial gallons. If the *sester* was equivalent to a *sextarius*, that would make it roughly 1 pint. If this is correct and using modern standards -- which I must stress is fraught with problems -- 23 *sesters* would equal half a bushel (a modern bushel has 64 pints). Stenton, on the other hand, regards a *sester* as roughly a bushel,\(^\text{90}\) which would be vastly more than a pint. Kemble must have had something similar in mind when he


\(^{89}\) Bosworth, 866a.

\(^{90}\) Stenton, 467.
commented, "This seems an immense amount of barley." Curiously he refers back to the Latin. It must be stressed, however, that it is dangerous to assign absolute values to early medieval measures, which were hardly standardized.

[4, 1a] As explanation to this section Kemble writes, "The fold was often distant from the homestead, and required careful watching, especially during the dark winter months."92

[4, 1b] Assuming that the fall plowing began at the same time in the tenth century as it did in the thirteenth, then "the time that one first plows" would have been sometime in October.93 In Gerefa 10, which describes the activities of the estate during the fall, it mentions among the work done in August, and September and October, "eac yrðe georne forðian."94 This being last in the list of labors for this season might indicate that plowing was done in late September, early October. We may then assume that plowing up to St. Martin's Day would take between 8 to 6 weeks, which would then represents 8 to 6 acres of plowing (for the size of an "acre" see note on section [3,3]).

The translation of raecan is somewhat problematic. The manuscript has clearly been amended, and the "c" appears to have "d" and "p" overlying it. Schmid based his translation "sorgen" on the reading raedan, as did Leo with his translation, “bereiten.” Kemble and Seebohm follow their lead with the translation "prepare." Liebermann's reading gives the best sense, and is the one used in my transcription. Douglas accepts

---

91Kemble, 232, n. 5.
92Kemble, 324, n. 1.
93Homans, 67.
94"...and also to eagerly pursue plowing."
Liebermann's transcription, but renders *raecan* as "present," which fits well with the recognized meaning of the verb, but does not make good sense within the context.

Liebermann's translation “erholen” is less secure, but makes sense. In his dictionary Hall adds to the definition of this word "procure" with a question mark.95

[4, 1c] I have translated *ben* as "work-on-demand," since the primary meaning of *ben*, "request," might obscure the probability that there was little choice involved.

Liebermann defines *ben* as "die [ursprünglich ausserordentliche bei Arbeitsnot erfolgende] Aufforderung, der Befehl zur Fron, im Ggs. zur und neben der ordentlichen Wochenfron."96 This work was "a kind of surplus demand," which exceeded the normal, specified work. Vinogradoff notes that this kind of work was done during the most labor intensive times of the year, and that later texts speak of this labor being done out of love for the lord.97

Kemble, following Leo, understands "grass-ploughing" as plowing virgin meadow for new arable, though he himself admits that this interpretation does not fit will with what follows.98 Schmid simply left this portion of his translation blank. Seebohm provides the half-translation "grass-yrth." Liebermann, however, sees in *gaersyrðe*, the kind of plowing duty known from the thirteenth century, called "aver-earth or grass-earth." Vinogradoff defines this duty as follows, "This obligation arises when the

95Clark Hall, 276.

96Liebermann, vol. 3, 249.

peasants want more pasture than they are entitled to use by their customary rights of common. 99 I, along with Douglas, follow Liebermann's interpretation.

[4, 2b] In this context, fedan is taken as a plural subjunctive.

[4, 3] The term landseten is translated in Hall and Bosworth as "occupation of land," 100 the definition which Douglas uses in his translation. However, Kemble understood this as "first stocking his land," and Seebohm translated this as "his outfit." In keeping with them Liebermann suggests "Bodeninventar," "fittings for (working) the land),," which fits better in this context.

It is worth reiterating that the term aecer cannot be understood as an absolute measure, and in the same way, neither can the term gyrd, which later was set at 30 acres. However, it has been pointed out by Liebermann as well as Stenton 101 and others that a gyrd had a relative value traditionally regarded as 1/4 a hide. When one reads charters, it seems as though the term was used as a set standard of land measure, being used in conjunction with the hide in describing the area of land. For example in the Tidenham charter, Middleton is said to have "5 hides and 14 gyrd s."

The coincidence that the gebur held a gyrd ("yardland" later "virgate") and also received two oxen, 1/4 of a plow team, suggests a correspondence with the later ratio of 1

---

98 Kemble, 234, n. 2.
99 Vinogradoff, Villainage, 280.
100 Bosworth, 619a; and Clark Hall, 211.
101 Liebermann, vol. 3, 249; and Stenton, 467.
ox per bovate, 2 bovates per virgate and 4 virgates per hide.\textsuperscript{102} In this system it took 4 peasants (who collectively held 1 hide) to provide a full plow-team of 8 oxen, and each was assigned an amount of arable in proportion to the number of oxen he owned.

From this section Seebohm assumes that the \textit{gebur} held 30 acres and followed the three-field system. He added the 3 acres of \textit{gafolyrðe} to this 7 acres to produce a 10 acre holding. He then assumes that this constituted only 1/3 of his total fields, the other thirds being in fallow or for spring/winter wheat according to the three-field system.\textsuperscript{103} The forced nature of his argument is all too apparent, and there is no indication in the text that such is the case. Further, this section is not discussing the total holdings of the \textit{gebur}, but rather how much of his holding was sown with the estate's seed. The RSP does not give any indication of the size of a \textit{gebur}'s holding.

[4, 3a] Leo and Schmid's translation, "das Jahr hindurch," cannot be accepted. As Liebermann points out, "Vor der ersten Ernte ist der Neusiedler zu jenen Leitungen unfähig."\textsuperscript{104} This had clearly been noticed by Kemble, who translated this as "After the first year." Why Schmid did not follow Kemble's translation, of which he was aware,\textsuperscript{105} is curious. Seebohm also translated, "Wherefore after that year."

[4, 3c] Leo and Schmid translate \textit{gyme} as "sorge für den Nachlass." In a similar vein Kemble translates, "let his lord look after what he leaves." This translation insinuates

\textsuperscript{102}Vinogradoff, \textit{Villainage}, 238.

\textsuperscript{103}Seebohm, 141.

\textsuperscript{104}Liebermann, vol. 3, 249.

\textsuperscript{105}Reinold Schmid, \textit{Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen} (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1858), lxiv.
that the goods of the *gebur* belonged to his family, while the lord simply looked after it. Given that the *gebur* had been completely equipped with house, field and goods, Seebohm's stronger "his lord takes back what he leaves," and Liebermann's "halte sich...an" seem more appropriate.


[4, 6] The term *scir* has been problematic. Kemble and Douglas, after Leo's "*landschaft,*" simply rendered it as "shire," while Seebohm translated it as "district." While *scir* can, of course, mean the administrative district known as a "shire," this meaning does not fit well here. The RSP has, for the most part, been looking within the estate, and it is not in keeping to have it look beyond the estate to the shire. Liebermann, in keeping with Schmid’s "Amt," understands *scir* as "[Gutsvogtei]amt." 106 However, in light of Barrow's observation that multiple estates could be called *scir*, 107 it is reasonable to translate it as "multiple estate." The reference to the *ealdlandraeden*, then, may refer to the previous practices and customs on an multiple-estate before fragmentation into smaller manors, as was the practice during the tenth century. 108 I have interpreted *scire* 

---


108 Richard Jones and Mark Page, “Characterizing Rural Settlement and Landscape:
as a partitive genitive. Regarding the reasons for this interpretation see the discussion of this section in Chapters Three and Four.

[5, 2] Despite the prefix bed- ("request"), this was reaping done on demand. It was different from work-on-demand (ben) only in that it specifically refers to reaping. Given that harvest was the most pressing activity of the agricultural year, it is not surprising that reaping would be a most important form of work-on-demand. 109

[5, 5] This stipulation is the same as for the gebur [4,3c], presumably because like the gebur, the beekeeper was provided with skeps and other supplies by the estate. 110 The exception of "whatever might be free" suggests that the beekeeper was able to acquire and accumulate wealth/goods on his own, which, being his own, would then pass to his heirs.

[6] Liebermann translates gafolswan as "Zins[bäuerlicher] Schweinehirt," a swineherd who pays rent. Since only tenant's paid gafol I decided to translate this term as "tenant-swineherd," in contrast to a "bound-swineherd," who was not a tenant, but bound to the estate.

[6, 1] Unlike Leo and Douglas, I translate eald as "mature," as opposed to “old,” following Liebermann.

[6, 2] Exactly what the perquisites (gewyrce) for the swineherd were, the RSP doesn't say. However, we might gain an idea of their nature from Vinogradoff's comment that at Whittlewood Forest in the Middle Ages,” Medieval Archaeology 47 (2003): 82-83.

109 Vinogradoff, Villainage, 284.

Glastonbury Abbey, the swineherd received "one sucking-pig a year, the interior parts of
the best pig, and the tails of all the others which were slaughtered in the abbey."\textsuperscript{111}

\textbf{[6, 4]} The use of the word \textit{lagu} here may indicate that this rule regarding the
possessions of the bound swineherd and the bound beekeeper was not dictated by the
local custom, but by the charter which created the estate. This rule must be the same as
that mentioned in [5,5] which states that the possessions of the beekeeper reverted to the
estate upon his death. This also insinuates, however, that just as the beekeeper seems to
have been able to acquire wealth and possessions of his own (which were regarded as
"free"), the bound swineherd must also have had opportunities for personal profit. The
same "law" regarding the \textit{gebur}'s possessions [4,3c] should be noted, and taken as an
indication that the \textit{gebur} was not entirely "free."

\textbf{[7]} Traditionally, the \textit{aehteswan} has been taken to be a slave, and Bosworth defines
this term as, "a swineherd who belongs to the property of his lord."\textsuperscript{112} Liebermann
translates this as "leibeigenen Schweinehirten," making him bound not to the estate, but
to the lord.\textsuperscript{113} Though the term \textit{aehteswan} occurs only in the RSP a related term,
\textit{aehtemann} (which occurs in section [9,1]) has greater attestation. From the existing
evidence one may propose that, the \textit{aeht}- element of the compound is not referring to the

\textsuperscript{111}\textsuperscript{111}Liebermann, vol. 3, 250.
\textsuperscript{112}\textsuperscript{112}Bosworth, 13a.
\textsuperscript{113}\textsuperscript{113}Liebermann, vol. 3, 250.
person as property, but rather to the "property, lands" of the lord. Consequently, Pelteret
translates *aehtemann* as "a person attached to the lord's demesne." Nevertheless, he
defines *aehteswan* as "a swineherd belonging (emphasis mine) to the demesne," and
despite noting that the term does not necessarily indicate status, still sees the RSP as
regarding him as a slave.\footnote{114} However, there is no need to interpret the RSP in this way.
If the *aehteswan* were by definition a *þeow*, or "slave," then why would the text have to
specify that he was entitled to the rights of a *þeow*? Rather, this concluding clause would
make more sense if the *aehteswan* were not *de facto* a *þeow*, but that the text wanted to
stress that he received the same rights as a *þeow*. Therefore, in this translation of the
RSP the *aehte-* element is regarded as referring to "the property of the estate," and the
*aehtemann* and *aehteswan* are interpreted as those who were assigned the task of taking
care of the estate's property.

\[8\] The translation of *esne* is based on Pelteret's discussion of the term in his
appendix on "Old English Terminology of Servitude and Freedom." In the Laws of
Aethelberht, the *esne* was a "hired laborer," and, though under another, still had the same
rights as a freeman. However, by the tenth century (at least in Northumbria) it had
gained the sense of "slave." The translation "slave-laborer" is meant to communicate
both meanings of the term.\footnote{115}

\[9, 1\] For the meaning of *aethemann*, see the commentary for section [7].

\footnote{114} David A. E. Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England from the Reign of Alfred
until the Twelfth Century*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History (Woodbridge, Suffolk:
Boydell Press, 1995), 262.

\footnote{115} Pelteret, 271-274.
Boswell defines *nydriht* as "A duty that must be performed, service, office."¹¹⁶ Douglas translates it as "dues," and Liebermann as "nothwendigen [Mindest]gebühr." However, the whole topic of the section is what provisions were due to property-men, so it seems incongruous to end the section with a reference to what they owe. It is therefore tentatively suggested here that the compound *nydriht* is referring to the right (*riht*) to have one's needs (*nyd*) provided for, hence the translation "the right to necessities."

The definition of *folgere* as found in Bosworth is, "one of a class of freemen who has no dwelling of his own, but is the follower or retainer of another, for whom he performs certain agricultural acts,"¹¹⁷ a definition adopted by Liebermann.¹¹⁸ This definition is based both on the word’s etymology (from *folgian*, "to follow") and from Cnut's Secular Law §20, where *folgere* stands in contrast with *heorðfaest* (i.e., "one with an established household"). From this Bosworth and Liebermann derive the meaning of a follower without his own dwelling. However, Paul Harvey rightly points out that this translation is based on suppositions that are not supported by Cnut's Law. He also rejects taking *folgere* as simply a general term for a "demesne worker," pointing out that it would make little sense in the structure of the text.¹¹⁹ He therefore suggests the translation "ploughman," first because it is a glaring omission, second because *folgere*

---

¹¹⁶Bosworth, 719a.

¹¹⁷Bosworth, 300a.


¹¹⁹Harvey, 14.
comes at a point in the list of estate workers where one finds the plowman in later records. Finally, Harvey points out that in the RSP the perquisites of the workers are related to their tasks; and the perquisites recorded here deal with fields, which would be appropriate for a plowman. He does, however, caution that, "This argument cannot be supported by any other instance where folgere does mean `ploughman': it is simply a shot in the dark."\(^{120}\) I might also suggest that the folgere could be “one who harrows” the field. The harrow often “followed” the plow, and this meaning would make as much sense as any other. Since, however, we do not know exactly what this term is referring to, I have translated it literally and placed it in quotation marks.

Douglas fails to translate *on twelf monðum*. Further, his translation of *geearnian* as "have use of" is somewhat puzzling.

The provisioning of gloves and shoes seems to be a practice that was also followed in the twelfth century. The Glastonbury Inquisitions of 1189 mention that "all the household and workmen employed" were assigned clothing.\(^{121}\)

\[10, 1\] Douglas fails to translate this section.

\[11\] The *leap* was a measure of volume, which Bosworth suggests was 2/3 a bushel.\(^{122}\) However, as with all metrology of this period, it is doubtful that the *leap* represented a fixed and precisely defined measure.

\(^{120}\)Harvey, 15.

\(^{121}\)Vinogradoff, Villainage., 322.

\(^{122}\)Bosworth, 625b.
The translation of *ealdorman* is difficult. It certainly is not referring to the office. Liebermann notes it probably refers to either the reeve of the estate or the lord himself. Douglas' translation of "overseer" suggests an official position, which might not be intended here. Hence, the somewhat broad translation "superior" is used, following Liebermann's own "Vorgesetzte."

The foreknowledge and permission of the estate was necessary for allowing an animal to graze in the common pasture. IV Edgar 9 states that if an animal grazed on the common for five days, and there had been no notification by the owner, it was forfeit the owner and the herdsman was whipped. To appeal this, the owner had to inform the estate whose knowledge (*gewitnys*) he brought the cattle to the meadow.

Like the plowman, the ox-herd also received shoes and gloves for his services.

Liebermann supposes that, since the ox-herd received a *metecu*, as did the *esne* of section [8], that he was also unfree.

Again, if we assume that the ox-herd was unfree because he received a cow for food, we should then suspect that the cowherd was also unfree.


124 *he þeahhwæþere cyþe on hwaes gewitnysse he þaet orf bohte*. IV Eadgar 9 in *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].

Liebermann points out that it was around the autumnal equinox that the then two-month old lambs were weaned, thus freeing up the milk supply.\footnote{Liebermann, vol. 3, 251.}

Liebermann points out that the later Latin translation of this text misunderstood the Anglo-Saxon, and states that the cheese-maker was to render 100 cheeses to the estate. There is a question, however, of whether this translation is a misunderstanding or a reinterpretation.

The first and of this section is translated as "but," because what follows (the making of butter for the lord's table) stands in contrast to the cheese that is the cheese-maker's due. Its purpose is to indicate that while the 100 cheeses belonged to the cheese-maker, the whey that results from the process of making it belonged to the lord, and was given to him in the form of butter.

According to section [14], the shepherd was entitled to the buttermilk during the summer, the rest, then, was for the cheese-maker. Strained whey (\textit{wringhwaeg}) is simply "whey pressed out of cheese."\footnote{Bosworth, 1275a.}

The word \textit{berebrytta} is problematic, as this compound is known only from the RSP. The word \textit{brytta}, however, is well attested, and means "a bestower, dispenser, distributor."\footnote{Bosworth, 132a.} Liebermann equates him with the \textit{gerenter/granetarius} of Walter of
Henley, whose job it was to tally the grain brought to the estate granary at threshing time. Paul Harvey notes that it is used in later texts down through the fifteenth century, but is known only in Wiltshire and Somerset.

Liebermann translated *bydel* as "Büttel," and Douglas as "beadle." However, this term is best known from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, during which time the beadle was appointed by the lord to look after his interests, collect rents, enforce duties, manage the demesne and to take care of the lord's property. However, there is no evidence that the term *bydel* ever referred to these functions. The meanings that are attested for this term are "one who bids or cries out, a herald, proclaimer, minister" or "one who bids or summons to appear in a court of law." Since using the word "beadle" might import an anachronistic meaning, I have avoided it in my translation. However, many manors were granted *mid sace und mid socne*, which used in hendiadys refers to the granting of the right of jurisdiction within the bounds of the estate. For a fuller discussion of *sacu* and *socn* see Stenton. It would therefore be necessary for an estate to have someone who would summon people to the lord's court or to announce the lord's judgment in a case. For this reason the translation "warrant-officer" has been chosen,

---


131 Harvey, 20.


133 Bosworth, 137a.

134 Stenton, 487.
with, however, the recognition that there is no evidence regarding the specific function of a *bydel* on an estate.

Regarding the plot of land given to the *bydel*, Charter 910 mentions a *bydelaece* as one of the landmarks in defining an estate boundary.

[20] Sections [20] and [20,1] are most difficult. One gets the impression that the copyist missed a line of text between these two sections. Douglas indicates this by inserting "..." at that part of his translation. However, since the words *on ðam endum ðe to etenlaese licgan forðam* of [20] and *nyhst etenlaese forðam* of [20,1] are so similar (if not redundant), it is possible the that scribe may have consulted two versions of the text, and accidently conflated them. In either case I have followed Douglas in this respect, and inserted “...” in the translation, though indicating uncertainty by adding a question mark.

While elsewhere I have retained Liebermann's section divisions, I have moved the words *hwilces landsticces geann* from [20,1] to [20], since it completes the clause begun in this section.

Part of the difficulty for this section is the adverb *aer* (which most commonly means "before," "previously") with a present tense. Douglas ignores the difficulty by translating the verb as a past tense. Liebermann more properly translates it as *erst* with the present tense ("schützt"). Perhaps an equally valid proposal is that *aer* here means "soon," indicating that the repercussions of the hayward's laziness would be quickly felt.
The hayward is, of course, well known in later manorial texts and manuals. Of the duties ascribed to the hayward in the Seneschaucy, the one that seems to fit well with the RSP is that, "Late and early he should keep watch that nothing is stolen, eaten by the beasts or spoilt." Since the haegweard conforms in one respect to the later hayward, and since there is really no other good option, "hayward" is an acceptable translation with the caveat that one should not presume that the functions haegweard were necessarily identical to those of its twelfth-/thirteenth-century descendent.

[21] Unlike Liebermann and Douglas, I have chosen to interpret syn as a subjunctive and not a truncated indicative, as I did in [4] and [4,4]. This does less violence to the morphology and it still makes sense within the context.

[21, 1] Douglas fails to translate ðe we aer beforan ymbe spraecon.

Leo translates ðeoda as "Gemeinde" and Schmid translates it as "Gutsleute." Here I follow Douglas and Liebermann and regard the term as referring to an area not a group of people.

[21, 3] The "laws" should not be confused with customs or practices. The lagu are the rules and regulations that were decreed form a higher authority (see commentary on section [1]). Hence, the laga are probably not the practices that the people themselves had decided on, but those dictated to them by law or, more likely, by charter. Therefore, on has been translated here as "with respect to," as opposed to the "among" of Douglas and the "im" of Liebermann – without prejudice to either.

[21, 4] Vinogradoff notes that it was common, at least during the twelfth and thirteenth

135Oschinsky, 281.
centuries, to provide a meal for the tenants when they were doing work-on-demand.\textsuperscript{136}

Most of the activities described in this section would fall under this category of labor services, which are referred to in [4,1c] and [5,2].

[21, 5] The meaning of "exhortation" for \textit{myngung} is well attested,\textsuperscript{137} and is clearer than Douglas' and Liebermann's "memorandum."

\textsuperscript{136}Vinogradoff, \textit{Villainage}, 174.

\textsuperscript{137}Bosworth, 704a.
CHAPTER III

THE PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON ESTATE

While much has been written about what the RSP tells us regarding the duties of the geneat, the gebur and the cottager, little if anything has been done to try to establish the physical landscape of the estate described in the RSP. This is not a trivial question. The configuration and location of fields would have directly affected the labor services of tenants determining, if not the nature of those services and how they were performed. Further, if we begin with the presumption that matters are written and discussed chiefly when they become an issue, understanding the physical environment in which the RSP was composed might provide a clue as to why the need arose to spell out tenurial rights and obligations in the RSP in the first place.

Determining the layout of an Anglo-Saxon manor centers on the question of whether or not these estates were based on an open-field system. An open-field system is one in which all holdings of an estate’s cultivators are pooled into one large field, with each of them plowing and tending their particular sections of the field. This form of agriculture presumes, if not necessitates, a nucleated village, in which all the cultivators lived and around which their fields would radiate. Certainly, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, particularly in the Midlands of England, this was the dominant form of agriculture, and a definitive feature of “champion” estates, which also exhibited strong
lordship and peasants holding virgates and half-virgates in the open field. From the mid-nineteenth century up to the mid-twentieth century scholars have debated how far back this form of field management went. Some scholars had argued that open-field agriculture was practiced before the Anglo-Saxon immigration, while others, that the Anglo-Saxons introduced it.

The past thirty years have seen an explosion of field surveys and archaeological studies of villages in England, a movement dubbed the “quantitative revolution.” The results of this research have shown that there were indeed other field management strategies employed in England in the early Middle Ages, most notably the multiple estates, which were comprised of scattered settlements, either hamlets or homesteads. While all now agree that there was a general movement from scattered settlements to nucleated villages, the question remains as to when this shift occurred, at what pace and where. There are two main schools of thought. One holds that nucleation was a process lasting for four centuries from the late ninth through the early thirteenth centuries, the other that the process occurred within a short period of time, during the ninth and tenth centuries.


139 For example Howard Gray, *English Field Systems*, Harvard Historical Studies, no. 22 (Cambridge, 1915).


Further, the most current research suggests that the pace of nucleation was related to the ecology of the estate in question, with areas of intense cultivation moving toward open-field agriculture rather quickly, while on the opposite end of the spectrum woodland regions resisted the trend.

No matter which theory regarding the pace of nucleation one adopts, all would agree that, if the RSP was first composed in the latter half of the tenth century, it was written during the period when estates were in the throes of changing to nucleated villages with open-fields. When one recognizes the labor services emphasized in the RSP, it is clear that the region that it reflects was one with a mixed economy; being agrarian with a strong pastoral element. Such “intermediate regions,” with both arable and pasture/woodland, succumbed to nucleation, but at a slower pace. The RSP may, therefore, reflect such a change late in the tenth century. Since regions with scattered settlements seem to have had lighter labor services than those with open-fields, a shift from one to another would have also resulted in significant changes in the duties of tenants and their relationship to the estate, especially affecting the position of the gebur. The RSP’s own indirect solicitation of information regarding alternative methods of

---


managing an estate support the notion that the text was written on a reconfigured estate, one which was facing new challenges as customary relationships with tenants were being redefined. The RSP then provides us with an opportunity to observe the social ramifications of the shift to open-field agriculture and how it altered the status of the tenants of the estate.

**Historiography**

Previous interpretations of the RSP have been the result of how scholars have conceived of the physical organization and structure of the Anglo-Saxon manor. From the second half of the nineteenth century through the first half of the twentieth, scholars had essentially only two sources for ascertaining the agricultural systems of the Anglo-Saxons. The first of these were the field configurations extant during the nineteenth century. The second was textual evidence, primarily Anglo-Saxon laws, charters and the RSP. The first scholar to try to integrate this evidence was Frederic Seebohm, who published his observations in *The English Village* in 1883. His method of investigation was to examine field conditions in England as known from pre-enclosure maps and surveys, and then to see if the Anglo-Saxon documentary evidence fit the those conditions. Of Seebohm’s conclusions the two most important for our purposes are that peasant holdings were comprised of strips within an open field system, and that villages were not communities of independent free peasants, but for the most part lay on the estate of a lord.145 For Seebohm, this agricultural structure went back at least to the beginning

145Seebohm, 110 and 127.
of Anglo-Saxon settlement; “...it seems to be clear that as far back as the evidence extends,..., the holdings – the yard-lands – were held in villenage, and were bundles of a recognized number of acre or half acre strips in the open field...”

Howard Gray’s work, *English Field Systems*, is chiefly concerned with when and where a two or three field system of crop rotation was used in England, mostly using eighteenth century enclosure awards as well as Tudor and Stuart surveys. Through his investigation Gray demonstrated that the two- and three-field systems were limited to a region running north-south through the center of England, the same region where open fields predominated. In discussing the earliest recorded instances of open field husbandry he also reexamined Seebohm’s evidence for open field systems during the Anglo-Saxon period. He collected references from 19 charters which indicate the presence of intermixed strips in open fields by terms such as *gedalland* (“divided land”), *heafodaecer* (“headland”) and *aecer under aecer* (which he took to mean “intermixed fields”). In summing up the evidence Gray states, “... in seven counties of the southern midlands some twenty charters of the tenth and eleventh centuries testify to the existence of open common arable fields...” In addition, Gray, like Seebohm before him, refers to Ine’s laws, c. 42. He argues that the *gedalland* referred to in the text was not pasture, but arable, and that the import of this text is its date, which indicates that open fields were
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known at the end of the seventh century.\textsuperscript{150} While accepting many of Seebohm’s observations, Gray is more cautious in his conclusions, refusing to generalize, but confining his conclusions to stating that we see arable open field in Wessex and the southern edge of Mercia “clearly at the end of the seventh century and quite unmistakably in the tenth.”\textsuperscript{151}

A more hands-on, practical approach was adopted by the Orwins in the late 1930s. They point out in their book, \textit{The Open Fields}, that while one can talk about a Celtic system of square fields or a Saxon system of open fields, there is no way to determine their real date or origin.\textsuperscript{152} From the Orwins’ perspective, the development of open fields and the distribution of land was not based on political, but on practical considerations of plowing methods, topography and soil type.\textsuperscript{153} It was, in fact, the introduction of the mould-board plow, which necessitated fields taking on a longer shape, with headlands (areas at which the plow team would turn and move to the next furrow).\textsuperscript{154} The Orwins also stressed that previous efforts to give definitive sizes of acres and furlongs were too idealistic, and were never found in practice. The size of “lands,” and “furlongs” were determined by soil type and topography, and were, therefore,

\textsuperscript{150}Gray, 61.

\textsuperscript{151}Gray, 62.


\textsuperscript{153}Orwin and Orwin, 27.

\textsuperscript{154}Orwin and Orwin, 32.
variable. Their conclusion was that open-field farming was inevitable in primitive communities of subsistence farming. For the sake of protection, sharing of resources and pooling of labor, people herded together in villages, as opposed to homesteads. Because the work of plowing required contributions by all the farmers of the community, it was much more economical to plow the fields in a contiguous area. Each farmer was allotted a strip consisting of one day’s work, with the allocation of strips being rotated among the farmers as the plowing progressed. They concluded that this system of farming was introduced into England by Saxon colonists as they settled in communities living at a subsistence level of farming.

Loyn, in harmony with the Orwins, argues that open-field farming and cooperative village communities were undeniable in the later Anglo-Saxon period, and evidence for them is strong for the early Anglo-Saxon period. He asserts that most of England south of the East Riding was dominated by the open-field system. For Loyn Ine’s Law, especially c. 63-68, indicates the presence of a nucleated village and a worked demesne from the late seventh century on. In his model of social evolution, Anglo-
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Saxon peasantry was originally free, knowing no lord but the king. But by Ine’s day a process of subordination of the *ceorl*, the free peasant, had begun, and was accelerated by the Scandinavian invasions and the payment of the *geld*, taxes which raised money for buying off the vikings.\(^\text{162}\)

Some thirty years after the Orwins wrote, Joan Thirsk published an article in *Past and Present*, in which she argued that information gained since the 1930’s required a reexamination of previous models regarding the “common-field system.”\(^\text{163}\) Much of her thesis rests on her definition of “the common-field system.” While previous scholars had spoken of an “open-field system,” a Midlands or “champion” farming system, specifically in regard to the management of arable, Thirsk combined arable, meadow and commons management into a single system, which she termed the “common-field system,” and which she characterized by 1) arable and meadow being divided into strips, 2) arable and meadow being opened up to common pasturage, 3) use of common wastelands, and 4) communal institutions that regulated crop rotation and land use.\(^\text{164}\)

Her fundamental argument is that all of these features did not come together into a single system until rather late in the Middle Ages, and it is not until the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries that one finds clear documented evidence of a mature “common field
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\(^{162}\)Loyn, 203-204.


\(^{164}\)Thirsk, 10.
It was an increase in population and the resulting growth of arable with the inverse decline in pasture that forced communities to cooperatively manage the communities agricultural efforts, a process probably beginning sometime in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.166

Before the 1960s scholars could only draw on medieval documentation (much of it late) and the field surveys of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in order to ascertain the agricultural systems of the Anglo-Saxons. From the late 1960s onward, however, there was a flourishing of archaeological work on villages and walking surveys of English fields. Thanks to this “quantitative revolution,” for the first time there was now information regarding villages and fields that could be assigned specific dates, and thus allowed scholars to gain an diachronic view of village and field development in England.

However, by nature, this research was comprised of intensive surveys of individual sites. One of the earliest attempts to synthesize this information into a larger picture of Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns was Christopher Taylor’s Village and Farmstead (1983). In contrast to the villages and open fields of early Anglo-Saxon England envisioned by Loyn, Taylor reported that the archaeological evidence showed that early Anglo-Saxon settlements of the fifth and sixth centuries were comprised of isolated farmsteads and small hamlets, few of which lasted for more than a century.167

165Thirsk, 14.
166Thirsk, 1
167Christopher Taylor, Village and Farmstead: A History of Rural Settlement in England
Evidence from the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries indicated that there was very little change from the previous pattern; the settlements remained small and short-lived.\textsuperscript{168} However, during a period of 100 years before and after the Norman Conquest, nucleated villages began to be formed.\textsuperscript{169} This process was slow, and Taylor suspects that by 1000 A.D. there were few if any nucleated villages.\textsuperscript{170} Nucleation could be the result of several factors: the growth of a single community, agglomeration, or deliberate planning. While the factors that formed nucleated villages differed from region to region, the evidence from the northern part of England suggests that most villages were planned as new settlements in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{171} While many historians link the development of the open field system to the rise of nucleated villages, Taylor is somewhat skeptical. He argues that open fields systems could operate successfully without a nucleated village at its center.\textsuperscript{172} Therefore, for him, the evidence regarding the date of nucleation does not necessarily shed any light on the method of field organization.

Somewhat later Della Hooke wrote a chapter in \textit{Anglo-Saxon Settlements}, which refined Taylor’s approach by examining settlement patterns in three regions distinguished

\textsuperscript{168}Taylor, 122.
\textsuperscript{169}Taylor, 130.
\textsuperscript{170}Taylor, 125.
\textsuperscript{171}Taylor, 138.
\textsuperscript{172}Taylor, 131.
by their topography: areas of intensive agriculture, intermediate regions with arable, pasture and woodland, and finally heavily wooded areas. As a representative of the first type Hooke looked at the parishes of the Vale of White Horse (Oxfords.) and the Wylye Valley (Wilts.). Her conclusion is that in these types of regions the area of cultivation was the same in Anglo-Saxon times as it was in the later Medieval period and that they were probably cultivated under an open-field system.\textsuperscript{173} She dates the existence of nucleated villages to the middle and later Anglo-Saxon period (from 600-1066 A.D.).\textsuperscript{174} Hooke selects the west-central region of Berkshire, at the Kennet and the Lambourn confluence, as an example of an intermediate region. This is an area with a diversified topography, having arable, pasture, and woodlands. She observes that these regions reflected a less nucleated pattern of settlement, “one perhaps more suited to a pastoral economy, and the charters occasionally refer to boundary settlements, apparently farmsteads...”\textsuperscript{175} Finally, as an example of woodland area she examines settlement patterns in eastern Berkshire, which was to form the heart of the Forest of Windsor. She notes that here the parishes are much larger, and that the estates here were the least stable and most subject to boundary change.\textsuperscript{176} In this article, then, Hooke convincingly argues that the pace of nucleation was dependent in part on the topography of the region, with areas of traditionally intense agriculture moving more swiftly to a nucleated village/open

\textsuperscript{173}Hooke, “Regional Variation,” 135.
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\textsuperscript{175}Hooke, “Regional Variation,” 146.

\textsuperscript{176}Hooke, “Regional Variation,” 151.
field form of agriculture than regions of mixed or wooded topography.

In the same volume David Hall published an article reviewing the settlement patterns found in Northamptonshire. He reaffirms that in the early Anglo-Saxon period, settlement was primarily of scattered settlements, which comprised “multiple estates.”\(^{177}\) In contrast to Taylor, however, Hall finds evidence that the process of nucleation occurred much earlier, noting that most scattered settlements were abandoned in the ninth century.\(^{178}\) He argues that it was at this time that nucleation started as well as the beginnings of the open field system.\(^{179}\) Like Taylor, however, Hall does not see the transformation of settlement and field patterns being complete until the end of the thirteenth century.\(^{180}\) However, for Hall, the process of nucleation moved more quickly during the tenth and eleventh centuries than after; he notes that nearly all the present villages were already in existence on the eve of the Norman Conquest.\(^{181}\)

In 1997 Carenza Lewis, Patrick Mitchell-Fox, and Christopher Dyer published the results of an archaeological and textual survey of the east midlands, focusing on Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, selected


\(^{178}\)Hall, 103.

\(^{179}\)Hall, 108.

\(^{180}\)Hall, 108.

\(^{181}\)Hall, 121.

because of their variety of topography, the presence of nucleated villages as well as dispersed settlements and an abundance of historical sources. The results of the their research reaffirmed many of Hall’s observations a decade earlier: that Anglo-Saxon settlements of the fifth through ninth centuries were dispersed and impermanent, and that these small hamlets and farmsteads ceased to exist sometime after 850 A.D. They conclude that it is at this time that one can date the genesis of nucleated villages, since there is no evidence that people were living anywhere else after the mid-ninth century. However, like Hooke, they also noted that the rate nucleation was regionally defined. For example, Burystead at Raunds (Northants) was carefully and deliberately planned, and by the ninth century 69% of the dispersed settlements in Leicester had been abandoned. However, in Buckinghamshire 57% of the early Anglo-Saxon sites were still inhabited by the later Middle Ages, and that the network of widely scattered hamlets persisted into modern times. Though they agree with Hall and Taylor’s belief that the process of nucleation was one that lasted from the ninth century through the twelfth, overall, Lewis, Fox, and Dyer take a more cautious stance than Hall, stating that by the mid-eleventh century “at least some of the nucleated villages were already in
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existence.”188 One important observation is that the place-names of certain settlements within a larger multiple estate often reflected that community’s function within the estate, such as Barton (“barley farm”) or Carlton (“ceorl’s settlement”). These names are seen as a reflection of a manorial organization which Lewis, Fox and Dyer date to the later part of the pre-Conquest period.189

In contrast to Lewis, Fox and Dyer, Tony Brown and Glenn Foard saw the process of nucleation and the adoption of open-field systems as separate occurrences, but both happening within the ninth and tenth centuries. In a volume dedicated to Christopher Taylor, Brown and Foard published the results of a archaeological and documentary survey of Northamptonshire.190 They again affirmed what had been noted in earlier studies, that in the early and middle Saxon period, the dominant form of land organization was multiple estates, with dispersed settlements.191 They suggested, however, that there were three phases in the evolution from scattered settlements to villages with “champion” field systems: 1) nucleation, 2) replanning, and 3) infillings.192 The first phase is characterized by the abandonment of scattered settlements in the mid-ninth century. But while the movement of people from dispersed settlements to a single settlement must have caused a reorganization in land ownership, the use of organized
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open-field systems had not yet occurred. Brown and Foard suggest that this system of agriculture was to be imposed on nucleated villages during the “great replanning” of the tenth century. These planned fields and settlements apparently allotted room for growth, setting up tenement plots that were initially empty. The last phase of development represents the “filling in” of these plots and the further division of hides into component virgates, which led to the “basic medieval pattern. Of course, this process did not proceed at the same pace in all places, and in areas with substantial blocks of woodland, its development was particularly retarded.

Recently Richard Jones and Mark Page published the results of their survey of the region of the forest of Whittlewood, covering the area of north Buckinghamshire and south-west Northamptonshire. Jones and Page, like Brown and Foard, selected this region because of its diverse topography and the presence of both nucleated villages and dispersed settlements. In keeping with previous studies, Jones and Page saw signs that multiple estates dominated before the tenth century. Unlike Brown and Foard, however, they saw the development of champion countryside as perhaps developing later
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than the “great replanning” of the tenth century. They also mention that the new owners of the manors resulting from the breakup of multiple estates were able to impose new labor services on their tenants and establish standard tenements of virgates and half-virgates. In contrast, the area of Whittlewood remained largely pastoral. The woodland hindered the creation of large open fields, but also represented the potential for expansion through colonization of the woodland when necessary. The people in this region remained in dispersed settlements with relatively light labor services.

The general picture that arises from the archaeological work done over the last thirty years is that the first Anglo-Saxon settlements were comprised of small dispersed hamlets and farmsteads. The great estates of the early and mid-Saxon period (from c.400 to 850 A.D.) were of the “multiple estate” type, having an estate center and various (often specialized) settlements scattered on the land. It is clear, however, that sometime after 850 A.D. these scattered settlements were abandoned (doubtless the Scandinavian incursions were a major factor). Between this time and the Norman Conquest began a period of nucleation and the development of the open-field system. Another recognized feature of the Late Anglo-Saxon period was the fragmentation of the large estates, that had formerly been multiple estates. The large estates were broken up and granted to new lords of new and smaller manors. The current question in the debate is chronological; some scholars maintain that nucleation and the adoption of the open-field system was a
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slow process over four centuries, while others see it as a revolution occurring within the short span of a century or so. In either case, it has been recognized that nucleation was not a constant process, but occurred at different rates in different regions. Further, there were parts of England (usually upland regions) where it never took place.

The Estate of the RSP

Both of the current chronological schemes for the process of nucleation center on the tenth century, and it is clear that this century is pivotal. Since the RSP was probably composed sometime in the mid- and late tenth century,202 this text becomes an important witness to the social conditions extant during this transitional period. It is, therefore, important for us to at least attempt to ascertain the region of the estate for which the RSP was written, and determine whether or not this estate represented the nucleated, open-field method of agricultural management or a multiple estate.

One approach to determining the ecological context of the RSP estate is to examine the types of duties represented in the text. However, before doing so it would be helpful by way of contrast to examine a couple of charters which, like the RSP, specify the duties of the estate’s tenants. The first and most famous example is that of the Tidenham charter, by which king Eadwig (955-957/959) granted the Tidenham estate to the Abbot of Bath in 956.

“At each weir that is within the 30 hides is required every other fish for the lord of the land and every unusual fish, sturgeon and dolphin, any other notable see-fish. And no one is allowed to sell any fish for money

while the lord is on the land before he informs him (the lord) of it. Much corvee work is required from Tidenham. The geneat shall work as much on land as from the sea, whichever one commands him, and (he shall) ride and provide horses, and conduct transport, drive cattle, and do many other things. The gebur must do what is his obligation. He must plow half an acre for week-work, and get the seed himself at his lord’s barn. He should set aside as church-fee whatever is of his own. He should carry (?) for weir-building, 40 large (branches) or 1 cartload of branches, or he should build 8 yokes, (and) 3 ebbs. He should raise 15 yards of the fencing, or dig 15 (yards), and he should dig a 1 yard ditch for the burg-fence. He should reap 1 and a half acres. He should mow half (an acre). As for other week-work, always according to the degree of work (to be done). He should give 6 pennies after East, one half sester of honey on Lammas Day (Aug. 1st), 6 sesters of malt at St. Martin’s Day (Nov. 11th), one clew of good net string. On the same estate he who has 7 swine is obligated to give 3 (of them), and so forth always the tithe.”

The similarities between this charter and the RSP have been recognized from a very early date. However, what is of interest to note are the differences. Particularly
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203Æt ælcum were þe binnan þam XXX hidan is gebyreð æfre se oðer fisc þam landhlaforde & ælc seldsynde fisc þe weordlic byð, styria & mereswyn, healic oðer sæfisc. And nah man nænne fisc wið feo to syllanne þone hlaford on land byð, ær man hine him gecyðe. Of dyddan hamme gebyreð micel weorcraедæn. Se geneat sceal wyrcan wyrca on lande, swa of lande, swa hweðer swa him man byt, & ridan, & auerian, & lade lædan, drafe drifan, and fela oðra dǐnga don. Se gebur sceal his riht don. He sceal erian healfne æcer to wice worce. And ræcan sylf þæt sæd on hlafordes berne gehalne to cyrcscette sa hweþere of his agenum berne to werbolde, XL mæra oððe an foʒer gyrd, oððe VIII geocu byld, III ebben tyne æcertyninge XV gyrd, oððe diche V tyne, & dicie I gyrdan burhheges ripe oðer healfne æcer. Mawe healfhe on oprüfæn weorcan wyrcæ, a be weorces meþe. Sylæ VI pennegan ofer estre healfne sester hunies to hlaf mæssan, VI systres mealtes to martines masse an cliven godes nett gernes. On ðam sylfum lande stent se ðe VII swyn hæbbe þæt he sylle III, & swa forð a þæt teþe. And ðæs naþulæs mæsten rædene þonne mæsten beo Sawyer, Ch 1555 (Birch 928) in Dictionary of Old English Corpus, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].
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striking is the place that duties involving fish and fish-catching have in the text. Tenants were supposed to provide fish for the lord’s table, especially those of an exotic type. The charter specifies that they were not to sell fish without the lord’s permission. And along with his agricultural duties the gebur was expected to provide the sticks necessary for weir building or to build 8 yokes and 3 ebbs.\textsuperscript{205} Also, as part of his regular payments the gebur was expected to provide 1 clew of net-yarn. These duties and payments make sense when one realizes that the estate of Tidenham lay on the north shore of the Severn and was bounded on the west by Wye River. We can, therefore, see in this charter that, since the economy of an estate was determined by its ecology, the duties of an estate’s tenants could reflect its ecology and topology.

Another charter that defined the duties of its tenants is the one by which Eadweard the Elder (899-924) granted 10 holdings at Stoke-by-Hysseburne to the old minster of Winchester.

“Here are written the rights and obligations, which ceorlas must do at Hysseburne. First in respect to each household, 40 pennies at the autumnal equinox and 6 church-measures of ale, and 3 sesters of bread-wheat, and to plow 3 acres on their own time, and to sow with their own seed, and to bring (grain) to the barn on their own time, and 3 pounds of rent-barley, and a half acre of meadow mowed on their own time as rent and, and to bring it to the rick, and 4 cartloads of cut rent-wood for the heap of firewood on their own time, and 16 yards of rent-fencing-wood also, and on their own time and at Easter 2 ewes with 2 lambs and we <reckon?> 2 young sheep for old sheep, and they must wash the sheep and shire (them) on their own time, and every week do whatever one commands, except for 3: at Christmas, the other at Easter, and the third on rogation days.”\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{205}An ebb is a net attacked to stakes called yokes for hemming in fish during the incoming tide and to prevent them from returning to the sea when the tide goes out.

\textsuperscript{206}Her synd gewritten þa gerihta þæ ða ceorlas sculan don to Hysseburnan. Ærest æt
What will be immediately noticed is that there is not the distinction between geneat and gebur regarding agricultural labors that one finds in the RSP. Further, these services are far lighter, requiring tenants to plow only three acres of land per year (compared to the RSP’s gebur plowing around 15 acres) and mowing only a half an acre. Unlike the RSP the Hysseburne charter gives some prominence to tenant obligations regarding sheep, requiring them to wash and shear them on their own time, i.e. in addition to the work they would normally be asked to do during the week. Also different from the RSP is the giving of gauolwyda, i.e. a payment made to the estate in wood. All of these clues suggest that the Hysseburne estate was not one that fit into Hooke’s region of intensive agriculture. Given the emphasizes of the text, it would appear that the estate of Hysseburne was an area of mixed economy. There was agriculture, but it appears that sheep-herding was a more important part of the manorial economy. One might also surmise that this area had substantial woodland. This correlation between wooded area and lighter service duties coincides with the observations of Brown and Foard as well as those of Jones and Page.

hilcan hiwisce feorwerti penega to herfestes emnihte & VI ciricmitten ealað & III sesðlar hlafhwetes. & III æceras geerian on heora agenre hwile & mid heora agenan sæda gesawan & on hyra agenre wile on bærene gebringan & ðreo pund gauolbærer & heafne æcer gauolmæde on hiora agienre hwile & ðæt on hreace gebringan. & IIII foðera aclofenas gauolwyda to scidhraece on hiora agenre hwile & XVI gyrda gauoltinninga eac & hiora agenre wile & to eastran two ewe mid twam lamban & we two geong sceap to eald sceapan. & hi sculan waxan sceap & sciran on hiora agenre hwile & ælce wucan wircen ðæt hi man hate butan ðrim, and to midden wintra, ðorðu to easran, ðridde to ganddagan. Sawyer Ch 359 (Birch 594) in Dictionary of Old English Corpus, edited by Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].
With the above examples in mind we can now turn our attention to the RSP. As noticed above, the agricultural duties of the geneat were limited to reaping and sowing. What stands out are the requirements to erect deer-hedges, maintain hunting-blinds and build fences. All of these labors suggest an area with woodlands, which provided the lord with hunting, but also meant that areas had to be fenced off, to protect arable from woodland creatures consuming the crops. In connection with this the prominence of swineherds in the text should be noticed, taking up 16 lines in the original text. Since woods were very important for the herding of swine, their emphasis may support the notion of significant among of woodland on the RSP estate.

The agricultural aspect of this estate’s economy, however, can hardly be ignored. The vast majority of the gebur’s duties were agriculture, plowing at least 15 acres of land per year, paying the estate 23 sesters of barley as well as providing 6 loaves of bread for the estate’s swinherd. The geneat was also required to help with the reaping and sowing of fields, the two most labor intensive activities on a farm.

Finally, we also have a pastoral element of the estate’s economy well represented. The RSP mentions the wages due to ox-herds, cowherds, shepherds and goatherds. The importance of herding to the estate might be gleaned from the fact that the cheese-maker received as her wages 100 cheeses per year. Assuming that her portion was only a fraction of the total cheese production, we are left with the impression that there was a substantial number of cattle, sheep and goats on the estate to provide the milk necessary for the amount of cheese the estate must have produced.

The cumulative effect of these observations is the impression that we are dealing
with a relatively diversified ecology, arable mixed with woodland and substantial pasture. This kind of morphology fits well with Hooke’s “intermediate” land type, such as is found in mid-Berkshire. It is interesting that based on linguistic considerations scholars have concluded that the text was written in the same general region, south-west England, perhaps west Wiltshire or east Somerset.  

The next question that needs to be asked is whether the RSP estate represented a multiple estate or a nucleated one. Here the results seem to be mixed. The duties of the geneat mention leading visitors to the lord’s curtilage. This suggests that the manor was some distance away from the geneat’s dwelling. The importance of carrying duties, which fell on the geneat, the gebur, and even the beekeeper would be in keeping with an estate with scattered settlements and the need of transporting goods to the estate’s central place, such as a berewic, a complex of farm buildings that belonged to the lord. The woodland duties of the geneat may also be significant. One might assume that in order to build deer-hedges and maintain hunting blinds, the geneat lived near woods, which would probably lie in the more peripheral sections of the estate.

However, there is a passage in the RSP which strongly suggests that the tenants’ holdings of its estates were cultivated in a common open field: the sections describing the hayward [20-20,1]. Though it is impossible to be certain as to the duties of the hayward in the Anglo-Saxon period (to my knowledge this term occurs only in the RSP), the closest understanding of this office that matches the description in the RSP is the function known from later estate manuals in which the hayward was responsible for making sure
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that grazing livestock did not stray from the meadow and begin to eat the crops of the arable. To help ensure that the hayward did his job the writer of the RSP suggests that the hayward's field be placed at the edge of the arable. This suggests that the holding of the hayward lay between the meadow and the holdings of other peasants. Further, the phrase on ðam endum, indicates that his holdings were part of a group of holdings, which would best fit a context in which there are consolidated fields, possibly using open-field agriculture.

Another possible indication that the RSP refers to a consolidated, open-field system, is that the lord provided the gebur with two oxen [4,3]. That a gebur owned a gyrd (related to "yardland," and later "virgate") and two oxen is suggestive of the later ratio between the number of oxen owned by a peasant and the amount of arable assigned to him. In this system, a yardland was comprised to two bovates and the owning of one ox was associated with each bovate. Thus it would take four peasants, each owning a full yardland, to provide the eight oxen needed for a full plow-team. This ratio seems to appear in the RSP, and may suggest that a similar system was in operation on its estate. This would mean that not only an open-field system of farming, but also a highly cooperative social structure among the cultivators was in place.

One way in which the apparently contradictory evidence could be reconciled is to suggest that the estate of the RSP was only partially nucleated, that is, that some of the tenants and their holdings had been consolidated into a nucleated village and a

---

contiguous, open field, while other tenants, the geneatas, still held their lands as farmsteads and hamlets scattered on the estate. Since, as we shall see in the following chapter, the primary function of the gebur was to tend to the lord’s field, it would make sense to consolidate the geburas at the estate’s center. In this way, they would be closer to the lord’s field and their work could be more easily supervised and coordinated.

This form of estate organization, with the geneatas being in scattered homesteads while the geburs worked an open field, fits well with the Hooke’s “less nucleated pattern of settlement”209 in intermediate regions with isolated patches of woodland.210 Hooke also notes that the charters for the area of Berkshire, “... occasionally refer to boundary settlements, apparently farmsteads like dunanwywrpe in Beedon.”211 Still, the labor duties of the gebur of the RSP estate (far greater than those at Hysseburne) would reflect the greater labor services imposed on the tenants of nucleated estates.212

How this scenario fits with Brown and Foard’s two step process of nucleation and replanning is not clear. However, if regions with large pasture and/or substantial woodland were resistant to nucleation (as the work of Hooke, and Jones & Page indicate), the consolidation of some of the holdings may have occurred rather late, during the same time as the “great replanning.” It was during this same time, the tenth century, that many of the large multiple estates were being fragmented into smaller manors and

209Hooke, “Regional Variation,”146.

210Hooke, “Regional Variation,”144.

211Hooke, “Regional Variation,” 146.

212Jones and Page, 82-83.
were granted to new lords. It is possible that it was the process of fragmentation that
necessitated the replanning of the RSP estate. However, given the topology and the
estate, it was only necessary to consolidate some of the arable, leaving other tenants, the
geneatas, their independent and dispersed holdings.

The language of section [4,6] of the RSP may well indicate that its estate was
created by fragmentation of a larger multiple estate. The section admonishes, *hede se ðe*
*scire healde ðaet he wite a hwaet ealdlandraeden sy · 7 hwaet ðeode ðeaw*. Douglas
translates this as, “Let him who has the shire always know what are the ancient
arrangements about the estate and what is the custom of the district.”213 The difficulty of
this translation lies in understanding the word “shire” (*scir*). In this context it cannot
mean the administrative unit, but must refer to an estate. However, the normal word used
for an estate in the RSP was *land* not *scir*. The difference in meaning between *land* and
*scir* is that the word *scir* is a term used for a thegnage, in this case a multiple estate held
by a thegn.214 Still, we are confronted with the problem of why the RSP uses the term
*scir* instead of *land* in this section. I would suggest that this difficulty can be removed if
we understand the form *scire* not as an accusative, but as a partitive genitive, meaning
"part of a multiple estate." According to this interpretation, we would translate section
[4,6], “Let him who holds part of a multiple-estate see to it, that he always knows old


estate-arrangements, and what is the practice of the region." This would suggest that the author of the RSP was working with a manor that had once been part of a larger multiple estate,

and that it was necessary for him to keep in mind those customs and arrangement that had been in force previously, when the manor had been yet part of a multiple estate.

Another possible piece of evidence is the presence of the word lagu, "law," in the RSP. The modern translations of the RSP seem to handle lagu as a near synonym to "custom" or "practice" (þeaw). However, as noted in the commentary on section [1], the word lagu usually refers to rules and regulations that are imposed by a higher authority, usually God or the king, whereas the term þeaw would refer to those practices that have been in place within an estate. The term occurs four times in sections [1], [4,4] [6,4] and [21], both alone and as part of a compound. In the first case it is used in reference to the thegn and his obligations to the king, and since these obligations would be dictated by the king, its presence in this section makes sense. Section [6,4], however, mentions that the bound swineherd and the bound beekeeper are subject to the "law" (lagu) when they die. This would imply that the regulation regarding their possessions after their death was not part of local custom, but was dictated by the king. Section [4,4] mentions the "estate-law" (landlagu), that the possessions of the gebur revert to the lord upon his death, and that this "law" is in force on many estates. Finally, section [21] states that "estate-laws" (landlaga) are varied and should not be imposed everywhere. If lagu is in reference to a decree from the king, then its best sense in the RSP would be in reference to the rights of the lord granted by the king by charter (bocriht).
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Conclusions

The picture, then, that we are able to postulate regarding the physical organization of the estate on which the RSP was based, is one of limited nucleation. In this model, some of the estate’s tenants, the *geburas*, were resettled in a planned village during the time of the “great replanning” of the tenth century. Other tenants, the *geneatas*, continued to inhabit scattered farmsteads on the estate. The reason for this reorganization of the estate may have been its being separated from what was a larger multiple estate to form a new manor. Its resemblance to the Tidenham and the Hyssebourne charters imply that the RSP itself may have borrowed much of its form from one such charter. If we assume that the duties of an estate’s tenants would have been spelled out in a charter only if they had changed from their previous arrangements, then it is possible that their enumeration in the Tidenham and Hyssebourne charters reflect such changes, and that the similar format of the RSP is due to similar circumstances. Certainly, if the estate of the RSP does represent a reorganized manor, the services and dues of the tenants, particularly the *geburas*, would have been profoundly affected. By restructuring the physical landscape of the estate, the social landscape would have been altered as well. It is to the examination of this new social context that the following chapter will turn.
CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL LANDSCAPE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON ESTATE

As seen in the previous chapter, reveals that the manorial structures of the Anglo-Saxon period were far from homogeneous or static. The late Anglo-Saxon period in particular was a time of change from estates comprised of scattered settlement to those with nucleated villages. With this in mind and by looking for clues within the RSP itself, I have proposed that the estate upon which this text was based was one with a diversified ecology and economy, having a substantial agricultural element, but also significant woodland and pasture. Estates of these types of ecology may have been somewhat resistant to the nucleation process, and based on the description of services in the RSP, I have suggested that its estate was partially nucleated.

If the physical structure of Anglo-Saxon estates underwent profound changes during the late Anglo-Saxon period, then the relationships between tenants and lords doubtless underwent equally significant changes. It seems quite likely, in fact, that lords may have used the process of replanning as a means of strengthening their control over their tenants and increasing their service dues. Most likely it was the gebur who suffered the greatest changes to his status. His function as the primary cultivator of the inland, the lord’s fields, meant that as lords consolidated their inland to improve efficiency and control, the gebur was relocated and the nature of his services altered. There is evidence
that this social restructuring resulted in certain abuses, undermining the freedoms and rights of tenants. I will here argue that the RSP was composed in part as a response to these social issues, reaffirming not only the duties of an estate’s tenants, but also their rights and rewards.

**The Purpose of the RSP**

An important factor in understanding the social significance of the RSP is ascertaining the document’s purpose. This is largely spelled out for the reader at the very end in section [21,5], “This is, however, an exhortation regarding the provisions of people and all that, about which I have previously discussed above.”215 Surprisingly, this last comment has gone unnoticed by scholars, and yet seems to spell out the function of the text. The statement about “provisions” would indicate on one hand that the RSP was written to admonish landholders to make sure that the people, dependent on them, were properly provided for. On the other hand, this last section also refers to everything that the author had written about above, which would also include the obligations of the various individuals of an estate to their lord.

The rather generic language of the text supports the notion that the RSP presents an ideal estate.216 The author uses vague references, such as “on some (estates)” ([2] & [3]) or “on many estates” ([1] & [6,1]), or simply states that something “is due” ([7], [8],

---

215Translation mine. ðis is ðeah myngung manna biwiste 7 eal þaet ic aer beforan ymbe rehte.

et al.) or “is proper” ([6]). It is impossible to be certain which or if all the conditions described in the RSP applied to the estate of the author. Thus, the RSP cannot be a practical manual for running one particular estate, but as Liebermann notes, “...he (the author) wants to offer a manual, though not for his immediate successor on only his estate; he also has other estates in mind.”\(^{217}\) However, Paul Harvey proposes a somewhat more narrow function as an administrative text "composed to guide the local managers of a single estate-owner, a single hlaford,..."\(^{218}\)

In 1963 another contribution toward the issue of the RSP’s authorship and purpose was proposed by Dorothy Bethurum. She suggested that the RSP was actually a rewriting by bishop Wulfstan of an older document.\(^{219}\) She argues that the estate upon which the RSP was based was an ecclesiastic holding, because it seems that in the description of the thegn in section [1], only the trimoda necessitas\(^{220}\) was required of the lord of that estate. That these were the only services required of the RSP estate is a reasonable conclusion, given that the other duties of the thegn are preceded by the phrase,

\[\text{\textit{er will einen Leitfaden liefern, nicht etwa dem künstigen Nachfolger nur auf seinem Posten; er zieht auch andere Güter in Betracht.” Liebermann, iii, 246.}}\]


\[\text{\textit{That is, military service, the building and maintenance of bridges and of fortresses. For the authenticity of the term trimoda necessitas see commentary on section [1]. Despite the origins of the term, it is well understood by modern scholars, and so I still use it.}}\]
“Moreover, concerning many estates more obligations from the land arise...” She argues that the RSP, and particular the Gerefa, betray certain stylistic characteristics attributable to bishop Wulfstan. However, Bethurum herself admits that many of these features, such as phrases of two stresses, are common in Anglo-Saxon literature. The topic of the RSP is one that Bethurum thinks would be of interest to a bishop, “The general theme of ... the relationship of everyone on the land to the land itself and to his overlord, is just such a theme as would interest the Archbishop, for the orderly arrangement of society was one of his principal concerns through his whole life.”

Ultimately, for Bethurum, the RSP provides a glimpse of the magnificent wealth and power of the bishop, a theme that Wulfstan would have regarded as appropriate, as befitting an earthly representative of the heavenly king.

However, assuming that Wulfstan or some other ecclesiastic composed the RSP, it seems insufficient to suggest that its only purpose was to reveal “episcopal magnificence” through an ordered estate, especially of we accept the RSP’s own statement that it was written as an "exhortation," which carries with it certain moral implications. When one reads the sermons of Wulfstan, it is evident that one of his major themes is the morality of social order. In his most well-known sermon, Sermo lupi ad anglos, Wulfstan proclaimed that the devastations wreaked by the Vikings on England

\[^{221}\text{eac of manegum landum mare landriht rise...}[1].\]

\[^{222}\text{Bethurum, 164.}\]

\[^{223}\text{Bethurum 166.}\]

\[^{224}\text{Bethrumu, 170.}\]
were a sign of God’s wrath over the moral and social decay in England. Among the sins of the nation was the oppression of the weak by the strong: “too many are reduced to poverty, and poor men are oppressed,”225 “the rights of thralls226 are restricted,”227 “freemen are not allowed to govern themselves, neither to travel where they will, nor to move their possessions as they will,”228 and “…neither are thralls allowed to have what they have acquired on their own time, gained by their labor.”229 On the other hand, dependents were also rising up against their lords, and not respecting their social position: “And there is also much foul lord-treachery in the world, that one plots against his lord’s life or drives him alive from his land,”230 “Yet any thrall may run away from his lord...if that thrall foully fells that thegn, he lies without recompense (with wergild) to his family,”231 “And often the thrall binds fast the thegn who was previously his lord, and


226 The archaic term “thrall” is used here for þrael, not only because of etymology, but because of its broad connotation of anyone bound to another. For a discussion of this term see David Pelteret, Slavery in Early Mediaeval England, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995), 317.


228 “…fige men ne motan wealdan heora sylfira ne faran þar he willað, ne ateon heora agen swa swa hi willað.” Wulfstan, “Sermo ad lupi, 262, ll. 49-50.

229 “…ne þraelas ne moton habban þaet hi agon on agenan hwilan mid earfedan gewunnen,” Wulfstan, “Sermo ad lupi,” 262, ll. 51-52.


by God’s wrath makes him into a thrall.”232 Clearly, for Wulfstan, part of the moral decay of the land was the disintegration of the relationship between the lord and his thralls, which we need not understand as referring only to landless slaves.

I believe that the cause for these tensions can be found in the reorganization of estates, which have been discussed in the previous chapter. As has been noted, estates where nucleation was hindered or completely retarded imposed significantly lighter services on their tenants. It would not be unreasonable to assume, therefore, that the labor services of tenants were much lighter on estates before nucleation than after. The relocation of tenants from their farmsteads and hamlets may have occasioned the loss of freedom to travel and property rights mentioned above in the Sermo lupi. Conversely, these changes in tenurial rights could have also prompted conflicts between lords and their peasants, who by virtue of their holdings had become thralls, i.e. men who were bound (to one degree or another) to their lord. The status of tenants, the gebur in particular, will be more fully discussed below.

If Wulfstan did write the RSP, and the “orderly arrangement of society” was important to him, then this text would well represent his concerns regarding the upheavals and injustices caused by manorial reorganization. But even if Wulfstan did not compose the RSP, his sermon nevertheless testifies to the diminution of rights, oppression by lords and subsequent tenuous nature of tenurial loyalty. Doubtless, any bishop or spiritual leader would have been concerned about these kinds of abuses, and

the RSP can be seen as a fitting admonition to an orderly manorial structure by offering an ideal example.

The overall structure of the RSP may well confirm the concern of the author regarding proper social relationships. There is, of course, more than one way that one can outline the development of the RSP. Paul Harvey, for example, identified three parts to the text: Part 1 dealing with free landholders, Part 2 with individuals who worked apart from the demesne, and Part 3 with “other workers on the demesne.” However, one can detect an even broader pattern. The first six sections deal exclusively what with the various individuals of an estate owe to the lord (in the case of the thegn, what he owes to the king as ultimate lord). Sections [7] through [20] focus on what various workers of an estate are owed for their services. In fact, the RSP is completely silent as to the duties of these workers, so much so that we cannot be sure as to the function of certain ones. The topics of one’s obligations and what one is justly owed speak to fundamental issues of social justice.

As was suggested in the previous chapter, such an explanation provides greater clarity to section [4,6]. If the social upheavals mentioned in the Sermo lupi were due to a shift from scattered settlements to nucleated villages or to a restructuring of arable to an open-field system, then the references to the “old estate-arrangements” (ealdlandraeden) of a multiple estate (scir) make more sense. It has been noted that concurrent with nucleation and replanning was the fragmentation of multiple estates into smaller manors,

233Harvey, 12-13.
which were granted to new lords.\textsuperscript{234} The RSP would then be admonishing lords of
manors derived from a fragmented multiple estate not to unjustly disregard the customs
and arrangements that existed before fragmentation. One could conceive of how tenurial
arrangements could be massively redefined in the favor of the lord by such a radical
reconstruction of an estate.

Of course, if the RSP is a general exhortation regarding the just structure of a
manor, one needs to mention the statement, “we should not impose in any way these
rights and obligations on all regions” \textsuperscript{[21,1]}.\textsuperscript{235} However, the reason for this statement is
clear in light of the numerous occasions where the author reminds the reader that
practices vary from place to place ([2], [3], [4], [4,4], [6] and [21]). Consequently, a
singular arrangement cannot be justly imposed on all estates. The important thing,
according to section [4,6], is that a lord must always keep in mind the customs that had
previously existed on his manor. What is offered, then, in the RSP is an example of how
a manor can be justly structured in keeping with most practices, though there is the
recognition that local custom will produce different arrangements.

Unfortunately, the issue of authorship and purpose is complicated by the history
of the RSP’s transmission. What we have suggests a later, early eleventh-century
reworking of an early text. If indeed Wulfstan (or some other cleric) rewrote a pre-

\textsuperscript{234} For example Richard Jones and Mark Page, “Characterizing Rural Settlement and
Landscape” \textit{Medieval Archaeology} 47 (2003): 67; and Tony Brown and Glenn Foard,
“The Saxon Landscape,” in \textit{The Archaeology of Landscapes: Studies Presented to
Christopher Taylor}, ed. Paul Everson and Tom Williamson (Manchester and New York:

\textsuperscript{235} \textit{ne sette we na ðas gerihtu ofer ealle ðeoda}
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existing document to produce the RSP the question naturally arises: what kind of
document did he use as his template? Bethurum suggests "a document already drawn up,
probably dating from Oswald's episcopacy," on the basis that the duties of the geneat
described in the RSP are similar to those outlined by Oswald in a letter to king Eadgar.

But she does not indicate what kind of document this might have been. However, the
similarity between the RSP with the Tidenham and the Hyssebourn charters (discussed in
Chapter Three) should be recalled, and it is tempting to see a common origin for all of
them. This justifies a closer examination of these charters.

The charter regarding Stoke-be-Hysseburne (Sawyer Ch 359) purports to record
the donation of an estate by Eadweard the Elder in 900 A.D. to the old minster at
Winchester. However, Maitland has convincingly argued that there are features to this
charter that make it suspicious. First of all, the language is clearly modernized and
reflects the language of the eleventh more than the tenth century. Secondly the
eschatocol is repeated. Finally, two other documents in the same cartulary discuss the
same transaction. All of this seems to indicate that the monks of Winchester forged
the document in order to improve Eadweard's gift. It is not only the size of the donation

---

236 Dorothy Bethurum, “Episcopal Magnificence in the Eleventh Century,” in Studies in
Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Broduer, ed. S. B. Greenfield (Eugene:
University of Oregon Books, 1963), 165.

237 Bethurum, 166.

238 Anglo-Saxon charters define the boundaries of the land given by listing the landmarks
along its periphery, referring to them in order until one comes full circle. This list of
landmarks is called the "eschatocol."

239 Frederic William Maitland, Domesday Book and Beyond: Three Essays in the Early
that Maitland calls into question, but also the services of the peasants listed in the charter, stating, "Therefore this famous statement about the ceorls' services is not the least suspicious part of a highly suspicious document."\textsuperscript{240} It is not inconceivable that at a time when manors were being restructured to improve their efficiency and when lords were exacting greater services from their tenants, the monks of Winchester wanted to follow the same trend and to increase the labor duties of their tenants. Certainly one way to do this would be to create a forgery, purporting to have defined these duties from the very time that the donation was given.

The origins of the services described in the Tidenham charter are equally questionable. The document is copy of a charter in a cartulary compiled in the twelfth century. The actual conveyance of the land with its eschatocol is on folio 57, while the list of services is on folio 73. As Maitland notes, "The statement of services immediately precedes the lease of Tidenham to Stigand, K. 822 (iv. 171). Thus we have really better reason for referring that statement to the very eve of the Norman Conquest than to 956."\textsuperscript{241} Like the Hyssburne charter, the Tidenham list of services seems to date from the eleventh century, and may have been composed by the same proposed motivation, i.e. to increase the services of the tenants under the pretense that these arrangements dated back to the donation of the estate, and had royal origins.


\textsuperscript{240}Maitland, 331.

\textsuperscript{241}Maitland, p. 330, n. 2.
If, then, a social commentator were to write a document decrying the redefinition of tenurial arrangements by lords, what better text to use as a template than a charter that had redefined tenurial obligations? I would suggest that by echoing the language of these charters, the author would have recalled to the reader the devices used to enact new burdens on tenants, while at the same time defining what he would regard as a fair relationship between tenant and lord.

Of course, it could be argued that the similarity of these documents indicates that the RSP was not written at cross purposes to those of the Tidenham or Hysseburne charters, but was composed with the same goal in mind, to redefine labor services in favor of the estate. In fact, the services due the *gebur* in the RSP are heavier than those in the Tidenham charter -- in the later the *gebur* only plows half an acre as week-work and there was no "work-on-demand" (*ben*) as in the RSP. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the Tidenham and the Hysseburne charters reflect estates of different ecologies, and therefore different economies than the RSP. The RSP, in contrast to Tidenham and Hyseburne, seems to be concerned with preserving the rights of its tenants, even in the first half of the text, which discusses the obligations of the tenants to the estate (sections [1] through [6]). The RSP emphasizes that the *gebur* should be provided with a house, the tools for his work and even livestock (section [4,3] through [4,3b]). As has been previously mentioned, the holder of an estate is urged to beware of the old arrangements on the estate, and to preserve them accordingly. Finally, and most importantly, the entire second half of the RSP is devoted to spelling out what perquisites the estate owed to its workers, which to my knowledge is unique. Perhaps it is because
previously scholars have been concerned about tenure on estates that they have tended to
overlook this section of the RSP. Most discussions stop with the section of the RSP that
deals with the gebur, and it is significant that Seebohm and Kemble did not feel it was
necessary to translate the RSP beyond that section.242 But when one incorporates
sections [7] through [20] in one’s view of the text, one sees a document which tries to
offer a balanced (and in the author's mind) fair presentation of the mutual obligations and
rights of the lord and his tenants.

In summary, the archaeology of English villages and landscapes tells us that
during the late Anglo-Saxon period, and at the very least during the tenth century, there
was a major shift from large multiple estates of scattered settlements, to smaller manors
with nucleated villages and probably open fields. These changes doubtless also altered
the relationship of the tenants with the estate, and if the Sermo lupi ad anglos is any
indication, not for the better. It is possible that lords took this period of reorganization as
an opportunity to increase dues and services from their tenants. The Tidenham and
Hysseburne charters may well represent such efforts. It is within this context of
economic and social change, if not upheaval, that the RSP was written, and it is against
this backdrop that one must understand the text's purpose. Whether composed by bishop
Wulfstan or not, the RSP is by its own admission an exhortation regarding the proper
provisioning of tenants as well as their obligation to the estate, and clearly emphasizes

(London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1883), 129-133; and John Mitchell Kemble, The
Saxons in England: A History of the English Commonwealth till the Period of the
the rights of tenants. Therefore, the RSP was more than just a practical manual. It exercised a moral function as well.

The Gebur and the Lord's Fields

In the previous chapter we examined the internal evidence of the RSP to determine the type of the topology and manorial structure of the estate on which the text was based. On the basis of this I have proposed that this estate had undergone only partial nucleation, which according to Hooke is in keeping with the ecology of the estate, as we have been able to ascertain it. In the case of the RSP it seems as though the geneatas of the estates had remained in either hamlets or homesteads at a distance from the central farmstead (berewic) and probably lived near wooded areas on the periphery of the arable. On the other hand, given the apparent function of the hayward, there do seem to have been open fields on the RSP estate. The proscription of the the RSP that the geburas were equipped with 2 oxen and a gyrd of land, is highly suggestive of a system of co-aration (cooperative, communal plowing), better attested in later times, in which each peasant was given 1 ox for half a yardland (gyrd), and 2 oxen for a full yardland.\textsuperscript{243} Since a plow team was made up of 8 oxen, it would take a number of peasants (for example, four peasants owning full yardlands) to make up a plow team. If this system was in place in the Anglo-Saxon period (which, of course, is uncertain) it would

\textsuperscript{243}See discussion in commentary on section [4,3] and in Chapter Three.
suggested a nucleated village with open fields and a cooperative system of aration.

If the above interpretation of the RSP is correct, we might assume that of the different tenants of the estate, the geneat was the least and the gebur was the most affected by manorial restructuring. If the RSP was a response to the new social realities created by nucleation and replanning, then the notion that the gebur was hit hardest by these forces finds confirmation in the RSP itself. Of the 179 lines that comprise the text, 41 lines are devoted to the gebur, entailing 40.5% of the first part of the text and nearly 23% of whole. If the size of this section indicates that the gebur was a major focus of the RSP, its contents particularly demonstrate the author's concern over change and diversity.

While statements regarding how services of tenants varied can be found in every section of the RSP's first half (another literary feature which distinguishes sections [1] through [6] from the rest of the text), there are two such statements in section [4], which deals with the gebur. Of these, sections [4,4] through [4,6] are actually rather long (comprising 8 lines) and are set apart from the preceding text with by majuscule characters for the words "δEOS LAND lagu."244 It is also significant that section [4,6] is included in the discussion of the gebur. If the reader is admonished to be aware of the previous arrangements of his holding when it was still part of a scir, then this statement’s placement in the section regarding the gebur suggests that it was this group of peasants that was most affected by fragmentation.

---

244The transliteration sets these sections apart not only by the characters of the first two words, but also by treating it as a different section, as does the manuscript of the RSP.
All of this would seem to indicate that a major focus of the RSP is on the rights and obligations of the *geburs*, and would also suggest that it was his rights and obligations that had become subject to change. It would be appropriate, then, to focus our attention on the *geburs*, particularly what his function was on the estate, how that function was carried out before nucleation and how it was changed by nucleation.

The best evidence for the functions of the *geburs* on the Anglo-Saxon estate is found in the RSP itself. Like the cottager he had to render week-work, two days away normally, but three days a week during harvest and from Feb. 2 to Easter, the period when the spring plowing is taking place ([4]).

He spent the night with the lord’s sheep from Nov. 11th to Easter ([4,1a]) and plowed 1 acre a week from the time when the fall plowing begins (possibly late September, early October) until Nov. 11th ([4,1b]). In addition, he plowed 3 acres as his work-on-demand and 2 acres as his pasturage-plowing ([4,1c]) as well as another 3 acres as his payment-plowing ([4,2]). The *geburs* were also to provide the upkeep for the lord's hunting-dogs ([4,2b]) and to give the estate-swineherd 6 loaves of bread ([4,3]). What stands out in this description is the amount of plowing that the *gebur* did for the lord's field. When added up, it amounts to between 16 and 14 acres of plowing for the lord. In contrast, the *geneat* mostly performed carrying services, and his only agricultural duties were that he was to help with the mowing of hay

---


246 See discussion in Commentary on section [4,1b].
and the harvest of grain ([2]). The agricultural demands on the cottager were also relatively light. He was to work for the lord every Monday and 3 days a week during the harvest ([3]). He was also to "secure his lord's field," though exactly what this is saying is less than clear.247 From what can be seen, of all an estate's tenants it is only the gebur who plowed the lord's fields.

A similar function can be seen in the Tidenham charter, though the services are less clearly spelled out. Here, as in the RSP, the geneat does riding services, but also seems to be more subject to arbitrary labors. The gebur, also as in the RSP, seems to be the estate's primary laborer, much of his work dealing with the fishing economy of the estate. But even here, he was also expected to plow the lord's fields - half an acre as week-work. At Hyssburne the situation is somewhat different, in that this charter does not make any distinctions between peasant status.

Turning from charters to law codes we find that the status of the gebur in Anglo-Saxon laws is rather vague. The word neahgebur occurs in II Aethelstan 9; IV Eadgar 7, 8.1 & 10 and Ine’s Law 40,248 in which it simply means “neighbor.” These laws merely stipulated the need for informing a neighbor if one were to attach (in the legal sense)249 cattle, ride after lost cattle, or make a business deal. The only clear instance of the word gebur is found in Ine’s Law, where it states that if one starts a fight in the house of either
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247 See commentary on section [3,4].

248 II Aethelstan, IV Eadgar and Ine’s Law in Dictionary of Old English Corpus, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].

249 I.e. to take and hold property and to have it before a court for legal disposal.
a rent-payer (*gafolgelda*) or a *gebur*, that he pays 120s. as punishment, and he pays the
*gebur* a further 6s. What is of interest is that this law contrasts a *gafolgelda*, i.e. one
who pays rent, with a *gebur*. By this one might surmise that the distinction was that the
former paid rent (*gafol*) to the estate while the latter did not. However, we know from
the RSP that the *gebur* did pay *gafol* by the late Anglo-Saxon period, which may indicate
that the distinction between the *gafolgelda* and the *gebur* was that the former only paid
rent, while the latter paid rent and worked on the lord’s field. One should finally note that
the *gebur* was paid 6s. while the *gafolgelda* was not, which may reflect the relative
poverty of the *gebur*, who may not have been able to absorb the cost of any damages
incurred by the fight.

What little evidence we have from the RSP, charters and laws does not provide
clear information regarding the function of the *gebur* on an estate. However, the one
feature that seems common is that the *gebur* was required to do services, the most
distinctive of which was plowing on the lord’s field. It seems reasonable to conclude that
along with the slaves that a lord might own, the *gebur* was responsible for the cultivation
of the lord’s land. It seems that it is this function that set the *gebur* apart from the other
tenants of an estate.

If indeed the *gebur* was the tenant primarily responsible for the cultivation of the
lord’s field, the question must be asked, where on a multiple estate with scattered farms
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250 *Gif ðonne on gafolgeldan huse oððe on gebures gefeohte, CXX scillinga to wite geselle
Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].
and hamlets was the lord’s field, and how did the gebur cultivate it? An answer to this question may be found in the examination of similar estates on the continent. In the Frankish kingdoms, as in England, while there were nucleated villages, the trend of dispersed rural settlement increased during the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries. Under this form of manorial organization, the demesne of the lord might be scattered among the various settlements. Evidence for a similar arrangement in Anglo-Saxon England can be found in the place names of hamlets which were once part of a multiple estate. Names such as Barton (beretun “barley farm”) and Hardwick (herdwic “dairy farm”) indicate that these settlements were often devoted to a particular agricultural function. Given the evidence from the continent we might also propose that these “barley farms” and such were actually part of the lord’s fields, cultivated by the geburas.

The information that we now have regarding the structure of multiple estates warrants a reexamination of statements in Ine’s Laws touching on field management at the turn of the eighth century. The most famous of these is c. 42, which is cited in almost all scholarly works on Anglo-Saxon society from Seebohm to Lyon as evidence of the existence of the open-field system as early as the late seventh century. The importance of this text justifies presenting this portion of the law in toto:


“If ceorls have an enclosed pasture in common or other divided-land (gedalland) to enclose, and some have enclosed their part, some have not, and they [cattle] eat their common acres or pasture, they, who own the gap in the enclosure, should go then and make recompense to those who have enclosed their part, for whatever damage might be done there. They (those whose fields were damaged) should request of him such justice in respect to the cattle, as it is appropriate. If then there are any cattle that break hedges and go in everywhere, and the one who owns it does not want to restrain it, or is not able, let him, who comes across it on his field, seize and slay it, and let the owner take its hide and flesh, and let him forfeit the rest.”254

The important word in this text is gedalland, that is, “land under joint ownership,” or “common land divided into strips”.255 Loyn asks, “If this is not open-field farming, it is hard to know what it can be?”256 Yet, the answer to his question can be found in Loyn’s own description of a type of land ownership known as “gavelkind,” which was practiced in Kent. This pattern of rural settlement was in the form of scattered hamlets, and the arable land was concentrated in fields held by groups of kinsmen.257 Presuming, as the archaeology suggests, that the standard pattern of settlement in all of England was in fact the hamlet and homestead, it is also reasonable to assume that a similar type of
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254 Gif ceorlas gærstun hæbben gemænne oððe oþer gedalland to tynanne, & hæbben sume getyned hiora dæl, sume næbben, & etten hiora gemænan æceras oððe gærs, gan þa þonne, þe ðæt geat agan, & gebete þam oðrum þe hiora dæl getynedne hæbben, þone æwerdlan þe ðær gedon sie. Abidden him æt þam ceape swylc ryht swylce hit kyn sie. Gif þonne hryðera hwelc sie þe hegas brece & ga in gehwær, & se hit nolde gehealdan, se hit age oððe ne mæge, nime se hit on his æcere mete & ofsla; & nime se agenfrigea his fel & flæsc & þole þæs oðres. Ine’s Laws 42, in Dictionary of Old English Corpus, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].


256 Loyn, 163.
land holding was practiced in Wessex. There is no reason why Ine’s Law c. 42 cannot be read as describing this pattern of settlement. Each homestead or hamlet would jointly own a concentrated and contiguous field. Yet the field would have been divided among the families of the community into strips for them to cultivate. The same could well be true of the meadow that was held in common by the families of the community. These fields could then be most certainly described as gedalland. Consequently, c, 42 of Ine’s Laws can be read without presuming a nucleated village with an open-field system.

The picture that emerges of the agricultural landscape at least by the ninth century is one dominated by multiple estates, each having a number of small settlements. These small communities probably cultivated a single, large, contiguous field. The reason for this was probably because of the use of the mould-board-plow, which was expensive and unwieldy. It was easier for a community to share a plow and to plow the field in long strips, reducing the need to turn the plow and its team. The field would then be divided into strips among the hamlet’s families. Many settlements were part of the lord’s fields, which were scattered over the estate, some of them specializing in the kind of crops they grew. It is most likely in these kind of settlements that the gebur, whose primary function was to cultivate the lord’s fields, was to be found.

Ine’s Laws might provide a clue as to how this form of agricultural management arose. Adrian Verhulst has noted that the eighth century was a period of major
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257 Loyn, 168.

transformation of estate management in the Frankish kingdoms. It was at this time that lords were beginning to directly exploit their lands as well as collect rents from their tenants. The result was what Verhulst calls the “bipartite estate,” one on which there were fields held and cultivated by tenants who paid rent, as well as the lord’s demesne, fields directly cultivated for the lord, the produce of which were exclusively his.259

During this period the demesne of the lord was expanded through reclamation of woodland.260 However, the lord was hardly going to cultivate these fields himself, and he needed labor to plow, seed, weed and harvest his crops. Doubtless, to a large degree slaves filled this need. But as the demesne expanded, so did the labor, the need for which doubtless expanded beyond the supply provided by slaves. Ine’s Laws c. 67 may reflect both this growing need for labor, and the means by which that need was met. This portion of the law code states:

“If one contracts for a yard of land or more for a fixed rent and he plows (it), and the lord wants to raise for himself the land to work and to rent, he (the tenant) does not need to accept it, if he (the lord) does not give him a house and he should forfeit the fields.”261

From this portion of the laws we can presume that lords commonly sought to demand from their tenants labor services for their inland. The tenant did not have to
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259Verhulst, 33.
260Verhulst, 37.
261*Gif mon gebingað gyrde landes ophe mare to rædegafole & geereð, gif se hlaford him wile þæt land aræran to weorce & to gafole, ne þearf he him onfon, gif he him nan botl ne selð, & polie para acra.* Ine’s Laws c. 67 in *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000) [CD].
accept these new demands unless the lord also provided a house. If the tenant declined, he “forfeited the land,” which, we may assume, means that the tenant was freed from his contractual obligations to the lord. What is of interest is the statement that the lord had to provide a house. Presumably, the tenant already had a house. What, then, would the need be for the lord to provide one? However, if we assume that the lord’s fields were not adjacent to those of the tenant, and perhaps were some distance away, then this clause in the law may refer to a house provided by the lord that was near the lord’s field. In this way, during the days that the tenant was supposed to cultivate the lord’s field he could stay in a dwelling near his work. It maybe possible that one saw at this time the rise of new small communities neighboring the lord’s fields. These hamlets would have been inhabited by slaves and occasionally by the geburas, who remained only during the time they were fulfilling their labor services.

However, scholars have pointed out, that the fortunes of an Anglo-Saxon peasant could be quite uncertain, and it could take only one bad harvest to plunge him into destitution. This tenuous status of the peasant would have been made only the more precarious by the Scandinavian incursions of the ninth century and again in the late tenth/early eleventh centuries. If a tenant fell into destitution he might fully commend himself to his lord, by which he became permanently bound to the lord and his estate.

262I would like to thank Dr. Constance Bouchard for suggesting this interpretation of the text.


Under such circumstances, the fields that the tenant had originally plowed for himself might become the lord’s fields (part of his demesne), or if he were already rendering service on the lord’s field, he might have given up his holding and permanently moved into the house provided for him by the lord in a settlement of geburas that were cultivating the lord’s field. Evidence of the latter process can be seen archaeologically. Brown and Foard have observed that the middle Saxon period (c. 600-850 A.D.) witnessed the desertion of cotes (settlements of free tenants).\textsuperscript{265} We might assume that inhabitants of these settlements moved into pre-existing hamlets which worked the lord’s fields. Perhaps it was under these circumstances that lords also provided the geburas with a strip of land in the arable for their own upkeep, an arrangement with which they would have already been familiar from hamlets with gedalland.

It is possible that these were the conditions on Anglo-Saxon estates when the process of nucleation began, perhaps in the middle of the ninth century and certainly by the tenth. If the scenario proposed above is correct, one can see how easily the transition could have been made. The lord would have already had a number of dispersed settlements that comprised his fields, his inland. In these settlements were the geburas, whose primary purpose was to cultivate the lord’s fields, but who had also received a portion of the field for their sustenance. The dwellings in which they lived had already been provided for them, as doubtless were the implements needed to do their work. It

\textsuperscript{1905}, 213.

would have been only natural for a lord to want to consolidate his fields and to gather together his *geburas* into a single community. By doing so, the work on the lord’s fields would have been much more easily supervised, the movement of tools, seed and produce would have been facilitated, and the actual plowing of the fields made more efficient. It is also possible that the threat of possible attacks by Danes would have motivated lords to combine their scattered communities into villages which could be more easily defended. The practice of dividing a single large field into allotments had probably long existed before this time on the various homesteads that dotted the landscape of multiple estates. Applying the same principle to the field of a nucleated village would have simply meant adapting it to a larger community. Given that the *geburas* were completely dependent on their lord and probably did not own their homes, it would have been a relatively easy matter to relocate them to a central community.

The *geneatas*, on the other hand, who inhabited the other, free settlements of the estate were probably not much affected by this process. Their riding and transportation duties would have been just as important to the function of the estate, bringing the rents from the other *geneatas* to the central manor. That their settlements were small, scattered, and probably on the periphery of the main village made the *geneatas* the perfect tenants to oversee the deer-hedges and the hunting-blinds that were in the woods. Nucleation and consolidation of the lord’s fields would have probably also made the mowing and reaping services of the *geneat* much easier. He now only needed to go to a single large village for his work, instead of traveling to a number of different fields.

There is admittedly very little evidence by which we can construct the social structure of...
multiple estates and trace their evolution into nucleated communities. Nevertheless, the scenario proposed above does fit with the information we do have, and leads us quite nicely to the manorial structure that we find the RSP.

When we consider, then, how the geburas was dependent on the lord, and how his fortunes were probably subject to his will, it can be easy to see how Wulfstan would be moved to preach about people being reduced to poverty and the rights and property of thralls (here read gebur?) were being respectively undermined and confiscated by the lords. With the collection of laborers into a larger community, supervision, and thence control would have been greatly enhanced. This coupled with the pooling of resources would have made it easier for lords to extract greater labor services from their geburas. It does not take a stretch of the imagination to conceive of the social abuses and injustices that could have arisen under these conditions.

During this period when relations between lords and tenants were being profoundly redefined there would have been a need to provide some model of estate structure that would have both seen to the efficiency of the manor, and yet have prevented the rights of the tenants from being undermined. The RSP would have filled this need perfectly. As mentioned above, it not only spells out what the author regarded to be a just and fair amount of labor from the gebur, it also emphasizes his rights. The RSP defines and limits the number of days that the gebur would work for the estate. It also clearly stipulates what the estate needs to provide for the gebur, to guarantee his own sustenance and stability. Of particular importance is its emphasis on the necessity for the lord being mindful of the customs, i.e. the services required of the gebur, that had
previously existed on the estate. A new lord should not have simply overridden the practices of the estate which he had acquired, but in dealing with his tenants needed to honor the practices to which they were accustomed. Naturally, the RSP deals with more than just the rights and obligations of the gebur; the whole second part of the text emphasizes the entitlements of the various workers of an estate. Nevertheless, the status of the gebur is clearly the major focus of the RSP’s author.

Conclusions

The archaeological evidence testifies to significant changes in Anglo-Saxon manorial structure centering around the tenth century. Large multiple estates were being divided into smaller manors, and the dispersed hamlets and farmstead were being coalesced into nucleated villages. Without doubt, there were equally significant social changes within the manor, especially in the relationship between the lord and the tenant. Admittedly, written echoes of these changes are scant, and any discussion of specifics will have to remain largely conjectural. However, there is sufficient information to hypothesize regarding the evolution of tenurial/lordly relationships and the abuses that seem to have accompanied it. These changes appear to have especially and profoundly affected the status of the gebur, the class of peasant who, with the slaves of the estate, was largely responsible for the cultivation of the lord’s fields. Ines’ Law suggest that, in order for a lord to demand service on his fields, he had to provide a tenant with a house and doubtless the tools he would need to perform his labor services. It seems as though originally these geburas still retained separate holdings, which they held in rental-contract from the lord. But as these peasants commended themselves to the lord
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(probably from need for economic security) they were left with only what the lord had provided for them, making them personally dependent on him and bound to his estate. The lost of personal freedom and the loss of property rights that resulted from this may well be reflected in Wulfstan’s *Sermo lupi ad anglos*, and reflects a deep concern, doubtless shared by many clerics, about abuses and oppression that these changes entailed.

When one reads the RSP against this socio-economic backdrop, its emphasis on the rights of *geburas*, as well as other classes of manorial tenants and functionaries, takes on a new and deeper significance. A comparison of the RSP with the Tidenham and Hyssbourne charters only highlights this. The latter two, which seem to be later forgeries (possibly to extort greater tenurial services), focus only on the demands and duties of their tenants. While similar, the RSP tries to more clearly define (and thus restrict) these services, as well as emphasize what these working tenants were owed by the estate. The dynamic of fragmentation, in which multiple estates were broken up into smaller manors, helps us to better understand the RSP’s exhortation to be mindful of old manorial arrangements (probably those of a multiple estate before fragmentation). In order to keep *geburas* and other tenants from losing customary rights, the lord who received a new manor from a fragmented multiple estate is admonished not to radically refine his tenant’s services and status. These observations are in keeping with the RSP’s own statement regarding its purpose as an “exhortation,” regarding these matters. Even if Dorothy Bethurum’s theory that Wulfstan had reworked a pre-existing text into the document that we now have is incorrect, it would be in keeping with general ecclesiastic
concerns over social justice that he or some other bishop would have composed the RSP in an effort to provide an example (perhaps based on an actual ecclesiastic manor) of a manor balancing the needs of a new agricultural system with the traditional rights of the tenants. When read from this perspective, the RSP becomes more than just a practical guide to efficiently running an estate, but also a moral document testifying to the obligations of lords to those who were dependent upon them.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Since the early nineteenth century there has been scholarly interest in the agricultural and social structures of Anglo-Saxon estates. From the beginning scholars have tried to glean information on this subject from Anglo-Saxon laws and charters, pre-enclosure surveys and maps, current rural landscapes, and (more recently) from village excavations and field walks. Arguably the most important piece of literary evidence regarding the Anglo-Saxon society is the text entitled *Rectitudines singularum personarum*. Since the 1830s scholars have focused on this text as they sought to understand the different levels of Anglo-Saxon manorial society. However, the questions that students of Anglo-Saxon England have asked of the RSP were limited to what were the rights and services of the thegn, the *geneat*, the cottager, and the *gebur*. Because of the narrow focus of their inquiry, much of the rest of the RSP went largely ignored. The functions of beekeepers, swineherds, ox-, cow- and goat-herds as well as cheese-makers seemed all too obvious (and unremarkable) to warrant much discussion. Consequently, Seebohm and Kemble felt they needed only to translated the first few sections of the RSP (those dealing with the thegn, *geneat*, cottage and *gebur*), and it was not until the 1950s that a complete English translation of this text was published.
This limited approach to the RSP left the second half of the document largely ignored, or if commented on, only in reference to its statement that customs varied from estate to estate. The RSP’s own statement of purpose [21,5] went unnoticed. The RSP became for scholars a list of the demands that the estate made of various tenants. Since the obligations of peasants was seen as the primary theme of the RSP, it was easy to see similarities with the Tidenham and the Hysseburne charters, which do focus exclusively on the services and rents due from tenants. This, however, prevented scholars from recognizing significant differences between these three documents and kept them from seeing the unique emphasis of the RSP on the rights and privileges that were to be accorded to an estate’s tenants, thus obscuring the nature and the purpose of the text.

Of course, before the 1970s those who wrote about Anglo-Saxon England did not have the advantage of data derived from archaeological surveys, and so could not know that the rural structures were in a state of transition during the ninth and tenth centuries. Those who studied Anglo-Saxon agricultural systems recognized that there were different land management systems, but they also presumed a degree of stability and continuity within each region. Only since the quantitative revolution have we been alerted to the degree of change that was occurring on estates and its probable social consequences. In light of this new information, the RSP’s statement of purpose, and its comments regarding the rights of tenants take on a new meaning. Though the practical function of the RSP has long been evident, we may now perceive a moral function, previously unnoticed, that may have prompted its composition and dictated its form. As a response
to perceived abuses, the RSP must be understood as presenting an ideal model that was probably not the norm.

What all this means for current scholarship is that we cannot look to the RSP for a definitive model of Anglo-Saxon estate structure. While scholars have from the beginning recognized regional variation in agricultural management systems, it is now necessary to acknowledge a significant mutability of these systems, and it is no longer possible to speak of a single agricultural system for the whole Anglo-Saxon period, even for one particular region. Our use of the RSP itself needs also to be reevaluated. Instead of trying to find in the RSP a descriptive document that would reveal to us the structure of Anglo-Saxon rural society, we must see it as a prescriptive document, motivated as much by moral considerations as practical ones.

This does not, however, mean that the RSP is not useful for understanding Anglo-Saxon society. What we certainly have here is the expression of one man’s social values, and more specifically what should constitute the authoritative source for dictating the rights and privileges of the various stations in society. For example, the thegn is presented as one whose role is not defined by custom but by law (lagu). His functions are dictated by the will of the king, and it is to his service that the thegn is dedicated. On the other hand, the functions and rights of tenants are determined for the most part by local custom and practice (þeaw, sidu). As far as the author of the RSP is concerned, these must be respected, and lord cannot lightly override them. Certain aspects of tenurial life can be dictated by law (lagu), either by direct legislation from the king or by charter. That the latter is probably referred to in the RSP is suggested by section [21]
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which speaks of “estate-laws” (land laga), which vary from estate to estate. One such “law,” for example, was the one regarding the reversion to the lord of the possessions of the gebur ([4,3c] to [4,4]), the bound swineherd and the bound beekeeper ([6,4]) once they died. Section [21,3] makes it clear that if a lord received an estate, he must work within the rights and obligations of its tenants as dictated by previous law. And if my interpretation of section [4,6] is correct, then even if the manor was a relatively new one created by the fragmentation of a larger estate, the lord is admonished to be aware of the customs that were previously in force.

What we find, then, in the RSP is a tension between the rights and obligations dictated by local custom and those necessitated by a new form of manorial structure. The former represented the arrangements that tenants had known and worked within perhaps for many generations. The later would have been new arrangements, possibly by which more rents and labor services could be exacted from the tenants. We can suppose that the decline in personal freedoms and property rights described in Wulfstan’s sermon were the result of lords ignoring the rights of tenants as dictated by previous charters or by local custom. It is also possible that the rights of tenants were further eroded by stipulations in charters, which exacted greater rent and labor services from an estate’s tenants.266 Those who were concerned about the diminishing rights of tenants (whether Wulfstan or other ecclesiastics) would have regarded these “laws” as opportunities for possible abuse. In either case, the admonition for a lord to respect the pre-existing

266 It is possible that the Tidenham and Hyseburne charters sought to imitate such charters.
practices of an estate

constitutes an attempt to preserve as much as possible the rights and privileges which tenants had traditionally enjoyed.

There is no doubt that the RSP can give us insight into the workings of an English manor of the late Anglo-Saxon period. We must, however, guard against taking this document as normative. What is perhaps of greater benefit is that the RSP illustrates how changes in manorial management created tensions between innovation and “custom,” which struck at the very question of what constituted a right authority for the dictation of social order. The RSP represents one attempt to reconcile the new order of manorial management with traditional customs and rights.
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APPENDIX A

LEXICON

Forms Used

The orthography used in the lexicon and index are those of the text. Where this orthography differs significantly from the standard orthographies, as represented by Hill and Bosworth, the more standardized form will be provided in parentheses immediately after the entry form.

When there are two different forms in the text, the one that is closest to the standard orthography will be chosen as the standard form for the main entry. Variant forms are noted parenthetically in the main entry. A variant will be listed under its own form, with a "see" reference to the main entry. In the index, the variant will list only those citations where that particular form occurs, while citations for both the standard and the variant forms will be found under the main entry. Forms in the text beginning with the prefix ge- will be treated as variants of their non-prefixed form.

For each lexical entry, the class of the verb and the gender of the noun will be noted. The declension pattern of nouns will be indicated by a number. All declension patterns are listed by number at the end of the lexicon.

Words Represented

All nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and conjunctions found in the RSP are represented in the lexicon and index, _beon_ being the only notable exception. Prepositions ad personal and demonstrative pronouns are not represented.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>m.</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>s.v.</th>
<th>s.w.v.</th>
<th>w.v.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an.v.</td>
<td>anomalous verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indecl.</td>
<td>indeclinable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

accusative | masculine
anomalous verb | neuter
adjective | number
adverb | plural
comparative | preterit
correlation | pronoun
dative | singular
feminine | strong verb
genitive | strong-weak verb
indeclinable | umlaut noun
instrumental | weak verb
a [adv.]: "always," "ever."

ac [conj.]: "but."

aecer [m. 1]: "field," "cultivated land"; "a certain quantity of land."

achtemann [m. 1]: "farmer," "serf," "property-person."

achteawan [m. 1]: "property-swineherd."

aeltc [adj.]: "each," "every"

eahtemann [m. 1]: "farmer," "serf," "property-person."

aelmesfeoh [n. 5]: "alms."

aer [conj.]: "before."

aer [adv.]: "soon," "previously."

aerendian [w.v. II]: "to run errands."

aerest [adv.]: "first," "at first," "before all"

aferian [w.v. I]: "to provide horses for the manor's work (as service for a lord)."

agan (agen) [adj.]: "own," "proper."

an [num.]: "one."

andlaman [m. pl. 12]: "utensils," "implements."

araeran [w.v. I]: "to rear (of swine)."

arisan [s.v. 1]: "to arise."

atellan [w.v. I]: "to tell," "to enumerate."

be þam þe [conj.]: "because."

bean [f. 8]: "legume."

bedrip [f. 8]: "requested-reaping," "compulsory service rendered to a landowner at harvest time."

beforan [adv.]: "above (in the sense of what has preceded in a document)."
began [an.v.]: "to come around to (regarding rotating duties)."

begyman [w.v. I]: "to look after," "to take care of."

behweorfan [s.v. 3]: "to prepare," "to treat."

belflys [n. 5]: "bell-wether's fleece."

ben [f. 8]: "work-on-demand."

bendform (benfeorm) [f. 8]: "meal given to tenants while performing work-on-demand."

benyrþ [f. 8]: "plowing-on-demand."

beo [f. (s. indecl., n.a.p. beon; d.p. beo(u)m)]: "bee."

beoceorl [m. 1]: "bee-master," "bee-keeper."

beocere [m. 2]: "beekeeper."

beod [m. 1]: "table."

beodan [s.v. 2]: "to command."

beorgan [s.v. 3 (w. d.)]: "to guard," "to defend," "to protect."

bere [m. 2]: "barley."

berebrytta [m. 12]: "barley-keeper."

bern [n. 5]: "barn."

beþurfan [s.w.v (with g. or a.)]: "to need."

bewitan [s.v. 1]: "to watch over," "to keep."

biwist [m./f. 1/8]: "sustenance," "food," "provision," "necessaries"

bledu [f. 8]: "dish," "bowl."

bocriht [n. 5]: "rights and obligations granted by charter."

brycgeweore [n. 5]: "work (building or repairing) on bridges."
burh [f, uml.]: "fortified dwelling."

burhbot [f. 8]: "maintenance of fortresses."

butere [f. 13]: "butter."

bydel [m. 1]: "warrant officer."

bysting [m. 1]: "beestings."

bytlan [w.v. II]: "to build."

candelmaesse [f. 13]: "Candlemas," "the feast of the Purification" (Feb. 2).

cealfian [w.v. II]: "to calve."

corn [n. 5]: "grain."

corngebrot [n. 5]: "grain dropped while being carried to barn."

cornlad [f, 8]: "transporting of grain"

cu [f. uml. (g.s. cu(e), cy, cus; d.s. cy; n.a.p. cy, cye; g.p. cu(n)a, cyna; d.p. cum)]: "cow."

cuhyrde (variant: kuhyrde) [m. 2]: "cowherd."

cuþ [adj.]: "usual," "known."

cweþan [s.v. 5]: "to say."

cyning [m. 1]: "king."

cyricseceat [m. 1]: "church-fee."

cyse [m. 2]: "cheese."

cyswyrtie [f. 13]: "cheese-maker."

cyþan [w.v. I]: "to relate," "to make known."

daeg [m. 1]: "day," [2; 4a; 14]; "life-time"; "Last Day"
dael [m. 1]: "portion."

dep [adj.]: "deep," "profound"; "serious," "severe."

deorhege [m. 2]: "deer-fence."

don [an.v.]: "to do," "to act," "to perform."

drifan [s.v. 1]: "to drive."

dung [f. 8 (g.s. dying, ding)]: "dung."

duru [f. 11]: "door."

eac [adv.]: "moreover;" "even."

eahta [num.]: "eight."

eal (eall) [n. 5]: "all," "everything."

eald [adj.]: "old," "mature."

ealdlandraeden [f. 8 (jo-stem)]: "established law of landed property," "old estate arrangements."

ealdormann [m. 1 (uml.)]: "overseer," "superior."

eall [adj.]: "all," "every;" "entire," "whole."

ealswa [conj.]: "(just) as."

earnian (variant: geearnian) [w.v. II (w. g. or a.]): "to merit," "to earn."

easterfeorm [f. 8]: "Easter meal."

eastre [f. 13]: "Easter."

elles [adv.]: "otherwise;" "besides," "as well as."

emniht (efenniht) [f. 8]: "(autumnal) equinox (Sept. 23)."

ende [m. 2]: "border," "limit," "end."

erian [w.v. I]: "to plow."
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esne [m. 2]: "slave laborer."

etenlaes [f. 8 {usually w-stem}]: "pasture."

fald [f?. 8]: "fold."

feccan [w.v. I (pret. feahte)]: "to bring (to)," "to conduct."

fedan [w.v. I]: "to feed," "to provide food."

fela (variant: feola) [sb.]: "many," "much."

feola (see: fela) [sb.]:

feorm [f. 8]: "meal."

feormian [w.v. II]: "to provide meals."

feowertiene [num.]: "fourteen."

fif [num.]: "five."

fiftiene [num.]: "fifteen."

folcgeriht (see: folcriht) [n. 5]:

folcriht (variant: folcgeriht) [n. 5]: "rights and obligations of the people."

folgere [m. 2]: "follower."

forgyman [w.v. I]: "to neglect."

forþam (variant: forþan) [conj.]: "for (the reason) that," "because."

forþan [see: forþam] [conj.]:

forþian [w.v. II]: "carry out," "to accomplish," "to fulfill."

forþsiþ [m. 1]: "going forth," "passing," "death."

fremu [f. 8]: "gain," "profit."

frige (freo) [adj.]: "free."
friþscip [n. 5]: "ship for defense."

frymetling [f. 8]: "young cow."

ful (full) [adv.]: "entirely," "completely," "fully," "full."

full [adj.]: "full."

fyr [adv. comp. of feorr]: "farther," "far."

fyrdfaereld [n. 5]: "military service" [fyrd "army" + faereld "journey," "expedition"].

fyrdweard [f. 8]: "military watch."

fyrst (first) [m. 1]: "space of time," "time."

gaers [n. 5]: "grass."

gaersswyn [n. 8]: "pasturage-swine."

gaersyrþ [f. 8]: "pasturage-plowing."

gafol [n. 8]: "payment." See discussion in commentary on section [2].

gafolheord [f. 8]: "swarm (of bees) subject to payment."

gafolpaenig [m. 1 (p. gafolpenigas)]: "penny as payment."

gafolraeden [f. jo-stem]: "terms of payment."

gafolswan [m. 1]: "tenant-swineherd."

gafolyrþ [f. 8]: "payment-plowing."

gan [an.v.]: "to go."

gathyrde [m. 2]: "goat-herd."

gear [m. 1]: "year."

geara (gearu) [adj.]: "ready."

gebann [n. 5]: "proclamation," "summons," "command."
gebur [m. 1]: "freeholder of the lowest class," "peasant," "farmer." Translated simply as "gebur."

gebyrian [w.v. I]: (impers.) "to happen," "to be time for"; "to be proper"; "to be appropriate"; "to apply"; "to be due to."

gecnawan [s.v. 7]: "to recognize."

gearnian (see: earnian) [w.v. II]:

gefriþian [w.v. II]: "to protect," "to guard," "to keep."

gehwar (gehwaer) [adv.]: "everywhere"; gehwaer...gehwaer "here...there," "in one place... in another."

gehwilc [adj.]: "any."

gelend [adj.]: "furnished with land."

geleornian (see: leornian) [w.v. II]:

gelic [adj.]: "like," "alike," "the same."

gemaene [adj.]: "common."

geneat [m. 1]: "companion," "follower," "dependant," "vassal," "tenant who works for a lord." Translated simply as "geneat."

geneatriht [n. 5]: "rights and obligations of the geneat."

geogeþe (see: geogoþ) [f. 10]:

gegoþ (variant: geogeþe [geoguþ]) [f. 10]: "young (of cattle)."

geong (variant: gyng) [adj.]: "young."

georne [adv.]: "eagerly."

gerad [adj.]: "conditioned," "disposed."

geraed [adj. past part. of raedan]: "decided."

geriht (see riht) [n. 5]:
geswinc [n. 5]: "work," "labor."

getellan [w.v. I]: "to tell," "to recount."

getrywþ (treowþ) [f. 8]: "faithfulness," reliability," "diligence."

geunnan (see: unnan) [s.w.v. ]:

gewirce (see: gewyrce) [n. ]:

gewitnes [f. 8]: "witness," "testimony," "knowledge."

gewyrce (variant: gewirce) [n. 6]: "perquisite." See glossary

gif (variant: gyf) [conj. ]: "if."

glof [f. 8]: "glove."

glofung [f. 9]: "glove-allotment."

god [adj. ]: "good."

gyf (see: gif) [conj. ]:

gyman [w.v. I (w. g. or a.]): "to take heed to;" "to take charge of."

gyng (see: geong) [adj. ]:

gyrd (gierd) [f. 8]: "an area of land, perhaps 1/4 a hide," "strip."

gytfeorm [f. 8]: "drinking feast."

habban [an.v. ]: "to have."

haeigwerd (haegweard) [m. 1]: "hayward."

haerfest [m. ]: "harvest-time."

haerfesthandful [n. ]: "harvest-handful."

halig þunresdaeg [m. ]: "Ascension Day"

ham [n. 1]: "residence."
headorhund (heahdeorhund) [m. 1]: "hunting-dog."

heafodweard [f. ]: "bodyguard duty."

healdan [s.v. 7]: "to hold"; "take care of"; "to maintain"; "to uphold."

heawan [s.v. 7]: "to hew," "to hack," "to cut."

hedan [w.v. I (obj. in g.)]: "to heed," "to see to it that"; "to take charge of."

hefig [adj. ]: "heavy."

hegegian (hegian) [w.v II]: "to fence in," "to palisade."

henfugol [m. 1]: "hen."

heord [f. 8]: "herd," "flock."

heorlppaenig [m. 1 (p. hearlppeningas)]: "hearth-penny."

hlaf [m. 1]: "loaf."

hlaford [m. 1]: "lord (of an estate)."

hors [n. 5]: "horse."

horsian [w.v. II]: "to provide with horses."

horsweard [f. 8]: "care of horses."

hreaccopp [m. 1]: "topping off a rick."

hreacmete [m. 3]: "food as perquisite for making a rick."

hundred [num. ]: "hundred."

hunig [n. 5]: "honey."

huniggafool [n. 5]: "payment in honey," "honey-payment."

hus [n. 5]: "house."

hwaeg (variant: hwaeig, hweg) [n. ]: "whey." See glossary.
hwaeig (see: hwaeg) [n. 5]:

hweg (see: hwaeg) [n. 5]:

hwil [f. 8]: "while"; þa hwile þe "while."

hwilc [adj.]: "any."

hwiltidum [adv.]: "sometimes."

hwyder (hwider) [adv.]: "whither"; swa hwider swa "wherever," "whithersoever."

hyrde (hierde) [m. 2]: "shepherd."

inheord [f. 8]: "herd kept by the lord on his lands," "estate-herd."

inland [n. 5]: "land in the lord's own occupation," "domain," "demesne," "lord's fields."
See glossary.

inswan [m. 1]: "estate-swineherd." See glossary.

kotsetla (cotsetla) [m. 12]: "cottager"

kuhyrde (see: cuhyrde) [m. 2]:

lad [f. 8]: "load."

laedan [w.v. I]: "to lead," "to convey."

laefan [w.v. I]: "to leave (behind)."

laengtensufel (lenctensufel) [n. 5]: "food allotment for the spring."

laes [f. 8 {usually w-stem}]: "pasture."

laessa [adj. comp. of lytel]: "less."

laeswian [w.v. II]: "to pasture," "to graze."

lagu [f. 8]: "law." See commentary on section [1].

lamb [n. 5 (p.n.a. lambru)]: "lamb."
land [n. 5]: "land," "estate."

landgafol [n. 5]: "land-payment." See commentary on section [2].

landlagu [f. 8]: "estate-law."

landriht [n. 5]: "rights and obligations from (holding) land."

landseten [f. 8]: "occupation of land"; "the necessities for occupying land."

landsidu [m. 11]: "estate-custom."

landsticce (landstycce) [n. 6]: "(small) plot of land."

lean [n. 5]: "(field given as) compensation," "remuneration."

leap [m. 1]: "basket"; "measure (perhaps 2/3 a bushel)." See commentary on section [11].

leode [f.p. 8]: "people."

leohht [adj.]: "easy," "light."

leornian (variant: geleornian) [w.v. II]: "to learn."

leosan [s.v. 2]: "to lose."

ligcan [s.v. 5]: "to lie," "to be situated," "to border."

lof [n. 5]: "good repute."

lufian [w.v. II]: "to love," "to cherish," "to value."

luflice [adv.]: "gladly." [21,3]

lytel [adj.]: "little."

ma [sb. indecl.]: "more."

macian [w.v. II]: "to make."

maedmaewect [?]: "mowing of a meadow."

maenig (see: manig) [adj.]:
maesse  [f. 13]:  "mass"; "special mass-day."

maessedaeig  [m. 1]:  "mass-day," "festival."

maesten  [n. 5 ja-stem]:  "mast," "pasture (for swine)."

maep  [f. 8]:  "lot," "state," "rank."

maepmed  [f. 8]:  "pay for making hay."

magan  [s.w.v. (pres. 1, 3 s. maeg; 2 meaht; p. magon; pret. 3 meahте)]:  "to be able."

manig (variant: maenig)  [adj.]:  "many," "many a," "much"

mann  [m. uml.]:  "person"; "people."

mara  [adj. comp. of micel]:  "more," "greater."

martinus  [m. indecl.]:  "St. Martin."  Day of celebration, Nov. 11.

mawan  [s.v. 7]:  "to mow."

medeme  [adj.]:  "middling."

meolc  [f. 8]:  "milk."

mete  [m. 2 (p. mettas)]:  "food-allotment."

metecu  [f. uml.]:  "cow for food."

metegafol  [n. 5]:  "food-payment."

metsung  [f. 8 {often 9}]:  "provisioning."

michaelis  [m. indecl.]:  "St. Michael."  Day of celebration Sept. 29.

midd  [adj.]:  "mid," "middle," "midway"; midda winter "Christmas."

midwinter  [m. 1]:  "Christmas."

mislic (see: mistlic) [adj.]:

mistlic (variant: mislic) [adj.]:  "various," "varied."
mondaeg (monandaeg) [m. 1]: "Monday."

motan [s.w.v.]: "to be allowed."

myngung (mynegung) [f. 9]: "exhortation," "admonition."

na [adv.]: "not," "no," "not at all."

ne [adv.]: "not."

neod [f. 8]: "needs."

nige (niwe) [adv.]: "newly."

nigefara (nifara) [m. 12]: "newcomer," "stranger."

niht [f. 8 (g.s. nihtes)]: "night;" "day (as in a 24 hour period)."

nu [adv.]: "now."

nydriht [n. 5]: Normally "duty," "office." Here "right to necessities." See commentary on section [9,1].

nyhst (niehst) [adv.]: "most nearly," "in closest proximity," "next (to)."

nyllan [an.v.]: "to not want to."

nyr [adv. comp. of neah]: "near" "nearer."

oft [adv.]: "often," "frequently"; swa oft swa "as often as."

oftraede [adj.]: "always available."

onwunian [w.v. II]: "to live (in the sense of "to inhabit")."

þeper [adj.]: "one of two"; "second," "other" þeper...þeper... "the one...the other..."

þpe [conj.]: "or."

oxa [m. 12]: "ox."

oxanhyrde [m. 2]: "ox-herd"
paenig [m. 1 (n.p. peningas)]: "penny."

pund [n. 5]: "pound (in weight or in money)."

raecan [w.v. I (pret. raehhte)]: "to procure."

raeden [f. 8 jo-stem]: "condition," "terms," "arrangement."

reccan [w.v. I (pret. reahte)]: "to instruct," "to explain," "to discuss."

ridan [s.v. 1]: "to ride."

riht (variant: geriht) [n. 5]: "what is straight/right," "rights and obligations." See commentary on section [1].

rip [n. 5]: "harvest."

ripan [s.v. 1]: "to reap."

saed [n. 5]: "seed."

saedcynn [n. 4 ja-stem]: "kind of seed."

saedere [m. 2]: "sower."

saedian [w.v. II]: "to sow."

saengcan (sengan) [w.v. I]: "to burn slightly," "to singe."

saet [f. 8]: "hunting-blind." See commentary on section [2].

saeweard [n. 5]: "coast-watch."

sawan [s.v. 7]: "to sow."

sceap [n. 5]: "sheep."

sceaphyrde [m. 2]: "shepherd."

scipaetere (sceapaetere) [m. 2]: "sheep's carcase."

scir [f. 8]: "multiple estate." See commentary on section [4,6] and discussion in chapter 3 on this section.
scoh [m. 1 (g.s. sceos, g.p. sceone, d.p. seon/scoum)]: "shoe."

scorp (sceorp) [n. 5]: "fittings (for a ship)."

scoung [f. 8 {usually 9}]: "shoes-allotment."

scoung [f. 8 {usually 9}]: "shoes-allotment."

sculon [an.v.]: "to have to," "must."

seam [m. 1]: "burden," "load."

secgan [an.v.]: "to say."

sel [adj.]: "good."

sellan [w.v. I]: "to give," "provide."

seofon [num.]: "seven."

settan [w.v. I]: "to set," "to impose."

siex [num.]: "six."

sleaewp [f.]: "sloth," "indolence," "laziness."

slyht (slicht) [m. 1]: "animal for slaughter."

slyhtswyn (slichtswyn) [n. 5]: "slaughter-pig"

spic [n. 5]: "bacon"

sprecan [s.v. 5]: "to speak."

standan [w.v. 6]: "to stand"; "to be in force."

sticung [f. 8 {often 9}]: "stabbing," "slaughter."

stifearh (stigfearh) [m. 1]: "little pig (kept in a sty)."

sulhaecer [m. 1]: "a strip of land for ploughing."

sum [adj.]: "some," "many a."

sum [pron.]: "some"
sumer (variant: sumor) [m. 1 (g.s. sumeres, d.s. sumera/sumere)]: "summer."

sumor (see: sumer) [m. 5]:

suster (see: syster) [m. 1]:

swa [adv. ]: "so," "as"; swa...swa "as .... as."

swan [m. 1]: "swineherd."

swanriht [n. 5]: "swineherd-obligations." See commentary on section [1].

swilc [adj. ]: "such"; swilc....swilc "such....as."

swyn (swin) [n. 5]: "swine," "pig."

syring [f. 8]: "buttermilk."

syster (variant: suster [sester]) [m. 1]: "a certain measure of bulk." See commentary on section [4,1].

sypþan (sipþan) [adv. ]: "after."

taecan [w.v. I]: "to direct."

ticcen [n. 5]: "kid."

tien [num. ]: "ten."

tima [m. 12]: "time."

toeacan [adv. ]: "besides," "also," "as well as."

tol [n. 5]: "tool."

treow [n. w-stem]: "tree."

tun [m. 1]: "enclosure," "group of houses," "curtilage." See glossary.

twegen [num. ]: "two"; twegen and twegen "two by two," "in groups of two."

twelf [num. ]: "twelve."

þaenne (see: þonne) [adv. ]:
þaer [adv.]: "there" "where."

þaet [conj.]: "that."

þafian [w.v. II]: "to tolerate," "to permit," "to allow."

þeah [adv.]: "though", "nevertheless," "however."

þeaw [m. w-stem]: "usage," "custom," "practice."

þed (see: þeod) [f. 8]:

þegn [m. 1]: "thegn."

þeod (variant: þed) [f. 8]: "people," "nation,"; "region."

þeow [adj.]: "servile," "bound."

þinc (see: þing) [n. 5]:

þing (variant: þinc & þingc) [n. 5]: "thing."

þingc (see: þing) [n. 5]:

þonne (variant: þaenne) [adv.]: "then"

þonne [conj.]: "when," "whenever"; (with comparatives) "than."

þrie [num.]: "three."

þrie and twentig [num.]: "23."

þunresdaeg [m. 1]: "Thursday."

þurfan [s.w.v.]: "to need," "to be required."

þus [adv.]: "thus," "so."

unnan (variant: geunnan) [s.w.v.]: "to grant."

unsawen [adj.]: "unsown."

ute [adv.]: "out."
**waentreow** (waegntreow) [n. w-stem]: "log given to the carter of a load of wood," "wagon-log." See glossary.

**wel** [adv.]: "well."

**wenan** [w.v. I]: "to think," "to imagine," "to expect."

**weorc** [n. 5]: "work," "labor," "task."

**werian** [w.v. I]: "to guard," "to keep," "to secure." See commentary on section [3,4].

**wicweorc** [n.]: "week-work." See glossary.

**wifmann** [m. uml.]: "female servant," "woman."

**willa** [m. 12]: "mind," "will."

**willan** [an.v.]: "to will," "to be about to."

**windfylled** (windfilled) [adj.]: "felled by the wind."

**winterfeorm** [f. 8]: "Christmas meal."

**wintersufel** [n. 5]: "food-allotment for winter"

**witan** [s.w.v. (1, 3 s. wat; 2 s. wast; p. witon; pret. wite; pp. witen)]: "to be aware of or conscious of," "to know."

**wringhwaeg** [n. 5]: "strained whey."

**wuce** [f. 13]: "week."

**wudeward** (see: wuduweard) [m. 1]:

**wudulad** [f. 8]: "carting wood."

**wuduraeden** [f. 8 jo-stem]: "an arrangement for wood (gathering)."

**wuduweard** (variant: wudeward) [m. 1]: "forester," "woodward."

**wyce** (wice) [f. 13]: "office," "duties of an office."
**wyrcan** [w.v. I]: "to perform," "to work."

**wyrþe** (weorð) [adj.]: "worthy ("of" w/gen.); subject ("to" w/ be)."

**ymbe** [adv.]: "concerning," "about." In relative clauses used as a resumptive preposition.

**yrþ** (irþ) [f. 8]: "plowing."
### NOMINAL DECLENSION PATTERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Neuters</th>
<th>Feminines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0 -as</td>
<td>8 -u -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -a</td>
<td>-e -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>-e -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0 -as</td>
<td>Long stems drop /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-e -as</td>
<td>9 -0 -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -a</td>
<td>-a -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>-a -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -as</td>
<td>-a -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-e -e</td>
<td>10 -0 -e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -a</td>
<td>-e -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>-e -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -e</td>
<td>-e -e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0 -0</td>
<td>A-Stems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -ra</td>
<td>11 -u -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>-a -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0 -0</td>
<td>-a -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-u -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuters</td>
<td>-0 -u</td>
<td>Long stems drop /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -a</td>
<td>N-Stems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>12 -a -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0 -u</td>
<td>-an -ena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-an -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-an -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-e -u</td>
<td>13 -e -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -a</td>
<td>-an -ena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -um</td>
<td>-an -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -u</td>
<td>-an -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0 -ru</td>
<td>14 -e -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-es -ra</td>
<td>-an -ena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e -rum</td>
<td>-an -um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0 -ru</td>
<td>-e -an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
INDEX TO THE RSP

a, adv.: 3,3
ac, conj.: 21,1
aecer, m.: 3,3; 4,1b; 4,1c; 4,3; 10
achtemann, m.: 9,1
achteswan, m.: 7
aelc, adj.: 3; 3,4; 4a; 4,1b; 4,2c; 6,1; 11; 19
aelmesfeoh, n.: 1,1; 2
aer, conj.: 15
aer, adv.: 4,4; 6,3; 20; 21; 21,1; 21,5
aerendian, w.v.: 2
aerest, adv.: 4,1b
aferian, w.v.: 2; 4a
agan, (agen) adj.: 4,2; 20,1
an, num.: 4,1; 4,2b; 4,3; 6,4; 8; 9; 11; 15
andlaman, m. pl.: 4,3b
araeran, w.v.: 6,1
arisan, s.v.: 1,1
atellan, w.v.: 5,4
be þam þe, conj.: 2; 3
bean, f.: 9
bedrip, f.: 5,2
beforan, adv.: 21; 21,1; 21,5
began, an.v.: 4,1a
begyman, w.v.: 15
behweorfan, s.v.: 6,2; 7
belflys, n.: 14
ben, f.: 4,1c
bendform, (benfeorm) f.: 21,4
benyrp, f.: 5,2
beo, f.: 5
beoceorl, m.: 5
beocere, m.: 6,3; 6,4
beod, m.: 16
beodan, s.v.: 3,4
beorgan, s.v.: 20,1
bere, m.: 4,1
berebrytta, m.: 17
bern, n.: 4,1b; 4,2; 17
beþurfan, s.w.v: 4,1c
bewitan, s.v.: 5
biwist, m./f.: 21,5
bledu, f.: 14
bocriht, n.: 1
brycgeweorc, n.: 1
burh, f.: 2
burhbot, f.: 1
butere, f.: 16
bydel, m.: 18
bysting, m.: 13
bytlian, w.v.: 2
candelmaesse, f.: 4a
cealfian, w.v.: 13
corn, n.: 8; 9
corngebrot, n.: 17
cornlad, f.: 21,4
cu, f.: 4,3; 13; 13,1
cuhyrde, (variant: kuhyrde) m.: 13
cup, adj.: 21,1
cweþan, s.v.: 4,4; 6,3
cyning, m.: 1,1; 3,4
cyricsceat, m.: 1,1; 2; 3,4
cyse, m.: 16
cyswyрhте, f.: 16
cyþan, w.v.: 21,1
daeg, m.: 3; 4a; 14
dael, m.: 15; 16
deop, adj.: 6,1
deorhege, m.: 1,1; 2; 3,4
don, an.v.: 5,4
drifan, s.v.: 4,2c
dung, f.: 14
duru, f.: 17
eac, adv.: 5,2; 6,1; 6,3; 18; 18,1
eahta, num.: 9
eal, (eall) n.: 5,4; 20,2; 21,5
eald, adj.: 6,1; 13
ealdlandraeden, f.: 4,6
ealdormann, m.: 12; 17
eall, adj.: 4,3a; 4,4; 9,1; 14; 16; 21,1
ealswa, conj.: 3,4

earnian, (variant: geearnian) w.v.: 4,1c; 10; 10,1; 12; 17

easterfeorm, f.: 9,1; 21,4

eastre, f.: 4a; 4,1; 4,1a

elles, adv.: 7

emniht, (efenniht) f.: 14

ende, m.: 20

erian, w.v.: 4,1b; 4,2

esne, m.: 8

etenlaes, f.: 20; 20,1

fald, f?: 4,1a

feccan, w.v.: 2

fedan, w.v.: 4,2b

fela, (variant: feola) sb.: 5,4; 21,4

feola, (see: fela) sb.: 21,4

feorm, f.: 9,1

feormian, w.v.: 2

feowertiene, num.: 13

fif, num.: 3,3; 5,1; 6,1

fiftiene, num.: 6,1

folcgeriht, (see: folcriht) n.: 21,4

folcriht, (variant: folgeriht) n.: 20,1; 21,4

folgere, m.: 10

forgyman, w.v.: 20; 20,1

forþam, (variant: forþan) conj.: 3,3; 18; 20; 20,1; 21,3

forþan, (see: forþam) conj.: 3,3; 18

forþian, w.v.: 4,3a

forþsip, m.: 4,3c; 5,5

fremu, f.: 10,1

frige, (freo) adj.: 3,4; 5,5; 18

frípscep, n.: 1,1

frymetling, f.: 13

ful, (full) adv.: 6,2; 20,2

full, adj.: 11; 14

fyr, adv.: 2

fyrdfaereld, n.: 1

fyrdweard, f.: 1,1

fyrst, (first) m.: 3; 4a; 11

gaers, n.: 4,1c

gaersswyn, n.: 2

gaersyrþ, f.: 4,1c

gafol, n.: 5,1
gafolheord, f.: 5

gafolpaenig, m.: 4,1

gafolraeden, f.: 5,1

gafolswan, m.: 6

gafolyrþ, f.: 4, 2

gan, an.v.: 12,1; 13,1

gathyrde, m.: 15

gear, m.: 3; 4a; 4,3a; 6,1; 11; 14; 15

geara, (gearu) adj.: 5,2

gebann, n.: 1,1

gebur, m.: 4; 4,2c; 4,3; 4,5

gebyrian, w.v.: 3,3; 3,4; 4,3; 4,3a; 4,3c;
5; 5,1; 5,5; 6; 6,1; 7; 9,1; 10; 11; 13; 15;
16; 17; 18; 18,1; 19; 20; 21,4

gecnawan, s.v.: 20

geearnian, (see: earnian) w.v.: 10; 10,1;
17

gefriþian, w.v: 20,2

gehwar, (gehwaer) adv.: 4; 4,4

gehwilec, adj.: 6,3

geland, adj.: 5,3

geleornian, (see: leornian) w.v.: 21,2

gelic, adj.: 4,4

gemaene, adj.: 12

geneat, m.: 2

geneatriht, n.: 2

geogeþe, (see: geogþ) f.: 14

geogþ, (variant: geogeþ [geoguþ]) f.: 14; 15

geon, (variant: gyng) adj.: 4,1; 6,1

georne, adv.: 21,2

gerad, adj.: 5,4

geraed, adj.: 5; 5,1

geriiht, (see riht) n.: 4; 4,3a; 7; 21,1

geswinc, n.: 18,1; 20

getellan, w.v.: 21,4

getrywþ, (treowþ) f.: 17

geunnan, (see: unnan) s.w.v.: 20,1

gewirce, (see: gewyrce) n.: 7

gewitnes, f.: 12

gewyrce, (variant: gewirce) n.: 6,2; 7

gif, (variant: gyf) conj.: 5,3; 10,1; 15;
17; 20; 20,2; 21,2

glof, f.: 12

glofung, f.: 10

god, adj.: 8; 20,2

gyf, (see: gif) conj.: 20; 20,2; 21,2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gyman, w.v.: 4,3c; 6,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyng, (see: geong) adj.: 6,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyrd, (gierd) f.: 4,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gytfeorm, f.: 21,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habban, an.v.: 3,3; 6,1; 7; 11; 13; 14; 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haeigwerd, (haegweard) m.: 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haerfest, m.: 3; 4a; 9,1; 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haerfesthandful, n.: 9,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halig þunresdaeg, m.: 3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ham, n.: 1,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headorhund, (heahdeorhund) m.: 4,2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heafodweard, f.: 1,1; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healdan, s.v.: 2; 5; 7; 20,2; 21,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heawan, s.v.: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hedan, w.v.: 4,6; 5,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hefig, adj.: 4; 4,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hegegian, (hegian) w.v: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>henfugol, m.: 4,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heord, f.: 4,2c; 12; 14; 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heorppaenig, m.: 3,4; 4,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlaf, m.: 4,2c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlaford, m.: 2; 3; 3,4; 4,1a; 4,1b; 4,3c; 5,2; 5,3; 5,5; 6,3; 12; 12,1; 13,1; 16; 20,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horns, n.: 4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsian, w.v.: 5,3; 6,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsweard, f.: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hreaccopp, m.: 21,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hreacmete, m.: 21,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hundred, num.: 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunig, n.: 5,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huniggafol, n.: 4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hus, n.: 4,3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwaeg, (variant: hwaeig, hweg) n.: 9; 14; 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwaeig, (see: hwaeg) n.: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hweg, (see: hwaeg) n.: 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwil, f.: 4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwilc, adj.: 20,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwiltidum, adv.: 5,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwyder, (hwider) adv.: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyrde, (hierde) m.: 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheord, f.: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inland, n.: 3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inswan, m.: 4,2c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotsetla, (cotsetla) m.: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuhyrde, (see: cuhyrde) m.: 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lad, f.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laedan, w.v.</td>
<td>2; 5,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laefan, w.v.</td>
<td>4,3c; 5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laengtensufel,</td>
<td>(lenctensufel) n.: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laes, f.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laessa, adj.</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeswian, w.v.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagu, f.</td>
<td>1; 6,4; 21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamb, n.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land, n.</td>
<td>1; 2; 3,3; 4a; 4,3; 4,4; 4,5; 5; 5,1; 6; 6,1; 21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landgafol, n.</td>
<td>2; 3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlagu, f.</td>
<td>4,4; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landriht, n.</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landseten, f.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landsidu, m.</td>
<td>4,4; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landsticce,</td>
<td>(landstycce) n.: 18,1; 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lean, n.</td>
<td>20; 20,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leap, m.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leode, f.p.</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leoht, adj.</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leornian, (variant: geleornian) w.v.</td>
<td>21,2; 21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leosan, s.v.</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liegan, s.v.</td>
<td>4,1a; 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lof, n.</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lufian, w.v.</td>
<td>21,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luflice, adv.</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lytel, adj.</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma, sb.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macian, w.v.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maenmaewect, ?</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maenig, (see: manig) adj.</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maesse, f.</td>
<td>3,4; 4,1a; 4,1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maessedaeig, m.</td>
<td>4,1; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maesten, n.</td>
<td>4,2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maeþ, f.</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maeþmed, f.</td>
<td>21,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magan, s.w.v.</td>
<td>5,3; 5,4; 10,1; 20; 21,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manig, (variant: maenig) adj.</td>
<td>1,1; 5,2; 6,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mann, m.</td>
<td>3,4; 7; 8; 21,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mara, adj.</td>
<td>3,3; 4,1c; 5,1; 10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>martinus, m.</td>
<td>3,4; 4,1; 4,1a; 4,1b; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawan, s.v.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medeme, adj.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meolc, f.</td>
<td>13; 14; 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mete, m.: 9; 10
metecu, f.: 8; 12,1; 13,1
metegafol, n.: 4,5
metsung, f.: 8; 9
michaelis, m.: 4,1
midd, adj.: 14
midwinter, m.: 9,1
mislic, (see: mistlic) adj.: 4
mistlic, (variant: mislic) adj.: 1,1; 2; 4; 21
mondaeg, (monandaeg) m.: 3
motan, s.w.v.: 12; 12,1
myngung, (mynegung) f.: 21,5
na, adv.: 21,1
ne, adv.: 4a; 4,4; 5,4; 20,1; 21,1; 21,4
neod, f.: 6,3
nige, (niwe) adv.: 13
nigefara, (nifara) m.: 2
niht, f.: 13; 14
nu, adv.: 5,4
nydriht, n.: 9,1
nyhst, (niehst) adv.: 20,1
nyllan, an.v.: 21,3
nyr, adv.: 2
oft, adv.: 4,1a
oftraede, adj.: 3,3; 6,3; 18
onwunian, w.v.: 21,2
oper, adj.: 10; 18
oppe, conj.: 9; 12; 14
oxa, m.: 4,3; 12; 12,1
oxanhyrde, m.: 12
paenig, m.: 4,1; 9
pund, n.: 8; 9
raecan, w.v.: 4,1b
raeden, f.: 4,3
reccan, w.v.: 21,5
ridan, s.v.: 2
riht, (variant: geriht) n.: 3; 4; 4,3a; 7; 14; 21,1
rip, n.: 21,4
ripan, s.v.: 2
saed, n.: 4,1b; 11
saedcynn, n.: 11
saedere, m.: 11
saedian, w.v.: 10
saencgan, (sengan) w.v.: 6,2
saet, f.: 2
saeweard, n.: 1,1; 3,4
sawan, s.v.: 4,2; 4,3; 10; 11
sceap, n.: 4,1; 4,3; 9
sceaphyrde, m.: 14
scipaetere, (sceapaetere) m.: 8
scir, f.: 4,6
scoh, m.: 12
scorp, (seeorp) n.: 1,1
scoung, f.: 10
sculon, an.v.: 2; 3; 3,3; 4a; 4,1; 4,1a; 4,1b; 4,5; 5,3; 5,4; 6,3; 18; 20,1; 20,2
seam, m.: 5,3
seegan, an.v.: 21
sel, adj.: 21,2
sellan, w.v.: 2; 3,2; 3,4; 4,1; 4,2c; 4,3; 4,3b; 4,5; 5; 5,1; 5,3; 6; 6,1
seofon, num.: 4,3; 13; 14
settan, w.v.: 21,1
siex, num.: 4,2c; 4,3
slaewp, f.: 20,1
slyht, (sliheht) m.: 6
slyhtswyn, (slihehtswyn) n.: 6,2
spic, n.: 7
spredcan, s.v.: 21,1
standan, w.v.: 2; 3; 4,3; 4,4; 6; 6,1
sticung, f.: 6,1; 6,2
stifearh, (stigfearh) m.: 7
sulhaecer, m.: 9,1
sum, adj.: 4a; 4,4; 4,5; 5,1; 18,1; 21,4
sum, pron.: 2; 3
sumer, (variant: sumor) m.: 9; 14
sumor, (see: sumer) m.: 14
suster, (see: syster) m.: 5,1
swa, adv.: 2; 4,1a; 4,1c; 4,4; 5,4; 6,3; 21
swan, m.: 6,2; 6,4
swanriht, n.: 6,1
swile, adj.: 3,4; 4a
swyn, (swin) n.: 6,1
syring, f.: 14; 16
syster, (variant: suster [sester]) m.: 4,1; 5,1; 9
syppan, (sippan) adv.: 13
taecan, w.v.: 2; 4a; 5,3
ticcen, n.: 15
tien, num.: 4,1; 6,1
tima, m.: 4,1b

toeacan, adv.: 4,1c; 5,2; 9,1

tol, n.: 4,3b

treow, n.: 19

tun, m.: 2

twegen, num.: 4a; 4,1c; 4,2b; 4,3; 8; 10; 12

twelf, num.: 8; 14

þaenne, (see: þonne) adv.: 21,2

þaer, adv.: 21,1

þaet, conj.: 10; 11; 13; 14; 16; 18; 20; 20,1

þafian, w.v.: 4,1c

þeah, adv.: 21,5

þeaw, m.: 3,3; 4,6; 21,1; 21,2

þed, (see: þed) f.: 21,2

þegn, m.: 1

þed, (variant: þed) f.: 4,6; 21,1; 21,2; 21,4

þeow, adj.: 6,4; 7; 9

þinc, (see: þing) n.: 1

þing, (variant: þine & þingc) n.: 1; 1,1; 5,4; 21,4

þinge, (see: þing) n.: 1,1

þonne, (variant: þaenne) adv.: 4,1c; 6,2; 18; 20,2; 21,2

þonne, conj.: 4,2c; 4,3c; 5; 5,5; 7; 11

þrie, num.: 3; 4a; 4,1c; 4,2; 9

þrie and twentig, num.: 4,1

þunresdaeg, m.: 3,4

þurfan, s.w.v.: 3,2; 4a

þus, adv.: 20,1

unnan, (variant: geunnan) s.w.v.: 17; 20

unsawen, adj.: 10

ute, adv.: 4a

waentreow, (waegntreow) n.: 21,4

wel, adv.: 5,3; 6,2; 11; 15; 20,1; 20,2

wenan, w.v.: 20

weorc, n.: 3,3; 4a; 4,3b; 5,2; 6,3; 18

werian, w.v.: 3,4

wicweorc, n.: 4a

wifmann, m.: 9

willa, m.: 5,2

willan, an.v.: 21,2

windfylled, (windfilled) adj.: 19

winterfeorm, f.: 21,4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wintersufel</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witan</td>
<td>s.w.v.</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wringhwaeg</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuce</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>3; 4a; 4,1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wudeward</td>
<td>(see:</td>
<td>wuduweard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wudulad</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>21,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuduraeden</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuduweard</td>
<td>(variant:</td>
<td>wudeward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wyce</td>
<td>(wise) f.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wyrcan</td>
<td>w.v.</td>
<td>2; 3; 4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wyrþe</td>
<td>(weorð) adj.</td>
<td>1; 6,2; 6,4; 20,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ymbe</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>21,1; 21,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrþ</td>
<td>(irþ) f.</td>
<td>21,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beestings (*hysting*): The first milk from a mammal after parturition (the act of giving birth).

bell-wether's fleece (*belfys*): A wether is a castrated ram (Anglo-Saxon *weþer*). A bell-wether was the ram that led the flock, and which was distinguished by having a bell around its neck.

bound (*þeow*): The term is traditionally interpreted as meaning one personally bound to his lord (and as such is translated as "slave"), as opposed to a "serf" who is bound to the estate. However, the RSP does not seem to recognize this distinction (see discussion in chapter 4).

butter milk (*syring*): Milk from which butter has been removed, the result of the preparation of butter and cheese (see section [16]).

curtilage (*tun*): Area of land occupied by a dwelling and its yard and outbuildings, actually enclosed or considered enclosed.

estate-swineherd (*inswan*): The swineherd who took care of the estate's own pigs.

leap (*leap*): A unit of bulk measure, possibly equivalent to 2/3 of a bushel.

lord's fields (*inland*); It is uncertain if this term refers to the whole portion of the estate the personally belonged to the lord or to only those field(s) of the estate, the whole of whose produce belonged to the lord of the estate. See commentary for section [3,4].

mast (*maesten*): The translation "pasturage" could be misleading, since it usually refers to grazing on grasses. In the case of pigs, they were driven into the woods to feed on mast, i.e. the fruit of the oak, beech and other forest trees, acorns and similar tree nuts.

pasturage-plowing (*gaersyrð*): The plowing done by a *gebur* on the lord's fields for the right to pasture his animals on the estate.

pasturage-swine (*gaerswyn*): A pig given by a *gebur* to the estate for the right to pasture
his animals on the estate.

**payment**/ **-payment** (*gafol*/*-gafol*): A payment given to the estate by a tenant, in money, in kind, or in both. Whether this should be understood as "rent," "tribute" or "tax" depends on how one understand the development of tenancy in Anglo-Saxon England.

**payment-plowing** (*gafolyrð*): Plowing done as part of a tenant's payment to the estate.

**perquisites** (*gewyrce*): From which comes "perk"; the profit from service beyond the amount fixed as the regular salary or wages.

**plowing-on-demand** (*benyrð*): The plowing that is done by a tenant upon request by the estate.

**property-person** (*aehtemann*): It is here proposed that the *aehte-* of the compound does not indicate that the person (*mann*) is the "property" (*aeht*) of the estate, but that this person looked after the property of the estate. In this way, the term does not refer to status, as much as function. See chapter 3 and the commentary for section [7].

**property-swineherd** (*aehteswan*): A swineherd who oversaw the care of the estate's pigs. For a fuller discussion of the term, see chapter 3 and the commentary for section [7].

**requested-reaping** (*bedrip*): Was essentially the same as **work-on-demand** (*ben*) except that it specifically refers to reaping.

**rick** (*hreac*): A stack, esp. a stack of hay or of sheaves of grain having the tops rounded and thatched to protect the interior from rain.

**wagon-log** (*weantreow*): This was a log of wood taken from a wagon load and given to a tenant as **perquisite** for carting the wood.

**week-work** (*wicweorc*): The regular labors of a tenant during the course of a week.

**whey** (*hwaeig*): The water and milk-sugar that remains after milk is coagulated into cheese. Strained whey (*wringhwaeg*) is simply "whey pressed out of cheese."

**work-on-demand** (*ben*): Labors that a lord could ask his tenants to do above and beyond their usual duties.