Volume 2
Chapter Five:

Securing the Extended West Saxon Kingship: Edward the Elder and Æthelstan

Æthelstan was brought up with great care by his aunt and the eminent ealdorman for the throne that seemed to await him.¹

The previous chapter argued that Edward the Elder’s assumption of royal authority over the Mercians was achieved only upon the death of his sister Æthelflæd. Even then Edward had to subdue Æthelflæd’s supporters at Tamworth in 918 and remove her daughter Ælfwynn from the political spotlight before he could truly stamp his own rule upon Mercian affairs. Yet even these measures were not sufficient to provide Edward with complete control. William of Malmesbury (of whom more will be written later in this chapter) reported that near the end of Edward’s reign there was discontent at the periphery of his realm when, Edward ‘a few days before his death suppressed the rebellious spirit of the city of the Legions, which was in revolt, relying on the support of the Britons.’² If William of Malmesbury’s evidence is trustworthy, and there was a serious rebellion against Edward at Chester, then it raises further questions about the strength of support for West Saxon rule at the edges of the king’s authority. Chester lay formerly within the sphere of influence of Æthelflæd and it is she who is credited with the construction of the string of fortified burhs of which Chester, erected in 907, was the most strategically important. It was most likely that Æthelflæd was responsible for the translation of the relics of Saint Werburgh to Chester as part of a co-ordinated strategy

¹ GR, ii. 133.3.
² Ibid. William is the sole source for the reduction of Chester by King Edward. John of Worcester makes no mention of it nor does the Chronicle.
of relocating important religious icons as the Mercian advance into the Danish held territories continued.\(^3\) From the building of the burh, and the translation of Saint Werburgh, it may be deduced that Æthelflæd was the actual figure of authority both inside the environs and around the peripheries of Chester; it was to her that the loyalty of the subject peoples had previously belonged rather than her brother. On this basis, to find that after the death of Æthelflæd, the inhabitants of Chester had formed alliances with the Welsh, and probably the Danes as well, rather than accept rule from far-distant Wessex, is not altogether surprising.\(^4\) The possible rebellion at Chester has important implications for the coming succession of Æthelstan, who, according to the Mercian Register, was elected king by the Mercian witan in 924. Sarah Foot has suggested that before his succession, Æthelstan may have been entrusted with looking after his father’s interests inside Mercia, after 918.\(^5\) If he was, then Æthelstan may have been present at Chester if this supposed rebellion against Edward did indeed occur. Æthelstan’s presence at Chester would have provided a visual display of solidarity between King Edward and his eldest son. It could have served as a reminder of the arrangements made for the West Saxon and Mercian successions planned some years earlier when Æthelstan was a mere child. Succession disputes in Anglo-Saxon England have been termed the ‘crucibles of tenth-century politics’ and with good reason, but they also


provided much concern in the ninth.⁶ Throughout both the ninth and tenth centuries the West Saxon kings made protracted efforts to realise smooth transitions of authority. The succession of Æthelstan in particular, is a prime example; it appears that Æthelstan’s grandfather, King Alfred may have presided over an elaborate display of political intent to secure for his first grandchild a royal future. This ritualised expression of future succession could have been ratified by Alfred’s son Edward, his daughter Æthelflaed and her husband Ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia. But unfortunately, the contemporary sources remain silent about any of these events and they only appear visible through the twelfth-century *Gesta Regum Anglorum* of William of Malmesbury. The validity of William’s evidence for the life and reign of King Æthelstan has been, and continues to be, the subject of much debate.

**William of Malmesbury: ‘a treacherous witness’?⁷**

In 1981 the orthodoxy of Æthelstan studies was turned upon its head. Michael Lapidge condemned William of Malmesbury’s extended narrative of the reign of Æthelstan, contained within his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, and also devalued secondary works heavily dependent on this source. ‘Scholars have invariably assumed (following William’s editor, Stubbs) that the poem which William proceeds to quote is derived

---


⁷ The phrase was coined by David N. Dumville, ‘Between Alfred the Great and Edgar the Peacemaker: Æthelstan, first king of England’, in his *Wessex and England From Alfred to Edgar: Six Essays on Political, Cultural and Ecclesiastical Revival* (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 141-171, at p. 146. William, of course, was not a witness to any of the events he portrayed about Æthelstan.
from the “obviously ancient book”. In fact there is no justification for so thinking.\(^8\) Lapidge’s assertion has, however, been fiercely contested.\(^9\) Rodney Thomson, Michael Winterbottom and Michael Wood have all defended William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum* as the principal source for Æthelstan’s early years.\(^10\) While all three agree with Lapidge that ‘the verse extracts, as they stand, can hardly be earlier than William’s own lifetime’, they also argue that this may be explained by William’s method of editing his ancient source.\(^11\) In a recent paper, Wood has gone furthest in defence of the *Gesta Regum*, and he has argued that ‘without a shadow of a doubt’ William of Malmesbury’s evidence stems from a tenth-century source.\(^12\) Wood may well have overstated his case here but in his last published work on the subject he took a more measured approach to the problem.\(^13\) Wood’s unwavering and fundamentally unequivocal declaration for William of Malmesbury’s very old book suggests that the case for and against this evidence might be re-examined. Any involved discussion about Æthelstan has to take

---


\(^9\) It may be that Lapidge never intended that his argument would cause so much controversy and that subsequent commentators have perhaps made more of these opinions than he envisaged. See Kent G. Hare, ‘Athelstan of England Christian king and hero’, *The Heroic Age* 7 (Spring, 2004), 1-12, http://www.mun.ca/mst/heroicage/issues/7/hare.html, see endnote 22 pp. 4-5, of 14 [accessed 9th Nov 06].


\(^11\) GR, Commentary, 117.


into account William’s *Gesta Regum* and decide whether or not it can be treated as a reliable source for tenth-century events. Although Michael Davidson has recently claimed that the appropriate sections of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum* have been rehabilitated, this is an overly optimistic view:

As Wood has established in as yet unpublished work, this statement, and other aspects of the account, suggest that it most probable that William was employing a lost tenth-century source for his section on Æthelstan. Yet while historians can be happy that the account has been rehabilitated, this does not however, give one licence to employ the evidence uncritically, as William was never one to remain a slave to his sources.\(^\text{14}\)

A number of eminent scholars have accepted Lapidge’s arguments and some of these have written extremely negatively about William and his very old book.\(^\text{15}\) Others have shown due consideration to Lapidge’s scholarship and his reasoning and have erred on the side of caution and a number of these have expressed their own reservations about the value of William’s evidence.\(^\text{16}\) Here lies the crux of the matter. If William’s account were unreliable it would date from the twelfth century when it was written and not the tenth; if so, to borrow once more from Dumville, historians writing about Æthelstan should not have ‘recourse to the dangerous pages of William of Malmesbury.’\(^\text{17}\) However, are the relevant pages of William’s *Gesta Regum* really dangerous? Arguments can be adduced in favour of William’s very old book and there

\(^{14}\) M. R. Davidson, ‘Submission and imperium in the early medieval insular world’ (University of Edinburgh, Ph. D. Thesis, 2001), p. 72. Wood has prepared a more thorough defence of William’s evidence but until his unpublished book *The Wars of King Æthelstan* becomes available, one must really make do with his most recent published work on the subject. Whether all scholars are now happy about William’s evidential status is doubtful.

\(^{15}\) Besides Dumville, see for instance, R. I. Page, ‘A tale of two cities’, *Peritia* 1 (1982), 335-351, esp. 341-343.


\(^{17}\) Dumville, ‘Between Alfred the Great and Edgar the Peacemaker’, p. 142.
is circumstantial evidence which, if analysed in conjunction with some independent source material, may vindicate at least some of what William had to say.

William’s *Gesta Regum* has a complex textual history; the work was originally commissioned by Queen Matilda (d. 1118) and was written to glorify of the West Saxon line of Cerdic, from whom she was personally descended.¹⁸ This would seem to suggest that the early English portions of the *Gesta Regum* have a clear agenda. However, it is difficult to see where William’s account of Æthelstan fits into this literary schema since this particular section is apparently not derived from the *Chronicle* narrative which has very little to say about Æthelstan or his reign in general. Neither is William’s narrative on Æthelstan a work of pure panegyric. The way William remarks upon the more negative aspects of Æthelstan’s rule would appear to contradict the principal motive behind the book’s original commission.¹⁹ The implications behind all of this are that William was either drawing upon a distinct literary source for his account of Æthelstan’s life and deeds or he invented the narrative himself. There seems to be no viable third option.

William of course was not averse to being creative with historical works when necessary, but, as his treatment of the reign of King Æthelbald of Mercia demonstrates,

---

¹⁸ *GR*, Commentary, xvii- xix and xxii. An account of the origins of William’s *Gesta Regum* can also be found in a letter to Matilda, printed in E. Köngsen, ed. ‘Zwei unbekannte Brief zu den *Gesta Regum Anglorum* des Willhelm von Malmesbury’, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 31 (1975), 204-214.

¹⁹ William did not always eulogise about Æthelstan. William accused Æthelstan of negligence during the lead up to the confrontation at Brunanburh when he ‘passed the time in indolent leisure’ whilst the barbarians of the North ‘laid waste’ to his kingdom; *GR*, ii. 135.9. There are further examples of William emphasising the more negative aspects of Æthelstan’s reign.
William also had a commendable passion for order and for what he believed to be 
historical precision. Haddan and Stubbs may have proved William’s assembled 
narrative about King Æthelbald to be wrong but this is essentially irrelevant.²⁰ What is 
important is that William made use of all the available sources, including charter 
evidence, to construct an account of that king’s reign, and that William clearly 
‘endeavoured to fit all his information together intelligently and to locate it in an 
historical context.’²¹ And it appears that he did so without a visible underlying 
motive.²² This is the principal reason why William’s *De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie* 
has been praised for being ‘perhaps the most remarkable piece of historical research of 
its day.’²³ William was proud of his passion for historical integrity and his ability to 
display this enthusiasm competently. He also enjoyed telling his readers so. In the 
prologue to the *Gesta Regum*, William professed to write about history ‘not to show off 
my more or less non-existent erudition but in order to bring forcibly into the light things 
lost in the rubbish-heap of the past.’²⁴ Leaving aside William’s conspicuous personal 
modesty *topos*, there are no known parallels for this particular metaphor and it could be 
that this forms a fair description of what William considered to be historical 
construction.²⁵ William’s alleged very old book may have been part of this buried

iii. 350-387.

Glastonbury, an Edition, Translation and Study of William of Malmesbury’s De Antiquitate Glastonie 

²² *GR*, ii. prologue, William wrote that he ‘collected chronicles from far and wide – almost, I confess, to 
no purpose.’

²³ James Campbell, ‘Some twelfth-century views of the Anglo-Saxon past’, *Peritia* 3 (1984), 131-150, at 
137.

²⁴ *GR*, ii. prologue. See also Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 7.

²⁵ Winterbottom, ‘*The Gesta Regum*’, 163, n. 22.
historical sediment which he then transformed into what he believed to be a coherent
and essentially reliable account.

The passage from William of Malmesbury that has caused all the scholarly fuss is
as follows:

Concerning this king there is a vigorous tradition in England that he was the most law-abiding
and best-educated ruler they have ever had; though it is only a very short time since I learnt
the extent of his education, from an ancient volume in which the writer was at odds with the
difficulty of his material, finding it hard to express his opinions as he would have wished. I
would add his words here in an abbreviated form, except that in the praises of his prince he
rambles beyond reason, in the style in which Cicero, king of Roman eloquence, calls in his
Rhetoric ‘bombastic’. His manner is excused by the practise of his time, and the excess of
panegyric is countenanced by his enthusiasm for Æthelstan, who was then still living. I will
therefore subjoin a few points in ordinary language which may perhaps make some
contribution to the evidence for his good qualities. 26

Addressing points of Latin, in particular William’s use of the subjunctive, Lapidge has
argued that not enough care has been taken when William informs his audience that he
‘would have’ added from the obviously ancient volume had it not been written in terms
that he found objectionable. 27 Countering this argument, Thomson and Winterbottom
have suggested that Lapidge himself has not taken sufficient notice of William’s
declaration that ‘this is the moment to set down the opinions of the versifier from whom
all of this has been extracted’, and the editors of William’s Gesta Regum have declared
that this statement ‘must apply to the whole of the contents of cc. 133-5 not merely the
verse extracts’ i.e. all of the central portion of the account that was given of Æthelstan’s

26 GR, ii. 132; De hoc rege non inualida apud Anglos fama seritur, quod nemo legalius uel litteratius
rempublicam amministrauerit. Quam quam litteras illium scisse pauci admodum dies sunt quod didicerim,
in quodam sane volumine uetusto, in quo scriptor cum difficultate materiae lactabatur, iuditium animi sui
non valens pro uoto proferre. Cuius hic uerba pro compendio subicerem, nisi quia ultra opinionem
facundiae Romanae Tullius in rhetorics appellat. Eloquium excusat consuetudo illius temporis, laudum
nimietatem adornat fauor Ethelstani adhuc uiuentis. Pauca igitur familiaris stilo subnectam, quae
uideantur aliquod conferre emolumentum ad dignitaris eius documentum.
27 Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 63.
reign. Leaning aside the technicalities of the Latin, Wood has additionally argued that William’s material is of such high quality that it must have come from a tenth-century source, one that was heavily revised by William. One possible text that William might have known is a now-lost work called the bella ethel[stani regis (The Wars of King Æthelstan) and which allegedly formed part of a composite manuscript, along with letters of Alcuin and of Charlemagne, that was in the Glastonbury library when it was catalogued in 1248. This reference was noted by Lapidge, but ultimately rejected as William’s original source on the grounds that there is no way of knowing what this text had originally contained. So where does William of Malmesbury’s account of Æthelstan now fit within the overall framework of evidence for this reign?

If William was using a literary source for his account of Æthelstan’s life, as seems possible, we need to ask whether this text was broadly contemporary with Æthelstan or whether it dated from William’s own time. Lapidge has demonstrated that the poem from which William quoted dates to after c. 1100, and he has argued that it was composed by a colleague of William’s at Malmesbury. Yet Lapidge has additionally speculated that William also drew upon ‘an unknown source’ when he

---

28 GR, Commentary, 117.
31 Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 61, n. 6; at 71, n. 49 also noted that William may have come across this manuscript while at Glastonbury. See also Michael Lapidge, Anglo-Saxon Libraries (Oxford, 2006), p. 72, n. 31, who has more recently written about this lost source and that ‘there have been some excruciating losses, such as the “Bella Ethelstani regis” (B39, item no. 261), apparently an account of the wars of King Æthelstan.’
32 Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’ 68-71.
described the ceremony of royal suitability for Æthelstan. The suggestion that William may have drawn upon an unknown, possibly tenth-century, source is clearly at odds with what William himself wrote. William went to great lengths to explain where he acquired his information from and it surely cannot be described as ‘unknown’. Replying to Lapidge’s suggestion that William was perhaps drawing upon this unrecorded source, Thomson and Winterbottom have dryly observed that ‘to imagine that William mentioned the “ancient volume” only to discard it in favour of another source of similar antiquity seems inherently incredible; “Ockham’s razor” must surely apply.’

The literary approach adopted by William in his portrayal of King Æthelstan adds a further dimension to this particular debate. Stylistically, William’s description of Æthelstan’s life is unusual. William’s portrayals of the later Anglo-Norman kings were heavily indebted to Suetonius and his De Vita Caesarum but his account of Æthelstan stands alone and displays a complete lack of Suetonian influences. Moreover, William’s earlier portrait of Alfred was modelled upon Asser (via Einhard) and his later description of Edward the Confessor stemmed from hagiographical models. These disparities have been noted by Jean Blacker who has additionally suggested that the tone of the extract about Æthelstan, which was arguably derived for the ancient book, remains essentially epic in character with many references to the Anglo-Saxon warrior

33 Ibid., 80-81. Lapidge’s preferred author for the ancient poem is Peter of Malmesbury.
34 GR, Commentary, 118. ‘Ockham’s razor’ is defined as: pluralitas non est ponenda sine neccesitate. Entities should not be multiplied unnecessarily.
The different literary perspectives offered by William further suggest that it may have been a pre-Conquest source that lay at the core of his account about Æthelstan. If William's evidence for Æthelstan were derived from an early, perhaps tenth-century source, conceivably even a lost bella ethel[s]tani regis, then this may help to explain why this particular portrait differs so substantially in composition from his other representations of kingly deeds. It also follows that if these contemporary influences exist they should be retrievable. The following discussion will demonstrate some of these contemporary influences and will additionally display certain independent evidence that may consolidate at least some of William's claims. Two of William's assertions in particular about King Æthelstan stand out and must be dealt with. They concern the possible 'fostering' of Æthelstan at the court of Ealdorman Æthelred and his wife, Æthelflæd, and whether or not as a child, Æthelstan was set apart for future kingship by his grandfather King Alfred who, William alleges, arranged that the royal youngster should undergo a ritualised ceremony possibly anticipating his royal future to 'the throne that seemed to await him.'

The question of whether William is to be trusted about Æthelstan's early years at the Mercian court will be tackled later but first the possibility that Æthelstan may have participated in a ceremony that was meant to assure him of future royal office will be considered.

---


36 *GR*, ii. 133.
Æthelstan: set apart for kingship?

Then, on his father’s instructions and by the terms of his will (testamento), Æthelstan was chosen king by acclamation, recommended as he was by his age - he was now thirty - and his mature wisdom. For his grandfather Alfred had long before wished him a prosperous reign, observing and welcoming the child’s notable good looks and graceful movements, and had knighted him at an early age with the gift of a scarlet cloak, a belt set with gems, and a Saxon sword with a gilded scabbard.

Tunc iussu patris et testamento Ethelstanus in regem acclamatus est, quem iam tricennalis eatas et sapientiae maturitas commendabant. Nam et auus Elfredus prosperum ei regnum olim imprecatus fuerat, uidens et gratiose complexus spectatae spectiei puerum et gestum elegantium; quem etiam premature militem fecerat, donatum clamide coccinea, gemmato balteo, ense Saxonico cum uagina aurea. 37

Potentially, this is one of the most valuable pieces of information that William offers us about King Æthelstan and about West Saxon dynastic strategies, yet some have viewed the alleged investiture of Æthelstan as a child with the ‘gift of a scarlet cloak, a belt set with gems, and a Saxon sword with a gilded scabbard’ as anachronistic. 38 William uses a twelfth-century phrase for his ‘knighting’ of Æthelstan (quem etiam premature militem fecerat) but this should not detract from its overall authenticity. William largely renders an accurate description of a ninth-century royal designation ceremony whereby the recipient was singled out as being throne-worthy. By far the most potent material symbolism belonging to this rite of passage came from the sword and belt. The cingulum militare was the most fundamental item of ceremonial military regalia and it epitomised the warrior ethos that permeated throughout the ninth and tenth centuries. 39

But as Patrick Geary has explained, through the ninth century the sword had also

---

37 GR, ii. 133.
38 Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 71 and 80. Smyth, King Alfred the Great (Oxford, 1995), p. 438 has suggested that ‘Alfred’s role in the so-called designation of Æthelstan as a future king can be dismissed out of hand.’
acquired a privileged role as a symbol of legitimacy and continuity.' Because of this collective imagery, the *cingulum militare* could at times be allegorical and in Æthelstan’s case it should be seen as such and be more liberally interpreted as part and parcel of the ritualistic trappings which defined his potential as a future king. Numerous continental precedents for this particular ceremony of legitimisation exist and William’s description of the show-piece ritual has impeccable ninth-century credentials.

When in 837 Louis the Pious decorated his son Charles with arms (including a sword and belt) it was as a clear precursor to his subsequent acclamation as king. The pre-ordination of Charles, complete with the indispensable equipment of the warrior was, according to Karl Leyser, a manifestation of ‘solemnity which served as the indispensable first step to furnish[ing] him with a kingship in one of the heartlands of the Frankish Reich.’ An even more contemporary example of ceremonial pre-ordination came in 877, when Charles the Bald instructed his wife, Richilde to present his son Louis (the Stammerer) with ‘the sword called of St. Peter through which he invested him with the kingdom.’ This sacred sword was in turn transmitted at the end of his own lifetime along with ‘the rest of the regalia’ by Louis to his own son, the future Louis the third. The ritual that King Alfred apparently arranged for his grandson Æthelstan mirrors these Carolingian rites of passage whereby investiture with

---

41 Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* 2 (Hanover, 1829), i. 6, 609-614.
43 *AB*. 877.
a sword encapsulating the virtues of the donor in turn conceptualised the stability of both the temporal and the spiritual worlds. This Frankish-inspired ceremony emphasised above all else the ‘ritualised expression of the handing over of the mundium, that is, of protective capacity and familial superiority, in a society which remained largely fragmentary’ and was hugely symbolic.45 The Carolingians ritualised the giving of valuable weaponry, especially swords and belts, by transforming these acts into ceremonial expressions of amicitia and filiation including, most crucially, a re-affirmation of consanguinity. In ninth-century Francia these rituals, and others, such as crown-wearings, royal acclamations, consecrations and coronations served vital functions of kingship. They provided the visual approval of lordship and were explicit reminders of consensus between rulers and their aristocracy.46

The ceremony described by William for Æthelstan is also reminiscent of Alfred’s own personal experiences of youthful pre-ordination. This particular childhood ceremony was magnified by Alfred and his entourage to resemble perhaps the ultimate ritual of royal designation, one of papal approval and consecration. In 853, the Chronicle claimed the young Alfred was sent by his father King Æthelwulf to Rome where he was confirmed by Pope Leo IV. By the 890s, when the Alfredian Chronicle had been compiled, Alfred’s confirmation had been transformed into a full-scale

46 Eric J. Goldberg, Struggle for Empire: Kingship and Conflict under Louis the German, 817-876 (Ithaca and London, 2006), p. 54.
'official' papal consecration of Alfred as a future king of the West Saxons. This was a deliberate distortion of events and the papal ceremony was 'no doubt wilfully misconstrued in late ninth-century Wessex as a royal anointing.' Alfred's calculated magnification of his papal experiences formed part of an orchestrated policy of consolidation for the West Saxon king within the re-structured political landscape of the 890s. The Chronicle reported that in 853 'King Æthelwulf sent his son Alfred to Rome. The Lord Leo was then pope in Rome, and he consecrated him king and stood sponsor to him at confirmation'. The authenticity that lay behind the exaggerated Chronicle claim is revealed in a short extract of a letter from Leo IV to Alfred's father King Æthelwulf. The letter demonstrates that Alfred was probably given the status of an honorary Roman consul and invested with the appropriate regalia that went with such an office:

To Æthelwulf, king of the English. We have now graciously received your son Alfred, whom you were anxious to send at this time to the thresholds of the Holy Apostles, and we have decorated him, as a spiritual son, with the dignity of the belt and the vestments of the consulate, as is customary with Roman consuls, because he gave himself into our hands.

Alfred's investiture as an honorary Roman consul came complete with the dignity of the belt and the vestments of the Roman consulate and included the girding on of a

---

49 ASC, 853.
50 MGH, Epistolae 5 ed. A. de Hirsch-Gereuth (Berlin, 1899), 602; extract from a letter a Pope Leo IV to Æthelwulf, king of Wessex for 853; trans. EHD, 219. The original letter that purports to be from Pope Leo IV can be found only in the Collectio Britannica, fol. 160v-171r, which contains 44 letters. The letters of Leo were distributed in the eleventh century and found their way into similar collections of papal letters. The letter about Alfred's 'anointing' is number 31 of the Collectio Britannica and has at times been the subject of careful scrutiny in order to determine whether the letter is genuine or is in fact a forgery of the 1060-70s. This was a period when Popes Alexander II and Gregory VII respectively were attempting to tie England more closely to the papacy. See Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages, eds. Detlev Jasper and Horst Fuhrmann (Washington, D.C. 2001), pp. 108-110.
ceremonial sword. That this ceremony was later transformed into a royal ‘anointing’
was probably inspired by Alfred and his Frankish helpers, in direct emulation of
Carolinger legitimising procedures. The evidence suggests that Alfred’s ‘royal
consecration’ was later mirrored when his grandson Æthelstan achieved a similar age.
Alfred once more drew upon the expertise of his continental contacts and aids,
including, if Lapidge is correct, John the Old Saxon, who celebrated this expression of
royal intent in verse.

William of Malmesbury’s description of Æthelstan’s ceremony anticipating his
future kingship does not stand in isolation. A near-contemporary acrostic poem appears
to support William’s account of this ceremony as it too anticipates Æthelstan’s eventual
succession and his intended role within the Alfredian and later the Edwardian polities:

You, prince [triiumuir], are called by the name of ‘sovereign stone’.
Look on this prophesy for your age: You ‘noble rock’ of Samuel the Seer, [standing] with
mighty strength against devilish demons.
Often an abundant cornfield foretells a great harvest; in Peaceful days your stony mass is to be
softened. You are more abundantly endowed with the holy eminence of learning.
I pray that you may seek, and the Glorious One may grant, the [fulfilment implied in your]
noble names.

51 Hilda Ellis Davidson, The Sword in Anglo-Saxon England (first published 1962, corrected reprint,
Woodbridge, 1998), p. 109. Gregory of Tours claimed that Clovis had been hailed by the Emperor
Anastasius as consul and Augustus in 508. Ian Wood, The Merovingian Kingdoms, 450-751 (London and
New York, 1994), p. 48 has argued that an ‘honorary consulship was not out of the question’ and for a
more substantial discussion see Michael McCormick, ‘Clovis at Tours, Byzantine public ritual and the
origins of medieval ruler symbolism’, in Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas Schwarz (eds.), Das Reich
52 W. H. Stevenson, ed. Asser’s Life of King Alfred together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously
Ascribed to Asser (Oxford, 1904, new impression, Oxford, 1959), at p. 181 recognised that this was a
‘misapprehension’ by Alfred and he further suggested that the king’s coronation in 871 may have been
perceived as a ‘consummation’ of the pope’s original ordination. On the issue of Anglo-Saxon emulation
of Frankish examples of king making see Nelson, ‘The Franks and the English reconsidered’, pp. 144-6
and for the Anglo-Saxon use of the term consul see M. Hunter, ‘Germanic and Roman antiquity and the
53 Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 72-73.
54 Ibid.
The identification of John the Old Saxon as the likely author of this acrostic poem places the text in Æthelstan’s lifetime, and most probably, considering the subject matter, during the period of his childhood. Lapidge has dated the poem to between 894 and 899 and he has argued that it was composed by John to commemorate a ceremony which took place while King Alfred was still alive and had been inspired by the king’s own earlier Roman experiences. This dating is persuasive, but is in itself highly dependent upon William of Malmesbury’s version of the ceremony. William is the only source which attributes the ritualistic display of intent to King Alfred’s lifetime.

Lapidge has argued that:

William [of Malmesbury]: ‘interprets the ceremony retrospectively as a designation of Æthelstan’s future reign (it could not have been self-evident in 899 or earlier that Æthelstan would succeed to the throne). Nevertheless, the detail with which William describes the ceremony suggests that he had knowledge (from an unknown source) that such a ceremony had taken place. I suggest that John’s acrostic poem was composed to commemorate this ceremony. Furthermore, if we can accept Stevenson’s conjecture that the ceremony involving Æthelstan was intended by Alfred as an adumbration of his own earlier investiture with the insignia of the consulship (or whatever) at Rome, then we have some explanation why the poet [John the Old Saxon?] chose the title triumuir for Æthelstan: it carried for John the straightforward meaning “consul.” \(^{55}\)

A number of the above points require clarification. Even Lapidge concedes that William of Malmesbury’s description of this ceremony probably originated from a contemporary or near-contemporary source. This seems to contradict his earlier claim that William’s knowledge about Æthelstan’s early upbringing has very limited value. Moreover, despite acknowledging that William was probably drawing from contemporary literature for his depiction of this ceremony, Lapidge rejects outright William’s claim that Æthelstan was being set apart for future royal office by his grandfather. This interpretation, he argues, is William’s alone who, with the benefit of twelfth-century hindsight, was able to view the ceremony retrospectively as an anticipation of

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 80-81.
Æthelstan's eventual reign as king. Æthelstan, however, was the first-born grandson of a reigning king (Alfred) and the eldest son of a future king (Edward) and it would have been apparent even in the late 890s that if Æthelstan survived his father he stood a chance of attaining the West Saxon kingship, or, more probably, as we shall see, of attaining the future kingship of the Mercians.

Lapidge has also argued that John the Old Saxon chose the unusual title of triumuir for Æthelstan because it formed a direct synonym for the seemingly genuine papal title of consul that Alfred received in Rome in 853. Yet Lapidge himself offers two different interpretations of this word, his second being the Old English ætheling, which, with its connotations of throne-worthiness, seems a more likely translation of the poem's general sentiments than does consul.56 But even if John meant consul when he chose the word triumuir it need not signify a literal interpretation. As Michael Hunter has argued, ancient offices were frequently 'modified when they were re-invoked in contemporary dress', and, taking a conservative approach as to why Alfred's visit to Rome later became viewed as a royal consecration, that he 'mistook his investiture to the consulate as his coronation.'57 It is this question of what was generally understood to have taken place in 853 that militates most strongly against John choosing the title of triumuir because it was a direct equivalent of consul. Alfred's papal recognition was re-invented in the 890s and this 'official' version underscored much of the rhetoric found

56 Ibid., 72-73. For a discussion on the word ætheling and its literal meaning of simply 'prince' see David N. Dumville, 'The ætheling: a study in Anglo-Saxon constitutional history', Anglo-Saxon England 8 (1979), 1-33, at 4-5.
within the Alfredian *Chronicle*. In this literary setting, Alfred’s childhood audience with Pope Leo IV had taken on a far-reaching significance that made the honorary title of Roman consul superfluous. Yet it was only within recent memory that this version had been carved into the fabric of Alfred’s kingship. The inner-sanctum of advisors who created this myth probably included John the Old Saxon. It, therefore, seems improbable that in a poem intended to praise the special - possibly royal - attributes of King Alfred’s first grandson, John would be authorised to remind the royal court that Alfred himself had only received the title of [Roman] consul in 853. This would be tantamount to an admission that King Alfred had not been pre-ordained for kingship himself.

If this were a replication of Alfred’s own ceremony, as seems possible, then the only thing realistically worth replicating was royal suitability. And this is where John’s title for the youngster, Æthelstan, is important. As Hunter further suggested, the Anglo-Saxons indulged in a ‘context of self-conscious Romanisms’ and such titles ‘illustrate a search for dignity in the traditions of imperial Rome.’

In a Roman context, a *triumviratus* means literally a college of three where a *triumvir* is one of its constituent members. This emphasis on a tripartite concord possibly reflects the deal that had been brokered between King Alfred, his son, Edward and his grandson, Æthelstan, as reported by William of Malmesbury. Similarly, John’s poetic word-play for Æthelstan’s name of sovereign-stone further reflects the youngster’s throne-worthiness. It seems unlikely that all this was a game that was being staged for the ageing king’s

58 Ibid., 39.
amusement; critical dynastic policies were being confirmed amidst a flurry of rituals. These rituals included the re-enactment of King Alfred’s own childhood royal pre-ordination, which was later memorialised by John the Old Saxon in acrostic verse. This brings us to the second crucial claim made by William of Malmesbury about Æthelstan’s early years; that Æthelstan was brought up at the Mercian court of Æthelred and Æthelflæd.

Æthelstan’s Mercian upbringing and the problems of royal succession

One tale that complements William of Malmesbury’s claim that King Alfred presided over a ceremony mapping-out a royal future for his grandson Æthelstan, is the additional declaration that ‘after that’ King Alfred also ‘arranged for the boy’s education at the court of his daughter Æthelflæd and Æthelred his son-in-law, where he was brought up with great care by his aunt and the eminent ealdorman for the throne that seemed to await him.’\(^59\) William’s pronouncement seems, at face-value, a perfectly plausible arrangement for it answers the difficult question of why the Mercian aristocracy were won over so convincingly by Æthelstan, following the death of Edward. Æthelstan, unlike his father, appears not to have had to deal with the recurring tensions equated with Mercian separatism. Moreover, according to the Mercian Register, Æthelstan was ‘chosen by the Mercians as king’, and by the time of his accession, he may have been like his aunt Æthelflæd, both a popular figure and a formidable war-

\(^{59}\) GR, ii. 133. Post haec in curia filiae Ethelfledae et generi Ethelredi educandum curauerat; ubi multo studio amitae et preclarissimi ducis ad omen regni altus.
leader. The ready acceptance by the Mercian annalist suggests that Æthelstan’s character was already well known; we might wonder whether Æthelstan had accompanied his aunt during her campaigns against the Danes. Although Dumville has also claimed that the Gesta Regum is an untrustworthy source of information about the youthful upbringing of Æthelstan in Mercia, certain positive, if cautious, inferences can be drawn from his discussion. ‘Much would be explained thereby’ Dumville has agreed; ‘but we must not assume that a mediaeval scholar would be incapable of seeing that too. William is a treacherous witness: for all the praise heaped on him in modern times, we must nonetheless recognise that his attitude to evidence is mediaeval and not ours.’

Leaving behind the historiographical debate about William of Malmesbury, it can be suggested that William may not actually be the sole source of information about Æthelstan’s Mercian upbringing. In both his Gesta Pontificum and his Gesta Regum William ascribed the foundation of the New Minster at Gloucester to the later period of King Alfred’s reign. While noting the benevolence of the Mercian leadership, William also wrote that ‘at Gloucester in the time of King Alfred, his daughter Æthelflaed and her husband Æthelred had built a monastery’ there. An entirely independent document containing information about the foundation of the New Minster at Gloucester supports William’s claim. During the reign of Edward I, at Michaelmas, in 1304, the prior of Saint Oswald’s at Gloucester was involved in a lengthy dispute between the sees of Canterbury and York; to bolster his claims at the court of the King’s

---

60 ASC, Mercian Register, 924.
61 Dumville, ‘Between Alfred the Great and Edgar the Peacemaker’, p. 146.
62 GP, ch. 155.
Bench, the prior produced documents from the York archive.\textsuperscript{63} One of these appears to have been either an original charter of King \textit{Æ}thelstan or, more plausibly, a copy of the original. It apparently contained information concerning the privileges granted to the priory of Saint Oswald's by King \textit{Æ}thelstan and these immunities, along with further relevant information, were recorded during the hearing. Although of late provenance, there are strong grounds for viewing this transcript as basically authentic. It exhibits sufficient linguistic characteristics to suggest a genuine diploma of \textit{Æ}thelstan lies behind its production. These include the given title of \textit{primericus} for Ealdorman \textit{Æ}thelred and a number of grecisms, clearly reflecting contemporary tenth-century usage, particularly in royal diplomas.\textsuperscript{64} If this transcript can be believed, it could reveal more information about King \textit{Æ}thelstan's early life and his reign.

The \textit{Æ}thelstan transcript also preserves the tradition that it was \textit{Æ}thelred who was responsible for the foundation of the New Minster at Gloucester. Although the document fails to specify when \textit{Æ}thelred may have founded the New Minster, William of Malmesbury's evidence suggests that its construction began during the later years of King Alfred's reign. As argued earlier, the creation of this spiritual and secular hub provides valuable clues as to Mercian aspirations and the minster played an important role in the reconstruction of the Mercian polity, albeit as one reformed within the

\textsuperscript{63} Michael Hare, 'The documentary evidence for the history of St. Oswald's, Gloucester to 1086 AD', in Carolyn Heighway and Richard Bryant (eds.), \textit{The Golden Minster: The Anglo-Saxon Minster and Later Medieval Priory of St. Oswald at Gloucester}, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 117 (York, 1999), 33-45, at 34-37.

overarching framework of West Saxon authority under King Alfred. Its foundation needs to be compared with Edward’s establishment of the New Minster at Winchester.\(^\text{65}\) As well as providing a focus for the Mercian leadership, the minster was intended to become a reference point for Mercian veneration as a future ‘royal’ mausoleum. The charter transcript also complements William of Malmesbury’s ‘lost’ tenth-century source and it too implies that Æthelstan may have been raised at the Mercian court of his uncle and his aunt. Additional information about how this process may have worked and what a number of the outcomes may have been might also be gleaned from the transcript. A considerable emphasis is placed upon an earlier putative agreement made between Ealdorman Æthelred, Æthelstan and King Edward the Elder. G. O. Sayles provided an English translation of this transcript in the late 1930s but in respect of this concord Sayles’ version is misleading and the one produced by Alex Rumble is much more accurate and is repeated here:

\begin{quote}
King Æthelstan in the first year of his consecration, according to a pact of paternal piety which formerly he pledged with Æthelred, ealdorman of the people of the Mercians, similarly sedulously promoting the paternal wishes of King Edward, with the full agreement and permission of his nobles gave with eternal liberty and removed from all secular servitude and delivered to the service of Almighty God with clergy dedicated to God the minster called New, where the mortal remains of the holy body of the blessed martyr Oswald rest in felicity and that that aforesaid minster was founded and built by Æthelred outside the old wall of the town of Gloucester and circumscribed with very definite boundaries.\(^\text{66}\)
\end{quote}

\(^{66}\) Alex Rumble’s translation can be found in Hare, ‘The documentary evidence’, at 43, n. 21. An earlier parallel Latin/English translation of this transcript can also be found in *Select Cases in the Court of King’s Bench Under Edward I*, ed. and trans. G. O. Sayles, 3 vols. Publications of the Seldon Society 58 (London, 1939), iii. 141-142. The Latin reads: *Primo, videlicet, transcriptum cuiusdam carte regis Adelstani de fundacione illius ecclesie, cuius originale in thesauraria ecclesie Ebor’ resedebat, vt dixit, in quo inueniebatur quod idem rex Adelstan ordinacionis sue anno primo, secundum paternem pietatis pactum quod olim Aederedo, primicerio gentis Mircionum, pepigit, paternis votis sedule fauens Edwardi, similiter regis, cum omni optimatum suorum consensu atque licencia eterna libertate tradidit et ab omni seculari servitute subtraxit etique omnipotentis sercucio mancipavit cum clerico deo deuto monasterium nomine nouum, vbi gleba sancti somatis macharii martiris Oswaldi pausat feliciter, et quod prefatum
An important portion of the Æthelstan transcript refers to a pact of paternal piety that had been previously drawn up between Ealdorman Æthelred and his nephew Æthelstan and its confirmation by King Edward. This contract offers important implications for Æthelstan’s upbringing and royal succession; that Æthelstan may have entered into a pact of paternal piety with his uncle rather than with his father invites further reflection. The pact of paternal piety suggests that Æthelstan was already involved in Mercian affairs before the death of his uncle in 909 and it could be that here Æthelstan was acknowledging an even earlier debt to his Mercian aunt and uncle.

_Spiritual kinship_

Scholars who have taken at face-value William of Malmesbury’s description of Æthelstan’s upbringing at the court of Æthelflæd and Æthelred have commonly used the term ‘fostering’ for this particular association. While fostering existed in the Early Middle Ages, both on the Continent and to a lesser degree in Anglo-Saxon England, the bond of royal kinship and obligation that may have been constructed between the Mercian leadership and the young Æthelstan has never been clearly defined. 67 Although Peter Parkes has recently resuscitated an argument originally made by Fritz Roeder in 1910 and has re-articulated that the West Saxon royal house used cliental

---

67 Fostering was used as a political expedient for both ‘cementing alliances with supporters for the parents and of keeping watch over potential enemies for the fosterer.’ See John Boswell, _The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe From Late Antiquity to the Renaissance_ (New York, 1988), pp. 207-208, n. 94.
fostering, this is not altogether convincing.\textsuperscript{68} Roeder's original argument was based primarily on William of Malmesbury's elaborate narrative of Æthelstan's 'investiture' and then linked with his clearly apocryphal tale that Edward the Elder had dallied with Æthelstan's putative mother at the home of the steward's wife: 'who served as a wet-nurse to the king's sons.'\textsuperscript{69} However, fostering and wet-nursing should not be seen as being synonymous and a different explanation for Æthelstan's upbringing at the Mercian court is required. The Æthelstan transcript allows for an alternative interpretation, suggesting that the ubiquitous and rather nebulous term of 'fostering' for Æthelstan's upbringing at the Mercian court might be replaced by a clearer categorisation. The language of the charter transcript is evocative of one particular bond of spiritual kinship popular in ninth-century Francia known as coparenthood.

Throughout the early medieval period, artificial bonds of kinship were created and reinforced by the application of rituals. In many instances, they provided the diplomatic bridges that forged closer political links especially in highly sensitive regions. In Carolingian Francia, the bond of spiritual attachment known as coparentage was frequently used to establish political mediation. Coparentage was probably the most complex of the artificial kinship ties created in the Early Middle Ages; it has also


\textsuperscript{69} GR, ii 139.
been repeatedly misinterpreted and has generally been viewed as being synonymous with godparenthood. As Joseph H. Lynch has pointed out:

Some of the confusion is due to a tendency to identify godparenthood with coparenthood, even though they are quite distinct from one another. From a very early date, godparenthood was favoured by the church for pastoral reasons, particularly since it promoted the religious and moral instruction of the young. In contrast, coparenthood had a different course of development, arising in popular culture and generally being ignored by the early medieval church. Yet coparenthood was probably the more important social relationship, since its creation was a voluntary, even a calculated, social decision that made adults into spiritual kinsmen who could immediately aid one another as kinsmen should, whereas the full implications of godparenthood could be realised only after the act of sponsorship, when the child had passed the age of reason.

Lynch’s observations that coparenthood was both voluntary and calculated are important. Unlike godparentage, where the church held a vested interest, coparenthood was secular by design and was organised to function either alongside or beyond the legislation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Like other forms of artificial parenthood, coparentage served to diffuse tensions but also to forge links between smaller familial units and extend this into to a wider kin-group. These multiple characteristics demonstrate why the bond was frequently chosen as a potential source of future political commitment and obligation. Evidence for coparenthood on the continent is plentiful but is much rarer in the Anglo-Saxon sources; where it does exist, however, the distinction between coparenthood and godparenthood was clear and precise. The earliest direct reference to coparenthood in England concerns King Alfred, Ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia and the children of a Danish chieftain named Hæsten.

---

72 Lynch, Christianizing Kinship, p. 135.
73 Ibid., pp. 143-150.
In 892, driven by the threat of impending starvation, a substantial Danish fleet under their experienced leader Hæsten arrived in Kent from Francia. Soon after Hæsten’s arrival, King Alfred attempted to negate this new risk to the security of his kingdom by imposing himself diplomatically upon the invaders using similar strategies which had brought him success with Guthrum and his followers at Wedmore in 878.74

One part of this scheme involved the baptismal sponsorship of Hæsten’s two sons:

Hæsten’s wife and two sons were brought to the king; and he gave them back to him, because one of them was his godson (gosun), and the other the godson of Ealdorman Æthelred. They had stood sponsor to them before Hæsten had come to Benfleet, and he had given the king oaths and hostages, and the king had also made him generous gifts of money, and so he did also when he gave back the boy and the woman. But immediately they came to Benfleet and had made their fortress, Hæsten ravaged his kingdom, that very province which Æthelred, his son’s cofather (cumpader), was in charge of; and again, a second time, he had gone on a raid in that same kingdom when his fortress was stormed.75

Alfred’s intention was to bring the Danish leader and all of his family into the overarching framework of Christianity by baptismal sponsorship, but there appears to have been an obstacle for him to get around. Although Hæsten’s two sons had not been baptised, their father seems to have already received the sacrament during his time in Francia.76 Consequently, the two boys were baptised at a Christian ceremony where

---


76 Dudo of St. Quentin, trans. E. Christiansen, Dudo of St. Quentin: History of the Normans (Woodbridge, 1998), i. 5-7. For the legendary elements of Dudo’s account of the sack of Luna, see Simon Coupland, ‘The Vikings on the continent in myth and history’, History 88 (2003) 186-203, at 197-200. Dudo’s account of Hæsten’s baptism at least may be based on more factual historical tradition. Although Hæsten’s career is difficult to map, the Annals of St. Vaast report on his activities under the year 891. Hæsten’s duplicity is recounted when he ‘made peace with Abbot Rudolf by deceit, so that he could go
King Alfred stood sponsor to one child and Ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia to the other. But owing to Hæsten already being a Christian - however superficial this conversion may have been to Hæsten personally - Alfred needed to find a further method of binding the Dane to himself and to Æthelred. A bond of coparenthood appears to have been forged between Hæsten and his erstwhile Anglo-Saxon enemies and these rituals may have accompanied the ceremony where the children were baptised. After undergoing the appropriate baptismal sacraments, Hæsten’s children are said to have become the godsons (godsunu) of the two Anglo-Saxon leaders. But when Hæsten’s subsequent treachery unfolds in the *Chronicle*, Æthelred of Mercia is no longer termed the boy’s godfather; he is explicitly referred to as being the child’s cofather (cumpæder). 77

*Cumpæder* is a very precise word and Whitelock’s translation of it as ‘godfather’ highlights Lynch’s contention that this particular bond of kinship has not always been accorded due consideration. 78 Etymologically, the Old English *cumpæder* is clearly a loan-word derived from the Latin *compater* and is a rare word in the Anglo-Saxon sources. 79 Alfred’s awareness of coparenthood was most probably another result of the Alfredian court’s interaction with Carolingian Francia, where coparenthood had often played a decisive role in Carolingian/papal diplomacy and the corresponding bonds wherever he wanted’; *Annales Vedastini*, s.a. 891, trans. Simon Coupland, *The Annals of St. Vaast* (Unpublished).

77 ASC, 893. For the suggestion that *cumpæder* is a very precise term carrying moral implications for the whole of this annal see Ruth Waterhouse, ‘The Hæsten episode in 894 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’, *Studia Neophilologica* 46 (1974), 136-141, at 140.
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underpinned numerous other high level political relationships. Hæsten’s eventual duplicity emphasises the Dane’s own loose morals rather than that coparenthood was not customarily binding. The precise terminology of *cumpæder* stresses the closeness of the twin relationships that now existed between Hæsten and Æthelred but also between Hæsten and Alfred. Hæsten’s later duplicity is actually a ‘double breach of faith’; for the Dane has reneged upon both the baptismal agreements with his two sons and his own obligations conceived by these bonds of coparenthood. Despite the eventual failure of coparenthood to obligate Hæsten, and to bring him successfully under King Alfred and Ealdorman Æthelred’s influence, the *Chronicle* narrative for 893 demonstrates that both Alfred and Æthelred were aware of the existence of the ritual and knew of its political potential.

---

80 Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship*, pp. 337-339 and Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship*, pp. 142-143. There may be another link between Alfred and coparenthood for he may have personally undergone the rituals of *compaternitas* when he underwent his ‘royal anointing’ at the hands of Pope Leo. Stevenson, *Asser’s Life of Alfred*, p. 180 pointed out that when Charlemagne’s sons Karlman and Louis were involved in their own papal ordinations these rituals were regarded by later writers as coronations. But the pope addressed Charles as *spiritalis compater* and similar language was used by Leo for Alfred who was *spiritalis filius*. For a further viewpoint on coparentage in Carolingian Francia see Rosamond McKitterick, ‘The illusion of royal power in the Carolingian annals’, *EHR* 115 (2000), 1-20, esp. 12-14.


82 Waterhouse, ‘The Hæsten episode’ at 140-141; contrast Thomas Charles-Edwards, ‘Alliances, godfathers, treaties and boundaries’, in M. A. Blackburn and D. Dumville (eds.), *Kings, Currency and Alliances: History and Coinage of Southern England in the Ninth Century* (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 47-61, p. 58; where he has argued that the bond of coparenthood failed to yield a secure peace. However, neither did the baptism of Hæsten’s sons and this is suggestive that the Dane had a lack of regard for any type of settlement. As Richard Abels, ‘King Alfred’s peace making strategies with the Vikings’, *HSJ* 3 (1991), 23-34, at 34 has pointed out, this was Alfred’s last attempt to negotiate with the new Danish army and after this failure, he fought them and if he captured them he killed them.
Coparentage held an additional advantage over godparentage in as much as it not only bound the coparents to the recipient of the ritual; it also forged the attachment known as *compaternitas* between the coparents themselves. The bond of *compaternitas* was thus used throughout Francia to bind, through oaths, neighbouring rulers to their Carolingian overlord. In Frankish diplomacy *compaternitas* was frequently deployed to cement alliances between equals or near-equals; 'it belongs naturally to the independent mode of diplomacy.' Many important diplomatic ties were thus underpinned by bonds of *compaternitas*. For example, when Charles the Bald bound his Breton clients, Erispoe and Salomon, to his overall authority he did so by instigating the rituals associated with the bonds of *compaternitas*.

One further Frankish parallel to the possible enlistment of the Mercian leadership as coparents for the young Æthelstan can be found in the *Annals of Fulda*. While not specifically referred to as a bond of coparentage, the language of the report suggests that these rituals may have been followed. In 887, the annals reported the death of Boso, who left a 'small son by the daughter of Louis, king of Italy. The emperor (Charles) came to meet him at the villa of Kirchen on the Rhine, and received him with honour to be his man, as if he were his adopted son (*honorisce ad hominem sibi quasi adoptivum filium eum iuneixit*). The term adopted son is suggestive and, as Timothy Reuter pointed out, whether adoption in a modern-day sense was known to the Carolingians is at best debatable. This episode clearly needs further analysis, for

---

85 *AF*, 887.
Reuter’s argument challenged the generally accepted version of this incident, whereby Charles was making Louis the heir to his empire. He suggested that this is too simplistic an explanation and he alternatively argued that Charles was actually making peace with the son of a man whom he had never accepted as a legitimate ruler.\(^8^6\) If this were a spiritual adoption reinforced by the bonds of *compaternitas*, it was one instigated for diplomatic reasons to do with succession and legitimacy. Charles was thus making a highly visible declaration to his nobility that the youngster was a suitable person to receive future royal power.

Reuter’s important observations make this a worthwhile parallel with King Alfred’s possible treatment of his grandson Æthelstan. For it may be that by spiritually adopting King Alfred’s eldest grandson in a ceremony perhaps reinforced by the bonds associated with coparenthood, the Mercian leadership provided the tools for publicising that there would be a smooth transference of authority within Mercia, where legitimacy and acceptance would prove the key issues at Æthelstan’s eventual succession. The constructed bond of *compaternitas* meant that whatever the consequences of Edward’s kingship he would be bound by oaths to his sister, his brother-in-law and to his first-born son, whose intended role within an Alfredian-designed polity Edward was meant to uphold. Taken collectively, the evidence that Æthelstan may have been set apart for kingship and later perhaps bound to his aunt and uncle through the rituals of coparentage and *compaternitas*, suggest that Æthelstan was being groomed for future

---

\(^8^6\) On all of this see Timothy Reuter, *The Annals of Fulda*, Manchester Medieval Sources: Ninth-Century Histories 2 (Manchester, 1992), 113 and n. 6.
royal office, possibly within Mercia. If so, then upon Edward’s death, King Alfred’s eldest grandson was to inherit the vacant Mercian throne last occupied, but relinquished in the late 880s, by his uncle, Ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia. The most important question arising out of all of these rituals is why were they deemed to be necessary?

*The partitioning of the Kingdom of the Angli et Saxones*

One method of restricting the likelihood of potential fragmentation or regionalism was by agreeing to the partition of an extended kingdom. The possible ceremonies of childhood acclamation and spiritual adoption for Æthelstan are evocative of certain Frankish ritualised ideologies which were fashioned for similar reasons. This might suggest they were initiated primarily to protect West Saxon governance over the Mercians, yet this is deceptive, for these ritualistic displays of intent also held implications for West Saxon succession. These highly visual ceremonies may have been just part of a complex series of policies designed to ensure the future of Alfred’s direct royal line in both Wessex and in Mercia. The placing of Æthelstan at the court of his uncle and aunt may be compared with the way in which successive West Saxon kings had allowed their eldest sons to participate in kingship within Kent during their own lifetime. However, this particular policy was more subtly orchestrated and was

---

87 Michael Wood, *In Search of the Dark Ages* (first published London, 1981, 1985 reprint), p. 135 has suggested that Æthelstan may have been intended to follow in his uncle’s footsteps and like Æthelred was intended to become the next ‘Lord of the Mercians’ rather than king. Wood admits, however, that the regalia used in this ceremony signified royalty.

also designed to limit the dynastic ambitions of a future challenger to the West Saxon throne. William of Malmesbury stated that Æthelstan was thirty years of age at his accession to the kingship in 924, and if this dating is believable, it places the ceremony of royal suitability very near to the end of King Alfred’s life and immediately into that most delicate and precarious period of kingship, the lead-up to the direct transmission.89

The question has been asked ‘was it King Alfred or Edward who had the idea of fostering Æthelstan at the Mercian court?’90 The answer may be that it was a joint enterprise but one sponsored initially by King Alfred. William of Malmesbury implies that King Alfred played the principal role in the ceremony of royal designation for Æthelstan. This further suggests that Alfred may have brokered a deal to ensure a future position for his grandson within Mercia, and by implication, within the overarching West Saxon polity, whilst also allowing Edward to re-marry in order to safeguard his family’s pre-eminence inside Wessex. If Æthelstan’s mother Ecgwynn was still alive when her son was set apart for kingship, this may have been a quid pro quo arrangement for her agreeing to step out of the political spotlight. Once divorced from Edward, there would have been no argument for raising the royal youngster outside Wessex since it would be expected Edward and his new bride would produce 

89 William’s statement that Æthelstan was thirty years of age at his accession is reminiscent of the age at which Christ began his ministry and was also the canonical age for the priesthood. Parallels with King Edgar’s ‘imperial’ coronation in 973 are also possible. Eric John, ‘The age of Edgar’, in James Campbell (ed.), The Anglo-Saxons (Harmondsworth, first published in 1982, 1991 reprint), pp. 160-191, at pp. 188-189 argued that Edgar’s ceremony in 973 inaugurated a new beginning and that this was a celebration of Edgar’s career as Christus Domini, the Lord’s Anointed. 
90 Janet L. Nelson, ‘Reconstructing a royal family: reflections on Alfred’, in Ian Wood and Neils Lund (eds.), People and Places in Northern Europe (Woodbridge, 1991), pp. 47-66, at p. 64. Contrast with Stafford, Unification and Conquest, p. 41, who has argued that Edward was behind Æthelstan’s Mercian upbringing. She has further suggested that this formed part of Edward’s policy to secure the West Saxon kingship for the first-born son of his new marriage and that Æthelstan may have ruled in Mercia as his father’s ‘underking’ between 918 and 924.
new heirs. While superficially, the prospect that Æthelstan was being groomed to inherit the vacant Mercian throne as early as the late 890s may seem either remarkably prescient or dynastically precarious, given that Edward had no other direct heirs at this juncture, in truth it was neither. By the 890s, Edward was a vigorous young prince and he would have been expected to father more male children by his new wife. Æthelstan’s Mercian upbringing, moreover, would end any future claims to Wessex by Æthelstan and the policy may have been designed with an intention that he was to rule Mercia as under-king to either his father or a more throne-worthy elder brother.\textsuperscript{91} If, on the other hand, Edward’s new union failed to produce additional male heirs, then Æthelstan, as the eldest son of the king, would have been well-placed to stake his royal claim in Wessex as well as in Mercia (as happened in 925 following the death of Æthelstan’s half-brother, Aelfweard). This was a low-risk dynastic strategy but one essential for the stability of the West Saxon dynasty at home and abroad in Mercia. This scheme helps to explain what could happen to an inconvenient eldest son when dynastic tensions dictated that drastic action was necessary. But, more importantly, it was also King Alfred’s way of ensuring that his eldest grandson would have a royal future in an uncertain, probably volatile, political climate.

\textsuperscript{91} Stafford, \textit{Unification and Conquest}, p. 41.
Edward the Elder and Winchester in the late ninth century

Alfred’s supervision of Æthelstan’s education and upbringing has frequently been commented upon but William of Malmesbury’s second claim that Edward may have prepared a will designating Æthelstan as his heir has fared less well. If Edward made a will it is no longer extant, but William’s assertion that King Edward made Æthelstan his heir to the kingship by will (testamento) is plausible. It suggests that Edward could have been involved in the creation of the policies involving his first-born son’s future accession. Ann Williams has, however, downplayed William’s statement and she has viewed Edward’s actions after 918 as essentially his protracted efforts to cement Wessex and Mercia together, and she further suggests, that these policies imply that Edward had no intention of dividing the extended kingdom. Edward, following Æthelred’s incapacity, however, allowed his sister Æthelflæd to dominate Mercian affairs – probably to encourage full Mercian co-operation with his military campaigns into the Danelaw from 910 onwards - and it was only at Æthelflæd’s death in 918 that Edward imposed his direct kingship upon the Mercians. If there was a binding agreement of compaternitas, following the spiritual adoption of Æthelstan, this could also conceivably account for some of Edward’s apparent reluctance to force the issue of direct governance over Mercian affairs while his sister lived. Once his sister had died, and her daughter Ælfwynn had been removed from the political sphere, however,

92 GR, ii. 133.
93 Ann Williams, ‘Some notes and considerations on problems connected with the English royal succession, 860-1066’, ANS 1 (1978), 144-167, at 150.
Edward could alter his policies to suit the new circumstances. Furthermore, the policies of the later-890s were possibly designed to restructure the Mercian kingdom while allowing Edward to regain the initiative within Wessex. By now the West Saxon polity had troubles nearer to home. As Patrick Wormald explained, Wessex, for all the rhetoric of the Alfredian texts, ‘was almost certainly a more loose-knit kingdom than the Chronicle retrospect makes out.’

The Alfredian polity found itself in a hazardous dynastic predicament in the 890s brought about by the terms of King Alfred’s will. The clause that caused the rifts inside the West Saxon kingdom in the 890s is described by Alfred himself. Upon the death of his brother Æthelberht in 866, Alfred met with his sole surviving brother Æthelred and between them they forged the following pact:

Then we were at an assembly at Swinbeorg and we [Alfred and his elder brother Æthelred] then agreed in the witness of the councillors of the West Saxons that whichever of us should live longer should grant to the other’s children the lands which we ourselves obtained and the lands which King Æthelwulf gave to us in Æthelbald’s lifetime, except those that he bequeathed to us three brothers. And each of us gave the other his pledge, that whichever of us should live longer should succeed both to lands and treasure and to all the other’s possessions, except the part which each of us had bequeathed to his children.

By entering into this agreement with Alfred, Æthelred at his death, all but disinherited his own children in favour of Alfred’s. At its simplest, King Alfred’s will, while not making any explicit reference to his eldest son as his preferred successor, relegated his

---

96 The opposite was of course true. Had Alfred died before his elder brother, his nephews, Æthelhelm and Æthelwold, would have been at the front of the succession race. Eric John, *Reassessing Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester, 1996), p. 72 described this clause as an early-medieval version of the eighteenth-century French legal construct known as a ‘tontine’. A tontine is an annuity scheme where the subscribers share in a common fund to the benefit of the last survivor.
nephews Æthelhelm and Æthelbald to the periphery of the succession. Alfred was aware of the enormity of this agreement and he later defended his actions amidst allegations that he had swindled his nephews out of their rightful inheritances, all this being performed in front of his witan at the unidentified site of Langanden. Producing King Æthelwulf’s will, Alfred made an impassioned appeal to his councillors against any perceived impropriety:

When it had been read, I urged then all for love of me – and gave them my pledge that I would never bear a grudge against any one of them because they declared what was right – that none of them would hesitate, either for love nor fear of me, to expound the common law, lest any man say that I treated my young kinsmen wrongfully, the older or the younger.

Once cleared of any wrongdoing, in essence, Alfred had succeeded in promoting the succession of Edward at the expense of the claims of his nephews. Alfred may have even instigated further measures to ensure Edward’s future succession. Barbara Yorke has suggested that as a child, Edward may have undergone a similar ceremony to the one William of Malmesbury described for Æthelstan, to stress Edward’s suitability to succeed his father as king of the West Saxons. This would have helped to distinguish Edward’s primary royal credentials against those of his (senior) cousins Æthelhelm and Æthelwold. Unfortunately, Yorke’s suggestion lacks firm evidence, but is bolstered by Edward’s subscription as rex in an original, or near contemporary, charter of his father’s dated to 898, from the archive of Rochester. Alternatively, when Alfred had

---

98 Miller, The Charters of The New Minster Winchester, 11. See also Keynes and Lapidge, Alfred, pp. 175 and 316, ns. 12-16.  
101 S 350.
his will drafted, probably between 886 and 888, he may have chosen merely to
designate Edward as his heir with the added insurance of generous provisions of land.\textsuperscript{102}
Alfred may not to have thought it necessary for him to bolster Edward’s claim even
further by resorting to an outwardly ritualistic display of intent. This could reflect the
period when Alfred’s powers were still in the ascendancy and he may have been
convinced that further demonstrations of his resolve were unnecessary, particularly
following the acceptance of his plea at \textit{Langden}. If Alfred did feel confident in his
ability to retain outright control over his eldest son’s royal destiny then it was a
conviction that would later prove misplaced. The terms of Alfred’s will may have been
generally agreed to in 886-8 but during the next decade frustration and possibly
dissatisfaction appear to have surfaced in some quarters of Wessex. This later
fermented into something much more dangerous and by the late-890s Alfred’s situation
had changed dramatically.\textsuperscript{103} There were now important factions opposed to his son’s
succession. The ceremony of designation for the young \textit{Æ} Ethelstan should be attributed
to the difficulties surrounding the coming transmission of the kingship from Alfred to
Edward. And, what is more, this ceremony might be reasonably approached as the
initial half of a two-pronged dynastic strategy.

The second half of this bilateral dynastic insurance policy concerned Edward’s
re-marriage and this too was an outcome of the internal disaffection inside Wessex.

\textsuperscript{102} For the possible dates when Alfred’s will was drawn up see Keynes and Lapidge, \textit{Alfred}, pp. 15-16;
172-3 and 313 and for a very informative map of the estates left to his nephews see p. 176. The most
likely date for the production of the will seems to be after 886. It must have been drawn up before the
death of Archbishop \textit{Æ} Ethelred, who according to the \textit{Chronicle} died on the 30\textsuperscript{th} June 888.
\textsuperscript{103} Abels, ‘Royal succession and the growth of political stability in ninth-century Wessex’, 96-97.
That plans were afoot for Edward to marry Ælfflæd while Æthelstan’s mother, Ecgwynn, was still alive is a distinct possibility. If William of Malmesbury’s description of Æthelstan’s childhood ceremony is taken seriously, then King Alfred had acknowledged that Edward’s marriage to Ecgwynn was not only legitimate, but had produced a royal son suitable for the elevation to kingship.⁴ Rumours that later surfaced suggesting that Ecgwynn was Edward’s concubine and her son, Æthelstan, illegitimate should be placed into the tenth-century context of royal succession to Edward’s kingship and the factionalism that blighted Æthelstan’s own succession in Wessex.⁵ Unfortunately, Ecgwynn remains an enigmatic character and even William of Malmesbury was unsure as to what should be made of a number of the stories surrounding her origins and status, and most may indeed be legendary.⁶ John of Worcester, on the other hand, wrote that Edward the Elder ‘had his first-born son Æthelstan by the most noble woman, Ecgwynn (ex muliere nobilissima Ecguwynna filium suum primogentum Æthelstanum).’⁷ The most contemporary information concerning Ecgwynn stems from the continent, however. The nun Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim (died c. 975), who at the request of the Abbess Gerberga II, niece of King Otto I, wrote the Gesta Ottonis, appears to have looked unfavourably upon Æthelstan’s mother. Hrotsvitha remarking upon the marriage of Edward the Elder’s daughter to Otto related that:

⁵ For concubinage, see Margaret Clunies Ross, ‘Concubinage in Anglo-Saxon England’, Past & Present 108 (1985), 3-34.
⁶ At different stages of William of Malmesbury’s narrative she was: a most illustrious woman, a concubine and the daughter of a shepherd. Apparently, there were a number of tales and ballads about Æthelstan and, according to Leland, some of these were still popular in the sixteenth century. See R. M. Wilson, The Lost Literature of Medieval England (2nd edition, London, 1970), pp. 42-43 and C. E. Wright, The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England (London, 1939), pp. 30-33.
⁷ JW, ii. s. a. 901.
For Edith, daughter of Edward [the Elder] the noble English king. She had remained at court after her father’s death while her brother carried the sceptre as king. A woman of humble birth bore the son to the king Edith, however, was the king’s noble wife’s child, while the brother’s mother came not of noble stock [generis mulier satis inferioris].

Hrotsvitha’s claim that Ecgwynn was socially inferior in comparison with Æthelstan’s half-sister Eadgyth may do nothing more than once again reflect the rivalry between the different strands of King Edward’s extended family. Wherever the truth lies about Ecgwynn’s social and marital status, Edward’s subsequent betrothal to a prestigious female from within the heartlands of the West Saxon kingdom is suggestive of some determined political manoeuvring inside the royal kin-group.

*Stabilisation in Wessex: the union between Edward and Ælfflæd*

Some time between the death of King Alfred in 899 and Edward’s coronation on 8 June 900 Edward married Ælfflæd. The union was an attempt to strengthen Edward’s position in the heartlands of Wessex and this is reflected in the choice of bride for Edward. According to William of Malmesbury, the bride’s father was Ethelmi comitis but this identification has occasioned some debate. Stafford has suggested that

---


111 *GR*, ii. 126.
Ælfflæd’s father may have been the ætheling Æthelhelm, Edward’s cousin, and the elder son of King Æthelred I, making this a union of political necessity and rapprochement.\(^{112}\) However, the closeness of kin between Edward and Ælfflæd makes Stafford’s suggestion less than persuasive; Edward and Ælfflæd were second cousins and thereby theoretically barred from marriage. Furthermore, if this was a match arranged to prevent conflict between the supporters of each of the æthelings Edward and Æthelwold (Æthelhelm himself most probably being dead by this time) it was a conspicuous failure. On the other hand, Yorke has made the case for Ealdorman Æthelhelm of Wiltshire.\(^{113}\) Æthelhelm of Wiltshire was a powerful and valued member of King Alfred’s inner-circle. He was entrusted by King Alfred to deliver the alms of the West Saxons to Rome in 887 and, according to the Chronicle, he died in 897.\(^{114}\) Æthelhelm of Wiltshire’s daughter would have provided the West Saxon dynasty with a marriage candidate for Edward from the heartlands of Wessex but from outside the polarised line of Cerdic. Out of the two suggestions, the most secure identification seems to be Ealdorman Æthelhelm of Wiltshire, whose daughter would have made an ideal choice of bride for Edward to stabilise the uneasy political situation inside Wessex.

One further possibility is suggestive that this match was most likely a politically-motivated product for the new union may have been sanctioned by the application of important rituals. Edward and his advisors may have adopted a radical

\(^{112}\) Pauline Stafford, Queens, Concubines and Dowagers, the King’s Wife in the Early Middle Ages (Atlanta and London, 1983), pp. 43-44 and Stafford, Unification and Conquest, p. 41.


\(^{114}\) ASC, 897 and Asser, ch. 86. Alfred granted Æthelhelm 10 hides at North Newton, Wiltshire in 892; see S 348.
approach to this new marriage and Ælfflæd may have been consecrated as queen.\textsuperscript{115}

These rituals were also indebted to Frankish procedures and viewed through the lens of Carolingian court politics, this was a further process of legitimisation that allowed Edward and his supporters the opportunity to bring nearer to fruition their preferred line of inheritance.\textsuperscript{116} Female consecration had been a well-founded political strategy from the reign of Pippin and the beginning of the Carolingian kingship in 751, although the process probably had even earlier origins.\textsuperscript{117} The consecration of queens was not merely the prerogative of the Carolingians, however, and the West Saxon line of King Alfred had experimented with consecrated queens before. As a tool for legitimacy it had great potential, but could also prove risky; an earlier female consecration had almost brought about the collapse of the extended West Saxon kingdom. This event was the celebrated (or notorious) marriage of King Æthelwulf to the Carolingian princess Judith.\textsuperscript{118} Although this marriage had forged closer ties between the West

\textsuperscript{115} Nelson, `The second English ordo', p. 367. For a fuller description of the rites of queen-making and the origins of female royal \textit{ordines} see Janet, L. Nelson, `Early medieval rites of queen-making and the shaping of medieval Queenship', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), \textit{Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe} (Woodbridge, 1995 reprinted 2002), pp. 301-315. Asser, chs. 12-17 may help us to date Edward’s marriage. King Alfred’s active distaste for queenship can be viewed through Asser’s intimate biography of the king. Alfred’s alleged contempt for this title of queen, along with the status it brought about, suggests that Alfred may have been dead before any inauguration ceremony for Ælfflæd as queen had been either agreed or implemented. Alternatively, Alfred may have had to defer to the court advisors and set aside his personal opinions about queens for the survival of his direct dynasty.

\textsuperscript{116} Janet L. Nelson, ‘The queen in ninth-century Wessex’, in Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (eds.), \textit{Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart} (Dublin, 2006), pp. 69-77, at p. 76. See also Henry A. Myors, in co-operation with Herwig Wolfram, \textit{Medieval Kingship} (Chicago, 1982), pp. 106-109 for the elevation of Pippin to the throne and that this event was sanctioned by Pippin’s wife Bertrada becoming queen ‘following the ancient \textit{ordo}.’


\textsuperscript{118} The royal \textit{ordo} used by Hincmar of Rheims in 856 has survived. See MGH Cap II. 296, 425-7. It is printed and discussed in Richard A. Jackson, ed. \textit{Ordines Coronationis Franciae: Texts and Ordines for the Coronation of Frankish and French Kings and Queens in the Middle Ages}, 2 vols. (Pennsylvania, 1995), i. 71-79. Judith’s exalted status can be confirmed within Wessex. She attests S 1274 as Judith
Saxons and the Carolingian kingship it had also brought with it acute dynastic tensions. West Saxon inheritance patterns had perhaps been changed only a couple of generations before Alfred achieved the kingship and had from then followed a fraternal rather than a filial route.\(^{119}\) A major part of this strategy had involved the downgrading of queens to the far less lofty status of king’s wife. This lessened the probability of internal conflict between throne-worthy \textit{æthelings} and also reduced the chances of minority rulership.\(^{120}\)

The arrival of Judith challenged the eventual nature of West Saxon succession. The Judith episode had previously fermented discontent and brought insurrection to Wessex and these tensions between Alfred and his brothers continued within their offspring, both before and after King Alfred’s death.\(^{121}\) Despite the past problems associated with Judith’s exalted royal status, her earlier consecration as queen now provided the catalyst for Edward’s actions.

If Edward needed something special to stabilise his power within Wessex, then the consecration of his new wife Ælfflæd provided the key. Although Joanna Story has suggested that restricting the status of the king’s wife was a ‘policy pursued most vigorously by Æthelwulf’s own dynasty’, this interpretation rests on Asser’s account of

\(^{119}\) Asser, chs. 13-15. See Janet L. Nelson, ‘A king across the sea: Alfred in continental perspective’, \textit{TRHS} 5\textsuperscript{th} Series 36 (1986), 45-68, at 55. Asser’s tale, as allegedly told to him by King Alfred, concerns the supposedly wicked Eadburh, wife of King Beorhtric of Wessex. The marriage took place in 789 and had seemingly profound political implications for the West Saxon kingdom. Beorhtric married Offa’s daughter and cemented an alliance between the two kingdoms. The alliance was partly precipitated by the threat to both Beorhtric and Offa from Ecgberht. See Keynes and Lapidge, \textit{Alfred}, p. 236, n. 30.

\(^{120}\) Stafford, ‘The king’s wife in Wessex’, 49.

\(^{121}\) Anton Scharer, ‘König Alfreds Hof und die Geschichtsschreibung’, in Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelerreiter (eds.), \textit{Historiographie im Frühen Mittelalter} (Munich, 1994), pp. 443-458, at p. 448 has suggested that although Judith was a very prestigious marital catch, the line of Cerdic in the \textit{Chronicle} is strictly male.
King Alfred’s apparent personal antipathy towards queenship.\textsuperscript{122} When Alfred’s elder brother King Æthelred granted land in Hampshire in 868, the charter recording this transaction reveals that it was attested by Wulfthryth *regina*.\textsuperscript{123} From this charter it is possible to demonstrate that Æthelred did not view the consecration and elevation of a king’s wife to the status of queen as negatively as his younger brother Alfred may have done. As a result, Æthelred’s sons Æthelhelm and Æthelwold appear to have been born of a consecrated queen and may have been considered by some to be more throne-worthy than was Edward himself.\textsuperscript{124} If Edward’s union with Ælfflæd included her consecration as queen this was to redress the dynastic imbalance for the continuation of King Alfred and Edward’s direct line. Edward’s new marriage enhanced his own status within Wessex and respectively the royal eminence of any male descendants from this consecrated union. Once Ælfflæd’s ordination as queen had been completed, any subsequent male children would be the sons of a ruling king and a consecrated queen and may be said to have been born *porphyrogenitus*. Edward’s marriage to Ælfflæd effectively downgraded Ecgwynn, whatever her previous social status may have been, and consequently relegated Æthelstan behind any male offspring of this new union with regards to the West Saxon kingship. At the death of Edward, the first male child of this new union, Ælfweard, was chosen to rule in Wessex ahead of his older half-brother Æthelstan. Ælfweard’s election as king of the West Saxons is indicated by two versions of the West Saxon genealogical regnal list and substantiated by the *Liber Vitae* of Hyde


\textsuperscript{123} S 340.

\textsuperscript{124} Yorke, *Edward as ætheling*, p. 31.
Abbey. 125 It may even have been Ælfweard – miscopied as Ælfredus - who the compiler of the book of Hyde Abbey alleges was elected in Wessex during King Edward’s lifetime (regalibus infulis redimitus). 126

On 8 June 900 Edward the Elder’s coronation took place, probably at Winchester where Edward most needed to demonstrate his royal authority. Felix Liebermann was of the opinion that Winchester was the site of Edward’s coronation and he suggested that this location is reflected in the charter evidence and in Edward’s itinerary. 127 It may even be that Edward’s new religious foundation at New Minster Winchester provided the ceremonial site for his coronation. Although the foundation of the New Minster at Winchester is dated to 901, it appears that part of the new church was already functioning by the time of Alfred’s death. A charter of Edward’s, dated to 901, suggests that King Alfred’s body was already buried there, perhaps in the wind-

125 Ælfweard’s kingship of the West Saxons depends upon his inclusion in a West Saxon regnal list embedded in the Textus Roffensis and a remark in the Liber Vitae of Hyde Abbey. For the regnal list see David N. Dumville, ‘The West Saxon Genealogical Regnal List; manuscripts and texts’, Anglia Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie 103 (1985), 1-32, at 29. Ælfweard is allotted four weeks as king. For comments on the Kentish background to the Textus Roffensis see Patrick Wormald, ‘Laga Eadwardi: the Textus Roffensis and its context’, in his Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image and Experience (London and Rio Grande, 1999), pp. 115-138, at p. 117, ‘if the cartulary clearly treasured Rochester’s memory of its proud past, the laws did as much for the kingdoms of Kent and England, whose rulers in Church and State were duly enrolled besides those of the ancient Christian patriarchs and of the Roman Empire.’ For the comments in the Liber Vitae of Hyde Abbey see Walter de Gray Birch, ed. Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey Winchester, Hampshire Record Society (London, 1892), p. 6. [Eadwerdum] duo pignora filiorum, Æbeluwerdus ... atque Æfuuerdus ... in sepupturae consortio secuti sunt; quorum unus clito, alter uero regalibus infulis redimitus, immatura ambo morte preuenti sunt.

126 Birch, Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey, p. 113. See C. Plummer and J. Earle, Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892-9), ii. 121. However, Smyth, King Alfred the Great, at p. 440, suggested that Ælfredus may have been Æthelstan’s half-brother or cousin and may have been the Alfred who led the alleged rebellion against Æthelstan as related by William of Malmesbury.

The New Minster may have begun providing Edward with some of the religious practicalities he required at the time of his coronation. Keynes is, however, convinced that Edward the Elder's coronation took place at Kingston upon Thames and has argued that:

It came to pass however, that on Whitsunday (8 June), in the year 900, the great and the good of the land gathered together for Edward's coronation. It would have been this event, more than any other stage in the king-making process, that symbolised the reassertion of the Alfredian kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons. The event itself took place at Kingston-Upon-Thames in Surrey. ¹²⁹

This argument is based entirely upon a questionable statement by Ralph de Diceto. ¹³⁰

Some years earlier Keynes had been much less enthusiastic about the reliability of Ralph de Diceto as a source for Edward's coronation:

The references to the coronations of Æthelstan, Eadred and Æthelred suffice to establish that kings were often crowned at Kingston in the tenth century, but one suspects that post-Conquest historians tended to assume that all tenth-century kings were crowned there (unless otherwise stated, as it were); thus, e.g., Ralph de Diceto's statements may be no more than assumptions. ¹³¹

Without supporting evidence, Ralph's statement is no more reliable now than it was in 1980, leaving Æthelstan's ceremony as the first such event that can be securely located at Kingston. Unfortunately, we have no available evidence as to the location, or locations, of the initiation ceremonies of Æthelwulf, Æthelbald, Æthelberht or Alfred either. Taking into account the mention of Kingston in the charter of 838, where Æthelwulf may have been designated as heir in his father's lifetime, it could be that this setting had provided the West Saxon dynasty with a geographical site for other

¹²⁸ Miller, The Charters of The New Minster, Winchester, no. 4, 29, for the reference to King Alfred's body and no. 2, 16 for the reference to the wind-church. As Miller points out, although the information contained within the charter about King Alfred's body contradicts the Liber Vitae of the New Minster, the latter document is not always trustworthy.
¹³¹ Simon Keynes, The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'The Unready' 978-1016 (Cambridge, 1980), p. 270, n. 6. The italics are those of Professor Keynes and not my additions.
ceremonies. But it is equally possible that no actual royal king-making ceremony took place at Kingston before Edward’s eldest son Æthelstan was crowned there. Keynes has argued that Edward the Elder’s Kingston ceremony reflected the importance of the River Thames in the construction of the Alfredian ‘Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons’ and that geographically it echoed the political union of Wessex and Mercia. However, at the death of King Alfred, Edward was in far greater need of a conspicuous exhibition legitimising his right to rule over his father’s kingship in Wessex than he was within Mercia. The policies created in the 880s and 890s had stabilised much of the situation inside Mercia. The political circumstances in Wessex were far more pressing and a much likelier location for Edward’s coronation is surely Winchester. A charter of 901 reflects the precarious state of affairs that Edward found himself in at this time, needing to stress his right to West Saxon kingship rather than pursuing further claims to dominate an extended West Saxon and Mercian polity. The royal style adopted by Edward in this diploma is unusual for him. Edward subscribes as rex Saxonum and Sean Miller has suggested that the title – one of the styles used by Alfred and perhaps even earlier by Æthelred – is ‘appropriate for Edward at the beginning of his reign.’ There were political difficulties that required Edward to make his royal presence felt inside Wessex. This was a time when, to borrow the seminal phrase of Kenneth Harrison, hungry aethelings had indeed begun to prowl.

132 See the comments by Wormald, ‘Living with King Alfred’, at 3-4.
133 Miller, The charters of the New Minster Winchester, 28, the charter is no. 4.
The Battle of the Holme

Shortly following Edward's coronation his disinherited cousin Æthelwold made his initial play for power. The ensuing rebellion against Edward the Elder reached its crescendo in 903 at the unidentified site known as the Battle of the Holme. The rebellion was downplayed by the author of the 'A' manuscript which was textually refined to justify Edward's rightful kingship. The more contemporary 'B' text, however, relates that Æthelwold was acclaimed as king by the Northumbrians which, crucially, is ignored by the Winchester revisionist. Æthelwold's revolt and its repercussions, both realised and hypothetical, may have been underestimated by some modern commentators. This imbalance has now been partly rectified, most notably by James Campbell, who has recently made a point of elaborating that the battle formed a watershed in tenth-century English political and social history:

Had it not been for the chances of battle and of war Æthelwold might very well have been regarded as one of the greatest figures in our island's story. Not only would tenth-century history have been entirely different; our interpretation of ninth-century history would have been very largely different also. Granted the strong bias of the Chronicle in favour of Alfred and Edward, for the drastic events of Æthelwold's rebellion to have squeezed themselves in is in itself a mighty tribute to their importance. ... What the annals seem to be telling us is that in the years immediately after 899, the major influence towards the unification of England was not Alfred's son Edward, but his nephew Æthelwold. Had Æthelwold won the battle in which he was, as it happened killed, England could, we may fairly guess, have been united in a different manner, involving much less warfare than ultimately proved to be the case.

Campbell's points are well made. However, it was not merely the West Saxon kingship that was at issue during this engagement. The composition of Æthelwold's army at the Holme encompassed the whole of the Danelaw, including a possible

137 Hart, The Danelaw, p. 514.
pretender to the Mercian throne and it is indeed unsurprising that the Mercian Register only refers to Æthelwold’s army collectively as ‘Danes.’¹³⁹ The list of those followers of Æthelwold who fell in the battle included ‘Brihtsige, son of the ætheling Beornoth.’¹⁴⁰ These two have been almost certainly identified as members of the Mercian high-aristocracy.¹⁴¹ It may even be that Brihtsige was a disaffected scion of the former Mercian royal line, perhaps, as Stenton suggested, a landless one.¹⁴² The northern annalist thought that the death of Brihtsige of such consequence that it forms the entire entry for 902 and, based upon this cumulative evidence, the Mercian was of some considerable importance.¹⁴³ Brihtsige’s death, fighting alongside Æthelwold at the Holme also ‘serves as a reminder that some Mercians may well have resented the imperial pretensions of West Saxon rulers.’¹⁴⁴ Whether West Saxon policies should be described as ‘imperial’ by this date is debatable but there may have been a significant number of Mercians who objected to the growing West Saxon influences within Mercia. Both Æthelwold and Brihtsige had much to fight for and it is conceivable that the latter was not so much fighting to help Æthelwold gain the West Saxon throne, but was rebelling against those policies constructed to protect West Saxon influences within Mercia. Brihtsige’s participation, alongside Æthelwold and against King Edward, raises

¹³⁹ ASC, Mercian Register, 903; see Hart, The Danelaw, pp. 514-515.
¹⁴⁰ ASC, 903.
¹⁴¹ Beornoth may have been the dux who witnessed charters for King Burgred and his son Brihtsige may be the same person as a certain Beortsgie who attested charters for King Alfred and King Edward. See Dumville, ‘The ætheling’, 12, n. 1.
the possibility that the ceremonial verification of Æthelstan's future kingship may not have found universal acceptance within the ranks of the Mercian nobility. It may be that Brihtsige became disenchanted because Æthelstan's ceremony confirmed West Saxon primacy over Mercian affairs into the next generation. This may help to explain his defection into the Danelaw and enrolment in Æthelwold's revolt.
Chapter Six:

Family Politics in Regional Contexts: the Obstacles to Æthelstan’s Creation of a Greater Wessex

King Æthelstan, lord of nobles, dispenser of treasure to men, and his brother also, Edmund ætheling, won by the sword’s edge undying glory in battle around Brunanburh.¹

Edward the Elder died on 17 July 924 and his eldest son Æthelstan eventually underwent a troubled accession to the composite realm of Wessex and Mercia.² All the complex political manipulation that went on within the Alfredian, and later the Edwardian polities, to ensure a smooth transmission of power at Edward’s death, in the end came to nought. The Edwardian Chronicle’s terse evaluation of the events of 924 (when ‘King Edward died and his son Æthelstan succeeded to the kingdom’) shrouds the machinations that accompanied Æthelstan’s succession to the West Saxon throne.³ It was never Edward’s intention that his eldest son Æthelstan should succeed to the kingship of Wessex; it was to be his younger son Ælfweard, the eldest son of his second marriage, who was to have become king there. Unfortunately for the Winchester establishment, this agreed line of succession only lasted for a brief period of time. Ælfweard died ‘very soon’ after his father, according to the Mercian Register and the ‘D’ text of the Chronicle, reports that this occurred just sixteen days after Edward’s death.⁴ Ælfweard’s premature demise meant

¹ ASC, 937.
³ ASC, 924.
that Æthelstan now had the opportunity to re-unite both kingdoms and replicate the polity achieved by his grandfather King Alfred and maintained, albeit after granting his sister and her Mercian aristocracy a degree of self-determination, by his father King Edward. Following the death of Edward’s sister Æthelflæd, and the marginalisation of her daughter Ælfwynn in 918, the king had assumed direct control of Mercia, creating once more a single integrated kingdom of Wessex and Mercia. But Æthelstan’s election in Mercia and Ælfweard’s elevation in Wessex suggest that Edward had kept to the succession route seemingly mapped out when the young Æthelstan was set apart for kingship within Mercia. Following his father’s death, Æthelstan may have been, therefore, secure inside Mercia but within Wessex it was quite a different story and he appears to have had to suppress opposition at Winchester before he could claim his right to his father’s West Saxon kingdom. Æthelstan may then be viewed as a peripheral figure in West Saxon internal politics. Although part of the West Saxon dynasty, his Mercian background seems to have proved sufficient to set him apart from the Winchester establishment.

5 See chapter 5 of this thesis.
6 Sarah Foot, ‘Æthelstan (893-4-939), Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/833?docPos=2 [accessed 14th November 2006] has suggested that Æthelstan was something of an ‘outsider’ at the West Saxon court and her further observations that the bishop of Winchester does not seem to have attended Æthelstan’s coronation at Kingston in 925 or indeed attested any royal diplomas of the following year should be noted.
Æthelstan: king in Mercia and Wessex

Æthelstan’s Mercian election is corroborated by another contemporary source not just the Mercian Register. An authentic Mercian charter from 925 likewise suggests that Æthelstan was acclaimed as king in Mercia before eventually succeeding to the throne of Wessex after the death of his half-brother Ælfweard. Based on the stated regnal years of Æthelstan’s charters, Armitage Robinson suggested that Æthelstan was ‘first of all, and probably without demur in 924’, elected as king by the Mercian witan.8 Even in its current truncated form, this diploma of 925 is an impressive document, witnessed by fifty-seven attesters, not including four Mercian bishops and Abbot Cynath of Evesham; for Robinson, this document demonstrated that Æthelstan presided over a great Mercian assembly held without the West Saxon bishops being in attendance and he further argued that:

We may well set it side by side with the statement that Athelstan “was chosen to be king by the Mercians”. It is even possible that it was at this very assembly that his claims were accepted, and that is what is referred to in the strange reference to the “matter of discussed obedience (ventilatae obedientiae causam)?” 9

The clause containing the phrase ‘matter of discussed obedience’ (ventilatae obedientiae causam) also finds its reflection in Æthelstan’s descriptive title of ‘I Æthelstan, King of the English and supervisor of the Christian household of the whole region well-nigh in the whirlpools of cataclysms’ (ego Æthelstan diuina indulgente clemencia rex Anglorum tociusque climatis ferme cataclismatum gurgitibus Cristiane patrigene preuisor). Both the charter phrase and Æthelstan’s regnal style may be not-so-veiled allusions to the political

9 Ibid., p. 45. Abbot Cynath was a member of the Worcester familia under Bishop Wærferth and he appears as such from 899 on. The charter is S 395; Charters of Burton Abbey, ed. P. H. Sawyer (Oxford, 1979), no. 2.
turmoil that accompanied Æthelstan in the year of his acceptance as king.\textsuperscript{10} Both may also be regarded as indicative of Æthelstan’s personal circumstances and are statements of political intent. The charter preamble and its related ‘matter of discussed obedience’ can be paralleled politically with the Chronicle entries for the 886 Mercian acceptance of Alfred as king in London, and Edward the Elder’s acclamation as ‘father and lord’ by non-West Saxons in 920.\textsuperscript{11} Like these Chronicle declarations, Æthelstan’s charter displays a similar politically-inspired vocabulary of aspiration and assimilation, but also like the Chronicle accounts of 886 and 920, this is not necessarily the language of submission.\textsuperscript{12} Æthelstan’s unusual regnal style of rex Anglorum should, therefore, also be approached from the perspective of Mercian and West Saxon unity. Given his original Mercian acclamation, Æthelstan might have been expected to have been styled as rex Merciorum, but as far as can be determined, he never was. The Mercian royal title had remained dormant since the

\textsuperscript{10} S 395; see Keynes, ‘England, c.900-1016’, 468.

\textsuperscript{11} Ann Williams, ‘Some notes and considerations on problems connected with the English royal succession, 860-1066’, ANS 1 (1978), 144-167151 and 228, n. 41.

\textsuperscript{12} For a traditional interpretation of Edward’s actions in 920 see F. T. Wainwright, ‘The submission to Edward the Elder’, in H. P. R. Finberg (ed.), Scandinavian England: Collected Papers by F. T. Wainwright (Chichester, 1975), pp. 325-344, but note the recent revision of his thesis by M. R. Davidson, ‘The (non) submission of the northern kings’, in N. J. Higham and D. H. Hill (eds.), Edward The Elder 899-924 (London, 2001), pp. 200-211 at p. 204 who has suggested that the Chronicle account should be partially interpreted from a Mercian perspective, including the political situation facing the West Saxons in that region. Æthelstan’s alliance with Ragnald after Edward’s death clearly demonstrates the complexities involved. Æthelstan gave Ragnald his sister’s hand in marriage and it was only at the death of the Dane that Æthelstan took his claims to an extended kingship further. See Dorothy Whitelock, ‘The dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the tenth and eleventh centuries’, in Peter Clemoes (ed.), The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickens (London, 1959), pp. 70-88, at p. 71. Timothy Reuter, ‘The making of England and Germany, 850-1050: points of comparison and difference’, in A. P. Smyth (ed.), Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe (London, 1998), pp. 53-70, at p. 57 also pointed out that although the tenth-century West Saxon kings had imperial pretensions, they also resorted to ‘cajolery and alliance’ where necessary.
reign of Ceolwulf II but it had not lost its potency. In 957, King Edgar would be elected by the Mercians and acclaimed as rex Merciorum in his early charters. Moreover, ‘supervisor of the Christian household of the whole region’ suggests that this was an interim charter possibly issued after Ælfweard’s death, but before Æthelstan’s Kingston coronation, and Æthelstan was stating his intentions to claim West Saxon primacy and add this to his Mercian kingship. Here Æthelstan was appealing to his Mercian witan for their support when claiming the whole of his father’s extended kingship. Æthelstan’s Mercian accession may have been assured, but if he were to become king in Wessex as well, he would need additional allies to achieve his objective and this is reflected in the location of Æthelstan’s coronation.

According to the Mercian Register, Kingston upon Thames in Surrey was chosen for Æthelstan’s consecration. By choosing Kingston, the Mercian nobility were proclaiming Æthelstan to be their king, but since the site was outside their traditional territorial ambit, it remains possible that Kingston was Æthelstan’s second coronation. Sir James Ramsey argued for two individual ceremonies, and, what is more, he additionally suggested that Æthelstan’s ‘enthronement at Kingston could only apply, in the first instance

---

13 It is conceivable that Ealdorman Æthelred may have used the title of rex Merciorum before his renouncement of the kingship following his and King Alfred’s political arrangements in the late 880s. However, if he used the title in any documents, they have not survived. See chapter four of this thesis.

14 See S 667; S 675 and S 677.

at any rate, to the kingdom of Mercia.\textsuperscript{16} Whilst the first observation is credible, the second seems unlikely.\textsuperscript{17} Both Charles Plummer and Murray Beavan disagreed with Ramsey’s second conclusion and they both suggested that Kingston was not even on the Mercian/West Saxon border at this time, let alone inside the kingdom of the Mercians.\textsuperscript{18} Æthelstan’s Kingston ceremony conceivably reflects an attempt at dynastic solidarity rather than purely geographical considerations. If Æthelstan’s coronation at Kingston was the first to take place there, it may have set a precedent to be followed by Eadred, Eadwig and Æthelred, who would all mirror Æthelstan’s ceremony at Kingston, as they attempted to become personally associated with the inherited virtus of Æthelstan’s later reputation.\textsuperscript{19} As a coronation site, Kingston is a reflection of the dynastic complications that confronted Æthelstan in 925 and there was a deep-rooted political dimension to his ceremony. Unable to make progress into the heart of Wessex, Æthelstan, or his advisors, chose Kingston, possibly for a second coronation, because of its past associations with the direct West Saxon lineage of King Ecgberht. Kingston invoked the remembrances of an earlier assembly of great consequence for the West Saxon royal line. In 838 Kingston had been the site of the pact of eternal friendship between the direct descendants of Ecgberht,\textsuperscript{16}\\textsuperscript{17} Sir James H. Ramsey, \textit{The Foundations of England. Or Twelve Centuries of British History B.C. 55 - A.D. 1154}, 2 vols. (London, 1898), ii. 281-282.\\textsuperscript{18} C. Plummer and J. Earle, \textit{Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel}, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892 and 1899), ii. 133 and Beavan, ‘The regnal dates’, 523.\\textsuperscript{19} I have argued in chapter five, that the statement made by Ralph de Diceto, \textit{Opera Historica: The Historical Works of Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London}, ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1876), i. 140, that Edward the Elder was crowned at Kingston, is not altogether reliable.
Æthelwulf and the see of Canterbury.²⁰ It was during this Kingston assembly in 838 that Æthelwulf was sponsored as the direct heir to the kingship of his father, Ecgberht. This pact (discussed at length in chapter one of this thesis) seems to have been still functioning by 898 and Edward had probably been installed by King Alfred as subregulus over Kent and the south east. However, at King Edward’s death, it seems apparent that Æthelstan needed support from somewhere other than inside Mercia if he was to win the West Saxon kingship. The choice of Kingston as the venue for this coronation, coupled with the possibility that Æthelhelm, the Archbishop of Canterbury, performed the ceremony, suggests that Æthelstan was making a visible statement of intent to gather additional, but especially Kentish, allies to his cause.²¹ Æthelstan was demonstrating here that he was unquestionably the eldest son of Edward the Elder and was directly descended from King Ecgberht himself, meaning that Æthelstan was the one true legitimate heir to the throne of Wessex.


²¹ JW, s.a. 924, is the source of the information that Æthelhelm performed the ceremony. For Æthelhelm see http://eagle.cch.kcl.ac.uk:8080/pase/offices/index.html [accessed 20th Dec 06].
On the 4th September 925 Æthelstan was acclaimed king at Kingston upon Thames. His succession to the West Saxon kingship may have been celebrated by the unveiling of a brand new royal ordo, reflecting both the difficulties of his accession and the political uncertainties surrounding his future kingship. At some point in the tenth century a new coronation order, commonly known as the Second English Ordo came into being, but just when this happened has been the subject of a prolonged historiographical debate. If we could get closer to why the Second English Ordo was composed, for whom it was created, and who may have actually used it, this may foster a greater appreciation of how West Saxon expansion was accomplished, for coronation rituals could perform a vital role in defining the aspirations of kingship. The importance of royal ordines has long been recognised, as has the notion that they functioned on a number of different levels. The rationale behind a king’s exposure to the drama of coronation rituals was encapsulated by David Warner when he suggested that ‘aside from demonstrating the ideological foundations of monarchy, the constant repetition of familiar acts and gestures provided visual continuity between generations of rulers and endowed government itself with a degree of objectivity.’ Warner’s remark about objectivity is appropriate since inauguration rituals could also quell political uncertainty and by so doing they could underpin successful kingship. As Janet Nelson has explained, ‘a man might be born king-

---
worthy, but he had to be made a king’; the inauguration rituals associated with legitimate kingship may have ‘indicated publicly the victor of a power struggle.’ Nelson’s comments are non-specific, but an examination of the early years of Æthelstan’s reign suggests that the application of formalised rituals did not always signal a complete cessation of internal discord, no matter what was intended. Æthelstan’s path to ultimate West Saxon acceptance was both lengthy and arduous and his coronation at Kingston neither ended speculation nor protected him from further dynastic conflict. A number of sources indicate that there was initial hostility towards Æthelstan at Winchester, with some of this material additionally suggesting that this antipathy endured throughout a considerable period of his reign and was only extinguished in 933. Identifying what rituals accompanied Æthelstan at his accession may, therefore, help to explain more about this enmity and how it developed. It may also help to establish how much dissension there was within a key faction of the West Saxon establishment following the collapse of Edward the Elder’s planned succession strategy, and this may, in turn, provide additional information about Æthelstan’s inheritance. For, while Æthelstan succeeded to the extended kingdom of Wessex in 925, that he did so was clearly by accident rather than by design.

The study of royal ordines in England and how they are connected to those in use on the continent owes much to the pioneering work of Percy Ernst Schramm. Schramm

argued that the Second English Ordo was composed for King Edgar’s coronation in 973 and stemmed from the environment of Benedictine monasticism. In comparatively recent times, however, Schramm’s dating of the Second English Ordo has been questioned and its origins moved to the first quarter of the tenth century. Derek Turner’s fundamental conclusion established that the ordo was composed long before Schramm’s dating of the 960s and ‘in its original form, would therefore presumably have been in use at least at Athelstan’s own coronation on 4th September 925.’ Turner’s findings were mirrored by those of Christopher Hohler whose examination of the Sacramentary of Ratoldus, which contains the earliest adaptations of the Second English Ordo, suggested a number of further conclusions about the origins of the ordo itself. One of the most important of these was that the Sacramentary of Ratoldus provides evidence for numerous links between England and the continent in the tenth century, and in particular, of the relationship between the West Saxon kings and Brittany. Hohler suggested that this text, although inspired by Ratoldus the abbot of Corbie (c. 972-986) and put together in the third or fourth quarter of the tenth century, contains a much earlier English pontifical that was adapted by exiled

members of the Dol community in the 930s. As Hohler noted, the only kings who held known diplomatic ties with the region were Edward the Elder and Æthelstan and out of the two he favoured Æthelstan as the inspiration behind the composition of the new ordo. Hohler’s suggested connection between the exiled Dol canons and the sacramentary was challenged but his additional proposal that Æthelstan was the first king to make use of the order has, until recently, proved less contentious. For example, Michael Richter has advocated a different origin for the Ratoldus text, that of Saint-Vaast, but he agreed with Hohler and Turner that the ordo was associable with King Æthelstan’s coronation.

For some while it seemed conclusive that the new ordo was first used for King Æthelstan’s coronation but this identification has now been disputed. Nelson, who has convincingly demonstrated that the ordo actually originated in the late ninth century rather than in the tenth, made a case that it may have been first used for the occasion of King Edward the Elder’s coronation in 900. This suggestion was followed up by Simon Keynes and he has also argued that the new ordo accompanied Edward’s coronation. In contrast, Nicholas Orchard has suggested that Turner and Hohler may well have been correct and that the Second English Ordo was drawn up for Æthelstan remains, according

28 Orchard, The Sacramentary of Ratoldus, xxix-xxxi, has demonstrated that the Dol canons came by their sacramentary not at Dol, as argued by Hohler, but at Paris. Orchard has also demonstrated that Hohler was correct in distancing the sacramentary from St-Vaast.
29 Hohler, ‘Some service books’, p. 69.
to Orchard, 'a compelling possibility.'

The arguments surrounding the first use of this ordo have been presented as a straightforward alternative between Edward and his son Æthelstan. This is rather misleading, however, since there are two separate questions that need addressing here. First, for which king was the Second English Ordo written? Second, which king actually made use of it? The answers to these two questions are not necessarily the same.

Some years ago the suggestion was made that 'the typical coronation ceremony appears as if written, not for a particular king or kingdom, but for any Christian king.' However, this is not quite so. There are linguistic features embedded within the liturgies of some ordines that enable chronological parameters to be set. By examining the language of certain ordines, individual kings can be either placed inside these limits or left outside a broadly secure chronological framework. As far as the Second English Ordo is concerned the earliest extremity seems to be the late-880s when Grimbald arrived in England from Rheims to join King Alfred's court-circle. Extracts from two new prayers embedded

---

33 The Leofric Missal, ed. Nicholas Orchard, Henry Bradshaw Society, 2 vols. (London, 2001-2002), i. 98-105, at 100 and n. 237. Orchard has noted Nelson's comment that the ordo may have been composed for King Alfred's benefit.

34 Ward, 'The coronation ceremony', 161. However, see C. A. Bouman, Sacring and Crowning: the Development of the Latin Ritual for the Anointing of Kings and the Coronation of an Emperor before the Eleventh Century (Groningen and Djakata, 1957), at p. 15. Whilst observing the manuscript of the Egbert Pontifical, Bouman noted that the actual name of 'some deceased king' may have been erased by the scribe in question.

35 Nelson, 'The second English Ordo', p. 365 has suggested that the Second English Ordo may have been originally composed for King Alfred's benefit. As she points out, the relevant West Frankish material may have been available at the West Saxon court at any time following the arrival of Grimbald in the late-880s. This does not, of course, mean that it was. However, as M. B. Parkes, 'The palaeography of the Parker manuscript of the Chronicle, laws and Sedulius, and historiography at Winchester in the late ninth and tenth centuries', ASE 5 (1976), 149-171, at 165-169 has argued, Grimbald's links with the scriptorium at Rheims may have meant that he was conversant with Frankish rites of ordination.
within the text, apparently stressing the role of a son succeeding to a realm comprised of two separate peoples and doing so directly from a successful father, set the upper limits. *Omnipotens sempiterne deus creator ac gubernator*, was recited as the king was about to be anointed, and *Sta et retine*, was read out as the king was actually enthroned.36 The first of these prayers contains the following phrase ‘*per longum uitae spatium paternae apicem gloriae tua miseratione unatim stabilire et gubernare*’ and this is generally interpreted together with the additional requirement within the prayer of ‘*utrorumque horum populorum*’. Overall the language suggests that this prayer may have been composed to stabilise a particular political situation and provide more secure governance for a new union created through the amalgamation of two separate peoples. Whereas ‘*amando quem hucusque paterna suggestione tenuista hereditario iure tibi delegatum*’ contained with the second new prayer, additionally indicates that the new *ordo* was produced for the succession of a king who directly followed a triumphant father on to the throne.37

Within the datable parameters of the *ordo*, only Edward and Æthelstan appeared to fulfil the necessary requirements. Nelson, reconstructing the *ordo*, expressed her opinion that the:

three references to two peoples supported by the additions *pariter, ultrique*, and finally the passage referring to “the apex of paternal glory” and “stabilising and governing [it] unitedly”. This last passage seems to refer to the making permanent of a political union, and – if we press a literal reading – one that was achieved by the father of the king for whose coronation the new passage was designed. Given the frequency of fraternal succession in the ninth and tenth centuries in England, the allusion would have more point if the king in question were

36 The prayers can be found in Orchard, *The Sacramentary of Ratoldus*, 49-50 and 54.
37 Turner, *The Claudius Pontifical*, xxxi-xxxiii. Schramm’s interpretation of the above phrase led him to place the *ordo* with King Edgar’s coronation.
For Nelson, Edward seemed the logical candidate on two counts. First, the emphasis placed upon unity between two peoples within the ordo, suggested to her, that Edward, who inherited the composite realm of Wessex and Mercia from King Alfred, best fitted this criterion. Second, the existence of a queen’s ordo, which accompanies the Second English Ordo in all the manuscripts, implied that this may have been composed specifically for the consecration of Edward’s second wife, Ælfflaed, thereby ruling out Æthelstan on the grounds that he remained (as far as can be ascertained) unmarried. Lately these arguments have been developed and set into a broader political framework, and it has now been additionally suggested that this new ordo was composed primarily because it ‘gave expression to the political and ideological developments taking place throughout the period’ of the end of the ninth century. The language of the new ordo, and its shift in emphasis to the setting upon the throne of a king who would be ‘supported by the subjection of both peoples’, suggested to Keynes that ‘the ordo itself takes us to the heart of the Alfredian conception of the Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons.’ For both Nelson and for Keynes the Second English Ordo thereby reflected the union of Wessex and Mercia, originally orchestrated by Alfred in around 886, and subsequently bequeathed to his son Edward. However, the arguments that Edward’s coronation was sealed by this new royal

41 Ibid., pp. 48 and 49. The italics are those of Professor Keynes.
ordo are not watertight and a vigorous defence of the earlier suggestion that the ordo was first deployed at King Æthelstan’s coronation can be mounted.

At the core of the revisionist argument is the formulation of the prayer emphasising the governance of ‘of both these peoples’ (utrorumque horum populorum) and that the Second English Ordo was specifically prepared for the coronation of Edward the Elder is dependent upon how this linguistic evidence is interpreted. One king who inherited his royal authority directly from a celebrated father during the period of 860 to 1000 is, however, missing from Nelson’s analysis.42 The possibility that the new ordo was initially composed for the coronation of Edward’s second son, Ælfweard, has been overlooked. Why this should be so is unclear because it has generally been agreed that Ælfweard was intended to succeed Edward in Wessex with his half-brother Æthelstan succeeding to the kingship in Mercia. So it might be that Edward had anticipated that his favoured son Ælfweard would inherit the combined authority over two separate peoples and not just one.

The Second English Ordo and West Saxon influence over Kent

An alternative explanation for the apparent language of unification embedded within this new ordo is possible. With its allusions to ruling over two separate peoples, the relevant

---

42 Nelson, ‘The second English Ordo, p. 365. The third king that succeeded directly from his father, according to Nelson’s list, was Edward the Martyr.
prayer may form a direct reference to the inclusion of Kent into a newly-extended kingdom of Wessex in the 920s, rather than a formalised reinforcement of an earlier union between Wessex and Mercia, which took place sometime around 886. Kent was of vital military and political significance in the early tenth century and had only recently been absorbed by Edward into Wessex by the time of his death. Initially, this political and dynastic assimilation had been maintained by the arrangements exemplified by the agreement between King Ecgberht and the community of Christ Church Canterbury in 838. There are a number of further factors, however, that point towards Edward making preparations to cement the unifying elements expressed by this particular agreement into the permanent fabric of his extended West Saxon polity. Edward appears to have had a desire to seal a more enduring incorporation of Kent into the expanding sphere of West Saxon politics.

On 2 August 923 Archbishop Plegmund of Canterbury died and Edward’s choice of Æthelhelm, the bishop of Wells, as a replacement for the Mercian Plegmund, reflects Edward’s aspirations openly. Edward’s appointment of Æthelhelm to the Canterbury archbishopric demonstrates a marked shift in emphasis towards further integration of the region as a West Saxon satellite. Æthelhelm was already a well-trusted West Saxon ecclesiastic and was probably born into the higher echelons of their nobility. Æthelhelm’s relationship with the bishopric of Wells is compatible with what may be surmised about the origins of the English pontifical embedded within the Sacramentary of Ratoldus. Hohler pointed towards Wells, which later became a centre for liturgical development, as the
likelyest place of origin for the pontifical. If this is coupled with Æthelhelm’s appointment to the see of Canterbury a case can be made for the ordo’s production sometime shortly after Æthelhelm’s inauguration in 923.43

There are significant reasons as to why Edward the Elder may have wished to advertise publicly his continued personal commitment to the kingdom of Kent in the 920s and beyond. He may further have tailored a number of his policies towards their reception by a Kentish audience. Edward’s apparent interest in Kentish politics provided Charles Plummer with his explanation for Folcuin the Deacon’s references to Eadwine as rex, following the ætheling’s death in 933.44 The use of the royal title by Folcuin, when he described Eadwine’s drowning, suggested to Plummer that Eadwine might have been elected as subregulus over Kent at the time of Edward’s death.45 While Plummer’s explanation as to why Folcuin used the royal title for Eadwine unfortunately lacks additional evidence, this hypothesis opens up the way for further discussion. Edward the Elder may have given more consideration to the problems of royal succession in Kent than has been previously thought.

43 Hohler, ‘Some service books’, pp. 66-69; for Wells see Andrew Prescott, ‘The text of the Benedictional of St. Æthelwold’, in Barbara Yorke (ed.), Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence (Woodbridge, 1988), pp. 119-147, at pp. 135-136. As Hohler noted, Wells did not become a see until 908. See also the letter by Hohler to Jeremy Myers cited by Orchard, The Sacramentary of Ratoldus, xxiv-xxvi.
44 Folcuin of St-Bertin, Folewini diaconi gesta abbatum S. Bertini sithensium, ed. O. Holger Egger, MGH, Scriptores 13 (1881), 107, 629.
What persuaded Plummer to suggest that Eadwine had been elected as *subregulus* over Kent was the strong tradition of maintaining West Saxon influence over that kingdom by the election of a son of a West Saxon king to this particular position. The exemplar of the royal *ordo* known as A, later adapted by Hincmar of Rheims for Judith’s coronation in 856, may have been first used for Æthelwulf’s anointing as *subregulus* of Kent at Kingston in 838.46 And as pointed out in the last chapter, it is conceivable that Edward the Elder himself may have undergone such a royal anointing at his father’s bidding sometime before 898.47 Numerous charter styles of the West Saxon kings referred to the inhabitants of Kent as a separate people, but with the same king as the West Saxons, and Alfred, in the capacity of a third party, is retrospectively styled as king of both Wessex and of Kent as *Ælfredus rex occidentalium Saxonum necnon et Cantwariorum*.48 There are allusions to further West Saxon/Kentish unification in a number of surviving charters suggesting that previous attempts were made to bring Kent further into the sphere of West Saxon politics. In its linguistic technique, the Second English *Ordo* is reminiscent of earlier improvised charter formulae drafted during King Æthelwulf’s reign when his charter scribes endeavoured to define the emerging power of the West Saxon kings and equate it with their increasing role in southern politics. There are three charters which exhibit such outward-looking

---

pretensions. Æthelwulf is styled as: rex occidentalium Saxonum centuriorum nec non cunctibus trali populi; rex australium populorum and rex occidentalium Saxonum necnon eodem Deo donante Cantuariorum 7 omni australi Anglorum populi. As argued in chapter one, the rebellion by Æthelwulf’s son Æthelbald, which left the West Saxon kingdom divided, curtailed for the time being any further experimentation in this direction. The two kingdoms remained separate at Æthelwulf’s death in 858 when: ‘Æthelbald [succeeded] to the kingdom of the West Saxons and Æthelberht to the kingdom of the people of Kent [and the kingdom of the East Saxons].’ But when Æthelbald himself died prematurely in 860, the three surviving brothers, probably driven by a necessity for dynastic unity, made a pact whereby Æthelberht succeeded to the entire composite realm. The *Chronicle* entry for 860 records that ‘Æthelberht succeeded to the whole kingdom (allum pam rice)’ and a charter of Æthelberht’s, dated to 861, reflects the enormity of this development. In this charter, Æthelberht granted land in Kent to Abbot Diernoth and the community of St. Augustine’s, in return for their continuing loyalty, both to the king and to his brothers. Keynes has suggested that this may reflect that Æthelberht was already beginning to integrate his brother, Æthelred, into the kingship. As Richard Abels has

49 The three charters are: S 287; S 291 and S 320. The first is from 839 and from the archive of Christ Church Canterbury. The second is from the archive of Rochester but does not originate from the *textus Roffensis* and is from the *Liber Temporalium*. It is no. 21 in *The Charters of Rochester*, ed. A. Campbell (Oxford, 1973). The third is from Malmesbury. See *GP*, v, 239. The witness list seems to stem from the late 830s and the charter may have been originally drafted in Kent. See Simon Keynes, ‘The West-Saxon charters of King Æthelwulf and his sons’, *EHR* 109 (Sept, 1994), 1110-1149, at 1112 and Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, pp. 388-389.

50 *ASC*, 858.


observed, a 'new kingdom was coming into being.'\textsuperscript{54} This thesis has already argued that that Kent was not an integral part of King Alfred's kingdom of the \textit{Angli et Saxones} in the late 890s, so the question therefore must be when did this new kingdom become hard fact?\textsuperscript{55}

King Alfred made defensive provisions for Kent in the 890s and these provide evidence of the region's consequence to the West Saxon kings in the late ninth century but the Danish military threat that these were intended to repulse had not been extinguished with the onset of the tenth.\textsuperscript{56} By the beginning of the tenth century political necessities had dictated that Edward re-emphasised his commitment to Kent, only recently absorbed into greater-Wessex. As Pauline Stafford has argued, the strategic significance of Kent to the West Saxon kings had not diminished at this juncture and 'no West Saxon king concerned with Viking movements in the Channel and with the defence of both Mercia and the newly-conquered Essex could ignore it.'\textsuperscript{57} No West Saxon king could disregard the security of the region, particularly at a time when there was a significant increase in hostile Danish activity on the Continent and in the Channel. Edward the Elder also had powerful historical and martial links with the kingdom of Kent and it was as the commander of the Kentish \textit{fyrd} that he first came to military prominence.\textsuperscript{58} The likelihood that Edward ruled

\textsuperscript{55} See chapter one of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{56} John Peddie, \textit{Alfred: Warrior King} (Stroud, 1999), esp. pp. 165-179.
\textsuperscript{58} See chapter one of this thesis.
as *subregulus* for his father, King Alfred, is strengthened by the words of the tenth-century chronicler Æthelweard, who implied that Edward was in control of all the south-eastern defences long before he inherited the kingship. It was Edward, rather than his father, who confronted the Danes head-on at Farnham in Surrey in 893. Reporting Edward’s response to the harrying of Northampton and Berkshire by the Danes, Æthelweard relates how:

> These matters then came to the notice of Prince Eadweard, the son of King Ælfred. He was at that time moving forces through the southern part of England. Later, however, they [the Danes] penetrated Wessex. He [Edward] came clashing in dense array into collision with the foemen at Farnham. There was no delay, the young men leaped against the prepared defences, and having slipped on their armour they duly exulted, being set free by the prince’s arrival, like sheep brought to the pastures by the help of the shepherd after the customary ravaging.  

Edward’s close ties with Kent are not merely discernible during the period of his royal apprenticeship; they were durable and continued after Edward inherited the West Saxon kingship, following Alfred’s death in 899. When Edward’s cousin, Æthelwold, made his bid for the kingship in 903, the Edwardian Chronicle confirms the pivotal role played by the Kentish fyrd in 903 when it reported that:

> the men of Kent lingered there against his command – and he had seven messengers sent to them. Then the Danish army overtook them there, and they fought there. And there were killed Ealdorman Sigewulf and Sigehelm, and the king’s thegn Ealwold and Abbot Cenwulf, and Sigeberht, Sigewulf’s son, and Eadwold, Acca’s son, and many besides them, though I have named the most distinguished.

James Campbell has drawn special attention to this particular passage and he argues that it was a standard military tactic for the troops who formed the vanguard in advance to make up the rearguard in defence. The men of Kent appear to have formed the backbone of

---

99 Æthelweard, s.a. 893.
60 ASC, 903.
61 James Campbell, ‘What is not known about the reign of Edward the Elder’, in N. J. Higham and D. H. Hill (eds.), *Edward The Elder 899-924* (London, 2001), pp. 12-24, at p. 17. It is interesting to note that the military traditions of the men of Kent ran deep. Besides the instances pointed out by Campbell, it should be noted that the county’s motto remains to this day *Invicta* and this is traditionally believed to have originated in 1066 during William’s march on London. Allegedly, Dover only agreed to a conditional surrender to
Edward's forces and were among his most trusted men.\textsuperscript{62} In possibly 919, Edward chose to make his ties with Kent even stronger and he married for a third time. The exact date of Edward's third marriage is unknown but we do know that their son, Edmund, was born in 920 or 921. Before this new marriage took place, Edward had renounced his then queen Ælflæld, herself from a prominent West Saxon family, so he could make this new match with Eadgifu, who was a member of the Kentish high-aristocracy. Since Edward already had three male heirs his new marriage should be viewed as a politically-motivated one that, among other considerations, 'assured the king of south-eastern support while he was away fighting in the midlands.'\textsuperscript{63}

Edward's choice of the Kentish noblewoman Eadgifu as his third wife not only reflects a desire to stabilise, and perhaps to reaffirm West Saxon internal political commitments towards Kent, but is also indicative of his wider geographical concerns. It is probably not coincidental that Edward's new marriage coincided with a renewed Danish offensive on the continental mainland. Kent remained crucial to the defence of Edward's

\textsuperscript{62} One of these noble families probably included the ancestors of Wulfstan of Dalham who was a leading figure during the reign of King Edgar. Andrew Wareham, \textit{Lords and Communities in Early Medieval East Anglia} (Woodbridge, 2005), at pp. 33-34, has suggested that Wulfstan had connections with Kent and with the West Saxon kings from the ninth century on. One of these was Wihtgar II who was a member of King Æthelstan's entourage leading up to the Brunanburh campaign. See Eric E. Barker, 'Two lost documents of King Æthelstan', \textit{Anglo-Saxon England} 6 (1977), 137-143, at 142.

Wessex, especially at this juncture, for the River Thames still provided the key to Danish inroads into his kingdom. During the first decade of the tenth century the Danish raids on Brittany had intensified and this threat culminated in around 920 with the complete collapse of that region’s defences. One chronicler lamented that in 920 ‘the Northmen devastated all of Brittany, defeating, killing or exiling the Bretons’ and Flodoard of Rheims reported in a similar fashion that Count Robert of Paris ‘conceded Brittany to the Northmen, which they had devastated, along with the pagus of Nantes.’ Although the surviving records describing the eventual fate of Brittany are sparse, it seems that some form of Scandinavian hegemony was imposed upon the region. Edward the Elder was conversant with the situation in Brittany and personally involved with the fate of the Bretons for a number of influential refugees had received succour at his court. It was Edward who inaugurated the climate of political and religious asylum between England and Brittany that would be more famously cultivated by his son Æthelstan. Edward’s third marriage therefore reflected the

---


67 King Edward the Elder was connected to Brittany as was his son Æthelstan. The latter’s links with Brittany are well-documented, but, Edward was also involved with the community at Dol. William of Malmesbury preserves a letter from Radbod of St-Samson to King Æthelstan invoking the memory of the king’s father, Edward the Elder, who had entrusted himself by letter to the confraternity of St-Samson; GP, v. 249. Among the notable refugees who received assistance at King Edward’s court was Mathuedoi, count of Poher, who died in the 920s. His son Alan (later to be known as Alan Barbetorte) may have actually been born in
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changeable political necessities of his rule and brought him closer links with the Kentish aristocracy.

Eadgifu’s father was Ealdorman Sighelm of Kent who, before his death at the Holme in 903, had been a nobleman of considerable influence and an important ally of King Alfred and of Edward. He is described as meus fidelis dux by King Alfred rex Saxonum in the charter of 898 which Edward also attests as rex.68 It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find that Eadgifu had considerable landholdings inside Kent and this injection of further Kentish estates would build upon the already formidable tracts of land held by Edward personally.69 Edward’s promotion of further integration between Wessex and Kent during the 920s built upon the considerable foundations already laid down by his great-grandfather Ecgberht in 838. These policies had been adhered to by Æthelwulf and Alfred but still allowed for the West Saxon grip on Kent to be tightened by the end of Edward the Elder’s reign. The relationship between Wessex and Kent had moved on from the situation of the ninth century when the Kentish magnates had supported Ecgberht’s overkingship, entering into ‘an honourable partnership’ with the ambitious West Saxons against Mercian

68 See S 350. Sighelm was the beneficiary of this charter and he was granted land at Farleigh. He fought with Edward at the Holme and died in this conflict. See ASC, 903 and Æthelweard, s.a. 903.
hegemonic power because there was ‘a liberality about Wessex to which [the Kentishmen] could respond.’ The composition of a vibrant new royal ordo in the 920s may reflect a desire to establish on a more secure footing the political union between the house of Wessex and the kingdom of Kent.

We do not know whether Ælfweard was ever married and his premature death rules out any chance that he underwent a full coronation, but the prospect that the Second English Ordo may have been composed with his succession in mind should not be entirely ruled out. It was, moreover, suggested earlier that a strong argument in favour of Æthelstan being the first king to make use of this new ordo can still be made. This does not necessarily mean that the ordo was intentionally drawn up for him. The possibility that Archbishop Æthelhelm was involved with the composition of the new ordo suggests a dating compatible with Æthelstan’s coronation in 925 and implies that this event may have provided the ceremony where it was unveiled. As does the strong possibility that Æthelhelm presided over Æthelstan’s coronation. According to Adelard of Ghent’s eleventh-century Vita Dunstani, Æthelstan’s Kingston ceremony was performed by Archbishop Æthelhelm (Athelm) personally. If the ordo was produced at the instigation

of King Edward and organised by his new archbishop of Canterbury, Æthelhelm, then Æthelstan was not the intended recipient. Æthelstan’s destiny lay elsewhere and it had already been mapped-out by Alfred and Edward some years earlier. It was not a future that included Æthelstan’s sovereignty over Wessex or for that matter over Kent. If Edward had the Second English Ordo composed to solidify the union of Wessex and Kent, then it was for the coronation of the king’s preferred West Saxon successor, Ælfweard, not his eldest son Æthelstan. This does not, however, mean that Æthelstan did not make use of these brand new liturgies when he was finally acclaimed as his father’s legitimate heir in 925.

Æthelstan and the Second English Ordo

It has been suggested that the existence of a queen’s ordo within all the manuscripts of the new order prohibits its first usage by Æthelstan. But does it? If Æthelstan did exploit the new liturgies it was because they were both available and resonated with his father’s legacy to Ælfweard. This means that the existence of a female ordo within the liturgies is not an impediment for Æthelstan’s possible manipulation of the king’s ordo for his own aggrandisement. The language of unification contained in the prayer would also have been useful to Æthelstan in other ways. It could have helped to shape his newly-restructured polity, where Æthelstan’s Mercia was now joined together with his father’s legacy of an integrated Wessex and Kent. This could mean that a slightly different interpretation of
those ‘two peoples’ is now possible. If, moreover, Ælfweard was the intended beneficiary, both the king’s and the queen’s ordines may have been composed simultaneously in anticipation of his future accession and marriage. Nelson’s suggestion that Edward’s second wife Ælfﬂaed was anointed as queen is a compelling one, but it does not automatically follow that this exact queen’s ordo found within the Second English Ordo, was specifically composed for Ælfﬂaed’s ordination. By the time of Edward’s second marriage the ideology of female ordination was already embedded within the framework of West Saxon culture and, moreover, as a concept, it probably had earlier Mercian origins. Dorothy Whitelock pointed out that there may have been a Mercian queen’s ordo composed and in use as early as 869. King Burgred’s queen, Æthelswith, attested a charter as ‘ego Æhelsuif pari coronata stemma regali Anglorum regina.’ The production of a new queen’s ordo merely suggests that the model found within the Second English Ordo was produced to accommodate the changes in West Saxon royal ideology towards the anointing of queens. Furthermore, Orchard has argued that the older royal ordo, known as A, might have better-suited Archbishop Plegmund for Edward’s coronation and in a similar fashion an existing female ordo may have underpinned the anointing of Ælfﬂaed. On the suitability of the earlier king’s ordo Orchard has argued that:

\[A\] contains all the blessings required. Indeed [A] could perfectly easily embody the substance of the ordo used by Plegmund at the coronation of Edward the Elder in 900 – which is not to rule completely out of account the possibility that the second “Second Coronation Order” had not

\[72\] For Whitelock’s suggestion about a possible Mercian queen’s ordo see Nelson, ‘The earliest surviving royal ordo’, p. 351, n. 51.
\[73\] The charter is S 214.
yet come into being. For the conception of “new” and “old” in the middle ages was patently not the same as ours. ... Plegmund might, for whatever reason, have preferred an older coronation ordo for Edward.\textsuperscript{75}

The Second English Ordo may then have been composed to serve Edward the Elder’s proposed coronation of Ælfweard, where the integration of Kent was a key factor, but because the king and his son both died within a matter of weeks, this possible strategy remained unfulfilled. On the other hand, Æthelstan, who clearly encountered opposition at Winchester at the time of his delayed (or second) coronation, required exactly the kind of ritualistic displays of syncretism and acculturation that are embodied within the liturgies of the new ordo. As the prayer emphasises, this newly-anointed king should be ‘supported by the subjection of both peoples’ and this language seems eminently appropriate for Æthelstan, given his lack of popularity at Winchester. It reflects, as did the Mercian charter of 925 discussed earlier, the policies of political accommodation and regeneration established during the fragile period of Æthelstan’s inaugural year as king. This becomes particularly apposite if the combined authority referred to was West Saxon and Kentish sovereignty. Æthelstan may have used these brand new liturgies to promote this union and to append its principles back on to the pact of 838 between Canterbury and Ecgberht’s direct lineage with his choice of Kingston for his coronation.

One major challenge when determining the origins and uses of the Second English Ordo appears to be a necessity to confront head-on a discernible historiographical fascination with the Alfredian union of Wessex and Mercia. The new prayers embedded

\textsuperscript{75} Orchard, The Leofric Missal, i. 105.
within the ordo have become entangled with what is actually a separate issue. The prayers are frequently interpreted as assertions of political intent composed for Edward’s benefit when making permanent this one particular alliance. However, there may not have been a collective ambition to cement into the permanent framework of West Saxon kingship an association between Wessex and Mercia in 900. William of Malmesbury’s account of King Alfred and Edward presiding over Æthelstan’s ceremony of royal suitability in the late 890s suggests that it may have already been decided that this essentially Alfredian union would be dismantled upon the death of Edward the Elder. Although William’s is later evidence, it is mirrored by the contemporary views of the author of the Mercian Register, when he wrote that Æthelstan was acclaimed as king by the Mercians, and by the scribe who produced the charter of 925. By advancing the ideal that the new ordo exemplified a permanent union between Wessex and Mercia - a kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons - Keynes has put to one side his earlier reservations about the longevity and durability of Edward’s polity:

> It is not clear, however, what was intended to happen after Edward’s death, or whether the constituent peoples of his realm would necessarily have respected the late king’s wishes. The counsellors in Wessex chose Elfweard as king, perhaps reflecting a preference on their part that he should be “king of the Anglo-Saxons” like his father and grandfather before him, though perhaps with no more than the kingship of the West Saxons in mind; at the same time, it seems, the counsellors in Mercia chose Æthelstan as king, presumably with the implication that he was recognised by them as king of Mercia.
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76 Nelson, ‘The second English ordo’, pp. 365-366 has addressed this problem, but after suggesting that the new ordo was composed to make ‘permanent a political union’ e.g. Edward’s cementing of the original union of Wessex and Mercia by King Alfred into the fabric of West Saxon kingship, she has argued, somewhat paradoxically, that ‘Edward the Elder himself ... seems to have envisaged a redivision between his eldest, but illegitimate son Æthelstan and his second, legitimate son, Elfweard – a plan frustrated in the event by Elfweard’s death within days of his father.’

77 Keynes, The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, p. 19.
The prominence given here to the ‘constituent peoples’ of Edward’s kingship and the uncertainty of just what this comprised by the 920s is, however, instructive. Æthelstan may have already been elevated to a possible Mercian kingship long before his coronation took place at Kingston and he could have been secure in his position as king over the Mercians. But he had not been accepted elsewhere and here may be the crux of the new ordo. It has been suggested, that the Second English Ordo ‘takes us to the heart of the Alfredian conception of the Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons.’ But does it? Rather, the Second English Ordo, and its later developments may be seen to epitomise the reign of King Æthelstan. He may have made use of the original liturgies himself and the later transformations Æthelstan made to kingship can also be detected in the evolution of the new ordo, where the subjection of two distinct peoples was increased to encompass authority over three. Robinson, who recovered the basis of the coronation order as it arrived on the continent, noted that its Consecratory Prayer has now changed so the king now has to:

nourish and teach, defend and instruct the Church of all Albion henceforward with the folks [peoples] to him united ... that he desert not the royal throne, to wit the sceptres of the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians, but by thy assistance may refashion their minds to the concord of their former faith and peace; that, supported by the due subjection of both peoples and honoured with fitting love, through the course of a long life he may be allowed by thy mercy to stabilise in unity and to govern the eminence of his father’s (or his ancestral) glory. 79

For Robinson, this prayer was produced for King Edgar’s coronation. But it is now safe to say that the English pontifical containing the Second English Ordo made its way to Francia in the mid tenth century, and it may have arrived with Oswald, the nephew of Archbishop

78 Keynes, ‘Edward, king of the Anglo-Saxons’, p. 49.
The 'three individual peoples' are named as the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians and, as Nelson has surmised, this was an attempt to update the Second English Ordo and was arranged in the 930s for the succession of Æthelstan's heir and successor, Edmund. These later evolutions to the language of the new ordo suggest that Æthelstan and his advisors may have developed the existing version to ensure that the rituals of kingship kept pace with the aggressive disposition of his rulership. Instead of taking the debate into the heart of Alfredian kingship, the Second English Ordo reflects the progressive nature of kingship in the first third of the tenth century, first by Edward and later by Æthelstan. With its evolution, the new ordo mirrors both the ritual and material symbolism that also found their expression in Æthelstan's flamboyant charter-styles and in the iconography of his coinage. By taking advantage of the new ordo, Æthelstan may have re-affirmed his position as king within Kent and reached Winchester with both his own Mercian supporters and with Kentish ones. Kent proved to be as crucial to Æthelstan as it has previously been to earlier West Saxon kings, but for different reasons. Æthelstan needed backing from somewhere other than from Mercia if he was to succeed in Winchester. This assistance came in the form of Kentish compliance and in the particular persona of Edward's Kentish queen, Eadgifu, who had a vested interest in the success of her step-son's claim to overall sovereignty. As for Æthelstan himself; he never forgot the support he received from the Christ Church community. Late into his reign, Æthelstan

---

80 Orchard, The Sacramentary of Ratoldus, xxiv-xxx. See also Sarah Hamilton, 'The Sacramentary of Ratoldus', Journal of Ecclesiastical History 57 (2006), 568-570. Andrew Prescott, 'The text of the Benedictional of St. Æthelwold', pp. 135-142, was instrumental in demonstrating that Hohler's timeframe was inaccurate. When the pontifical arrived on the continent has proved to be extremely difficult to pin down. For instance, Orchard, in his edition of the Leofric Missal, tentatively followed Hohler's suggestion of the 930s but has seemingly revised this opinion with his edition of the Sacramentary of Ratoldus. He now argues that the transmission should be re-dated to the mid tenth century. Compare Orchard, The Leofric Missal, i, 100 with Orchard, The Sacramentary of Ratoldus, p. xxviii.

presented to the establishment a gospel book bearing the words ‘may the archbishop and the community of this church, present and future, for ever regard the donation with diligent feelings … and may it in perpetuity provide an example of glory to those looking at it.’ It was presented by a grateful Æthelstan: ‘Anglorum basyleos et curagulus totius Bryttannie.’

The alliance between Æthelstan and Eadgifu

Æthelstan’s regnal style contained within his gospel book gifted to Canterbury demonstrates that he achieved much wider objectives than possibly even he imagined back in 925. But Æthelstan did not achieve his ‘imperial’ prominence on his own; he may have been assisted in this quest by his Kentish step-mother Eadgifu. Although Æthelstan and Eadgifu may seem unlikely political collaborators, the growing influence of the queen in West Saxon courtly circles can be detected long before the tenth century. Using Asser as a ‘contemporary witness and ethnographer’ to events at the court of Alfred, Nelson has observed that:

Asser reveals the persistence of alternative scenarios and strategies through the ninth century, hence varied outcomes that were the products of negotiation and argument. … An unmarried king’s son, given the existence of other potential male heirs, hints at royal-familial group strategy, just as unmarried sons, in similar circumstances, suggest family strategies at all social levels in modern as well as in medieval times.

Because Eadgifu’s name is absent from the witness-lists of King Æthelstan’s charters, the possibility that she was an important supporter of her step-son’s claim to Wessex has been largely ignored. As Stafford has reminded us, ‘Eadgifu’s role in Æthelstan’s reign, if any, is now lost;’ but as Stafford has also pointed out, Eadgifu may have been a leading figure who ‘helped determine Edmund’s designation, using her ‘influence befitting a future queen mother.’ The lack of charter evidence for Eadgifu during Æthelstan’s reign is a concern, but her absence from this series of documentation does not altogether prove that she should be disassociated from her step-son, and in this context, it may be significant that Æthelstan remained unmarried, suggesting a possible dynastic alliance with his step-mother. Eadgifu’s absence from Æthelstan’s diplomas is perhaps made all the more noticeable by her later prominence in the charters issued by her sons, King Edmund, and in particular, those by her second son, King Eadred. From 940 on, Eadgifu can be viewed demonstrably as a highly-motivated, indeed unrivalled, political figure and during Eadred’s reign she is second only to her son in royal circles. However, politically, the 940s and 950s were anxious times, with succession in Mercia yet again a pressing issue, one left unresolved until the re-division of the two kingdoms in 959. Eadgifu’s non-appearance in Æthelstan’s charters may be explained if her maternal royal interests had been looked after by her step-son, leaving her with less necessity to display her support for his royal cause openly. But once Æthelstan was dead, Eadgifu was compelled to emerge from the political

---

86 Stafford, Unification and Conquest, p. 43.
shadows by the growing uncertainty surrounding the succession. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that Eadred’s role at his elder brother’s royal court was only matched later by that of Edgar in 956. Here, as they had during Æthelstan’s rise to the West Saxon throne, Eadgifu’s lands within Kent again proved pivotal in securing support for the elevation and retention of the West Saxon kingship, by both Edmund and Eadred. Despite the absence of Eadgifu from Æthelstan’s charters during the challenging early part of his West Saxon kingship, other evidence suggests that they did enter into a mutually beneficial agreement concerning dynastic politics and the security of the future succession.

Another gospel book, generally referred to as the Gandershiem Gospels, contains the following inscription, written in Anglo-Saxon square-minuscule script:

+ eadgifu regina Æhelstan rex angulsaxonum
7 mercianorum

If, as seems possible, the Eadgifu regina referred to in this inscription was Æthelstan’s step-mother, it may also indicate that she was involved in both Æthelstan’s rise to the extended kingship and to the successful retention of his royal status. The inscription may also be said to hint tentatively that Æthelstan appropriated the new coronation ordo for his

87 Ibid.
88 See Keynes, ‘King Athelstan’s Books’, p. 189.
89 Ibid., pp. 190-192; as Keynes has rightly suggested we should be cautious in the identification of Eadgifu. Æthelstan also had a sister named Eadgifu who married the West Frankish king, Charles the Straightforward, and later returned to England with her child Louis d’Outremer, following Charles’ deposition in 923. However, both Donald Bullough and Pauline Stafford have argued that the Eadgifu found in the inscription should be identified as Æthelstan’s step-mother. See Donald Bullough, ‘The continental background of the tenth-century English reform’, in his Carolingian Renewal (Manchester, 1991), pp. 272-296, at pp. 286-287 and Stafford, ‘The king’s wife in Wessex’, 25.
own ends, as well suggesting there may have been a dynastic alignment with his father's second queen Eadgifu. Æthelstan's royal title of rex angulsaxonum 7 rex mercianorum is atypical, but it may reflect the period between Æthelstan's accession in 925 and the extension of his kingship when he achieved his authority over the Northumbrians in 927. Keynes has rightly counselled caution with this royal style, but he does suggest that it might reflect the context of Æthelstan's early kingship. The title rex angulsaxonum intimates his succession to the realm that was intended for his half-brother Ælfweard, to which has been added his own rightful designation as rex Merciorum. This may reflect the initial stages of his kingship, with its emphasis upon a new tripartite union, and moreover, this could have been partially conditioned by his intervention in 925 and the usurpation of his father's planned inheritance strategy. Æthelstan may also have made an early announcement of his intentions to unify greater-Wessex with Mercia by introducing a completely new regnal style, that of rex Anglorum, in 925. In general, Æthelstan made use of royal styles reminiscent of those used by Edward and Alfred (Angulsaxonum rex or similar) and this innovative regnal style of rex Anglorum does not reappear in any further

90 Keynes, 'King Athelstan's books', p. 190. The title Angulsaxonum rex appears in the following charters: S 354 of King Alfred; S 376 and S 1005 of King Edward and S 396 and S 397 of King Æthelstan.
91 S 395; the title seems to have been a favourite of the king's and was often used between 927 and 933. Many of these appear to have been drafted by the scribe known as Æthelstan 'A'. The charters issued before 933 using the title of rex Anglorum are: S 399; S 400; S 403; S 405; S 407; S 411; S 412; S 413; S 416; S 418; S 418a; S 419; S 422; S 423; S 425 and S 426. There is one charter, however, of Edward the Elder's that uses this title. It is S 374; see Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey Winchester, ed. Walter de Gray Birch, Hampshire Record Society (London, 1892), pp. 217-218. Keynes, The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, p. 17, n. 11 has tentatively suggested that it 'makes a good impression', but just how genuine this title is remains uncertain. Æthelstan 'A' was first identified by Richard Drögereit, 'Gab es eine Angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', Archiv für Urkundenforschung 13 (1935), 335-435 and Richard Drögereit, 'Kaiseridee und Kaisertitel bei den Angelsachen', Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ, Abt. 69 (1952), 1-57.
surviving documentation until 927. That it was used as early as 925, suggests Æthelstan had progressive royal intentions, possibly even before he was formally accepted in Wessex.

Æthelstan’s kingship and the submission of 927 at Eamotum

There is additional evidence that links Æthelstan’s drive for a wider rulership with Eadgifu. In 927 Æthelstan became the first king of the West Saxon line (discounting the rebel Æthelwold) to rule over Northumbria. The sources relating to Æthelstan’s kingship over the Northumbrians in 927 also have a significant bearing on assessing the political climate current in Winchester. Under 926 and 927 the ‘D’ manuscript of the Chronicle reported the events thus:

In this year King Æthelstan and Sihtric, king of the Northumbrians, met together at Tamworth on 30 January and Æthelstan gave him his sister in marriage.

In this year appeared fiery lights in the northern quarter of the sky, and Sihtric died, and King Æthelstan succeeded to the kingdom of the Northumbrians; and he brought under his rule all the kings who were in this island; first Hywel, king of the West Welsh, and Constantine, king of the Scots, and Owain, king of the people of Gwent, and Aldred, son of Eadwulf from Bamburgh. And they established peace with pledge and oaths in the place which is called Eamont, on 12 July, and renounced all idolatry and afterwards departed in peace.

Over the years scholars have expressed concern that the information about the northern primacy established by King Æthelstan at Eamotum, in 927, emanates solely from the

92 As has been argued earlier in this thesis, West Saxon rule over the north had been high on the agenda of King Alfred and was continued by his daughter, Æthelflæd, but it was Æthelstan who turned this particular vision into hard fact.

93 ASC, 926 and 927 ms. ‘D’.
eleventh-century ‘D’ manuscript. Whilst Eric Barker’s analysis of the Liber Vitae of Durham suggests that this particular text preserves a witness-list from a charter of King Æthelstan drawn up around the time of this submission in 927, further corroborative evidence for Æthelstan’s northern achievement is sparse. For this reason alone it is indeed fortunate that the verse-epistle, Carta dirige gressus, has survived. The Latin text and translation as reproduced by Michael Lapidge is as follows:

Carta, dirige gressus
per maria nauigans
tellurisque spacium,
ad regis palacium.

Rege primum salutem
ad reginam, clitonem,
claros quoque comites,
armigeros milites.

Quos iam regit cum ista
perfecta Saxonia:
uiuit rex Æthelstanus
per facta gloriosus!

Letter direct to your steps
sailing across the seas
and an expanse of land,
to the king’s burh.

Direct first of all your best wishes
to the queen, the prince,
the distinguished ealdormen as well,
the arm-bearing thegns.

Whom he now rules with this
England (now) made whole:
King Æthelstan lives
Glorious through his deeds!

94 For example, Alistair Campbell, ed. The Battle of Brunanburh (London, 1938), p. 46 and n. 2 suggested that the meeting convened at Eamont in 927 was the same gathering as mentioned by William of Malmesbury at Dacre, where Æthelstan is said to have stood godfather to Constantine’s son Guthfrith; Alfred P. Smyth, Scandinavian York and Dublin: The History and Archaeology of Two Related Viking Kingdoms, 2 vols. (vol. 1 Dublin, 1975, vol. 2 Dublin and New Jersey, 1979, reprinted in one volume, Dublin, 1987), ii, 12-13, also using William of Malmesbury’s Gesta Regum, has alternatively suggested that the version found within ‘D’ is a conflation of two separate submissions to Æthelstan, both mentioned by William; the first of which came at Eamont in 927 and the second at Hereford sometime afterwards. Taking these issues to a wider level, G. P. Cubbins, ed. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle a Collaborative Edition, vol. 6 MS. D (Cambridge, 1996), xxxi suggested that the entries for 925 and 926 may have been part of the original Mercian Register and his idea has been developed by Thomas A. Bredehoft, Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 2001), pp. 68-71, at pp. 70 and 71 who has argued that sometime in the early tenth century, the focus of this version of the Chronicle ‘replaces dynastic policies with national policies.’ It may be, that what Bredehoft views as a change in dynastic focus, occurs because of the way in which West Saxon policies under Æthelstan became broader in scope and these may have more in common with a Mercian approach to hegemony than a West Saxon oriented one. As Bredehoft suggests, the end-result is a continuation of the Chronicle with a more wide-ranging compass and it may have been one that King Alfred may have approved of.

95 Eric E. Barker, ‘Two lost documents of King Æthelstan’, ASE 6 (1977), 137-143, esp. pp. 139-141. This dating is based upon the possible attestations of both Cenwald and Oda. The only visit Æthelstan is said to have made to the north before both ecclesiastics received their episcopates is 927 at Eamont. See also Jan Gerchow, ‘The origins of the Durham Liber Vitae’, in David Rollason, A. J. Piper, Margaret Harvey and Lynda Rollason (eds.), The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 45-61.
Ille, Sictric defuncto, 
amrat tum in prelio
Saxonum exercitum
per totum Bryttanium.

Constantinus rex Scotorum
aduolat Bryttanium:
Saxonum regem saluando
fidelis seruitio.

Dixit rex Æthelstanus
per Petrie preconia:
sint sani, sint longeui
saluatoris gratia!

He, with Sihtric having died, 
in such circumstances arms for battle 
the army of the English 
throughout all Britain.

Constantine, king of the Scots, 
meets to Britain: 
by supporting the king of the English 
[he is] loyal in his service.

King Æthelstan said [these things] 
through the announcement of Peter: 
may they be well, live long. 
through the Saviour's grace! 96

Carta dirige gressus itself is part panegyric and part personal communiqué and is of critical 
importance. Without its reinforcing evidence there would have doubtless been even more 
speculation about the veracity of the submission at Eamotum in 927. These suspicions 
persist, however, and have now reached their ultimate conclusion. Benjamin T. Hudson 
has denounced the report of 927 found in the ‘D’ manuscript, and claims it is completely 
worthless as a contemporary record, arguing that King Æthelstan never met with any Celtic 
or northern rulers in 927 and that Æthelstan’s first verifiable encounter with the Scots came 
later in 934. Hudson dismisses the assembly at Eamotum as a product of historical 
revisionism, originally dating from the mid-eleventh century, before becoming enshrined in 
the historical works of the twelfth. On the 927 meeting Hudson has argued that:

If one accepts this entry as it stands, then Æthelstan fought an otherwise unrecorded battle 
against all the other kings in Britain and defeated them in the first year of his reign. ... In 
short, among the records produced in almost two centuries before the writing of D, this event 
is unknown; these include northern as well as southern records. Apparently a gloss on 
Æthelstan’s later primacy was interpolated into a notice of the subsequent meeting of 
Æthelstan with the leading Northumbrian nobles in the D version. By the twelfth century the 
confused account of a meeting between Æthelstan and other monarchs in Britain had been 
accepted at face-value. 97

96 The letter-poem survives in two manuscripts. One preserved at Durham and the second is London, British 
Library, Cotton Nero A. ii. See Michael Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems as evidence for the reign of Æthelstan’, 
74-75.
Hudson's opinions concerning the authenticity of the Chronicle report for 927 have been disputed by Michael Davidson who has defended the authenticity of the 'D' manuscript at length and has also stated that he finds Hudson's arguments about Carta dirige gressus to be 'unconvincing.' The most serious objection to Hudson's overall dismissal of the 'D' manuscript annal for 927 is his misapprehension that there is no other contemporary witness to these events. Hudson condemns the meeting at Eamotum as fictitious, but in order to do so he has to reject the recognised dating of Carta dirige gressus to 927 as well. He has alternatively situated the verse-epistle into a later environment, where its 'reference to the approach of ships and its emphasis on Æthelstan's survival' he claims, 'point to a time of composition after Æthelstan's victory at the battle of Brunanburh.' It is most unlikely that Carta dirige gressus is contemporary with the Chronicle poem on the Battle of Brunanburh, however, as will be demonstrated.

99 The original dating of the edition of the letter-poem Carta dirige gressus found within Cotton Nero A. ii, 10v-11v was undertaken by Walter de Gray Birch who was in turn followed by W. H. Stevenson and latterly by Michael Lapidge. All suggested a date of 927 for its composition and all agreed that it was sent almost immediately after Æthelstan had secured his overkingship in the north as recorded by the 'D' version of the Chronicle. See Walter de Gray Birch, ed. Cartularium Saxonum, A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History, 4 vols. (London, 1885-99), ii. 131; W. H. Stevenson, 'A Latin poem addressed to King Athelstan', EHR 26 103 (1911), 482-487, at 486-487 and Lapidge, 'Some Latin poems', 90-93.
100 Hudson, Kings of Celtic Scotland, p. 75.
Dating Carta dirige gressus and the Brunanburh poem

If Carta dirige gressus is studied in conjunction with the Chronicle entry for 937, the famous poem on the Battle of Brunanburh, it becomes apparent that they do not derive from same political milieu. Although both texts are concerned with King Æthelstan’s northern achievements and his subjugation of other kings, this is where the similarities end.

The Brunanburh poem opens with the triumphant declaration that in this year:

King Æthelstan, lord of nobles, dispenser of treasure to men, and his brother also, Edmund ætheling, won by the sword’s edge undying glory in battle around Brunanburh. Edward’s sons (afaran Eadwardes) clove the shield-wall, hewed the linden-wood shields with hammered swords, for it was natural to men of their lineage to defend their land, their treasure and their homes, in frequent battle against every foe. 101

The momentous achievement at Brunanburh is clearly not presented purely as Æthelstan’s personal triumph. The poem has the appearance of a composite panegyric created for both the king and his half-brother, Edmund, but ultimately the language is couched in such a way that makes the Brunanburh annal overall an encomium for the ‘accumulated and inherited virtus’ of the West Saxon royal line. 102 The principal theme of shared heroism is repeated throughout the Brunanburh poem creating possibly its most striking characteristic. Attention is drawn towards the victory as a collective accomplishment, suggesting that high on the agenda for the poem’s composition was a justification of Edmund’s eventual

---

101 ASC, 937. See The Battle of Brunanburh, ed. Alistair Campbell (London, 1938), p. 93; Æpelstan cyning, eorla dryhten, beorna beahgifa, and his broþor eac, Eadmund æþeling, ealdorlange tir geslogon at sacce sveorda ecgum ymbe Brunanburh; bordweal clufan, heowan healþhamora lafan aþran Eadwardes, swa him geæþele wæs from cneomægum, þæt hi æt campe ofþ wiþ laþra gehwaenæ land ealgodon, hord and hamas.

succession to this newly-forged *imperium*.\textsuperscript{103} In this context of future succession, the prominent role played by the Mercians at *Brunanburh* is acknowledged and is important.\textsuperscript{104} ‘The Mercians refused not hard conflict to any men who with Olaf had sought this land in the bosom of a ship over the tumult of waters, coming doomed to the fight’ declared the poet.\textsuperscript{105} The recognition of the Mercian contribution towards the defence of ‘this land’ as a single entity reflects West Saxon political aspirations current in the 930s and after. But the acknowledgement also reflects Æthelstan’s own Mercian upbringing and orientation and, moreover, it emphasises his complicated succession to West Saxon dominance. This is a literary strategy deployed to minimise any similar problems of royal transmission arising for Æthelstan’s eventual heir, Edmund.

Like Æthelstan, who had his own troubles consolidating his authority in Wessex, Edmund would need to stake a legitimate claim to Mercian succession as well as to West Saxon.\textsuperscript{106} This may be one reason why the poem is both reflective and portentous. Moreover, the mutual deeds of Æthelstan and his intended heir are firmly cemented into an

\textsuperscript{103} Cf. Walker, ‘A context for *Brunanburh*?’, p. 34 argued that the *Brunanburh* poem was composed as a panegyric for Edmund rather than for Æthelstan and is to be dated to the early years of Edmund’s reign.


\textsuperscript{105} ASC, 937. See Campbell, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, pp. 93-94; *Myrce ne wyrndon heardes hondplegan healefa nanum pera be mid Anlaf oer eargebland on lides bosme land gesohtun feto gefeohte*.

\textsuperscript{106} Cf. Alexander Callander Murray, ‘Beowulf, the Danish invasions, and royal genealogy’, in Colin Chase (ed.), *The Dating of Beowulf* (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1981), pp. 101-111, at p. 109 suggested that following Æthelflæd’s death in 918 the West Saxon kings also became the Mercian kings. However, this was not the way that things were intended to have panned-out. Excluding the brief period between 918 and 925 when Edward had annexed the Mercian kingship to his own ends, the West Saxon kingship had been partially distanced from its Mercian counterpart ever since the time of Æthelred and Æthelflæd in the late 880s. Part of this policy of regeneration in Mercia came in the late 890s when Æthelstan as a child was seemingly earmarked for the Mercian kingship in an elaborate ceremony.
unbroken historical continuum. The poem on *Brunanburh* mirrors the political aspirations of Æthelstan and his royal policy-makers and similar sentiments find their expression once more in the commentary on the arrival of the Saxons to British shores, contained in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 183. The body of the Corpus 183 manuscripts embraces other texts such as regnal-lists and royal genealogies and a number of these are also laden down with allusions to future West Saxon royal aspirations. Both the commentary on the arrival of the Saxons and the *Brunanburh* epic memorialise an imagined collective heroic past and fix the Saxon myth of conquest; the acclaimed arrival of Æthelstan and Edmund’s ancestors, into the present and then in turn project this image into an idealised future. Whoever was responsible for the production of the *Brunanburh* poem - and a compelling case has been made that this person was Æthelstan’s close associate, Cenwald, the bishop of Worcester - was thus manipulating the myths surrounding the arrival of the Saxons and cementing these into an unbroken dynastic sequence. The *adventus* myth, possibly through its dissemination in the Old English

---


108 This text begins ‘Quando Gratianus consul fuit secundo et Equitus quarta, tunc his consulibus Saxones a Wyrtegeorno in Brittania suscepti sunt.’ Cited in Catherine Karkov, *Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England*, 64 and 55-72. On the texts found within Corpus Christi 183, and for the dating of its production to between the summer of 934 and Æthelstan’s death in October 939, see Keynes, ‘King Athelstan’s Books’, pp. 170-185 and for the dating limits pp. 181-183. Contrast David Rollason, ‘Saint Cuthbert and Wessex, the evidence of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Manuscript 183’, in Gerald Bonner, Clare Stancliffe and David Rollason (eds.), *Saint Cuthbert: his Cult and his Community to A.D. 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989, reprinted 1998), pp. 413-424 at p. 415, n. 10 who has counselled caution in accepting that the king who presented the manuscript must have been Æthelstan. He points out that if the Wells episcopal list had not been updated the king in question might conceivably have been Edmund.

109 For the remainder of the corpus see Karkov, *Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England*, 64.

110 Walker ‘A context for *Brunanburh*?’, at pp. 28-31 suggested that the *Brunanburh* poem was composed by Cenwald and that it should be set into the same context as the series of alliterative charters. See also Foot, ‘Where English becomes British’. On the alliterative charters; Sawyer, *Charters of Burton Abbey* and Cyril
version of Bede’s Historia, had become ‘canonical’ in West Saxon political thought.Æthelstan and Edmund’s dynasty-defining victory at the sword’s edge meant that a fraction of this imagined chain of authority has been secured, but the continuum has not yet reached its ultimate finale:

Never yet in this island before this, by what books tell us and our ancient sages, was a greater slaughter of a host made by the edge of the sword, since the Angles and the Saxons came hither from the east, invading Britain over the broad seas, and the proud assailants, warriors eager for glory, overcame the Britons and won a country.

As Thomas Bredehoft has argued, the recurring theme of accumulated martial virtue - when read in the context of the Chronicle genealogies - means that the ‘invocation of the adventus Saxonum in Brunanburh serves to collapse the Chronicle’s migration narratives into a single “master narrative”’ of the Chronicle. There is, therefore, a prophetic voice to the poem, whereby Edmund in his position as Æthelstan’s heir, is placed into an essential location for the furtherance of this dynastic continuum that simultaneously stretches back in time and looks to the future. Without Edmund there can be no future is one principal message of the Brunanburh poem.


112 ASC, 937; ‘Ne wearð wael mare on þis eiglande aére gieta folces gefylled beforan þissum swordes ecgum, þæs þe us secgad bec, ealde udwitan, stilpan eastan hide Engle and Seaxe up becoman, ofer brad brimu Brytene sohtan, wlance wigsmihas, Wealas ofercoman, eorlas arhwaet, eard begeatan.’ Campbell, ed. The Battle of Brunanburh, pp. 94-95.
Edmund’s complete omission from *Carta dirige gressus* provides the real clues that this letter and the *Brunanburh* poem do not stem from the same epoch. For *Carta dirige gressus* to belong in a post-*Brunanburh* setting, it ought to mirror the poem’s essential conception of victory as a combined dynastic accomplishment achieved in harmony by both Æthelstan and Edmund. This, *Carta dirige gressus* does not do. The agenda of the verse-epistle stresses the virtues of King Æthelstan alone, without any recourse to Edmund. When the poem celebrating *Brunanburh* was composed, or when it was originally inserted into the various *Chronicle* texts, remains uncertain. Unlike the poem’s entry into the framework of the *Chronicle*, however, speed is the paramount concern of the author of *Carta dirige gressus*. The primary agenda of the verse-epistle is its swiftest possible arrival at Winchester with the news that King Æthelstan is alive and well. In all circumstances this assurance would have overridden any other considerations, but perhaps not were this message contemporary with the events of 937. In a post-*Brunanburh* setting, the queen of the second stanza must have been Eadgifu and for her to have received such a message immediately after this greatest of battles that did not contain a similar assurance about Edmund’s wellbeing is unthinkable. The verse-epistle makes no provision for news of Edmund’s welfare and this makes it almost certain that it was not written to celebrate the success of Æthelstan and Edmund’s *Brunanburh* campaign. It therefore appears that it must belong to earlier in King Æthelstan’s reign and the most probable date remains 927,
when Æthelstan accepted the submission of the northern and Celtic kings, as preserved in the ‘D’ manuscript of the Chronicle. This dating places the verse-epistle directly into a precarious period for Æthelstan and for his kingship.

*Carta dirige gressus* contains evidence of far more than Æthelstan’s northern military victories and his successful political assimilation of the north into West Saxon hands in 927. It goes to the very centre of the factionalism that beset Winchester following Æthelstan’s disputed succession to the West Saxon kingship. That the message was composed as a letter-poem is instructive.\(^{114}\) This message was dispatched directly following the submission at *Eamotum* by the swiftest possible route ‘across the sea and an expanse of land directly to your steps.’\(^{115}\) The implied urgency means that it is necessary to place the document into the context of political uncertainty at Winchester in 927. *Carta dirige gressus* has generally been cited as evidence for Æthelstan’s successful northern

---

\(^{114}\) Stevenson, ‘A Latin poem addressed to King Athelstan’, at 484-485 demonstrated that this letter belongs to a genre derived from a classical form of invocation that became a favourite with Carolingian court poets. The model for the letter-poem was Martial and its closest continental parallel is a similar text addressed to Charlemagne. Authors who are known to have used this poetic form include Alcuin; Paul the Deacon and Hrabanus Maurus. However, Stevenson also suggested that the poem was destined for the continent, but as Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 91-92 has convincingly demonstrated, the text was most probably conceived during, or just after, the celebrated submission to Æthelstan’s overkingship at Eamotum and was intended to be read first at Winchester.

\(^{115}\) Lapidge, ‘Some Latin poems’, 92 and n. 140 argued that the *regis palacium* of the poem was Winchester and the quickest route from *Eamotum* to Winchester included a sea passage possibly from Carlisle to the mouths of either of the Rivers Mersey or the Severn. *Eamotum* is most likely to have been Brougham Castle near Penrith. As Alfred P. Smyth, *Warlords and Holy Men, Scotland AD 80-1000* (London, 1984), at pp. 227-228 has pointed out, the border between Cumbria and Strathclyde may have been at Eamont in 927 and the location for the meeting may reflect this. For a breakdown of the speed differentials between land and sea journeys see the table produced by Norbert Ohler, *The Medieval Traveller*, translated by Caroline Hillier (Woodbridge, first published, 1989, reprinted, 1997), at p. 101. The table shows that even mounted couriers with changes of horses could only manage between 30 to 40 miles per day, whereas a sailing ship could make between 75 and 125 miles per day at an average of only 3 knots. If favourable winds, currents and the addition of oarsmen are added, then this figure can probably be doubled to a rate of 6 to 7 knots with the equivalent changes to the amount of miles covered.
campaigns, including his elevation to a wider rulership, and historical interest has consequently been concentrated in evaluating the last three stanzas. Yet, the initial three stanzas provide evidence of Æthelstan’s precarious political situation back at Winchester. They indicate an imperative that cannot be merely explained by a simple desire to trumpet the king’s military achievements at the earliest possible opportunity. There is an internal political dimension to these lines of poetry that should be viewed as an attempt to ensure the continuation of Æthelstan’s authority over Wessex in 927. An immediate notification that the king still lived provides the reason for the verse-epistle’s dispatch, thereby quelling any possible political agitation.

The manner with which the twin-announcement of Æthelstan’s health and his northern success are dealt with is unambiguous and the related question of intended audience needs clarifying. For whom was this letter-poem sent in 927 with such apparent exigency? It seems that the poem was addressed primarily to the queen who appears in stanza two along with her son the prince. Only then does the focus of the letter turn to the queen’s closest associates, the ealdormen and finally the arm-bearing thegns. There are two possible candidates for the queen in question. William of Malmesbury’s De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie provides some kind of evidence that Edward the Elder’s second wife, Ælfflæd, could have still been alive after Æthelstan’s accession.116 Unfortunately, this is the only source for this information. But it will be

---

demonstrated here, that it is highly unlikely that the prince in the report would have been Ælfflaed’s son, Eadwine, who was the closest rival to Æthelstan’s kingship, and indeed, for Edmund’s future kingship. So it seems that the queen in question was most likely to have been Eadgifu and the cethlon referred to is Edmund.117 This letter-poem makes the connection between Æthelstan and his step-mother Eadgifu clearer and it also makes the political situation back in Winchester clearer as well.

Æthelstan’s possible alliance with Eadgifu reflects not only the delicacy of his current political situation at Winchester, but also suggests a degree of personal animosity towards all of the family connections of his father’s previous queen, Ælfflaed. This antipathy may have had its genesis in Æthelstan’s perception that his mother had been maltreated by her husband, King Edward. This possible rancour may have left Æthelstan protecting the future royal ambitions of Eadgifu’s son, Edmund, as his favoured heir and directly at the expense of Ælfweard’s surviving younger brother, Eadwine. Evidence exists to suggest that there were serious dynastic rifts within Wessex, even after Æthelstan became king of the West Saxons. Æthelstan lacked sufficient support inside Winchester to make his authority secure. Although Paul Hill has argued that ‘notwithstanding the Winchester conspiracy, Æthelstan was elected there [at Kingston] with the overwhelming support of the nobility’ the evidence recommends that a less sanguine approach should be taken towards the extent of Æthelstan’s overall popularity, especially within a powerful

117 However, Paul Hill, The Age of Athelstan: Britain’s Forgotten History (Stroud, 2004), pp. 200-201 has suggested that the poem is addressed to Eadgifu and to the aetheling Eadwine.
faction of the Winchester establishment.\textsuperscript{118} This rivalry inside the West Saxon *stirps regia* would continue to seethe for some considerable time. It could even be suggested that the initial years of Æthelstan’s sovereignty reflected a major crossroads for the house of Wessex. For, even with Ælfwærd dead, Æthelstan was not the only possible successor to King Edward the Elder’s West Saxon kingship. Eadwine appears to have been considered as an heir in waiting to the West Saxon throne and it was Æthelstan’s good fortune that his half-brother had not yet reached an age to be considered for the kingship. This feud would continue, though, as would the political intrigues inspired by it, and these machinations would only reach a conclusion with the death of Eadwine in 933.\textsuperscript{119}

*The challenge to Æthelstan’s kingship: Winchester to 933*

Eadwine’s supporters continued to provide Æthelstan with problems at Winchester even after the West Saxon kingship had been achieved. Barbara Yorke has drawn attention to a charter which, she suggests, may reflect the existence of a continuing disaffection with Æthelstan’s kingship.\textsuperscript{120} This document records a very large lease of land made by the New Minster community to a thegn of King Æthelstan’s, with the king’s consent. The

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., p. 104.
\textsuperscript{119} Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, at p. 438 has suggested that Eadwine and his supporters challenged Æthelstan’s right to the kingship in Wessex and that this threat was only resolved when Eadwine was drowned at sea.
\textsuperscript{120} Barbara Yorke, ‘Æthelwold and the politics of the tenth century’, pp. 65-88, at pp. 70-71; the charter is S 1417.
grant, issued sometime between 925 and 933, offers a number of important clues as to Æthelstan’s situation within Winchester, suggesting strongly that there was a residual factionalism there. The charter, which survives as a contemporary copy, and may be considered authentic, records that with the king’s permission the New Minster community leased land to a certain Alfred minister. 121 It contains the only known attestation made by Eadwine in any document of Æthelstan’s reign, but the diplomatic style intimates that this is not one of Æthelstan’s ‘official’ royal diplomas and it is more likely a local product. 122 It also provides the first Anglo-Saxon charter reference to the Latin term cliton and Yorke has tentatively suggested that it could represent Winchester support for Eadwine, as the principal aetheling within an anti-Æthelstan faction, and, moreover, the word may even be a special reference to Eadwine as Æthelstan’s successor. 123 However, Yorke’s second suggestion seems unlikely; Æthelstan’s royal title of Angelsaxonum Denorumque gloriosissimus rex in the same charter points towards a dating post-927, and, judging by the appearance of the continental term cliton in both Carta dirige gressus and this charter, it is likely that both were drawn up by one of Æthelstan’s household clerics, perhaps as Lapidge

121 This reference to Alfred mirrors William of Malmesbury’s identification of the leader of the dynastic alignment opposed to Æthelstan, as contained in his Gesta Regum and reproduced at greater length by William in a spurious charter in his Gesta Pontificum. See Yorke, ‘Æthelwold and the politics of the tenth century’, p. 71, n. 57. However, William of Malmesbury himself suggested that this particular Alfred was exiled shortly following Æthelstan’s succession meaning that this identification is unlikely.

122 The charter is S 1417; The Charters of The New Minster, Winchester, ed. Sean Miller (Oxford, 2001), p. 52; the charter is no. 9.

123 Yorke, ‘Æthelwold and the politics of the tenth century’, p. 72. Later in the tenth century the term cliton became synonymous with aetheling but it was not used consistently. However, in one instance, just twenty years after this New Minster attestation, cliton would be used as a direct reflection of rex. For this document see David N. Dumville ‘The aetheling: a study in Anglo-Saxon constitutional history’, ASE 8 (1979), 1-33, at 7-9, esp. 9, n. 9; the text is Frithegod of Canterbury’s Breuiloquium Vitae Wilfredi, dateable to 947-958.
suggests, Peter, who also attested this document.\textsuperscript{124} From this solitary attestation it can be safely surmised that Eadwine was never a member of the king’s immediate entourage. It might also be possible to argue that Eadwine remained in virtual exclusion during these important first years and perhaps for even longer. The political orientation of the New Minster community suggests that Eadwine may have taken, or been given, refuge there and kept out of the reach of the king by the New Minster clergy.

The New Minster at Winchester was King Edward’s personal creation and its \textit{familia} appears to have been recruited primarily to serve his wishes. They may have loyally supported their founder’s preferred inheritance procedures, whereby a son of his marriage with the West Saxon noblewoman, Ælfieaflæd, succeeded Edward in Wessex. Following the death of Edward’s eldest son by this union, Ælfward, the community’s allegiance appears to have shifted to the royal claim of Ælfweard’s younger brother, Eadwine. Importantly, the account of the New Minster, which forms a preface to its \textit{Liber Vitae}, spurns all references to King Æthelstan. A mutual and long-lasting animosity between King Æthelstan and the New Minster community appears to have existed. Even Æthelstan’s memory was not sacrosanct and an attempt was seemingly made to have it erased from some of the New Minster’s documentation. A New Minster charter of King Æthelstan, dated to 11\textsuperscript{th} January 933, was at some stage meticulously altered and made to appear as if

\textsuperscript{124} The cleric Peter formed part of Æthelstan’s entourage when he met with the Celtic and Northern rulers in 927.
it was a charter of Edward’s dated 11th January 921. For his part, Æthelstan declined to
make use of the West Saxon royal foundation as a mausoleum, preferring Malmesbury for
his own burial and those of his kinsmen, Ælfwine and Æthelwine, who fought and died at
Brunanburh. When Bishop Frithestan of Winchester died he was replaced by a certain
Beornstan (931-4) who was a member of Æthelstan’s own clergy and this appointment may
have precipitated Eadwine’s journey to the continent, probably at Æthelstan’s
connivance. As for Eadwine himself, he may have provided a focal point for opposition
to Æthelstan, whether the young ætheling wished to be perceived as such or not. What
evidence there is concerning Eadwine’s eventual fate, although oblique is suggestive of
dynastic intrigue and requires further analysis.

`In this year the ætheling Eadwine was drowned at sea’

Laconic is a word favoured by many scholars when describing the linguistic qualities of the
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, but judged by any standards the annal for 933 is pithy to the point
of obfuscation. ‘In this year the ætheling Eadwine was drowned at sea’ wrote the
annalist. Why the ætheling Eadwine should have been at sea in the first place is left

125 Keynes, The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, p. 21 and ns. 58 and 59. The
charter is S 379 and it should be consulted in conjunction with the will of Wulfgar; S 1533. For Wulfgar’s
126 GP, v, 246.3.
127 Yorke, ‘Æthelwold and the politics of the tenth century’, p. 73. For Beornstan and his successor Ælfheah
see Keynes, The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, p. 22.
128 Miller, The Charters of The New Minster, Winchester, pp. 49-54.
129 ASC, 933, Ms. ‘E’.
unsaid and possibly with good reason. To find a potential context for Eadwine’s death, a seemingly near-contemporary continental account by Folcuin the Deacon of St-Bertin has to be consulted. Folcuin adds a further element of mystery to Eadwine’s drowning by suggesting that it occurred while the ætheling was escaping England at a time of political upheaval or commotion.130 Not all of Folcuin’s details are contemporary with 933, but his account provides important information about that year that is not found elsewhere. If Folcuin’s contributions are studied carefully they reinforce suspicions that 933 was a critical year in West Saxon political history. The near-silence of the insular sources may be viewed as suggestive and it is possible that there was a blanket thrown over the events of 933. These misgivings dictate that Folcuin’s account warrants a more detailed analysis for, despite being apparently unaware of political events in England circa 944, he possessed detailed information concerning the political circumstances current inside England a decade earlier. Sarah Foot has suggested that Folcuin may have known more than he was prepared to admit openly about the political situation within the West Saxon royal house in 933.131 She has demonstrated that Folcuin’s version of events must be treated seriously despite the obvious discrepancy between what he may have known and what he may have merely surmised.

130 Folcuin of St-Bertin, *Folcwini diaconi gesta abbatum S. Bertini sithensium*, ed. O. Holger Egger, *MGH, Scriptores* 13 (1881), 107, 629. Folcuin’s account is not entirely contemporary with the events of 933. This can be adduced by his error in stating that Æthelstan was responsible for granting the abbey of Bath in 944 to nine exiled members of the community of St-Bertin’s, in appreciation of the earlier respect they showed towards the body of Eadwine. On the exile of these members of the community, see J. Armitage Robinson, *The Times of Saint Dunstan* (Oxford, 1923), pp. 138-140.

On the arrival of the Frankish monks at the court of the English king in 944, Folcuin wrote that:

King Athelstan received them kindly, and at once gave them the monastery which is called Bath, mainly because King Edwin, the brother of this same famous king, had been buried in the monastery of St-Bertin. For in the year of the Incarnate Word 933, when the same King Edwin, driven by some disturbance in his kingdom, embarked on a ship, wishing to cross to this side of the sea, a storm arose and the ship was wrecked and he was overwhelmed in the midst of the waves.\(^{132}\)

During the translation of this particular passage into a modern-day English idiom some of the essential linguistic nuances have been obscured in transmission. The same extract in Latin reads as follows:

\[
\text{Quos rex Adalstenus benigne suscipient, monasterium quod dicitur Ad-Balneos eis statim concessit, ob id maxime; quia frater eiusdem incliti regis Edwinus rex in monasterio Sancti Bertini fuerat tumulatus. Siquidem anno Verbi incarnati 933, idem rex Edwinus, cum, cogente aliqua regni sui perturbatione, hac in maris parte ascensa navi vellet devenire, perturbatione ventorum facta navique collisa, mediis fluctibus absortus est.}\(^{133}\)

In its original language, Folcuin’s narrative exposes a striking literary parallel drawn between ‘some disturbance’ (as translated by Whitelock) inside Eadwine’s kingdom and the ‘storm’ (once more as translated by Whitelock) occurring at sea. Folcuin’s paired use of the descriptive term *perturbatione* appears to be a deliberate literary stratagem and reflects that the noun *perturbatio* has two interconnected, but essentially distinct definitions. In its fundamental explanation, *perturbatio* relates to a natural, elemental state of commotion, as portrayed by Folcuin in his second usage. Here Eadwine looses his life after being engulfed by waves brought about by the ferocity of the storm at sea. In its other definition, however, *perturbatio* refers to a constructed literary equivalent which emphasises unambiguously political disorder, even rebellion. This is the version of

\(^{132}\) EHD no. 26.
\(^{133}\) Folcwini diaconi gesta abbatum S. Bertini sithensium, 107, 629.
perturbatio which Eadwine is fleeing from and is the actual cause of his death not the storm.

It appears that Folcuin may have been drawing attention to his familiarity with the turbulent political situation current in England in 933 without being overly explicit. By using this literary repetition, Folcuin may also be demonstrating that there were ironic circumstances behind Eadwine’s fate. Eadwine’s flight from political turmoil, perhaps even away from direct physical confrontation, leads him into a situation whereby the natural duplication of the political phenomenon known as perturbatio becomes the direct cause of his untimely end. For Folcuin, whoever or whatever drove Eadwine to face the eye of the storm was responsible for his death not the storm itself. There is additional evidence that reinforces suspicions that Folcuin was being circumspect when reporting the events of 933. Where Whitelock translated cogente aliqua regni sui perturbatione as ‘driven by some disturbance in his kingdom’, Rodney Thomson and Michael Winterbottom, translating the same extract, have suggested that Eadwine left England ‘as a consequence of some political disturbance.’ 134 Thomson and Winterbottom have exploited the political aspects of perturbatio more emphatically than did Whitelock. However, this can be taken one stage further and a more literal rendition of Folcuin’s phrase and his sentiments might be that Eadwine was forced into exile away from a particular or a certain political disturbance. The implication of this alternative translation of aliqua suggests that Folcuin was aware of the direct circumstances behind Eadwine’s flight, but was uncertain as to how much he should reveal. This may be because Folcuin had heard, from what he understood to be a

134 GR, Commentary, 127.
reliable source, that there had been some serious political upheaval inside England. Folcuin may have even believed that Eadwine’s brother King Æthelstan was personally responsible for his young kinsman’s death.

One simple explanation of why Folcuin appears to have chosen to conceal the true extent of his knowledge of political disharmony in England in 933 could be that he feared losing the continuing benefaction of King Æthelstan. Folcuin’s report that following Eadwine’s death ‘King Æthelstan sent several gifts to this place as alms for him, and on this account he received graciously the monks of the same monastery when they came to him’ reveals a serious inconsistency in Folcuin’s chronology that is difficult to explain.\(^{135}\) The ruling house of Flanders held particularly close blood-ties with the West Saxon royal house. Arnulf the Count of Flanders and his younger brother Æthelwulf (Adelulf) were cousins of both Eadwine and King Æthelstan. It was Æthelwulf (Adulf) whom William of Malmesbury described as heading the embassy to King Æthelstan’s court in 926, requesting the hand in marriage of Æthelstan’s half-sister, Eadhild, to Hugh duke of the Franks.\(^{136}\) And it was the same Æthelwulf who presided over Eadwine’s funeral at St-Bertin in 933. These two facts have generally been interpreted to mean a continuation of the friendly relationships between England and Flanders and that Æthelwulf was in attendance at Eadwine’s funeral as King Æthelstan’s representative. But it does not necessarily follow

\(^{135}\) EHD, no. 26. Whitelock suggested that Folcuin was unaware that Æthelstan had died in 939 and had been succeeded by Edmund. See Dorothy Whitelock, *English Historical Documents c 500-1042* (2\(^{nd}\) edition, London, 1979), p. 346, n. 1.

\(^{136}\) GR, ii. 135.
that this relationship had not become strained during the period between 926 and 933. This interruption may be connected with the ravaging of the Frankish coast by Æthelstan’s fleet, as reported by Flodoard of Rheims under the year 939 when:

The fleet of the English was sent by their king Æthelstan to assist King Louis [d’Outremer, son of Charles the Straightforward] but when they crossed the sea, they plundered the coast of Flanders. Without accomplishing anything of their original mission, they went back across the sea from where they had come. 137

Why Æthelstan’s fleet should have plundered the coast of Flanders in 939 has never been convincingly explained. A number of suggestions have been recently put forward by Sheila Sharp, and these range from Æthelstan conceiving a policy of deterrent, either against the Danes or against Arnulf the count of Flanders, to a suggestion that the English sailors were ‘simply going beserk’ or that Æthelstan may have had a ‘secret agenda’ for the theft of relics. 138 All except the last suggestion are based upon theories listed some years ago by Philip Grierson, but none are particularly persuasive. 139 A more profitable approach may involve following up Grierson’s observation that the raid of 939 put paid to any diplomatic interaction between the English and Flemish courts. 140 The later exile of Dunstan in Flanders in 956 suggests that relations between the two had deteriorated at some point and


140 Grierson, ‘The relations between England and Flanders’, 89.
had remained unfavourable ever since. It is possible there was a cooling of diplomatic ties between England and Flanders before 939, one that stemmed from the dynastic turmoil at Winchester. Perhaps Æthelwulf oversaw Eadwine’s funeral because of a more personal attachment to Eadwine, and that the faction apparently opposed to Æthelstan stretched to both sides of the Channel. It might even be that the boat in which Eadwine lost his life originated in Flanders and not in England.

Scholars have generally been unsure whether Folcuin’s narrative can be linked with the rumours of persistent factionalism at Winchester that can be found in the works of some later medieval chroniclers. The Northern Chronicle embedded in Symeon of Durham’s Historia Regum for example, directly implicates Æthelstan but doubts persist over this, and other, later claims that the king was complicit in his younger half-brother’s death. Yet, the set of annals that form a discrete section of the Historia Regum, dating from 899 to 933, seem to contain contemporary or near-contemporary information. It has been suggested many times that Eadwine may have been involved with a faction opposed to Æthelstan. But so elusive is any firm evidence for this supposed factionalism that Sean Miller has

141 Symeon of Durham, Symeonis monachi opera omnia, ed. Thomas Arnold, 2 vols Rolls Series 75 (London, 1882-5), ii. 124, s.a. 933. Whether we can take the later sources for Eadwine’s death at face-value is difficult to assess. There were strong rumours that Æthelstan was implicated in the demise of his half-brother. Not only Symeon of Durham but also William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon elaborated upon these tales.


143 For instance Keynes, The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, p. 22 has suggested that Eadwine may have been involved with a faction opposed to the king but also suggests that it may have erupted again by 933. If there was an anti-Æthelstan faction, it is a moot point whether or not it blew hot and cold. It seems more plausible that there was always discontent at Winchester right from 925.
recently argued that 'it will probably never be clear whether there was a pro-Edwin party in
Winchester early in Æthelstan’s reign, though the fact that the near-contemporary Folcuin
calls Edwin a king rather than a prince may suggest that he got his information from such a
supporter of Edwin.' ¹⁴⁴ Miller’s suggestions allow for a certain amount of legitimate
conjecture about the depth of opposition to Æthelstan and whether Eadwine provided a
dynastic focal point for Winchester malcontents from 925 up to his death in 933. The
suggestion that Folcuin may have received his information from a supporter of Eadwine in
particular is a point worth pursuing.

Like Symeon of Durham, William of Malmesbury is another later chronicler who
accused Æthelstan of direct involvement in Eadwine’s death, and while William’s tale is
embellished with many literary flourishes, it may also have stemmed from a lost tenth-
century source. Like Folcuin’s account, William’s Gesta Regum is worthy of closer
examination. For someone must have related the tale of Eadwine’s death to Folcuin and
William of Malmesbury’s account may provide some possible answers to this conundrum.
William’s account of the death of Eadwine is an elaborate tale of treachery and revenge, but
it may also contain remnants of a more contemporary version. William alleged that when
Æthelstan uncovered the Winchester plot against his authority, the king discovered that his
half-brother, Eadwine, was implicated in the conspiracy. Æthelstan was so dismayed to
find his own half-brother involved in this treachery that his:

¹⁴⁴ Sean Miller, 'Anglo-Saxons.net: timeline',
at http://www.anglo-saxons.net/hwaet/?do=seek&query=925-933 [accessed, 22nd February 07]
cruelty took a form without parallel; for he compelled his brother [Eadwine], attended by a single squire, to go on board a boat without oars or oarsmen, and what is more rotten with age. Fortune long did her best to bear the innocent victim back to land; but at length, when they were far out to sea and the sails could no longer endure the fury of the winds, the young man, who was of a delicate nature and could no longer bear to live in such conditions, sought his own death by plunging into the waters. His squire with more prudence found courage to prolong his own life and, partly by evading the onset of the waves, partly by propelling the boat with his feet for oars, brought his master’s body to land in the narrow sea that flows between Dover and Wissant. Æthelstan, once he had simmered down, was aghast at what he had done and, submitting to a seven-year penance, took passionate vengeance on the man who had informed against his brother. 145

William’s claim that someone close to Eadwine survived the ordeal is interesting and there may be further elements of this narrative that are worth pursuing. For example, the identification of Wissant as the location where the boat eventually ran aground is feasible and perhaps these geographical elements have not been considered fully. Wissant is a traditional grounding-port between the Cap Gris-Nez and the Cap Blanc-Nez and is renowned for its extremely strong winds. This particular region in and around the lower Loire Valley and Brittany has ancient links with the Saxons and the area was still being referred to as Otlinga Saxonum into the middle of the ninth century, if not later. 146 Wissant itself is also famous for its unique clinker-built fishing boats commonly referred to as Flobards. These vessels also have Saxon origins; their name deriving from the ancient Saxon vloot bar (roughly translated as floatable) and they have been associated with this region of the French coast since the early medieval period. 147

145 Gesta Regum, ii. 139. ‘Tantum quorundam mussitatio apud animum in multas curas disentum ualuit ut ehebium etiam externis miserandum obitus consanguineae necessitudinis expelleret, inaudito sane crudelitatis modo, ut solus cum armigero nauem conscendere uiberetur remige et remigio uacuam, preterea uetustate quassam. Diu laborauit Fortuna ut insontem terrae restitueret; sed cum tandem in medio mari furorem uentorum uela non sustinerent, ille ut adolescens delicatus et uitae in talibus pertesus uoluntario in aquas precipitio mortem consciuit. Armiger, saniori consilio passus animam producere, modo aduersos fluctus eludendo, modo pedibus subremigando domini corpus ad terram detulit angusto scilicet a Dorobernia in Witsand mari. Ethelstanus, postquam ira deferbuit, animo sedato factum exhorruit septennique penitentia accepta in delatorem fratris animose ulitus est.’
146 On the lengthy Saxon associations with Brittany; Sharp, ‘England, Europe and the Celtic world’, 199.
147 Andrew Bebbington, ‘A fleet without a port’, at
As for Flobards, they are odd vessels, with certain characteristics that make them ideal for this particular region, including an exceptionally shallow draught, allowing them to be launched without recourse to a harbour. This quality alone would make one an ideal boat for a clandestine rendezvous but they are also remarkably sea-worthy when provided with the right crew. However, the medieval versions of the vessel were also notoriously unstable sailing-platforms. Because of their massive prominent bow, they are prone to stopping almost dead in all but the smallest of waves. The description of one of these vessels is mirrored by William of Malmesbury's description about the un-seaworthy nature of the boat used during the voyage of Eadwine (minus his additional flourish about it being rotten with age). In any environment other than the calmest of seas, these vessels had to be additionally propelled by oars (which, as William informs his audience, Æthelstan has had deliberately removed). If William's is a fair description of the vessel which Æthelstan cast Eadwine adrift in then the removal of both oars and oarsmen virtually sealed his half-brother's fate and that of his companion.148 A further point is worth emphasising. The casting adrift of his own kinsman in a vessel rendered un-seaworthy may, therefore, be the actual cause of William's description of King Æthelstan's later remorse, which finds a recurrent echo in the evidence from Flanders. Folcuin's claim about Æthelstan's munificence may be attributed to the king's concern for the soul of his kinsman, but it also suggests a certain aura of atonement on Æthelstan's behalf, towards the tragic outcome of

http://www.bymnews.com/new/content/view/8577/80/ [accessed 24th Feb 07]. Bebbington writes 'that the word [may] come from the ancient Saxon vloot bar, roughly translated as 'floatable', others [have suggested] that it is a corruption of flambart, which describes a type of sail plan. This latter seems unlikely, as it is not the sail plan used on flobards.' The web-pages contain interesting diagrams of the early versions of these boats.

148 There is an interesting parallel with William's story about Eadwine being cast adrift in a boat minus its oars in the Chronicle entry for 891. The tale of the three Scots, who arrived at King Alfred's court after coming from Ireland in a boat without oars, may also have implications of exile within its storyline; see ASC 891.
William of Malmesbury’s evidence mirrors this element of spiritual reparation when he stated that Æthelstan submitted to a seven-year penance for his part in Eadwine’s death. William was conceivably implying that Æthelstan was subjected to public penance, which was the punishment intended for those committing ‘high sins whose ramifications were wider, or more horrifying, such as fratricide.’ Whether Æthelstan was actually complicit in the death of his half-brother, Eadwine in 933 will never be proved, but what does seem certain is that Æthelstan benefited from Eadwine’s death. Without a suitable replacement for their loyalties, the threat posed by the faction opposed to Æthelstan’s authority evaporated and left the king free to mount his campaigns into the rest of Britain. But the years between 924 and 933 also left Æthelstan with a debt of gratitude to honour.

In an age where disputed succession was the norm rather than the exception, the transfer of the West Saxon kingship to the ætheling, Edmund, following Æthelstan’s death in 939, seemingly poses few questions to rival those of earlier accessions. Yet this is illusory. The plans for Edmund’s succession perhaps began as early as the 920s and may explain why Æthelstan failed to produce heirs. Leaving aside any hypothetical medical conditions and questions about Æthelstan’s sexual orientation, the most likely reasons for his remaining single are either his pronounced religious motivation or that he refrained from marriage for greater dynastic considerations. Either is possible, but out of the two, the one with the most appeal is that Æthelstan did not father heirs because he intended that

---


there would be a smooth transmission of the kingship to his younger half-sibling, Edmund. Possibly influenced by his own troubled accession, Æthelstan took an unusual route and entered into an arrangement with Edmund's mother, Eadgifu, the third wife and widow of Æthelstan's father, Edward the Elder. It was Eadgifu who provided Æthelstan with the support he required when he claimed the West Saxon kingship in 925 and this pact provided the key to both Eadgifu's sons' eventual successions. This image of Æthelstan as a dynastically-oriented monarch is mirrored in the poem celebrating his finest hour at Brunanburh, although not all commentators have seen this representation of fraternal accordance as genuine:

It presents an ideal of fraternal concord and co-operation within the West Saxon royal house that was largely illusory. Since there was no system of designated succession to the throne in tenth-century Wessex, the crown usually passed to the most credible contender for power and responsibility among eligible members of the royal house.151

But perhaps Walker's suspicions about fraternal concord and co-operation were unfounded, and there was a dynastic agreement between Æthelstan and the family of his half-brother, Edmund. Æthelstan's abstention from the norm protected Edmund. King Æthelstan's dynastic strategy ensured that Edmund would be the most credible contender when the time came for the kingship to be transmitted and this was the primary reason why Edmund's succession was enacted without incident. It has been argued elsewhere, that the rise to political prominence of Æthelstan's step-mother Eadgifu came about after 939, following the king's death. But this thesis contends that, despite her non-appearance in the king's charters, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Eadgifu may have played a prominent role in securing King Æthelstan's power-base in the period between 924 and 933. Her

lands and their related support from inside Kent were crucial to the winning and to the survival of Æthelstan’s West Saxon kingship, during these difficult initial years. Æthelstan, for his part, seemingly chose to put greater dynastic considerations before the establishment of his own personal lineage. In so doing, Æthelstan challenged the accepted norm for West Saxon royal succession.
Conclusion

The opening chapter of this thesis argued that the escalation of the Danish threat inside Kent forced the Christ Church community at Canterbury to come to diplomatic and spiritual terms with King Ecgberht and his direct descendants, at Kingston in 838. Ecgberht was prepared to make unbreakable concessions towards the Kentish nobility and the metropolitan see in order that he might secure their loyalty. A crucial part of this pact was the elevation of Ecgberht’s son, Æthelwulf, to the position of *subregulus* over Kent and the south east. This association was designed to secure the power-base created by Ecgberht, when he ended the period of Mercian hegemony within Kent, with his victory over the Mercian king, Beornwulf, at *Ellandun* (Wroughton) in 825. This victory first brought Kent into a lasting association with Wessex, an alliance that was later underpinned by both King Alfred and his son Edward. Alfred would later benefit from the procedures initiated by his grandfather and father but he would also be bound by the conditions set in place. The Kingston agreement remained important; it not only prevented Alfred from attempting to incorporate Kent and its environs into an overarching single polity in the late 880s and the 890s, but it was once more invoked in 925 with Æthelstan’s coronation at Kingston so he could gain Kentish and south-eastern support for his claim to the West Saxon kingship.

In the 850s, Æthelwulf developed the succession arrangements initiated by the Kingston pact when he made further provisions to change West Saxon inheritance procedures, primarily because of the fear of fragmentation to his extended realm. To this end, Æthelwulf journeyed to Rome and to the royal court of Charles the Bald to acquire support for his plans. But Æthelwulf’s actions caused dynastic discontent and upon his
return in 856, he found his kingdom in a state of upheaval with his son, Æthelbald in outright rebellion. The outcomes of Æthelwulf's continental venture conditioned Alfred’s later reign and contributed to his overall perception of royal authority. Later in the 890s, Alfred would promote his own kingship through a re-telling of the events of the 850s, in his own words and through other texts composed at his royal court. To help control King Alfred's family, the events of 856 were strikingly etched by Asser into his *Life* of the king. Examining King Æthelwulf's homecoming in 856 through the twin medium of Asser's narrative and King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* possibly gives a more secure reading of these events, besides allowing for a number of Alfred's personal apprehensions to emerge. Behind the overarching story-line lie retrievable indications that Alfred was insecure about his own sovereignty and was consumed by the prospects of possible betrayal. These anxieties frame a visible *leitmotif* discernible throughout Alfred’s reign as king. Alfred’s literacy allowed him to shape history and his ability to acknowledge the power of the written word sets him above earlier kings of the West Saxons. But Alfred did not merely recognise the significance of the written word; he further identified the immense value of the unwritten one as well. Consequently, the rebellion by Alfred’s elder brother Æthelbald in 856 went unreported in the pages of the *Chronicle* in an effort to minimise any impact that this outright dynastic discord may have caused.

Chapter two evaluated the two principal themes of legitimacy and overkingship. It developed Anton Scharer's observations about King Ecgberht: his possible Kentish origins and the suggestion that the *Chronicle* claim that Ecgberht was recognised as the eighth king who was *Bretwalda* was in reality a literary stratagem developed at Alfred’s court in the 890s, initially to legitimise Ecgberht’s right to West Saxon memorialisation,
but also to promote Alfred's own claims to hegemony. The seemingly evocative word \textit{Bretwalda} may be, as a number of scholars have claimed, a mirage, but it is one that invoked the nascent concept of 'Britain' as a political entity. The ideological consciousness of a 'ruler of Britain' was re-invented through the dissemination of Bede's \textit{Historia} in the late ninth century to encourage the spread of Alfred's influence. The title itself provided legitimisation retrospectively to Ecgberht's claim over the West Saxon kingship and, consequently, Alfred's own direct lineage, but it also invoked a sustainable image of Alfred as the heir to greatness. Because the reign of Alfred's father, \textit{Æthelwulf}, summoned up recent memories of discord, inter-family tensions and rivalry between Alfred and his brothers, a more appropriate father-figure was sought out and Ecgberht provided the perfect candidate for Alfredian panegyric. Ecgberht was presented by Alfred's royal court as the great successful forefather of Alfred, drawing conscious parallels with their representations of Alfred himself. By this strategy, Alfred and his advisors tightened their own grasp on the West Saxon kingship with this elevation of Ecgberht to the imaginary position of 'overking' of Britain.

One Alfredian text in particular suggests that the concept of 'Britain-ruler' was on someone's agenda at the royal court, for Asser dedicated his \textit{De Rebus Gestis Ælfredi} specifically to Alfred as 'ruler of all the Christians of the island of Britain.' Asser's dedication is a reflection of King Alfred's Gregorian conception of rulership, and Asser's depiction of Alfred as a Gregorian \textit{rector} helped Alfred become the leader of a pan-Christian alliance against the Danish invaders. The Gregorian term also allowed Alfred, and those around him, to redefine their future territorial ambitions with

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Anton Scharer, 'The writing of history at King Alfred's court', \textit{EME} 5.2 (1996), 177-206.
a particular emphasis upon Alfred achieving an ascendancy over the Welsh leaders. Asser recommended Alfred to a potential Welsh audience as rector of all the Christians of the Island of Britain (*omnium Brittanniae insulae Christianorum rectori*) and thereby defined Alfred’s right to Welsh overkingship in religious terms, without resorting to ties of kinship, military power, or earthly fealty. Alfred’s only apparent bond with his newly-acquired Celtic subjects was one of faith. Asser’s distinctive word *rector* expresses the truly exceptional nature of Alfred’s overkingship, as a form of royal authority that crossed the awkward boundary of ethnicity by appealing directly to a joint spirituality.

Chapters three and four essentially dealt with events outside Wessex; they were more concerned with the perception of Alfred and his West Saxons by their Mercian contemporaries than with the ways in which he and his people were viewed inside his own kingdom. West Saxon/Mercian relations took a distinct downturn after the arrival of the Danish *micel hæðen here* in England in 865. At the onset of the Danish invasions Wessex and Mercia were allied kingdoms, but as early as 868 fractures were appearing inside this coalition. Mercian perception of what constituted survival differed substantially from what King Alfred later viewed as acceptable. In the securer environment of the 890s, the West Saxon court looked back in time to a period when the survival of Wessex itself was in the balance and portrayed the end of Mercian autonomy as a direct result of disloyalty and betrayal. This theme of alleged Mercian complicity with the Danes suggested that a complete reassessment of the reign of King Ceolwulf II of Mercia was overdue. The West Saxon *Chronicle* portrayed King Burgred of
Mercia’s ejection by the Danes in 874 as signalling the end of legitimate kingship there and his successor, Ceolwulf II, was a figure parodied by the compiler of the Chronicle as a Danish collaborator. The literary maltreatment of Ceolwulf justified his disappearance from view and further served to enhance Alfred’s statesmanship within Mercia, thereby helping to guarantee the security of his newly-orchestrated political federation, and to win over the loyalty of the Mercians in general. By de-legitimising the former Mercian king, Ceolwulf II, and denouncing him as a traitor, the Alfredian court completed the literary portrayal of de-stabilisation that had begun with the rendering of his predecessor, King Burgred, as irresolute. This strategy essentially paved the way for Alfred’s acceptance in Mercia in the 890s and beyond.

With two essential functions in mind, the Alfredian court downplayed Ceolwulf’s credibility; the rhetorical messages reaffirmed Alfred’s role as the leader of a united Christian people while they simultaneously counselled against disloyalty and future separatist intrigue with the Danes. The Chronicle may not have been a product that projected the accomplishments of Alfred’s particular dynasty above all else, but it was a dynastically and politically-motivated creation that solidified the ideological foundations assembled at the court of King Alfred. Ceolwulf’s reputation was sullied by the Alfredian court for ideological imperatives, but there could have been a further motive for Ceolwulf’s marginalisation. A powerful case has been made that Alfred himself may have been subservient to the Danes during the period between 871 and 878.² There is also a possibility that Ceolwulf fought alongside Guthrum’s Danes at

the Battle of Edington. Ceolwulf had his own political agenda and it does not follow 
that he was a natural ally of the West Saxons merely because he was ‘English’ or 
because he was a Christian. Other examples of high-profile Christian leaders aligning 
with the Danes have been emphasised. Charles the Straightforward, Ealdorman 
Wulfhere of Wiltshire and Edward the Elder’s cousin, Æthelwold, were all guilty of 
Danish collaboration as viewed through the tinted lenses of Christian chronicles. But 
paganism was not a barrier to interaction, as Alfred’s own dealings with the Danes at 
Wareham in 876 exemplify and political necessity, or profitability, could outweigh 
moral considerations. Ceolwulf’s eventual fate can only be truthfully surmised, but his 
departure from the political arena was crucial for Alfred’s own security and kingship 
since it opened up the new political horizons that now beckoned for him following his 
arrangements with Guthrum.

Chapter four continued the theme of Mercian independence from the West 
Saxon king, arguing that Ceolwulf II was not the last legitimate and independent king of 
the Mercians, but that Æthelred, who became King Alfred’s son-in-law, was. To this 
end, the thesis offered a new way of interpreting some ninth-century charter evidence 
for Mercian aspirations. The argument that Ealdorman Æthelred was the last true 
Mercian king is adduced from three disparate sources pieced together into an 
overarching narrative. The Annales Cambriae report that the Battle of Conway was 
fought in 881 between the Mercians and the Welsh but they fail to name the Mercian 
leader there. It was argued in chapter four that this leader was Æthelred and that he was 
acting independently of the West Saxon king. A highly-detailed account of this battle at
Conway survives in a seventeenth-century printed edition and this source appears to name Æthelred as the leader of the Mercian forces at Conway. If this text is analysed in conjunction with the tenth-century Celtic Latin colloquy known as De raris fabulis, which offers an underdeveloped account of 'a great combat' between an anonymous rex Britonum and a similarly unidentified rex Saxonum, it could be that the latter was Æthelred and that he was indeed entitled to be recognised as a king of the Mercians. The short, but descriptive extract contained in De raris fabulis may provide a further description of the Battle of Conway and it seems possible that it originated from a similar environment to its contemporary text, the poem preaching Celtic togetherness, Armes Prydein Vawr.

Although the Chronicle rhetoric sets great store by the general submission to Alfred of all those not subject to Danish authority in 886, the defining year for West Saxon ambitions in Mercia was 883. This was also the year that the Welsh petitioned King Alfred concerning continued Mercian aggression. To achieve a cessation of hostilities along his western boundaries, Alfred reassured the Welsh that he held sufficient power to subdue the territorial ambitions of Æthelred and his Mercian fyrd by possibly demoting the Mercian king. If Æthelred accepted Alfred's policy of downgrading his status it constituted merely one aspect of the political arrangements necessary for the termination of the Mercian kingship. There may have been a quid pro quo suitable for the continuance of Mercian identity, one that rewarded the Mercian leader for agreeing to so great an alteration of his importance. This was partially achieved by Alfred giving his daughter's hand in marriage to the Mercian leader. But
Alfred may have extended further inducements to Æthelred and his Mercians. The disruption to Æthelred’s kingship may not have been intended to be the permanent end of the Mercian royal line. The evidential ambiguities that have been highlighted in this chapter, suggest that King Alfred never sought the obliteration of the Mercian kingdom, but intended to replace the old kingship with a new one of his own making.

There are a number of factors to recommend that the Mercians retained much of their former independence right through to 918. The seat of Mercian government founded at Gloucester, during the reign of Alfred, was important for the furtherance of Mercian influence and was given an extra dimension with the reburial of the important relics of Saint Oswald from Bardney, in Danish-held Lincolnshire in 909. The manner in which the translation of these relics was reported by the Mercian Register is important. Analysed in isolation of the Chronicle, the Bardney raid is indicative of the Mercian leadership’s ability to act independently of the West Saxon king. The nature of the Bardney raid, as reported by the Mercian Register, suggests that this text should be isolated from the main Chronicle and identified as being essentially Mercian in outlook. It is also crucial that the Mercian annals at times focused not only upon Æthelflæd’s heroic deeds but also represented her conduct as being divinely-inspired. The replication of this heavenly patronage for Æthelflæd could conceivably be replicated by certain Mercian numismatic iconography, where the ‘Hand of God’ symbolism especially, mirrors fundamental Carolingian royal imagery.

The delicate, and essentially Alfredian, concept of symbiosis between the West Saxons and the Mercians worked well until Æthelflæd’s death in 918. It was Æthelflæd, however, who was the keystone behind this alliance, particularly in the manner in which
she engaged the loyalty of the Mercian aristocracy; their personal commitment to Æthelflæd perhaps reached devotional proportions. Without Æthelflæd there was much less to bind the two parts of the ‘kingdom of the Angles and the Saxons’ together. Æthelflæd’s death in 918 effectively encouraged Edward to act as the vigorous early-medieval ruler that all the sources - both contemporary and later - reveal him to have been, and in this year he made the Mercian nobility forcibly submit to his personal rule at Tamworth. But it also appears that it had been decided in the late ninth century, that after Edward’s death, one of his sons would rule in Wessex, with another as king in Mercia. There was a certain irony about this arrangement since dynastic circumstances dictated that Æthelstan, who was to have ruled only in Mercia, eventually became the first king to unite successfully both Wessex and Mercia into a single dynamic entity.

Chapter five opened with a defence of William of Malmesbury’s Gesta Regum Anglorum as a valuable source for Æthelstan’s early life. Two of William’s claims were closely analysed; his assertion that Æthelstan was set apart for kingship as a child, and that later he was educated and raised at the Mercian court by his aunt and his uncle. It was argued that William largely renders an accurate description of a ninth-century royal designation ceremony, whereby the recipient was singled out as being throne-worthy and that these rituals were Carolingian in origin. William’s further claim that Æthelstan was raised in Mercia also rings true; it answers the difficult question of why Æthelstan, unlike his father, appears not to have had to deal with the recurring tensions equated with Mercian separatism. But this relationship needed a closer definition and it was argued that it resembles the Carolingian bond of royal kinship and obligation known as coparenthood. This is suggested by an analysis of an undervalued later
version of a charter of King Æthelstan, which was possibly originally drawn up in the year of his consecration in 925.

One method of restricting the likelihood of potential fragmentation or regionalism was by agreeing to the partition of an extended kingdom. The possible ceremonies of pre-ordained acclamation and spiritual adoption for Æthelstan are evocative of certain Frankish ritualised ideologies which were fashioned for similar reasons. This suggests that they were initiated primarily to protect West Saxon governance over the Mercians, but this is deceptive; these ritualistic displays of intent also held implications for West Saxon succession. These were highly visual ceremonies and as such were part of a complex series of dynastic policies designed to ensure the future of Alfred’s direct royal line in both Mercia and in Wessex, where there were now important factions opposed to Edward’s succession. In the late 890s, Edward faced discontent and possible dynastic crisis at Winchester and he was forced to counter a significant claim to the West Saxon kingship from his cousin, Æthelwold, the son of King Alfred’s elder brother, King Æthelred I. This particular dynastic dispute had a later contributory effect upon Edward’s eldest son’s future succession.

Edward the Elder died on 17 July 924 and his eldest son Æthelstan eventually underwent a troubled accession to the composite realm of Wessex and Mercia. All the complex political manipulation that went on within the Alfredian, and later the Edwardian polities, to ensure a smooth transmission of power at Edward’s death, in the end came to nought. The Edwardian Chronicle’s terse evaluation of the events of 924 (when ‘King Edward died and his son Æthelstan succeeded to the kingdom) shrouds the
machinations that accompanied Æthelstan’s succession to the West Saxon throne.³ It was never Edward’s intention that his eldest son Æthelstan should succeed to the kingship of Wessex; it was to be his younger son Ælfweard, the eldest son of his second marriage, who was to have become king there. Yet, on the 4th September 925 Æthelstan was acclaimed king of the West Saxons at Kingston upon Thames in Surrey. His succession to the West Saxon kingship may have been celebrated by the unveiling of a brand new royal ordo, reflecting both the difficulties of his accession and the political uncertainties of his future kingship. A fresh explanation for the apparent language of unification embedded within this new ordo is possible. With its allusions to ruling over two separate peoples, it could be that the new Ordo forms a direct reference to the inclusion of Kent into a newly-extended kingdom of Wessex in the 920s, rather than a formalised reinforcement of an earlier union between Wessex and Mercia, which took place in the late 880s, as argued by both Janet Nelson and by Simon Keynes.⁴ It is also possible that the new coronation ceremony was composed to celebrate the coronation of Edward the Elder’s favourite son, Ælfweard, but was appropriated by Æthelstan for his own ends and used for his coronation at Kingston.

This theme of Kentish solidarity with Æthelstan continued and during the challenging early part of his West Saxon kingship, Æthelstan entered into an agreement concerning future dynastic strategies with Eadgifu, the Kentish widow of King Edward.

³ ASC, 924.
The rivalry inside the *stirps regia* of the house of Cerdic continued to rage for some considerable time and this feud can be defined through the years 924-933, when it was finally extinguished with the death of Æthelstan’s half-brother, and rival for the throne, Eadwine. By focusing on the early years of King Æthelstan’s reign, this final chapter allowed the crucial, if underdeveloped, role played by his Kentish step-mother, King Edward’s third wife, Eadgifu, to rise to the surface. The growing importance of queens in power-brok ing West Saxon succession to the throne is important and is worthy of further research. After Æthelstan died in 939, the dowager Eadgifu was the first West Saxon queen to play a high-profile role at court, but her pre-eminence can be viewed much earlier, in that she was a leading participant in securing Æthelstan’s kingship. Æthelstan’s kingdom was not won or lost on the battlefield of Brunanburh in 937; it was won and lost at Winchester between 924 and 933.

This thesis has investigated the dynastic strategies and the network of alliances constructed by the West Saxon kings to keep hold of the royal throne of Wessex between 802 and 939. It is noteworthy that their ascending trajectory to power started with a ruler, Ecgberht, who was possibly, indeed quite likely, of Kentish descent. Moreover, the king of the West Saxons who transformed their aspirations into reality, Æthelstan, was always considered an outsider by the West Saxon establishment at Winchester (at least until 933) due to his Mercian upbringing and outlook. The presence of external, not exclusively West Saxon elements, throughout the period of consideration here, hints at two underlying themes emanating from the overall research. The first is the observation that the emergence of Wessex as the dominant power was as
much due to external factors, such as the associations made with Kent and with Mercia, as to the internal abilities and skills of the West Saxons and their kings. The second is that, notwithstanding these external influences, the West Saxon kings undoubtedly demonstrated a unique capacity to attract, maintain and exploit loyalties: they were the early medieval rulers who transformed kingship in England from the exercise of supremacy to the less brutal but no less effective exercise of overlordship.
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