# 1. Cnut, King of the English, 1017–19

Ryan Lavelle

The question of how rulers of England and those around them viewed their control of the lowland British polity which had been emerging during the course of the tenth and early eleventh centuries remains contentious. It has been thrown into sharp relief in recent years by George Molyneaux's valuable reassessment of tenth-century England, which takes Cnut's assumption to power in 1017, recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as its starting point to look back over the tenth century.[1] Although, as Molyneaux is quick to point out, Cnut's division of the kingdom into four (Wessex "for himself" ["him sylfan"], East Anglia for Thorkell, Mercia for Eadric, and Northumbria for Eiríkr) in 1017 does not mean that the credit for a "kingdom of England" should be Cnut's, but rather the division may have meant that Cnut was in effective control of more territory than his predecessors—those stemming from the West Saxon dynasty—had enjoyed: the loss of Lothian may have become a concrete reality after the battle of Carham in 1018, but much of the territory from the Tees down to the coast of the English Channel was more than superficially subordinate to Cnut. Such control had been within the scope of the ambition of rulers after Æthelstan, who might style themselves, as Æthelred did, "Emperor of all the Peoples of Britain," even while they could not quite manage to live up to this. What distinguished Cnut, however, was a new practical control. This was coupled with an ideological determination on the part of Archbishop Wulfstan, and of other heirs to the tenth-century religious reform movement, to drive the political manifestation of the English identity forward in a polity that could be realised as a "kingdom of England."

Still, although we might use formulations such as the "kingdom of England" or the "territory" or "earldom" of "Wessex," these terms may not always have been as clearly defined as we might like to think. A town or city could be identified to contemporaries in terms of the geographical space of the settlement more than by the "burhwara" ("town-dwellers") within, but territories, whether they were *regnes* or *prouinciae*, remained defined by the subjection of people within them. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* provides something approximating to an official record of the reign of Cnut, at least at the start of his reign: Cnut may have succeeded to a kingdom ("rice"), but it was to a "kingdom of all the English people" ("eallon Angelcynnes ryce").[2] This chapter is about how Cnut found himself in control of that group of people and its land—a group of people and land far larger than the Danish area with which Cnut had previously been engaged.[3] Cnut, a young man of not much

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

more than twenty years, was able to adapt himself to, and indeed adapt, notions of English identity and the forms and structures of English power. The question of Cnut as an Englishman is not a new one. Whereas L. M. Larson's Cnut of 1912 remained implacably an old Viking (albeit a politically agile Christian one), only remaining in England because of the dangers of its revolt,[4] the view from Sir Frank Stenton in 1943 was that Cnut was one of the last of the barbarians to be converted by Christian civilization: although Stenton could not see Cnut as an "Anglo-Saxon" king, he noted his "enthusiastic devotion to the interests of the church in England."[5] It is worth remarking on how such assessments consider Cnut's position in terms of his control of an agglomeration of territories (or even empire), or how they at least assess him in the knowledge that he would come to control his brother's Danish territory when the time came.

There is good justification for a focus on that trans-marine achievement, and in the light of Cnut's retention of a large number of ships and his rapid reaction to his brother's death in 1019, it would be surprising if he did not have Denmark in his sights in some way. Recent books by Timothy Bolton, as well as other papers in this volume, have done much to return Cnut's interests to the North Sea and its environs.[6] It has been suggested that the appearance of Cnut's name on some early Danish coins, minted according to a design owing something to an Æthelredian coin pattern, is an indication that Cnut may have been recognised as a co-ruler with his brother Haraldr before 1018/19, but the evidence is not conclusive.[7] In any case, while a suggestion of joint-rule might help us to understand the smoothness of Danish succession in the wake of the death of Haraldr, it remains significant that Cnut was a king in England, recognised as such, for two years between 1017 and 1019 and that he could only be a nominal king in Denmark with, at best, his interests there promoted by the presence of Ælfgifu of Northampton (a suggestion which depends on the assumption that she married Cnut in 1013×14, left England in the wake of Æthelred's return, and remained in Denmark when Cnut came to England in 1015—a plausible, yet sadly unprovable sequence of events).[8] Cnut did not know, indeed could not know, that his brother Haraldr would die when he did, but he did know that Haraldr would continue to rule in Denmark and may have been expected in due course to determine the Danish succession for his own heirs.[9] When considering Cnut's reign in England, we often reach for parallels between Cnut and William of Normandy, whose military conquest of England came almost exactly half a century after that of Cnut.[10] However, William conquered and ruled England in the knowledge that he remained duke of Normandy. Sveinn Forkbeard, who embarked on conquest knowing that his patrimony was in the hands of Haraldr, his eldest son, is a closer

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

parallel to William than Cnut in this respect. It was hardly a consolation prize but for a period Cnut had to make what he could of English kingship alone.[11]

## Conquering the Kingdom: From North to South

Where should we begin? In writing about the reign of King Stephen (1135–54), Edmund King suggested in 1994 that the idea of the first hundred days of a presidency (with reference to that of Franklin D. Roosevelt) "can be taken back [to the twelfth century] without anachronism, for it says no more than that the first impressions created by a new regime are crucial in the establishment of its authority."[12] King applied this idea to the reign of Stephen with some success, and the formulation of "the first hundred days" is a useful tool: it can give a sense of the support for the incumbent, his or her hopes, dreams, and a sense of how they begin to respond to "Events." Unfortunately, this has its limits in the case of Cnut. As we have seen, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* notes the point at which Cnut succeeded to the kingdom in its entry for 1017. Yet did that take place immediately after the death of Edmund Ironside on 30 November 1016 (and thus within the temporal auspices of the year 1017)?[13] Or did this entry refer to a coronation ceremony in the summer of 1017, a point at which Cnut's regime could really be said to have established its authority? We should not forget, either, that the CDE version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* refers to Cnut as "King" ("cyng") in terms of his election by the Danish fleet in 1014, his return to Sandwich in 1015, and his campaigns in Mercia in 1016. It is possible that his kingship was accepted in the south of England in 1016 (meaning he was made king of the English three times in the course of four years—surely a record!). The question of a coronation ceremony and its possible date is discussed below. However, while a precise assessment of Cnut's first hundred days, if we interpret it by what he had achieved by 10 March 1017, escapes historical record, there is enough evidence about the start of Cnut's reign in England to justify making this assessment over a longer timescale than one hundred days.

While M. K. Lawson's 1994 biography of Cnut, the first book-length study of the ruler since 1912, emphasises the agency of "the most successful of all pre-Conquest rulers in Britain," one cannot help but read Lawson's Cnut as a figure enveloped by an existing system of English governance and ecclesiastical networks, rather like an incoming Prime Minister stifled by the established policies of Whitehall civil servants.[14] Others have seen the institutions as a machine that could be used: James Campbell's insistence on the state-driven mechanisms of Cnut's housecarls was, for him, a validation of the institutions of the kingdom that Cnut had inherited.[15] The late Timothy Reuter provided an abiding image of the manner

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

in which Cnut, like other political contestants in the tenth through to twelfth centuries, could step behind the controls of a car (presumably a powerful one) because of the inherent stability of the system: "like a car, it needed a driver," he wrote, "but anyone who knew how to drive could drive it."[16]

The use of these mechanisms was a choice made by Cnut, who actively engaged with them, and it was determined by the development of policy. The apparent ease with which Cnut slipped into forms of Anglo-Saxon kingship and the ways in which we read the winning combination of Cnut and Wulfstan as illustrating the apogée of the pre-Conquest achievement belie just how revolutionary Cnut's form of kingship was in contemporary English or even European terms. There was a precedent in England during this period for "Viking rulership," a term which must be seen as a shorthand for control of a "fleet-army" and for the acquisitive features of kingship with roots in Scandinavia.[17] As other papers in this volume demonstrate, Cnut was not backward in demonstrating his kingship through war-leadership and in acquiring and distributing wealth.[18] Questions of the composition of the *Beowulf* poem during the reign of Cnut notwithstanding, the maintenance of cultural links to Scandinavia was evidently not a mere political contrivance, to be picked up at will.[19] If Cnut's patronage is evident in the skaldic poem *Liðsmannaflokkr*, it was related to the ongoing politics of rivalry between Cnut and the man of the moment, Thorkell the Tall, perhaps stemming from the immediate aftermath of the campaign of 1015–16. This patronage suggests that Cnut was not unaware of the significance of presenting himself as a Viking in an English context.[20] Matthew Townend and Roberta Frank have shown the significance of Cnut's patronage of skaldic poets for a Norse-speaking audience, "enisled," as Frank put it, "in a sea of Anglophones."[21] Nonetheless, given the contextual evidence for the composition of *Liðsmannaflokkr*, some of the other surviving poetry, containing frequent references to the control of Norway, may coincide with a later period of Cnut's reign, when there was potential for crisis in an empire which encompassed Norway, and the later poetry may not reflect the cultural direction of Cnut's English court at the start of his reign.[22]

Cnut's kingship was not simply "Viking rulership" in an "English" shell, however. Before the period 1017–19, Cnut's predecessors as Viking rulers in England included a range of rulers of York, such as his namesake Knútr (ca. 900–ca. 905), Sigtryggr Cáech (ca. 920–27), Óláfr Sigtryggsson (941–44 and 949–52; d. 981), and Eiríkr Blóðøx (948–9 and 952–4); in East Anglia there was Guthrum, or "Æthelstan" as he became known, together with the anonymous rulers who may be identified through the St. Edmund currency of the late ninth century. The rule over areas of Britain and Ireland by the leaders of Viking retinues tended

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

more generally to be based on places with access to bodies of water, particularly the Irish Sea, which gave rulers the opportunity to bring together maritime realms.[23] Cnut's eventual creation of an empire based around the North Sea had much in common with this Insular dynamic, but what is noteworthy here is that Cnut's rule initially involved a shift from the traditional means by which a whole host of Anglo-Scandinavian rulers had asserted their control on territory in Britain. While it is difficult to generalise from only a century in which there was some form of political hegemony over lowland Britain, it is at least possible to say that the territorial foci of rulers based outside Wessex naturally differed from the foci of the majority of the West Saxon dynasty. While the territorial possessions of the latter group were concentrated in a region south of the Thames, the rule that Vikings imposed on Northumbria made use of existing structures of power in the north of England in the early tenth century.[24]

To some extent, a consideration of the reign of Æthelstan (924–39) provides us with a sense of the way in which political power could shift from Wessex to a different region within England when circumstances permitted, even for a ruler of the West Saxon dynasty. Although Æthelstan's presence in Wessex was not inconsiderable, he seems to have moved mostly in the midlands and the north, as the evidence of his assemblies to the north of the Thames suggests.[25] Our view of Æthelstan is determined by the exceptional survival of evidence of charters, written by a scribe who was meticulous in recording places of assembly. This evidence, though restricted to charters, does seem to be commensurate with Æthelstan's links with the Mercian nobility and his essentially "pan-British" agenda.[26]

More so than Æthelstan, whose Mercian connections made him "something of an outsider in Wessex,"[27] Cnut was self-evidently a political newcomer whose connections lay outside Wessex, and it would therefore have made sense for him to think in terms of England outside Wessex. Here I wish to stress the road not taken: the opportunity existed in the middle of the second decade of the eleventh century for Cnut to rule in a manner which shifted the centre of political gravity away from the Thames valley, away from the south of England. That he did not choose to do this may suggest a driver slipping behind the controls of Timothy Reuter's sports car. Nonetheless, his concentration on the south of England is all the more striking, in the light of the possible glimpse of the initial intentions of the Jelling dynasty's campaigns of conquest of 1013-16 (which may be distinct from the large-scale booty-gathering of the first decade of the eleventh century with which Sveinn was closely involved). In the 1013-16 campaigns, Sveinn's (and, by extension, Cnut's) ground was the north of England, and the fact that he started to ravage England only after he crossed Watling Street in 1013 seems to be related to a policy of cultivating an ethnic "Danishness" in the

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

"Danelaw," as Pauline Stafford pointed out in 1985.[28] Although, as Stafford pointed out in a later publication, Sveinn "aimed at a conquest of the English kingdom from the North, not merely a revival of the Viking kingdom of York,"[29] Sveinn seems to have planned to make use of the city for his coronation in February 1014,[30] and he was initially buried there before his body was taken to Denmark.[31] Cnut also had links with the social and political landscape north of Watling Street: one was his marriage to Ælfgifu, identified by the D recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in its 1035 entry as being "of Northampton" ("þære Hamtunisca"); presumably this marriage took place in 1013 or the beginning of 1014.[32] Although the possibility remains that Cnut was married to Ælfgifu on his return to England in 1015, or even in 1016, this political alliance with midland nobles seems to have been more pressing in the early part of the 1013-16 campaign. Cnut's marriage to Ælfgifu gave him a strong familial link to her powerful kindred.[33] Cnut made use of his father's base in Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, in the aftermath of the recall of Æthelred from Normandy in 1014: while most of the English nobility deserted him, an act for which their hostages, given in the surrenders of 1013, were mutilated, the people of Lincolnshire (cited in the *Chronicle* by the old kingdom's name of Lindsey) remained loyal to Cnut.[34] Although Cnut departed from the south of England in 1014, returning there in the following year, in 1016 Cnut still responded to the actions of Edmund Ironside and Earl Uhtred in a manner which betrayed his northern interests at a point when his position in Wessex was looking more secure. We see him then heading north, an act which opened up Edmund's opportunity to lead the resistance from London.[35]

It is difficult to determine precisely where Cnut spent his days after the death of Edmund, for although he may have been in Winchester for the assembly that led to the grant of land at New Minster in Easter 1019 (a crown-wearing?), we only know of Oxford as his location in the period prior to 1019.[36] Most of his other appearances are from after 1019. The death of Earl Uhtred *might* be re-dated to 1018×19, following a sensible revision of the evidence by A. A. M. Duncan in 1976, which, on the face of it, might have implications for the presence of Cnut in Northumbria, where the earl was killed. It is likely, as Duncan says, that Uhtred's death owed more to political circumstances after 1016 and that *De Obsessione Dunelmi* is a useful source in that respect; however, that Cnut was present, with his troops hidden behind a curtain ready for Uhtred to meet his dramatic and treacherous end, does not seem credible evidence for personal intervention by Cnut in Northumbria in the years immediately after 1016.[37]

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

Once we look at the more reliable evidence for Cnut's presence, we see him in the south of England for much of his reign, most often in the Thames valley.[38] Even if, as Barbara Yorke notes elsewhere in this volume, the role of Winchester is overstated by historians,[39] the broader significance of Wessex and the south of England in Cnut's worldview of the English kingdom still stands. This makes sense, given that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records Cnut's division of the kingdom into four, with Wessex going to Cnut himself: rather than taking from this that Cnut had assumed ealdormanric powers and that his authority elsewhere was diminished, we might read it as the *de facto* recognition that authority rested in the south of the kingdom. After all, the division of the kingdom at Olney in October 1016 had made Edmund the first king of the West Saxons since the tenth century. The *Chronicle*'s claim that Cnut acceded to "the land of *all* the English people," ("*eallon* Angelcynnes ryce"—my emphasis) while noting the different earls' areas of authority, is thus an indication that a division was acknowledged even while it was a statement of an overarching sense of political identity. As Jay Paul Gates has recently observed, this was a shift toward a polity which was a kingdom in terms of geographical area rather than of a people "of the English" (i.e. of English "descent"): a subtle and important difference.[40]

## Projections of Authority: Coronations and Title

How was this political identity manifested in this early period? There are no charters which can be reliably dated to the first year of Cnut's reign, whether we count that as late 1016 or 1017, and we do not even have a contemporary record, let alone an account, of the coronation itself. There is some suggestion, if John of Worcester can be trusted on the matter, that Cnut's acceptance by the West Saxon nobles at Southampton in 1016, in the wake of the death of Æthelred, was a coronation.[41] Yet it is just as likely that this ceremony may have been more along the lines of the acclamation of Sveinn Forkbeard in 1013, or indeed that of Cnut after his father's death in 1014. It is reasonable to suppose that the late-twelfth-century dean of St. Paul's, Ralph de Diceto, was accurate in recording that Archbishop Lyfing of Canterbury presided over Cnut's coronation at London in 1017.[42]

A hint that a coronation had been performed in 1017 is provided in the legal text associated with the record of Cnut's assembly at Oxford in 1018, recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in which "Danes and English were agreed" ("Dene *7 Engle wurdon sammæle");[43] the D-version adds that this was "[according] to Edgar's law" ("to Eadgares lage"). The legal text may record promises of coronation oaths in a manner of better-known royal coronation promises declared in charters issued by Kings Henry I in 1100 and Stephen

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

in 1135.[44] If this were indeed the case, with Archbishop Wulfstan as the author of the 1018 text, it is interesting to think of him behind any coronation *ordines* of 1017. Whether he had adapted a text intended for Sveinn in 1014 we cannot know, but it would hardly be surprising if he had a role in Cnut's coronation.[45]

Kingston-upon-Thames does not seem to have been used as a coronation site after Æthelred's coronation of 979. The confusion generated by the *Vita Ædwardi Regis*, which reports that Edward the Confessor was crowned in Canterbury rather than in Winchester, as in the *Chronicle,* suggests that traditions associated with coronation could be manipulated if necessary.[46] Presumably the circumstances of Cnut's ascent to power necessitated similar manipulation. If the coronation were, as seems likely, in London, this was a bold statement, for London was the place which had offered Cnut his greatest opposition. There is an instructive comparison with the same use of nearby Westminster by William the Conqueror, who had also been opposed by London in 1066.[47] With Æthelred's body at St. Paul's, Cnut's statement would have been all the bolder if his coronation were also the occasion of his marriage to Æthelred's widow, Emma (also known as Ælfgifu); this possibility is suggested by the circumstances of the so called "third recension" of the English royal *ordo*.[48]

As might be expected, the *Chronicle* emphasises legitimacy, and this suggests that continuity was important in its presentation of Cnut. The formula, noted above, which relates that Cnut succeeded to "all the kingdom of the English," is one common to records of the accession of Anglo-Saxon kings since the ninth century.[49] Given that it took Æthelred just over a year to be crowned king (following the death of his brother in 978),[50] and given the likelihood of a delay between Sveinn's acclamation in late 1013 and the calling of the Witan in York in February 1014, it would seem appropriate to call the interval between the death of Edmund on 30 November 1016 and Cnut's coronation a pause—*not* an interregnum.[51]

Some cross-Channel comparison is provided by Geoffrey Koziol's reading of late tenth-century Frankish charters. I wonder whether the first Cnut charters, from 1018 and 1019, survive (albeit sometimes just in the form of a grand title in a witness list) because they were indeed the first charters declaring the legitimacy of a king who had recently been annointed, and perhaps also because they were determined by the composition associated with peace-making implicit in the agreement at Oxford in 1018 (for which see below).[52] Putting to one side the implicit reference to an early Cnut charter at Winchester, which will be discussed below, the survival of a Worcester lease of 1017 hints at the way in which land transactions took place independently of royal authority when that authority could not be present to establish itself in public performance.[53]

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

Policy Tensions

Despite the upheavals and tensions evident in the immediate aftermath of 1016, there is no clear instance of governance-by-ravaging in Cnut's England. In contrast to his son Harthacnut in his reign, Cnut does not seem to have asserted a form of authority, such as that which, by reference to the imposition of power by brute force, Timothy Reuter characterised as "state-directed Bissonic violence."[54] Every king claiming control of some form of an English kingdom since 900, arguably right through to the twelfth century, faced some opposition in the first decade of his assumption of the throne, responding with violence. Within living memory, Edgar, made king of England in 959, had attacked the Isle of Thanet in 969, ten years after becoming king of England; according to Roger of Wendover, this was to avenge some harm committed there against merchants from York.[55] His son Æthelred, made king in 978, used violence in order to impose his rule on Rochester in 986. Back in the early tenth century, the actions of English kings were characterised by violence and retribution against territory outside Wessex, even if the broader narrative *might* be interpreted as one of long-term strategic foresightedness.[56] And after Cnut, just about the only thing we see from his son Harthacnut, made king in 1040, is an attack on Worcestershire by Harthacnut's housecarls in 1041.[57] Cnut bucks that trend, although there are ways of seeing exceptions to this reading. An easy way to explain Cnut's apparently non-violent record is that his reign's violence towards potential opposition took place before he acceded to the throne as sole English ruler.

The obvious issue here is the execution of English nobles in 1017, a dramatic event that was recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* directly after the record of Cnut's division of the kingdom after acceding to the throne. The record of the exile of other figures suggests that Cnut was not free from potential opposition.[58] However, a charter of Cnut's reign from early 1019 (Figure 1) indicates that tensions did not have to manifest themselves in warfare or "state"-directed violence for them to have meaning in a locality. Cnut gave a piece of land in Hampshire to a certain inhabitant of Winchester, "young, daring and inconstant" ("adolescens animosus et instabilis"), who had evidently persuaded Cnut that this estate was free for the king to donate. As the charter records, Cnut realised the apparent mistake and took the land back, granting it once more to New Minster.[59]

[Figure 1: Single sheet charter of Cnut granting an estate at Drayton (Hants) to New Minster, Winchester (S 956, dated Easter 1019). By permission of the Warden and Scholars of Winchester College.]

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

As Simon Keynes has observed, Cnut may have been following in the footsteps of Æthelred and perhaps also of Edgar, whose errors had been committed while young, and who was making amends for an important ecclesiastical house.[60] That may be revealing of Cnut's sense of kingship, and in his commentary on the Drayton charter, Sean Miller notes that two other charters, both probably from early in Cnut's reign, refer to Cnut acting according to the wishes of Æthelred.[61] However, we should note Barbara Yorke's observation of Cnut's relative parsimony towards New Minster.[62] The Drayton charter shows that the "adolescens" was evidently still alive at the time of writing, had not been in exile, and was present in Winchester to contest the donation of the charter and the evident loss of his land. Cnut's words—or rather the words of the charter's draughtsman, who is influenced by the style of Wulfstan[63]—have it that "there are in the possession of the aforementioned youth letters contrary to this privilege, and acquired by fraudulent investigation" ("penes prescriptum adolescentem litteras huic libertati contrarias . et calliditatis indagine adquisitas haberi comperimus"). The implication is that such letters be ignored under pain of anathema, although there is no specific injunction such as King Alfred's command in the version of his will that survives to destroy earlier versions.[64] There was certainly a dispute: a document from the abbot of New Minster recorded the lease, during the reign of Æthelred (978-1016), of a hide at nearby Barton Stacey to a certain Wulfmær and his wife, with the expectation that it, along with "another hide" at Drayton would revert after their lifetimes to the church. Perhaps the young man of the Drayton charter was related to Wulfmær or his wife, or both, and had expected to receive the land at Drayton.[65] If the earlier charter were used as evidence that both lands were to go to New Minster, the young man had a case. Only the Barton Stacey land had been explicitly leased, and Miller suggests there may have been another document which has not survived.[66] The young man may have been right, too, to draw attention to the king's right to grant him this land. The estate at Drayton bordered a royal estate which, according to Domesday Book, contributed to a render in kind known in Hampshire as the "Farm of One Day" ("firma unius diei").[67] This estate, which lay at Barton Stacey (and was distinct from the New Minster's holding at Barton Stacey), was reorganised, presumably at some point in the eleventh century, in order to provide some economically viable render. In 1066, Barton Stacey was assessed for a "half" ("dimidia") of one day's farm, suggesting that some loss of economic value had taken place at some point from the full day's farm. Land at Kings Worthy was noted as a "bereuuice" ("berewick," meaning an outlier land-unit) to the Barton Stacey estate; that Kings Worthy land had probably experience its own loss of value

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

given that there were multiple claimants on the larger Worthy estate from which Kings Worthy was formed (see Figure 2).

[Figure 2: The estate at Drayton (Hants) granted to New Minster, Winchester, in 1019, with places named in the text. The boundaries of the Domesday hundreds and other eleventh-century vills are marked with regard to information in the Alecto Historical Editions *Domesday Book* maps (N.B. the uncertainties of boundaries and the placement of vills have not been represented in Figure 2, and this should only be taken as an approximate guide).]

Drayton may itself have had some importance as a piece of royal land. If the Wulfmær of the earlier lease were a thegn who witnessed "fairly low down the list of *ministri* between 986 and 1005,"[68] we might justifiably infer that he got the sort of long service award due to royal thegns from a royal estate. Whether or not Drayton was the sort of bookland that King Alfred famously wrote of thegns deserving, it was hardly unreasonable for a son to expect to receive it.[69]

It is perhaps revealing of this young man's expectation to receive royal land that Drayton lies on the other side of the Barton Stacey estate from a neighbouring royal estate, that of Hurstbourne. The blurred lines between what a king could and could not use as they saw fit are revealed by the fact that Hurstbourne said to have been amongst the "lands belonging to the royal sons" ("terras ad pertinentes filios") which Edgar had granted to Abingdon Abbey, presumably during a time of bolstering estates at the forefront of monastic reform in the 960s.[70] Early in Æthelred's reign, the land had been brought back under royal control and later (we cannot be sure when but it is presumably in the last decade of the tenth or first few years of the eleventh century), writing in a charter for Abingdon, Æthelred had to make amends for the lands' reacquisition by providing some other lands to the abbey by way of compensation. If that was not enough evidence of blurred lines, nearby, at what later became Abbot's Worthy, Cnut granted land to Archbishop Lyfing in 1026.[71]

Evidently the Drayton dispute was far from having ended in Easter 1019, when the New Minster charter recording the transaction was drawn up. The charter provides hints that Cnut's acquisition of power in Wessex had presumably involved negotiation, buying the favour of the *local* nobility, perhaps comparable with the position of Godwine, a man who rose to prominence as earl of Wessex under Cnut. Such men were characterised by Robin Fleming as "Englishmen short on family histories but long on personal loyalty."[72] Presumably this is evidence that at the start of his reign, or perhaps during the period after or shortly before the death of Æthelred, Cnut came to Winchester or at least close enough to the

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

city for him to be subject to the kind of petitioning by figures who may have been influential locally, but who were not so important that they dominated the wider political landscape. Also worth noting here is the phrase "young, daring and inconstant" ("adolescens animosus et instabilis"), whose words aptly echo Cnut's own position at this time, even if he was striving not to be the last of these.[73]

If this young man had been useful to Cnut prior to 1019, the charter might indicate that he was no longer in favour; perhaps Cnut now sought the favour of the New Minster and was willing to sacrifice the young man's wishes in order to gain this. The fact that the charter records an injunction against the possession by the young man of certain "letters" ("litteras"), said in the Drayton charter to be fraudulent, while tacitly acknowledging the continuing existence of this youth, suggests that a dispute was still in progress to which even the charter could not give full confidence of resolution. In terms of Cnut's early reign, it says something of the limits of Cnut's power and of his need for negotiation that he appears not to have had the full power to dispose of this young man in 1019 in the manner that he had of others in 1017.

The Drayton charter is a small and local issue, however. Tensions could also heighten and be defused on a larger scale and Cnut's early reign sees a profligacy of peace-making. The agreement between Edmund and Cnut in the autumn of 1016 provides a clear example: the D manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* refers to the "north part" ("norðdæl"), of the kingdom being Cnut's in that agreement, a word echoed in the *Chronicle*'s use of the verb "dælian" with regard to the division of the country in 1017.[74] Oxford, a location which reflected the divisions of 1016 and 1017, saw the third of these agreements, resulting in a declaration of a legal code in 1018. Given that Cnut had mutilated hostages in 1014, presumably in recognition of the breaking of a peace agreement made between English nobles and his father, the declaration of a peace with Cnut had to be taken seriously.[75]

Paul Dalton has drawn attention to the making of peace at river and island sites, and of course the agreement at Olney in 1016 has particular importance in that respect.[76] Oxford, however, as a place on the interstices between Mercian and West Saxon territory, on a river with islands and a long crossing across marshy ground which was not unlike the Ravning Enge bridge at Haraldr Bluetooth's complex at Jelling, could be read as a place of territorial liminality.[77] The making of agreement in Oxford in 1018 might be compared with another agreement there in 1035, which saw the nobility of Wessex and Mercia meeting in the wake of the death of Cnut.[78] Clearly the inter-territoriality mattered. In St. Frideswide's church in Oxford, according to a charter of Æthelred of 1004, a group of Danes had sheltered from a

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

mob from the town and suburbs.[79] The church was burnt down with the death of those inside, so presumably Oxford had a strong memory of this ethnic hostility. Oxford may therefore have been a sensible location for a statement of reconciliation, particularly as this town had been a specific target of Sveinn's destructive campaign in the Thames Valley in 1013, when its people surrendered to him.[80]

There were further memories associated with the town. A tower in Oxford had been the place of the death of the chief thegns of the "Seven Boroughs" ("Seofonburgum," a chronicler's synonym for Danelaw territory), Sigeferth and Morcar, at the instigation of Eadric in 1015. This event seems to have provided an impetus for Cnut to come back to England—perhaps Cnut's own family link to the dead thegns, through his marriage to Ælfgifu of Northampton, had played a role here. In the twelfth century, William of Malmesbury read the 1004 charter of Æthelred as a record of the deaths of the followers of the thegns in 1015, confusing them with the Danes of the town who had been burnt on St. Brice's Day 1002.[81] Only three years had passed between the death of the thegns in 1015 and the Oxford agreement of 1018, and if a tradition which *explicitly* confused the refuge and burning of 1002 with the 1015 events in the St. Frideswide's charter can be posited, it is most likely to have happened at a point closer to William of Malmesbury's own time than Cnut's (assuming, that is, that a second church-burning did not take place in 1015).[82] While the traditions of transference in the episode were an important element for identifying the traditions of what C. E. Wright famously noted was the oral "saga literature" of Anglo-Saxon England, there remains something to be said about the episode for Cnut's contemporaries. If his contemporaries were fully aware that Sigeferth and Morcar's deaths had not happened on St. Brice's Day 1002, we should be sensitive to the manner in which events could still become linked in popular memory, often quite quickly. Oxford had been a place where people identified as Danes were burnt in the recent past, and others who were identifiably linked to Cnut's family, who had been murdered by Eadric, executed by the new king in 1017. Surely these links gave extra weight to the choice of Oxford as a place of reconciliation under Cnut.

## Concluding Remarks

It was obviously useful to portray oneself as a legitimate king of the West Saxon royal dynasty but the smoothness with which this happened should not fool us into believing that this was Cnut's only option. In the circumstances, such a portrayal was a sensible option to take. A reshaping of Cnut's presentation of kingship was necessary between 1014 and 1017,

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

leading to a declaration of law in 1018. Cnut's claim to Denmark was realised in 1019 and not before because legitimacy had remained a live issue. Despite his conquest of the English kingdom, the æthelings, young men with royal claims because of their kingly descent, were still at large, as Simon Keynes pointed out, noting the naming of Edward son of Æthelred "king of the English" in a Ghent charter dated to 1016. Although this charter was most probably copied in the 1040s, Keynes called it "evidence of a kind that […] Edward had passed through Flanders shortly after his expulsion from England, in search of help at the shrine of saints."[83] One English ætheling was trouble—with Edward's brother Alfred at large, two were the makings of a dynasty. Cnut could not afford to ignore Edmund Ironside's sons, either. For all that the stories of these boys turned into legend, there is evidence that they presented a longer-term danger too.[84]

Looking beyond the narrow chronology of this paper by nearly a decade, we may see the context for a new dynamic in Cnut's reign in the actions of a new duke, Robert "the Magnificent": in power in Normandy from 1027, Robert was prepared to support his English cousins Edward and Alfred more actively after a period of relative calm across the Channel. Although trouble in Scandinavia needed Cnut's attention for much of the second half of the 1020s, the potential relocation of Edmund Ironside's body to Winchester from his south-western repose in or around 1032 shows a renewed attention to legitimacy at a time of potential pressure.[85] Given the type of kingship that Cnut had chosen, English legitimacy mattered to Cnut. It may be instructive to note that Cnut's early royal policy changed around the time when his own ætheling, Harthacnut, was probably born, ca. 1018.[86] Before an ætheling arrived who could be linked to the kinship of the West Saxon royal family through the anointed queen Emma, he could not afford to present himself as anything less than a legitimate English king.

---

**Cnut, King of the English, 1017–19 – Ryan Lavelle**

[1] Molyneaux, *Formation of the English Kingdom in the Tenth Century*, pp. 1–4, referring to *ASC* CDE 1017.
[2] *ASC* CDE 1017. For the official standing of the *Chronicle*, see Brooks, "Why is the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* about Kings?" Konshuh, "*Anraed* in their *Unraed*."
[3] Darby, *Domesday England*, p. 90, suggests a population of between 1.2 and 1.6 million south of the Tees in 1086, which may assume to be slightly less at the start of the century. The modern measure of the area of England is 130,279 km² (approximately 70 000 hides south of the Tees in Domesday Book – Abels, "English Logistics and Military Administration, 871-1066," p. 262); compare with Denmark's 42,931 km² (more like 60,000 km$^2$ when Skåne and territory in modern Sweden are taken into account – the loose hegemonic control over parts

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

of Norway focused on the Oslo Fjord area is more difficult to define in terms of land measurements).
[4] Larson, *Canute the Great*, pp. 112 and 162–79.
[5] Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 397. On this issue, see Ellis, "Ecclesiastical Policy of Cnut in its Political Context," 000-000.
[6] Bolton, *Empire of Cnut the Great*; *Cnut the Great*. In this volume, see particularly Bolton's paper, "The History of Cnut and the Potential Uses and Abuses of the Scandinavian Narrative Sources," and Missuno, "Cnut, the Conquest of England and the Danish Homelands," above/below.
[7] Blackburn, "Do Cnut the Great's First Coins as King of Denmark date from before 1018?" This is discussed critically by Jonsson, "Coinage of Cnut," pp. 223–24 and more positively by Bolton, *Empire of Cnut*, pp. 155–6 (though now less favourably by Bolton in *Cnut the Great*, p. 52, n. 91). I am grateful to Gareth Williams for discussion of this.
[8] For Ælfgifu's position, see Bolton, "Ælfgifu of Northampton;" however, for the suggestion that she was in England for much of Cnut's early reign, based on a reference in the Thorney Abbey *Liber Vitae* and the "of Northampton" byname in *ASC* D 1035, see Lawson, *Cnut*, pp. 123–24.
[9] Bolton, *Cnut the Great*, p. 130, deals with the question of Harald's unpopularity in Denmark in the problematic *Annales Ryenses*, though does not countenance his deposition; a picture of unpopularity may not be a world away from the unrest in Denmark at the time of Cnut's arrival there in the *Vita Ædwardi Regis*, ch. 1, pp. 10–11.
[10] Ashe and Ward (eds), *Conquests in Eleventh Century England*, reflecting the other major conference to consider 1016 in 2016, relates to the parallels between Cnut and William more explicitly than the current volume; note also the parallels made in Paul Lay (ed.), *Century of Conquest* themed edition of *History Today* 66:10 (October, 2016).
[11] Although noting Cnut's influence in Denmark during his brother's lifetime, a useful comment on the principle of the elder son retaining the patrimonial territory and the significance of a parallel with the experience of William of Normandy's conquest in 1066 is provided by Lund, "Cnut's Danish Kingdom," pp. 28–30.
[12] Edmund King, "Introduction," pp. 9–10, noting the concept in Schlesinger, *Age of Roosevelt, volume 2*, pp. 1-22. This approach was not used in King's more recent biography, *King Stephen*, however.
[13] See Metlitskaya, "The 'Æthelredian Fragment' of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," 000-000.
[14] Lawson, Cnut, pp. 196–98 (quotation at p. 196).
[15] Campbell, "Some Agents and Agencies of the Late Anglo-Saxon State," pp. 203–04; cf. Hooper's reading of housecarls as a private group, in "Military Developments in the Reign of Cnut;" both, admittedly, were most interested in Harthacnut's housecarls, in *ASC* CD 1041.
[16] Reuter, "The Making of England and Germany, 850-1050," pp. 58–59.
[17] Viking kingship in Britain is discussed in Downham, *Viking Kings of Britain and Ireland*.
[18] For economic and social ties see Missuno, "Cnut, the Conquest of England and the Danish Homelands;" a perspective on the longer-term background of Cnut's conquest is provided by the classic paper by Wilson, "Danish Kings and England in the Late Tenth and Early Eleventh Centuries." Assessments of Cnut's career in England as a "Viking" leader can be seen in Bolton, *Cnut the Great*, pp. 53–91 (though note that Bolton points out (p. 89) that a reliquary seized in battle was kept intact and later was presented to Canterbury), and in my own shorter study, *Cnut*, especially pp. 20–21. A military perspective (albeit one which foregrounds Thorkell and Sveinn over Cnut) is provided by Howard, *Swein Forkbeard's Conquest of England*.
[19] For the question of dating the *Beowulf* manuscript see Kiernan, "Beowulf in the Age of

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

Cnut," North, "Cnut, the Scyldings, and the First Page of *Beowulf*," and Orchard, "Reading Beowulf in the Time of Cnut," 000-000.

[20] Poole, *Viking Poems on War and Peace*, pp. 86–90; the historical context and dating associated with the events of the last stages of the conquest, is discussed in Poole's "Skaldic Verse and Anglo-Saxon History," pp. 284–86. An alternative reading might relate it to the use of the memory of glory days as part of the brief reconciliation of Thorkell and Cnut in 1023, following similar motives of reconciliation through the commission of artworks as quarrelling Carolingian brothers in the mid ninth century (for which see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians*, p. 174).

[21] Frank, "King Cnut in the Verse of his Skalds," p. 108; Townend, "Contextualizing the *Knútsdrápur*."

[22] Townend, "Contextualizing the *Knútsdrápur*," pp. 152–62, is an important discussion of dating. See Lavelle, *Cnut*, pp. 83–85.

[23] See Downham, *Viking Kings of Britain and Ireland*, with a consideration of the Irish Sea basis of Viking kingship in England at pp. 97–123.

[24] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*; "'Hamlet and the Princes of Denmark': Lordship in the Danelaw, *c*.860–954." On the political significance of York, see also Rollason, *Northumbria, 500–1100*, pp. 214–30.

[25] Hill, *Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 85 and 87.

[26] Molyneaux, "Why were some Tenth-Century English Kings Presented as Rulers of Britain?" Foot, *Æthelstan*. The geographical significance of a deliberate link between Wessex and Mercia might be noted *c*.926 in the Grateley lawcode: see Lavelle, "Why Grateley?"

[27] Foot, *Æthelstan*, p. 18.

[28] Stafford, *East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 124–5 and pp. 135–43. Note that Stafford was at pains to point out that 'Danish' identity was not a monolithic feature and was subject to manipulation. See also Innes, "Danelaw Identities."

[29] Stafford, *Unification and Conquest*, pp. 65–7 (quotation at p. 65)

[30] Plans for a coronation in York are suggested by Wilcox, "Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance."

[31] For a discussion of the evidence, see Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle, "Royal Burials in Winchester," pp. 234–5.

[32] *ASC* D 1035; note that, probably with good reason, there is no *ASC* entry recording the marriage to Ælfgifu.

[33] Bolton, "Ælfgifu of Northampton"; see also Insley, "Politics, Conflict and Kinship in Early Eleventh-Century Mercia" (although note that Insley reads the marriage as dating to 1015×1016).

[34] *ASC* 1014; there is, to my knowledge, no specific study of the context of Gainsborough, but for its riverine significance, see Stafford, *East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 13. For recent work on the strategic importance of Lincolnshire mints in the reign of Æthelred, see Williams, "Military and Non-Military Functions of the Anglo-Saxon Burh, *c*.878–978," pp. 155–56.

[35] *ASC* CDE 1016. For a view of the strategic vision of Edmund Ironside in this period, see McDermott, "Edmund II Ironside and the Siege of London 1016," 000-000.

[36] However, cf. Yorke, "Cnut's Winchester," 000-000.

[37] Uhtred's death, recorded in *ASC* CDE's 1016 entry but not specifically attributed to that year but Durham sources are more circumspect about his survival past that point: Duncan, "The Battle of Carham, 1018;" see also the assessment of the evidence by Woolf in *From Pictland to Alba*, pp. 236–40. The narrative recording Cnut's presence at Uhtred's death, *De Obsessione Dunelmi*, is in Morris, *Marriage and Murder in Eleventh-Century Northumbria*,

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

p. 3.
[38] Hill, *Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England,* p. 91.
[39] Yorke, "Cnut's Winchester;" I must own up to guilt of this sort of assumption: see Roffey and Lavelle, "West Saxons and Danes: Negotiating Early Medieval Identities," pp. 17 –25.
[40] Gates, "*Ealles Englalandes Cyningc*: Cnut's Territorial Kingship and Wulfstan's Paronomastic Play;" This had also been noted by Beech, "The Naming of England" The clearest statement on the political importance of the notion of the *Angel-cynn* remains, however, Wormald, "*Engla Lond*."
[41] Lawson, *Cnut*, p. 82, citing JW vol. 2, s.a. 1016.
[42] Ralph de Diceto, *Abbreviationes Chronicorum* s. a. 1017, in *Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto*, ed. Stubbs, vol. 2, p. 169. See Lawson, "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Homiletic Element in the Laws of Æthelred II and Cnut," p. 157.
[43] Quotation from *ASC* D. The use of an Old Norse word loan-word, *sammæle*, for a sense of being in agreement may be instructive, though Pons-Sanz, "Norse-Derived Vocabulary in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*," pp. 283–84, notes that an earlier eleventh-century Kentish use of the term (in S 1455), may mean it is non-specific; cf. my own comments on *friðmal* and *formæl* in Æthelred's 994 agreement with the Vikings: Lavelle, *Alfred's Wars*, p. 329. The significance of the location of Oxford is considered below, p. 000.
[44] *EHD* 1, p. 452; for Henry and Stephen, see *EHD* 2, pp. 432–5; Kennedy, "Cnut's Law Code of 1018." See Stafford, "Laws of Cnut and the History of Anglo-Saxon Royal Promises."
[45] The circumstances of 1066, recorded in the 'first-draft' history of the *Carmen*, provides a sense of the manner in which compromise could be reached with two prelates in a London-based coronation; although Archbishop Stigand of Canterbury is written out of the official history of post-1066 England, the *Carmen*, an otherwise pro-Norman view of events, notes the significance of Stigand's presence at Westminster, at a ceremony involving the Archbishop of York. *Carmen de Hastingae proelio*, ed. and trans. Barlow, pp. 46–49. For the possible use of a previous ruler's *ordo* in a later ceremony (Harold's in the coronation of William), see Nelson, 'The Rites of the Conqueror."
[46] *Vita Ædwardi Regis*, ed. Barlow, p. 14, has it at Canterbury; *ASC* CDEF 1043, at Winchester; the consensus (see e.g. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, p. 61) is that Winchester was the place of consecration, however. On Kingston-upon-Thames, see Keynes, "Burial of King Æthelred the Unready at St Paul's," pp. 142–43. Here, I develop observations made in Lavelle, *Cnut*, pp. 31–2.
[47] See Bates, *William the Conqueror*, pp. 247–56.
[48] For Æthelred's body and his links to London, see Keynes, "Burial of King Æthelred the Unready at St Paul's." Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, pp. 174–78, addresses Emma's role in the "Third Recension of the Second *Ordo*" in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 44. I gratefully acknowledge Liesbeth van Houts for discussion of this issue.
[49] An important new thesis, currently being prepared for publication, on the formulas used in emphasising legitimacy, such as *fengon to rice*, is Konshuh, "Warfare and Authority in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle."
[50] Although Dumville, "The Death of King Edward the Martyr – 18 March, 979?" offers an alternative chronology to the reading of 978 for the killing of Edward, the delay between the king's death and Æthelred's consecration is still an integral part of the reading of the chronology. For the delay in early coronations, see Garnett, "Coronation and Propaganda," pp. 92–93.
[51] On the speed of the coronation in 1066, see generally Garnett, "Coronation and Propaganda."

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

[52] Koziol, *The Politics of Memory and Identity in Carolingian Royal Diplomas*. Charters from this period (albeit mainly problematic texts insofar as not representing genuine charters, the witness lists are useful), are S 951–56.
[53] For discussion of the 1017 lease S 1384, see Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 25–31.
[54] Reuter, "Debate: The 'Feudal Revolution': III," p. 191, discussing Campbell, "Was it Infancy in England?" p. 6. Thomas Bisson's reading of such violence is now best provided in *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*.
[55] *ASC* DEF, 969; *Rogeri de Wendover chronica*, Vol. 1, *s.a.* 974, pp. 414–15, trans. *EHD* 1, p. 284. Roger of Wendover's detail of the killing of York merchants provides an explanation for the ravaging but the *ASC* emphasises royal agency.
[56] I discuss this issue in my paper "Representing Authority in an Early Medieval Chronicle."
[57] *ASC* CDE 986; CD 1041, and JW, vol. 2, *s.a.* 1041.
[58] *ASC* CDE 1017; C and D E 1020. For Eadric, see Parker, "'In London, Very Justly'," above/below.
[59] S 956, in *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, pp. 162–3. Translated in *EHD* 1, pp. 599–601.
[60] Keynes, *Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready'*, pp. 176–86, discusses Æthelred's period of 'youthful indiscretions', noting a comparison with the Drayton charter at p. 186, n.
[61] *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, p. 162. S 949 (AD 1017×32) and S 960 (AD 1023). Given that Miller notes the similarity of the post-witness-list blessing S 949, a charter granted to Fécamp in Normandy, to that of S 956, it is likely to be from early in the reign of Cnut rather than later, when relations with Normandy were strained (Lavelle, *Cnut*, p. XX).
[62] Yorke, "Cnut's Winchester," pp. 000–000.
[63] *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, p. 162.
[64] S 1507 (AD 872×88).
[65] S 1420 (AD 995×1005), in Miller, *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, p. 157.
[66] *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, p. 158.
[67] The bounds of the land are discussed in *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, pp. 163–4; *Domesday Book: Hampshire*, ed. Munby, fol.38c (entry 1:17). I discuss this system (known elsewhere as the 'Farm of One Night' (*firma unius noctis*) and its meaning for royal resources in my *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex*, pp. 13–47.
[68] *Charters of the New Minster*, ed. Miller, p. 158.
[69] *King Alfred's Version of St. Augustine's Soliloques*, ed. Carnicelli, p. 48. For bookland rewards from royal estates, see Baxter and Blair, "Land Tenure and Royal Patronage in the Early English Kingdom;" Lavelle, *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex*, pp. 116–22.
[70] S 937. For the charter's significance, see Lavelle, *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex*, p. 1.
[71] S 962; see Lavelle, *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex*, p. 37 (although note that this earlier publication does not give enough attention to the Drayton estate discussed here).
[72] Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, p. 48. Bolton, *Cnut the Great*, notes the importance of English "collaborators" to Cnut at this stage in his reign.
[73] If S 956 can be related to the milieu of the narrative charters of Æthelred's reign, there is something to be said for the possibility that, like the play on the name of the criminal Æthelsige related in S 886 (AD 995), there was a pun in the reference to the young man of S 956 being 'daring and inconstant'. Given that among the many attributes with which wolves were associated was that of daring, and the tendency of the first element of a personal name to follow a patronym, was this young man a descendant of *Wulf*mær? On the nature of the representation of wolf names, see Pluskowski, *Wolves and the Wilderness in the Middle Ages*,

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.

pp. 142–45.
[74] *ASC* D 1016; CDE 1017. On the division of the kingdom, see Reuter, "Making of England and Germany," p. 56.
[75] Hicklin, "Role of Hostages in the Danish Conquests of England and Norway."
[76] Dalton, "Sites and Occasions of Peacemaking in England and Normandy."
[77] For the topography of the crossing at Oxford, see Dodd, "Synthesis and Discussion," pp. 12–16. The Ravning Enge bridge is discussed in Pedersen, "Monumental Expression and Fortification in Denmark in the Time of Harald Bluetooth," pp. 71–3.
[78] *ASC* E 1035.
[79] S 909 (AD 1004).
[80] Blair, *Anglo-Saxon Oxfordshire*, pp. 167–68, links the massacre of 1002 and Sveinn's arrival in the town in *ASC* CDE 1013.
[81] WM, *GRA*, p. 310–11 (identification of the charter at p. 310, n. 1).
[82] Wright, *Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 179–82, discusses this as an episode typical of transference in oral literature. It is worth noting that there are 13 manuscripts containing the charter (see the catalogue of manuscripts under S 909), so scribal interest in the episode may also have played a part in the transmission of the story.
[83] Keynes, "Æthelings in Normandy," pp. 177–81 (quotation at p. 181).
[84] For Edmund's sons, see Ronay, *Lost King of England*.
[85] Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle, "Royal Burials in Winchester," pp. 224–6.
[86] For a compelling argument that Harthacnut is the ætheling named in the will of the noblewoman Æthelgifu, S 1497 (normally dated between 990 and 1001), see Kiernan, "*Beowulf* in the Age of Cnut," p. 000; Bolton, "Ælfgifu of Northampton," makes a case for the presence of Ælfgifu and her children in eastern Denmark, a matter which would suggest that the need for a child with Emma was a specifically English one.

**"In London, very justly": Cnut's English Reputation and the Death of Eadric Streona-Eleanor Parker**

This chapter available online at https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501513336-00. Copyright (c) The Author, 2022.