慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ
Keio Associated Repository of Academic resouces

Title	Alfred "the Really Great" : what happened at the battle of ashdown
Sub Title	
Author	小田, 卓爾(Oda, Takuji)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1997
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.73, (1997. 12) ,p.10- 26
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	安藤伸介, 岩崎春雄両教授退任記念論文集
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0010

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Alfred "the *Really* Great"

—— What Happened at the Battle of Ashdown ——

Takuji Oda

In his version of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, King Alfred added many passages which do not occur in the Latin original. In chapter XVII he says, of fame seeking:

> Þ is nu hraðost to secganne, Þ ic wilnode weorðfullice to libbanne þa hwile þe ic lifde, ⁊ æfter minū life þæm monnum to læfanne þe æfter me wæren min gemyndig on godum weorcum.[1]

It can be said that his long cherished desire has been fulfilled: he is still alive within the memory of the English people and numberless things are attributed to him as his inventions and achievements —— he beat the marauding Danes and saved the kingdom of Wessex; he invited scholars from foreign countries and translated some Latin books into his own language in coorporation with them; he tried to promote the spread of education and set up something like a school in his court; he ordered monasteries to be built and gathered monks of various nationalities; he was full of curiosity and provided many craftsmen and adventurers with a friendlly reception; he himself devised an apparatus with six candles to keep accurate time, and so on. All these and others are vividly described in Asser's *Life of King Alfred* and may be corroborated historically.[2] It is true that no English kings

apart from him have the title "the Great" and no one can deny that he was really the greatest of all English kings, but his image was so engraved on people's minds and was so bright that it overshadowd the true origins of many things. 'Alfred ordered White Horses to be cut into the hillsides to mark his victories over the Danes.' 'He was the king who started the British Navy.' 'Oxford University was founded by him.' 'At all events he burnt some cakes in a farmer's cottage and was told off by his wife', and so on. These are the images pleasurably created in traditon, some based on facts, some on love for him. And the Victorians made up his image of a national hero, the eulogical "England's Darling" being dedicated to him to good purpose. Eminent scholars such as E.A. Freeman and J.R. Green also extolled him to the skies.(3) Among the nineteenth century historians, however, there are some like Sharon Turner who found fault with the king.(4) They keenly turned the long continued stream of panegyric and eulogy, though it can not necessarily be said that such judgments rise from completely reliable sources.

(1)

There are some medieval historians and men of faith highly critical of him. Although they may have also written in the medieval context, they were naturally free from modern prejudice.

Pope John VIII sent a letter to Ethelred, archbishop of Canterbury, exhorting and warning him to stand himself as a wall for the house of the Lord and not to cease to resist the king, that is, King Alfred, on account of urgent countermeasures. The Pope is said to have been cautious of the king's strong paganish attachment for dispending medicines. He says he has written a letter to the king to admonish him to show due honour to the archbishop for the love of Jesus Christ.(5) Fulk, archbishop of Reims, coercively and meddlesomely wrote to King

Alfred as to the appointment of the archbishop of Canterbury to Grimbald whom Fulk chose to send to England at the request of the king. Fulk had hinted at his apprehensions for the king's lack of obedience to the Church, if not a straightforward criticism.[6] In the medieval legends of what we call "Alfred and the Cakes" the hero is often blamed for being careless and thoughtless.[7] The most harsh criticism of Alfred may be the one made by a twelfth century Abingdon chronicler. He reproached the king for looting all the appurtenances in the abbey site 'like Juda, one of the Twelve, did. '[8] It could be said that there was a medieval undercurrent of morality in these criticisms.

That William of Malmesbury, in his twelfth century account, straightforwardly criticized young Alfred's conduct and behaviour at the Battle of Ashdown is exceedingly interesting in the sense that the same battle scene was vividly, and differently from William's, depicted by Asser in Alfred's life time. A comparative reading of the two will not only show some amazing contrasts, but also reveal what really happened at the battlefield. Alfred's youthful thoughtlessness has become the target of William's criticism :

> Memorabilis prae caeteris pugna fuit quam apud Escendune fecit ; congregato namque eo loci Danorum exercitu, et in partes diviso, hinc duobus regibus, illinc omnibus ducibus, rex cum fratre Elfredo adventavit. Itaque sortito par pari retulere ut Ethelredus contra reges, Elfredus contra duces consisteret. Utrorumque exercituum animis erectis, vesper jam occiduus bellum in crastinum protelavit. Vix ergo repente diluculo Elfredus paratus aderat : frater, divino intentus officio, remanserat in tentorio ; stimulatusque nuncio paganos efferatis mentibus

> irruere, negavit se quoquam progredi quoad esset finis officii. Quae fides regis multum fratrem adjuvit, immaturitate juventae praeproperum, etiam progressum : namque jam acies Anglorum declinabant, et, urgentibus ex alto adversariis, fugam meditabantur, quod iniquo Christianis loco pugnaretur ; cum ille, Dei cruce consignatus, ex insperato advolat, hostem proturbans, civem in arma ciens ; cujus virtute simul et Dei miraculo Dani territi, pedibus salutem committentes, fugere. Caesus ibi rex Osecg, comites quinque, vulgus innumerum.(9)

William of Malmesbury may have had some knowledge about Asser's *Life*, as Professor Whitelock concludes that 'we may note that his dealings with Worcester would give him an easy opportunity to see the manuscript of the *Life* which lies behind the *Chronicon*.'(10) But, as we shall see later, his account of Alfred's conduct at the Battle of Ashdown is interestingly different from that of Asser.

(2)

The Battle of Ashdown, or the 'Battle of White Horse' named after the turfcut horse-figure on the hillside of the supposed battlefield, is known to be the dramatic event through which Alfred earned his good reputaion as a hero. R.H. Loyn writes, 'This was the battle in which the young Alfred confirmed his reputation. Asser tells us that Alfred began the battle alone. His brother, Ethelred, was hearing mass when the Danish host was sighted, and would not join battle until it was completed.'(11) The heroic image depicted here may be generally recognized as what Alfred really used to be like. Then is it that what William of Malmesbury and other medeival writers told us of was

fallacious or fictitious?

The Chronicler of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* briefly noted what happened at Ashdown in 871,[12] while Asser, a large part of whose accounts is based upon the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, gave us the details of the war situation using four hundred and forty-five words.[13] Probably Asser was deeply attached to the battle fought by the young Alfred, who would become his lord and friend later. The process of the battle described by Asser may be divided into three stages.

When the Christians saw the Viking hosts dividing into two, they also split their army up into two divisions, as Asser, parallelling William of Malmesbury, tells in the following words:

> Quo dolore et verecundia Christiani commoti, iterum post quatuor dies contra praefatum exercitum in loco, qui dicitur Æscesdun, quod Latine 'mons fraxini' interpretatur, totis viribus et plena voluntate ad proelium prodeunt. Sed pagani, in duas se turmas dividentes, aequali lance testudines parant — habebant enim tunc duos reges et multos comites — concedentes mediam partem exercitus duobus regibus et alteram omnibus comitibus. Quod Christiani cernentes, et etiam ipsi exercitum in duas turmas oppido dividentes, testudines non segnius construunt. Sed Ælfred citius et promptius cum suis, sicut ab his, qui viderunt, veredicis referentibus audivimus, ad locum proelii advenit: nimirum erat enim adhuc frater suus Æthered rex in tentorio in oratione positus, audiens missam, et nimium affirmans se inde vivum non discessurum antequam sacerdos missam finiret, et divinum pro humano nolle deserere servitium; et ita fecit. Quae

> regis Christiani fides multum apud Dominum valuit, sicut in sequentibus apertius declarabitur.

Here we should bear it in mind that Alfred and his army reached the battlefield, while Ethelred was still in his tent praying and hearing Mass. The king declared that he would never forsake divine service for the service of men, keeping firmly the order of status — first God, then men. Asser does not tell us anything other than that Alfred marched up briskly to the battlefield with his men, though he suppliments it with 'I have heard from truthful eye-witnesses' as if he would avoid carefully making his own comment. William of Malmesbury, however, berates Alfred sharply for his youthful thoughtlessness.

At the second stage, the Christians had decided to fight against the Danish hosts, both sides being in the same battle formation as described above. Now they were ready to fight :

> . . . . . Quibus ita firmiter ab utraque parte dispositis, cum rex in oratione diutius moraretur et pagani parati ad locum certaminis citius advenissent, Ælfred, tunc secundarius, cum diutius hostiles acies ferre non posset, nisi aut bello retrorsum recederet aut contra hostiles copias ante fratris adventum in bellum prorumperet, demum viriliter aprino more Christianas copias contra hostiles exercitus, ut ante proposuerat, tamen quamvis rex adhuc non venerat, dirigens, divino fretus consilio et adiutorio fultus, testudine ordinabiliter condensata, confestim contra hostes vexilla movet. Tandem rex Æthered, finitis quibus occupatus erat orationibus, advenit, et, invocato magni mundi principe, mox se

certamini dedit.

It is a wellknown story that, since the pious king remained long in prayer and the Danes came up to the battlefield quickly, Alfred, though second in command, could bear the battlelines of the enemy no longer. He was forced to choose one of the alternatives, advance or withdrawal. One more choice may be possible here, though Asser does not mention it; that is, passive resistance or death. Advance was Alfred's choice. Whether the Christians had been fighting in a favourable stituation or not before the king arrived at the battlefield after his prayer, Asser leaves it open or ambiguous. If Alfred's army had been superior to the Danes in the fight, Asser would have vividly portrayed the details of the affair. But actually he did not. As to how long and how the battle had been fought before Ethelred came out of the tent and participated in the battle, we can not get any information from all the editions of the *Life* with the exception of W. H. Stevenson's. Stevenson elaborately supplies from Florence of Worcester the passage 'Tandem rex Æthered . . . mox se certamini dedit.'(14) Otherwise no one would know when or whether the king had fought the battle. William of Malmesbury, however, affirms that the Christians had been about to give way, being pressed upon by the Danes from the higher ground. Just at the most unfavourable moment of the battle situation, King Ethelred, signed with the cross of God, unexpectedly hastened to the battlefield, entered the engagement and put the enemy to flight.

At the third and last stage, Asser made a precise description of the event for those who are ignorant of the fact that the battlefield was not equally advantageous to both sides: the Danes occupied the higher position first and the Christians were storming uphill. There was a low and solitary thorn-tree, around which a fiece battle was fought. Here,

not as in the case of the first stage, Asser says as an eye-witness himself that he has seen the tree with his own eyes:

> Sed hoc in loco nescientibus intimandum est, quod ille locus certaminis belligerantibus inaequalis erat; nam pagani editiorem locum praeoccupaverant, Christiani ab inferiori loco aciem dirigebant. Erat quoque in eodem loco unica spinosa arbor, brevis admodum, quam nos ipsi nostris propriis oculis vidimus, circa quam ergo hostiles inter se acies, cum ingenti omnium clamore, illi perperam agentes, isti pro vita et dilectis atque patria pugnaturi, hostiliter conveniunt. Cumque aliquandiu animose et nimium atrociter hinc inde utrique pugnarent, pagani divino iudicio Christianorum impetum diutius non ferentes, maxima suarum copiarum parte occisa, opprobriosam fugam cepere; quo in loco alter de duobus paganorum regibus et quinque comites occisi occubuerunt, et multa millia paganae partis in eodem loco, et insuper per totam campestrem Æscesdun latitudinem ubique dispersa, longe lateque occisa corruerunt. . . . . .

One of the two heathen kings and five earls were slaughtered and many of their men were slain also. Towards the end of the battle the tide turned in favour of the Christians. The fight went on perhaps until nightfall the next day and finally the Christians won the victory. Without W.H. Stevenson's clever editing, we would never have known by whom this victory was achieved.

According to William of Malmesbury, it was evidently when Ethelred joined in the the battle that the tables were turned in favour

of the Christians. If we accept the supplied passages from Florence of Worcester, however, the generally accepted account, that 'Ethelred. . . . . would not join battle until it was completed,' would seem to be rather dubious. Asser may not have seen the battle going on, as the thorn-tree episode suggests, but he described the Christian army having an edge over the enemy realistically as if he were a real eye-witness. As far as Asser's description is concerned, it was due to Alfred that the Christians won the victory at the Battle of Ashdown.

(3)

About a year before, another king had been suffering from the Viking invasion in East-Anglia. An unconquerable Danish sovereign, Inguar, was targeting King Edmund of East-Anglia. According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the *Chronicle of Æthelweard*, the Danes took up winter-quarters at Thetford, and the same winter King Edmund decided on war against them. The Danes won the victory and they slew the king and swept over the kingdom.(15)

After more than one hundred years, probably between 985 and 987, his life was written by Abbo of Fleury. Judging from the above two chronicles, Edmund seemed to take the initiative in fighting against the Danes. It is no wonder that he, as a king, should resist the enemy in order to defend his own kingdom and his people from its raids. In Abbo's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*,(16) however, we see no sign of his violence. As to its absence from Abbo, as Professor Whitelock says, 'one could surmise that the armour-bearer was asked only for his account of the actual martyrdom, or that this was what impressed Dunstan.'(17) The armour-bearer and Dunstan are the communicators of this story. Abbo heard Dunstan tell the story of St. Edmund in the presence of the Bishop of Rochester, the Abbot of Malmesbury, and

other brothers. Dunstan heard it, when he was young, from a very old man recounting it to King Athelstan. The aged man had claimed to have been working as an armour-bearer under Edmund. Abbo says he wrote *Passio* at the request of the monks of Ramsey Abby while he was staying there. Since all those who took an interest in the story of Edmund are men of faith, it would be rather natural that their attention should be focused mainly upon the martyrdom and miracles. Still almost all of Abbo's accounts in *Passio* can be trusted, since though some 116 years had passed since Edmund was martyred, their memories can well cover those years.(18)

Inguar sent a message to Edmund demanding his ancient treasure and his hereditary wealth and reign. Although Bishop Humbert, Edmund's friend, tried to persusde him to surrender or flee, Edmund would never give even a slight nod, thinking of the loyal subjects wiped out by the Danish invaders:

> Hoc est quod desidero, quod omnibus votis antepono, ne supersim meis fidelibus karissimis, quos cum liberis et uxoribus in lecto eorum animas furando perdidit pirata truculentus.

Thus, to all the suggestions and threats the messenger sent by Inguar uttered to Edmund, he replied keeping the same attitude thoughout that he would never desire to live and see his beloved people being slain by the abominable pagans. He gave up fighting against the Danes instead of taking arms to save his own kingdom and people from perishing on the earth. Turning to Inguar's messenger, who announced the terms on which his kingdom might be saved and retained, he exclaimed firmly:

> . . . . . plane Christi mei exemplum secutus nolo puras commaculare manus, qui pro ejus nomine, si ita contigerit, libenter paratus sum vestris telis occumbere.

The king was captured, his weapons thrown aside, and he was bound with chains. Finally being beaten savagely, he was tied to a tree and, as if he were a target to practise at, the whole of his body was pierced with arrows or javelins. He actually bristled with them 'in passione similis Sebastiano egregio martyri,' as Abbo depicts. It was not earthly pleasure but eternal life that he gained.

Many of Edmund's people perished, wiped out by the heathen raiders, and the king also died. Finally the kingdom of the East-Anglians collapsed. Edmund could have taken weapons to resist the heathen enemy, but he abandoned all worldly happiness for perpetual freedom. Abbo's description shows an image that is quite passive, almost serene :

> Cumque staret, mitissimus, ut aries de toto grege electus, volens felici commercio mutare vitam saeculo, divinis intentus beneficiis, jam recreabatur visione internae lucis, qua in agone positus satiari cupiebat attentius.

(4)

Looking back at the Battle of Ashdown, Asser describes King Ethelred as being a very religious man. Alfred marched up to the battlefield with his men promptly, for his brother had still remained in his tent at prayer, hearing mass. He declared he would not leave the tent 'vivum' before the priest had finished mass. It is worthy of notice that Ethelred firmly placed the service of God before the service of

men. Asser, however, does not necessarily criticize Ethelred's strong convictions, since, concluding his account of the king, he firmly says 'Quae regis Christiani fides multum apud Dominum valuit, sicut in sequentibus apertius declarabitur.' That Ethelred had never deviated from the medieval moral code could be fully verified by the evidence that Ethelred and Edmund are religiously almost identical with each other at the time of crisis, particularly in that both the pious kings had given priority to the service of God over that of men, to eternity over this life. William of Malmesbury does not blame Ethelred at all for having remained for a long time in his tent praying and hearing mass instead of marching up to the battlefield swiftly. It is young Alfred that he criticizes for being much too much impetuous due to the thoughtlessness of youth. It is as if Alfred had stolen a march upon Ethelred by taking advantage of his brother's piety. Probably Alfred was the leader of the whole of the Christian armies, since the collective 'Christiani' is used by both Asser and William of Malmesbury. The Christian army had been forced to fight against heavy odds, since Alfred dashed out into the battlefield carelessly. Ironically it was his pious brother who had helped Alfred out in his loosing battle. It is worthy of notice that Ethelred hastened forward 'Dei cruce consignatus.' What William of Malmesbury criticized young Alfred for would undoubtedly be his lack of faith and piety. And it can safely be said that Asser and William's Ethelred and Abbo's Edmund are imaged upon the same religious basis. Asser's Alfred is, however, strictly different from William's Alfred and in the sense of faith and piety he is different also, from the Edmund whom Abbo pictured in *Passio*. The point is that the Alfred in the *Life* gave priority to the service of men and this life.

As Whitlock writes, 'neither the Chronicler nor Asser were

interested in or well-informed about East-Anglia, and may not have known any details.'[19] To what degree and extent they are interested in or informed about King Edmund and the situations of his kingdom may still be open to question, but Asser's *Life*, much of source of which is the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, traces the detailed route of the Danish raiders which sacked East-Anglia. In cc. 32 and 33, King Edmund's martyrdom and the fall of his kingdom are described briefly with an exclamatory 'proh dolor!' added to the original. Though it is said that legends of St. Edmund began to be circulated in the tenth century, Asser may have known at least something of the tragical passive resistance of the king. William of Malmesbury, as has been seen above, had an opportunity to know Asser's *Life*. In their context it may not be improbable that between Asser and William, though they lived in different ages, there had been a solid common ground upon which their writings could be based. Both of them could have shared the faith and piety King Edmund had manifested during the time of crisis.

Asser and William described King Ethelred as if he were on the same pious plane as Edmund or Abbo. It is on the same basis that Alfred's conduct at the Battle of Ashdown was criticized by William. Asser, however, left Alfred's conduct and the battle situations ambiguous. It seems as if he were anxious to avoid writing about the king's conduct in a pejorative manner by cunningly using hear-say evidence.

(5)

Asser's policy of writing the *Life* could be seen in some passages in c. 73 :

. . . . . atque, ex parte non modica, res gestas domini mei

> Alfredi, Angulsaxonum regis, postquam praefatam ac venerabilem de Merciorum nobilium genere coniugem duxerit, Deo annuente, succinctim ac breviter, ne qua polixitate narrandi nova quaeque fastidientium animos offendam, ut promisi, expedire procurabo.

Indeed, it is only through Asser that so much information concerning Alfred, even his private affairs, can be obtained — the life of Queen Osburh, Alfred's mother, and how Alfred obtained an illuminated book from her ; the tragical episode of Offa and his daughter Eadburh ; how Æthelbald married Judith, Alfred's mother-in-law ; how Alfred loved learning ; Alfred's earlier illness ; how the people would not help him; and more. It is not too much to say that Asser himself was a 'truth teller'.(20) On the other hand, however, he could not choose but write about Alfred at Ashdown ambiguously after having considered all the relevant factors.

Asser was an elderly Welshman from the see of St. David in Dyfed. Dyfed was one of the eight Welsh kingdoms in the late ninth century located in the far west of Wales. In cc. 79-81, he goes into detail about his visit and return to King Alfred, and the affairs of Wales. In these chapters the difficult stuations St. David's was in at that time are stressed, and we can catch a glimpse of Asser's real intention. His people would be happy, he thought, 'si ego ad notitiam et amicitiam illius regis qualicunque pacto pervenirem.' To sum up in the words of Keynes & Lapidge and Kirby, 'there were good political reasons why Asser's service with Alfred could be of benefit to St. David's ; in particular, the support of Alfred would provide security for the community against the depredations of Hyfaidd ap Bleddri, king of Dyfed.'(21) Kings of south Wales were constantly attacked either by the

son or sons of Rhodri Mawr the Great and the men of Ethelred, ealdorman of Mercia. King Hyfaidd of Dyfed was one of them, being threatened by the king of Gwynedd. He had consoled himself in his anger against the king by frightening the powerless place, the see of St. David. Mercia and most part of Wales had already been under the influence of King Alfred. Whatever hard political bargain Asser may have driven with Alfred, he was persuaded to visit Alfred and had a cordial reception at the court of Wessex as Alfred's friend and adviser. The *Life*, which was written somewhere around 893, was the biography of the author's contemporary hero.

Taking all this into consideration, Asser understandably showed great favour to Alfred in his *Life*. It is significant, however, how small the portrayal of Alfred 'the brave man of war' is in the *Life*. Starting with Asser's prayer and the birth and genealogy of Alfred, Asser describes a series of pagan invasions chiefly taken from the *Anglo-Saxon Chroncle*. Then come the chapters of Alfred and his father's journeys to Rome. It could possibly be said that a wave of religious enthusiasm had been sweeping over the kingdom of Alfred's father, King Æthelwulf. Apart from the descriptions in the chronological framework, based upon the *Anglo-Saxon Chroncle*, Asser seemed to be mainly concerned with showing his readers Alfred as a pious Christian, confronted by heathen hosts, defeating them finally and reconstructing the Christian kingdom of Wessex. When writing about Alfred himself, Asser placed much more stress upon the king's spiritual outlook and religious motives. In c. 89, for instance, comparing Alfred to the fortunate thief hanging next to Christ on the gallows of the Holy Cross, Asser writes in a solemn style of how Alfred's *Enchiridion* was begun :

> . . . . . qui Christianae fidei rudimenta in gabulo primitus inchoavit discere. Hic aut aliter, quamvis dissimili modo, in regia potestate sanctae rudimenta scripturae, divinitus instinctus, praesumpsit incipere in venerabili Martini solemnitate.

In view of the fact that King Æthelwulf sent his youngest son to Rome twice, such a fervant religious enthusiasm as expressed in the above passages would not necessarily be unnatural.

If the Battle of Ashdown had been written in the same tone, however, we should not have met Alfred as portrayed in the battlefield and Alfred's conduct would never have been criticized by William of Malmesbury. Then he, with his brother, would have been defeated by the Danes, loosing their earthly kingdom just as King Edmund did. In fact it is not a portrait of Alfred distorted by religious enthusiasm, but a portrait of Alfred the man facing up to reality, that Asser shows us at the Battle of Ashdown.

NOTES

(1) W.J.Sedgefield, ed., *King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius* (Oxford), 1899, p.41.

(2) W.H.Stevenson, ed., *Asser's Life of King Alfred* (Oxford), 1904. All the quotated passages of Asser's *Life* in this essay are from this editon. (Henceforward cited as *Life*).

(3) E.A.Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England. Its Causes and Its Results* (Oxford), 1873, Vol. I, p.33. J.R.Green, *The Conquest of England* (Macmillan), 1883, p.188.

(4) S.Turner, *The History of the Anglo-Saxons* (London), 1836, Vol.I, p.543, note.

(5) D.Whitelock, trans., *English Historical Documents* I, c.500-1042 (Oxford), 1979, pp. 811-3.

(6) D.Whitelock, *op. cit.*, pp.814-7.

(7) In the medieval legends of what we call 'Alfred and the Cakes,' Alfred is not only despised by a herdsman's wife, but also severely criticzed by the authors for his unsavoury conduct, as described in the *Annals of St Neots*; 'Ille uero noluit eos audire, nec aliquod auxilium eis inpendebat, sed omnino eos nichili pendebat.' D. Dumville and M. Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A Collaborative Edition,* 17 (D.S.Brewer), 1984, p.77. See S.Keynes and M.Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* (Penguin Books), 1983, pp.187-202. T. Oda, 'Alfred and the Cakes,' *Hiyoshi Journal* V (1990), pp.39-62 (In Japanese).

(8) J.Stevenson, ed., *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon* (London), 1858, Vol.I, p.50.

(9) T.D.Hardy, ed., *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi Gesta Regum Anglorum atque Historia Novella* (London, 1840), Vol.I, pp.176-7.

(10) D.Whitelock, 'William of Malmesbury on King Alfred,' *From Bede to Alfred* (London), 1980, p.93.

(11) R.H.Loyn, *Alfred the Great* (Oxford), 1976, p.20.

(12) See C.Plummer and J.Earle, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel* (Oxford), 1952, Anno 871.

(13) W.H.Stevenson, *op. cit.*, cc.37-9.

(14) Stevenson gives no notes on this interpolation.

(15) A.Cambell, ed., *Chronicon Æthelweardi* (London), 1962, p.36. See also the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Anno 870.

(16) F.Harvey, ed., 'Passio Sancti Eadmundi,' *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi* (London), 1907, pp.56-59. (Henceforward cited as *Passio* and all the passages of *Passio* are quotated from this edition).

(17) D. Whitelock, 'The Legend of St. Edmund,' *From Bede to Alfred* (London), 1980, p.221.

(18) See the beginning of *Passio*, 'Incipit epistola passionis sancti Eadmundi regis et martyris.' F. Harvey, *op. cit.*, pp.6-11. See also D. Whitelock, *op. cit.*, pp.218-9.

(19) D.Whitelock, 'The Legend of St.Edmund,' p. 218.

(20) In c.13, Asser says about King Alfred, 'Quod a domino meo Alfredo, Angul-Saxonum rege veredico, ...'

(21) Keynes and Lapidge, *op. cit.*, p.261. See also D.P.Kirby, 'Asser and his Life of King Alfred,' *Studia Celtica* (1791).