Friendship and Favour in Late Anglo-Saxon Élite Culture

A Study of Documentary and Narrative Sources, *c.* 900–1016

2 Volumes

Volume 1: Analysis

Els Schröder

Submitted for the degree of PhD in Medieval Studies

University of York

Centre for Medieval Studies

May 2012

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the textual representation of friendship in a selection of documentary and narrative sources, portraying the ideas circulating amongst the élite of late Anglo-Saxon England. Friendship as a reciprocal bond at the heart of both formal and informal power negotiations in the social structure of the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom has surprisingly been overlooked in research of this period. The aim of this study is to assess and reveal some of the ideological discourses which position friendship at the intersection of formal and informal bonds, public and private negotiation of power and authority, idealised and actual conceptualisations of social interaction, and secular and religious relations in an increasingly layered and complex society. A detailed study of sources in both Latin and the vernacular will be presented, opening up two linguistic modes channelling and negotiating this essentially reciprocal bond within a complex social interchange based on personal bonds and loyalty. Lawcodes, charters, wills, a selection of poetry, and a collection of hagiographical material will be assessed in close detail, demonstrating that friendship was both an ideological and practical notion at the heart of the social fabric of late Anglo-Saxon England. In doing so, friendship's flexibility, multi-interpretability, and supplementary nature will prove to be its most valuable aspects for revealing ideas and commenting on various issues from within the construction of society, including the gendered vocabulary of social bonds. Friendship occurs as establishing and negotiating the bonds between the kings and their dependants alongside affective modes of behaviour, and as shaping and communicating the precarious relationship between the lay and religious élite. This in turn has important lessons to teach for the study of medieval friendship in a wider European context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1: ANALYSIS

Abstract.. **i**

Table of contents…………………………………………………………….. **ii**

List of Tables Volume 1…………..………………………………………… **vi**

Notes on references and translations…………………………………….. **vii**

Acknowledgements…………………………………………………………... **viii**

Author's declaration………………..……………………………………….. **ix**

CHAPTER 1
An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Friendship……………………………………. **1**

1.1 Introduction………………………………………………..……………. **1**

1.2 Terms and meanings…………………………………………..………… **5**

1.2.1 Modern preconceptions and the boundaries of friendship……………….……. 5

1.2.2 Terminology………………………………………………………….………... 7

1.2.3 Latin – *amicitia* and its traditions………………………….……………….. 9

1.2.4 Old English – *freond* and *wine*………………………………..………….. 13

1.2.5 Infringing interpretations? – some Old English and Latin terms……..……... 16

1.3 Context and Approach…………………………………..………………… **19**

1.3.1 Interaction with other forms of bonding……………………….…………… 19

1.3.2 Friendship and late Anglo-Saxon society……………………….………….. 25

1.3.3 The historiography of medieval friendship – initiatives and approaches…... 29

1.3.4 Spiritual and affective friendship…………………………….……………... 32

1.3.5 Affection and gendered discussions of friendship………….……………… 34

1.3.6 Pragmatic and political friendship……………………………….………… 36

1.3.7 A balance of power – formal, informal, public, and private dimensions…... 40

1.3.8 Beyond realities –idealised friendship and social imagery…….…………… 43

1.3.9 Approach and limitations…………………………………………….……... 43

1.4 Outline of the thesis…………………………………………..…………. **46**

CHAPTER 2
Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Lawcodes…………………………………………… **49**

2.1 Introduction……………………………………….………………….. **49**

2.1.1 The nature and use of lawcodes …………………………………..……….. 51
2.1.2 Lawcodes and the hand of Archbishop Wulfstan of York……..…………... 53
2.2 Discourses of friendship in 'pre-Wulfstanian' lawcodes……….……... 56
2.2.1 Friendship 'in action' – representations of society….………..…………….. 56
2.2.2 Negotiating power: formal and informal friendships………..……………... 69
2.3 Discourses of friendship in 'Wulfstanian' lawcodes………..…………… 78
2.3.1 Friendship and Wulfstan's 'Holy Society'....……………………..………….. 78
2.4 The dynamics of friendship and the dynamics of change………..…....... 91

CHAPTER 3
Friendship Discourses in Anglo-Saxon Charters……………………………... 95
3.1 Introduction……………..…………………………………..……..……… 95
3.2 Friendship discourses in royal diplomas………..……………………….. 97
3.2.1 Diplomas and their use as evidence ………………….....………………… 97
3.2.2 Friendship in proems……………….…………………………….………… 100
3.3.3 Friendship in other parts of diplomas…………..……………………….... 107
3.3.4 Discourses of friendship in royal diplomas………………….…………….. 116
3.3 Friendship discourses in wills…….………………………………...……… 119
3.3.1 Wills within power structures………..……………………………………... 119
3.3.2 Friendship and the mediation of power…………..………………………… 122
3.3.3 Pious trafficking, moveable wealth and female agency…………………….. 129
3.3.4 Friendship and the limitations of language…………...…………………….. 135
3.4 The negation of formal and informal power in charters………………... 137

CHAPTER 4
Representations of Poetic Friendships…………………………………………… 140
4.1 Introduction……………………………………………………………….... 140
4.2 Beowulf – the lasting resonance of the heroic past……………………… 143
4.2.1 Beowulf – a model of the past……………………………………………… 143
4.2.2 Friendship, affection, and gendered discourses…………………………….. 145
4.3.3 The centrality of friendship…………………………………………………. 162
4.3 Brunanburh – the creation of history.……………………………………… 164
4.3.1 The Battle of Brunanburh – traditions remodelled……………………….... 164
4.3.2 Inclusion and exclusion and interpersonal bonds……..…………………… 167
4.3.3 The perfect solution – a future in submission…………………………..... 171

4.4 Maldon – remembering the past…………………………………………….. 173

4.4.1 The Battle of Maldon – nostalgia and remembrance……………………….. 173

4.4.2 Friendship and power negotiation……………………………………………... 176

4.4.3 A new hope in a return to former behaviour?... 182

4.5 Poetic friendships and the importance of social platforms...…………….. 184

CHAPTER 5

Friendship in a Religious Landscape……..……………………………………. 188

5.1 Introduction……………………………………………….………………..……. 188

5.2 Æthelwold, Winchester and the absence of friends…………..………… 191

5.2.1 Wulfstan and Winchester……………………………………..………….. 191

5.2.2 Social imagery and identity…………………………….……………... 195

5.2.3 Friendship regulated……..………………………...…………………….. 203

5.3 Oswald, Ramsey and the friends of God.……..………………….....……... 205

5.3.1 Byrhtferth and Ramsey……………………………….…………..…... 205

5.3.2 Spiritual friendship as ennobling marker of laymen……..………………… 208

5.3.3 Friendship celebrated………………………………….…………………... 217

5.4 Dunstan, favour and patronage…………...……..…………………….. 219

5.4.1 The cleric B……………………………………...……………….…….. 219

5.4.2 Friendship, patronage, and gender………………………….……………… 221

5.4.3 Friendship mediated……………………….……....……..………….……... 231

5.5 Religious discourses of friendship………..……………………………… 232

CONCLUSION………………………………………………………………….. 237

Bibliography…………………………………………………………………….. 246

Abbreviations………………………………………………………………… 275

VOLUME 2: APPENDICES

Table of Contents…..……………………………………………………………… i

List of Tables Volume 2….…………………………………..…………………… ii

Appendix A – Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Lawcodes…………………………… 1

Quotations of lawcodes containing friendship vocabulary…………..……………… 4

Appendix B – Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Diplomas……………………………. 20

Quotations of diplomas containing friendship vocabulary…………………………. 24

Appendix C – Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Wills………………………………… 37

Quotations of wills containing friendship vocabulary……………………………… 42

LIST OF TABLES VOLUME 1

Table 1: *Wine* in context in *Beowulf*……………………………………...……… 147
Table 2: *Freond* in context in *Beowulf*……………………………………...…… 147

NOTES ON REFERENCES AND TRANSLATIONS

Abbreviations used throughout this study have been provided at the back of this volume, conform the regulations of the University of York regarding the presentation of theses.

Quotations from the Bible are taken from the edition prepared by Robert Weber, B. Fischer, J. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele, and Roger Gryson for the *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft* and are indicated in the text with book, chapter and verse references. All English translations of the Vulgate are taken from the Douay-Rheims translation.

Wills and charters are referred to by their Sawyer number and cited from the appropriate editions as indicated in the footnotes. All references to the lawcodes have been taken from Felix Liebermann's edition, and his abbreviations have been used for short references in both text and footnotes.

As published translations exist for many of the sources mentioned in this thesis, these have been used where appropriate. My debt to these translations is reflected in the footnotes upon first use. Where no translation exists, I have produced my own. For passages in the lawcodes, new translations have been provided in Appendix A. These translations are my own, but they may overlap with the published translations by Felix Liebermann, A. J. Robertson, and F. L. Attenborough which have all been consulted. All mistakes introduced are naturally my own.

Full citations for above-mentioned translations and editions have been included in the bibliography. Citations are presented using the style guide as prepared by the Modern Humanities Research Association.

In transcribing Old English and Latin sources I have followed the spelling and punctuation conventions utilised by the editors of the published editions, deviating only to replace the wynn with a <w>. This means that spelling for Old English and Latin throughout this thesis is not necessarily consistent as the editors may have followed different conventions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

‘Ða getriewan friend þonne ic secgge ðæt ðeowyrðeste ðing ealra þissa weoruldgesælða.’

With all my love, I dedicate this thesis to Peter Schröder and Annemiek Dorpema, without whose support, belief, strength, and affection I would never have been able to pursue this dream. My grandmother Nel Dorpema and my brother Koen Schröder have always listened to my anxieties and supported me through heavy weather, for which I am extremely grateful. I want to thank all those that I have found shelter with over the years, in particular Anieke Menninga, Stephanie The, Claudia Esch, Marco Mostert, and Anna Adamska, whose doors and hearts always stood wide open for me. I cannot imagine my life without Marieke Steijvers, Inge Wijgerse, and Nienke Huitenga; thank you for your love, our years of friendship, and all that jazz.

I am grateful for the academic support that I have received at the Centre for Medieval Studies in York. My heartfelt thanks are first and foremost for my supervisors, Katy Cubitt and Elizabeth Tyler, who have relentlessly spurred me on and patiently dealt with all the calamities in these eventful years. Matthew Townend and Tom Pickles have been extremely helpful with their encouragement and comments on my writing, and Simon Ditchfield and Peter Biller have been generous with their time during those hours spent in the History Department. I would very much like to thank the community at the Centre for Medieval Studies for making the past few years such a pleasure and for turning King’s Manor into a place to feel at home. I would like to acknowledge the help, encouragement, and camaraderie of Gillian Galloway, Sarah Burton, Fernando Guerrero, Eleanor McCullough, Alison Spyker, Kate Thomas, Charlotte Kingston, Anna Clarke, Chelsea Shields-Más, Carolyn Twomey, Courtnay Konshuh, and Debs Thorpe, with whom I spent excellent hours discussing my work whilst often trespassing into ‘real’ life.

The years of study in York were made possible by several benevolent grants.
In the Netherlands, I want to thank the VSBfonds, the Reiman de Bas fonds as part of the Prins Bernard Cultuurfonds, and the Mullerfonds for their generous support. In England, I was kindly helped by the Centre of Medieval Studies, the Stapley Trust, and the Funds for Women Graduates. My debt to all people who believed in me and my project is beyond words.

My last thoughts are for Windy McKinney, my *eaxlgestealla*, and for Kats Bilous, my *deorling*, who have endured and lived this thesis with me through everything.

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

CHAPTER 1

An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Friendship

1.1 Introduction

> "To say that a man is your Friend, means commonly no more than this, that he is not your enemy. Most contemplate only what would be the accidental and trifling advantages of Friendship, as that the Friend can assist in time of need, by his substance, or his influence, or his counsel; but he who foresees such advantages in his relation proves himself blind to its real advantage, or indeed wholly inexperienced in the relation itself. Such services are particular and menial, compared with the perpetual and all-embracing service which it is. Even the utmost good-will and harmony and practical kindness are not sufficient for Friendship, for Friends do not live in harmony merely, as some say, but in melody. We do not wish for Friends to feed and clothe our bodies, –neighbours are kind enough for that–, but to the like office to our spirit."[1] *–Henry David Thoreau*, *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers* (1849)

Henry David Thoreau's contemplations upon friendship, embedded in a narrative which was partly a travel diary, partly a memorial, and partly a philosophical and religious essay, demonstrate some of the wide array of issues associated with this relationship, defined by reciprocity. Thoreau offers us various interpretations of what friendship, and being a friend, might mean: an absence of hostility, a basis for harmony, advantages, support, influence, and counsel. In his view, it is part of a larger system that underlies the very 'song' of life, an evanescent experience that is over and over again re-established and refashioned as a result of mankind's social nature.[2] He reflects upon friendship's incidental nature, its problematic interplay with sexuality, its equalising character, and its affective qualities; he differentiates it from Christian charity; and he defines its purpose as of public importance and advantage, as a bond pursuing a greater general good.[3] In doing so, he does not present a

---

1 Henry David Thoreau, *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*, ed. by Carl F. Hovede. William L. Howarth, and Elizabeth Hall Witherell (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 266

2 Thoreau, *A Week on the Concord*, pp. 261-262.

3 Thoreau, *A Week on the Concord*, pp, 263, 269, 271, and 275; 276; 277.

definition of friendship, but shows different facets of a complicated bond that will be the subject of this study.

Thoreau's reminiscences do not stand by themselves. The question of what friendship is and how to be part of it, was as relevant in the past as it is today. The oldest known story in the world, the epic *Gilgamesh*, is woven around the friendship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu.[4] In Ancient Greece, Plato and Aristotle tried to describe its nature; in the Roman Republic, Cicero treated the subject within a political context.[5] In the Bible, it is a reoccurring bond between men, and between men and God, which inspired a Christian exegetical tradition.[6] Medieval scholars, such as Isidore of Seville and Alcuin of York, tried to define the bond.[7] The newly established Cistercian orders tried to situate the bond within a spiritual and religious setting.[8] Then, if we fast-forward to our times, the popularity of J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter series is greatly affected by the appeal of the friendships between the main characters.[9]

---

4 *The Epic of Gilgamesh. An English Version*, trans. by Nancy Katharine Sandars, Penguin Classics, 100 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964).

5 For an introduction to these classical ideas, see James McEvoy, 'Theory of Friendship in the Latin Middle Ages: Hermeneutics, Contextualization and the Transmission and Reception of Ancient Texts and Ideas, from *c.* AD 350 to *c.* 1500', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 3-44, pp. 11-19; David Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Key Themes in Ancient History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 67-82, 122-137.

6 For references to friendship in the Bible, see our discussion below, pp. 11-12. For a discussion of ideas of friendship in Christian exegesis, see Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, Cistercian Studies, 95 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1988), chap. 2, pp. 38-90 [2nd edn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010); all citations are from the 1st edn, unless otherwise stated]; E. G. Cassidy, 'He Who Has Friends Can Have no Friend: Classical and Christian Perspectives on the Limits of Friendship', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 45-67, pp. 46-47; Donald Burt, 'Friendship and Subordination in Earthly Societies', in *Christianity and Society. The Social World of Early Christianity*, ed. by Everett Ferguson (New York and London: Garland, 1999), 313-355, pp. 317-322.

7 Isidore of Sevilla, *Etymologiarum sive originum liber XX*, ed. by W. M. Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press), X: De vocabulis, A: 4-5: 'Amicus, per derivationem, quasi animi custos. Dictus autem proprie: amator turpitudinis, quia amore torquetur libidinis: amicus ab hamo, id est, a catena caritatis; unde et hami quod teneant. Amabilis autem, quod sit amore dignus.' Alcuin, *Pippini regalis et noblissimi iuvenis disputatio cum Albino scholastico*, ed. by J. P. Migne, *Alcuinus Opera Omnia*, PL, 101 (Paris: PL, 1851), 0975 – 0980, col. 0978b: 'Pippin. Quid est spes? Alcuin. Refrigerium laboris. Pippin. Quid est amicitia? Alcuin. Aequalitas amicorum [*MS variation* animorum]. Pippin. Quid est fides? Alcuin. Ignotae rei et mirandae certitudo.'

8 For a discussion, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, chaps 5-6, pp. 180-296.

9 Nicholas Tucker, 'The Rise and Rise of Harry Potter', *Children's Literature in Education*, 30.4 (1999): 221-234, p. 228.

These examples testify to the lasting appeal of friendship, and the ongoing intrigue surrounding the bond: friendship is not a clearly defined notion, and therefore needs to be interpreted. It is a concept, rather than an understood term; it is an achieved, rather than ascribed relationship; it interacts with ideas of both public and private communication; it is an emotion, and possibly a quality; it cannot be measured; it is assumingly an equalising notion, yet interacts on a levelled stage; it is subjective. Just as friendship is immediate to our everyday life, so too was friendship invested in the makeup and experience of past societies, while simultaneously being part of the very fabric of society itself. The complexity of the concept of friendship is also its attraction as topic for research; it presents us with a puzzle as it challenges definition. This challenge formed the inspiration for this study of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England.

As friendship can only be described rather than defined, and as our modern perceptions of friendship do not simply overlap with pre-modern ideas, we cannot set the parameters of what friendship should be in advance.[10] Our expectations are relevant in so much as they may serve to measure some of our findings. However, only a contextualisation of the notion within its own historical and textual representation will allow us to reach for an understanding of the role, function, and meaning of friendship in a medieval setting.[11] Friendship is, as David Konstan has knowledgeably remarked in his study of Classical friendship, an "historical variable".[12] Subsequently, we cannot aim to research Anglo-Saxon friendship as a stable concept, or as an all-embracing model, and we cannot attempt to answer the question of what Anglo-Saxon friendship *was*. Instead, we need to listen to our sources and allow the variable nature of friendship to speak for late Anglo-Saxon

---

10 For a sociological discussion, see Ray Pahl, *On Friendship*, Themes for the Twenty-First Century (Cambridge and Maldan, MA: Polity, 2000), chap. 1, pp. 13-44; Mark Vernon, *The Philosophy of Friendship* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 1-11. For a historical approach of the same topic, see Eva Österberg, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics. Studies in Mediaeval and Early Modern History*, The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lectures (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2010), pp. 6-9 and 199-203; Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, pp. 1-14.

11 A similar conclusion has been proposed by Julian Haseldine, whose survey of historiographical traditions of the friendship imagery of Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) and Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167) reflects a similar scepticism of the approach taken by some scholars, questioning whether their focus may have been inspired by modern conventions rather than being rooted in their own appreciation of friendship, see Julian Haseldine, 'The Monastic Culture of Friendship', in *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, ed. by James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 177-202, pp. 191, 200.

12 Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, p. 1.

England in its own voice. Anglo-Saxon England offers a particularly interesting voice on this account, as it speaks in two tongues: Old English and Latin. The availability of sources in two languages opens up a wider range of mentalities to reflect upon, as vernacular sources assumingly have a more diverse audience than Latin texts and thus offers a means to look at the communication of friendship within lay (aristocratic) circles. In this respect, a discussion of medieval friendship in this particular kingdom also allows a more layered and varied interpretation of the concept, and will contribute to a broader, multi-lingual perception of the bond in a European perspective.

Despite the relevance of friendship as a topic of research for opening up layers within society and for exploring ideological changes within the conception of society, no coherent study of Anglo-Saxon friendship has been undertaken as yet. Friendship functions in studies of Anglo-Saxon society, but often only in passing remarks. Two informative essays –one exploring the relation between friendship and moveable wealth in the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes by Thomas Charles-Edwards, and one investigating friendship in the corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters by Julia Barrow– offer a first insight into the bond in late Anglo-Saxon England, as will be discussed in our historiographical survey below.[13] However, the analysis in this study will be different both in scope and focus, aiming to unveil a variety of friendship discourses in Anglo-Saxon sources, approximately dated *c.* 900–1016.

This approach allows not only an insight into the social settings in which friendships were presented, but also into the ways in which this bond reflected ideological and social changes that occurred within this tumultuous period of England's history. Just as a glance into the bookcase of a new acquaintance reveals many secrets about this person's taste and values, just so will the following chapters investigate a range of cultural and literary expressions of Anglo-Saxon society. In order to present the multi-facetted function and meaning that the bond could have in Anglo-Saxon society and its ideological representations, discourses of friendship will be examined within both formal and informal settings, and as idealised within ideological discourses. Notwithstanding these directions, we are dealing with a

---

13 T. M. Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Medieval Settlement. Continuity and Change*, ed. by P. H. Sawyer (London: Arnold, 1979), 180-187; Julia Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 106-123.

subjective notion, and as such, a short exploration of our own preconceptions is needed prior to an investigation of late Anglo-Saxon discourses of friendship.

Therefore, this chapter will serve as an introduction to the various ideas and aspects that need to be considered before examining Anglo-Saxon friendships. It is organised in two complementary parts. The first part will investigate the terminology and interpretations of friendship, to identify some starting points for research. Firstly, a short investigation of modern friendship will highlight our own preconceptions. Secondly, although no objective quantifier can be established for the *definition* of friendship, we have to establish the linguistic qualifiers as examined in our sources. Therefore a survey of the terminology of friendship in both Old English and Latin will serve to identify and position friendship language in our research. The second part of this chapter is dedicated to the historiographical contextualisation of this study. Firstly, interaction between friendship and other bonds in late Anglo-Saxon society will be discussed, previous to a short introduction to late Anglo-Saxon society and the position of friendship within its social fabric. Secondly, a historiographical survey will position our research within the scholarly tradition. And thirdly, the approach and the limitations of this study will be summarised, prior to an outline of the thesis.

1.2 Terms and meanings

1.2.1 Modern preconceptions and the boundaries of friendship

Friendship in a modern context is often considered a private relationship predominantly, embedded in affection and intimacy and seen as an expression of individuality and personal choice.[14] Despite this close association between friendship and intimacy, friendship also has a public dimension and social function, which is today often regarded suspiciously or considered negatively as commonly associated with opportunism and nepotism. Furthermore, gender seems to have a dividing

---

[14] Pahl, *On Friendship*, pp. 2-3. These ideas are, for example, exemplified in the East York community of Toronto, Canada, in the 1960s and 1970s, see Barry Wellman, Peter J. Carrington, and Alan Hall, 'Networks as Personal Communities', in *Social Structures. A Network Approach*, ed. by Barry Wellman and S. D. Berkowitz, Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences, 2 (Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 130-184, p. 145.

influence on modern friendships. All our friendships are considered unique, demonstrating the various dynamics, experiences, and needs that create the association in the first place. None of these relationships is stable or exclusive, as the result of friendships' 'melodious' aspects; they do not exist in a vacuum, and are always part of a larger idea of society. Subsequently they are never understood and are part of an ongoing process of redefinition.[15] For example, a former co-worker may become a close intimate, a mere acquaintance, or may simply be forgotten after changing jobs. These examples emphasise the voluntary nature of friendships: they are created out of choice, based on an idea of reciprocity. These variations and dynamics in friendships are often visibly and/or actively expressed, either verbally, or demonstratively, in body language and behaviour.

Yet in an Anglo-Saxon context many of these preconceptions will be found difficult to explore as we are restricted by the evidence contained in our source material, and by its nature. For example, the few Anglo-Saxon letters that have survived from the tenth century are part of a formal epistolary tradition, rather than offering an individual insight into the authors' feelings and ideas.[16] Contours of friendships may be disclosed when following the disposal of family heirlooms in wills, or royal gifts in diplomas, yet often these bonds cannot be followed over a period of time as our information is scattered and incomplete; subsequently, it will be impossible to map dynamic changes within friendships.

However, this does not mean that our modern preconceptions lead to nowhere: our discussion has demonstrated that friendship is never an understood or given bond, it involves active association and choice, and is rooted in a form of reciprocity. This will prove to be a practical division to denote the boundaries between friendship and other forms of bonding: only friendship is inevitably reciprocal. We can position our discourses of friendship within a larger conception of society, and will be able to reflect upon its public dimensions without being hindered

---

[15] Gerald D. Suttles, 'Friendship as a Social Institution', in *Social Relationships*, ed. by G. J. McCall and others (Chicago: Aldine, 1970), 95-135, p. 100; Jacqueline P. Wiseman, 'Friendship: Bonds and Binds in a Voluntary Relationship', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3 (1986): 191-211, p. 198; Graham A. Allan, *Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 89-90; Pahl, *On Friendship*, p. 73.

[16] For a discussion of the epistolary tradition in the Middle Ages in general terms, see Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections*, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), pp. 23-24.

by a negative connotation. Expressions of friendship within a gendered context can be investigated, and layered portrayals of the bond can be mapped. Just as we can explore the reasons for entering modern friendships, so too can we analyse the possible incentives for establishing associations in an Anglo-Saxon context, revealing some of its connotations, functions, roles, and layers.

1.2.2 Terminology

For exploring the terminology of friendship, four tools are at the disposal of the researcher of Anglo-Saxon England: transmitted traditions,[17] dictionaries,[18] the searchable database *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* (hereafter *DOEC*),[19] and the *Thesaurus of Old English* (hereafter *Thesaurus*).[20] All these tools need to be used with prudence, as none of these can solve our problem of definition: friendship is a multi-interpretable notion and subsequently, its meaning will always be dependent on the context in which it is used. For this reason, a range of dictionaries have been used in the following to offer some insights into the limitations of exploring idiom through a purely semantic approach, emphasising the need for a further (con)textual investigation.

---

17 As will be discussed below for *amicus* and *amicitia*.

18 For Latin, the following dictionaries have been consulted: *A Latin Dictionary*, *Founded on Andrews*' *Edition of Freund*'*s Latin Dictionary: Revised*, *Enlarged*, *and in Great Part Rewritten*, ed. by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879) [hereafter *Lewis&Short*]; *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, ed. by R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1975–) [hereafter *DMLBS*]; and *Niermeyer Mediae Latiantis Lexicon Minus: Lexique Latin mediéval–Medieval Latin Dictionary–Mittellateinische Wörterbuch*, ed. by J. F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft, rev. by J. W. J. Burgers, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002) [hereafter *Niermeyer*]. For Old English, the *Dictionary of Old English*, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney and others (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1994–), as accessible under license at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca [hereafter *DOE*]; *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller*, ed. by Joseph Bosworth and T. Northworth Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1898) [hereafter *Bosworth&Toller*]; *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller: Supplement*, ed. by T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921) [hereafter *Bosworth&Toller: Supplement*]. Both the *DMLBS* and the *DOE* are not yet complete; the first has been published in 14 facsimiles up to 'res', the second has provided A-F on CD-ROM and microfiches (1994), and A-G on a revised CD ROM and under license searchable at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca (2004).

19 *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney, with John Price Wilkin, and Xin Xiang, 2009 Release, University of Toronto (2009), as accessible under license at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca [hereafter *DOEC*].

20 *A Thesaurus of Old English in Two Volumes*, ed. by Jane Roberts and Christian Kay, with Lynne Grundy, London Medieval Studies, 11, 2 vols (London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, King's College London, 1995) [hereafter *Thesaurus*].

Manuela Romano has come to a similar conclusion with respect to friendship vocabulary in Old English, emphasising that a full semantic description of the concept of 'friendship' has to include ideas such as extralinguistic meaning, graduality, and vagueness, with its own categorical structure.[21] As such, friendship is naturally close to a discussion of social terms in Anglo-Saxon England and accordingly, a study of friendship is a potential research angle for discussing and reconstructing the social reality of the Anglo-Saxon period; in the extralinguistic meaning of friendship vocabulary lays its importance for discussing social concepts and society in general.[22] However, this extralinguistic meaning of friendship can only be revealed by investigating it in a wider social context. Romano has focussed in her research on a 'Germanic' culture from which these expressions of friendship are supposed to originate, by comparing her results with an examination of the Old Norse semantic concept of 'friend', and by embedding her results in a short discussion of the social notions as present in Tacitus' *De Origine et Situ Germanorum* (also known as *Germania*) and the Old Norse sagas.[23] This illusion of a *Germanische Ursprung* for cultural and social expressions is no longer tenable, as Anglo-Saxon scholarship has freed itself from nineteenth-century ideas of a Pan-Germanic culture and the anachronistic testimony of Tacitus.[24]

Furthermore, by focusing on Old English expressions of friendship only, Romano has denied the influence of Latin semantics, embedded as it is in both Classical and Christian discussions, on the creation of an Anglo-Saxon concept of friendship. Subsequently, she has denied Anglo-Saxon friendship one of its most fascinating aspects and its potential for further research in a wider European context.

---

[21] Manuela Romano, 'Revising Old English Definitions of FRIEND: A Cognitive Account', *General Session and Parasession on the Role of Learnability in Grammatical Theory*, ed. by Jan Johnson, Matthew L. Juge, and Jeri L. Moxley, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 1996), 340-351, pp. 344-346.

[22] Romano, 'Revising Old English Definitions of FRIEND', pp. 340, 346.

[23] Manuela Romano, 'The Scope of the Metaphor for Friendship in Old English and Old Norse: A Contrastive Analysis', *RESLA/ Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (1998-99): 305-314, p. 312.

[24] For a discussion, see, amongst many, Joyce Hill, 'Confronting *Germania Latina*: Changing Responses to Old English Biblical Verse', in *Latin Culture and Medieval Germanic Europe*, ed. by Richard North and Tette Hofstra (Groningen: Forsten, 1992), 71-88; and Roberta Frank, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with their Lord in the *Battle of Maldon:* Anachronism or Nouvelle Vague', in *People and Places in Northern Europe, 500-1600. Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer*, ed. by Ian Wood and Niels Lund (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), 95-106.

Romano's findings with respect to Old English semantics will be acknowledged, yet a new attempt will be undertaken to situate an Anglo-Saxon concept of friendship within a linguistic setting that takes into account both Latin and Old English terminology in a general survey, using the aforesaid tools. These interpretations are not complete, as a full semantic study of notions of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England is beyond the scope of this doctoral thesis. Although a short linguistic investigation is essential, it will also serve to demonstrate the desirability of a historical, rather than a semantic, study of Anglo-Saxon friendship, as ultimately, dictionaries do not position their interpretation within its appropriate social and cultural context. Despite the fact that the following survey will focus on terminology, this will only serve as a starting point for a further conceptualisation of friendship within a broader, and more layered, textual and social context.

1.2.3 Latin – amicitia and its traditions

The common Latin term to denote friendship is *amicitia*, and a friend is *amicus.* The understanding of these two words are, since the time of the Roman Republic, often interpreted according to Cicero's understanding of the bond in his widely circulating treatise *Laelius de Amicitia*, which therefore needs to be discussed briefly as it gives a starting point for understanding the secular connotations of *amicitia* and *amicus* in a medieval context. Cicero was not an original thinker, and derived most of his ideas on friendship from discussions of the topic by Plato and Aristotle; however, these Greek texts were not available in the medieval west, and Cicero offered, as an intermediary of Aristotelian thought, an acceptable discourse for a Christian audience.[25]

Cicero's notion of friendship was as an integral part of virtue (*virtus*), and showed the way to a virtuous life.[26] This virtue was directly linked to the organisation of society, as the unity of interest was interpreted as directed towards the greater good of society; consequently, friendship underlies both society as a

---

25 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. xxxiii; and for a discussion of Cicero's influence on the church fathers, see chap. 2, pp. 38-90; Cassidy, 'He Who Has Friends Can Have no Friend', pp. 46-47; Burt, 'Friendship and Subordination in Earthly Societies', pp. 317-322; and McEvoy, 'Theory of Friendship in the Latin Middle Ages', p. 13.

26 Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, ed. by H. E. Gould and J. L. Whiteley (Wuconda: Colchazy-Carducci, 1999), 22:83-84, pp. 54-55; 27: 100, p. 64; 27:104, p. 66.

whole and harmony.[27] Cicero's idea of friendship was thus a positive force and stabilising factor in the creation of society; he considered friendship as an alliance between virtuous men, from which utility and instrumentality towards the greater good of society derived naturally.[28] As nature, virtue, and goodwill directed the bond, it followed that friends should treat each other as equals, even if not equally positioned within society, and never envy each other.[29] Although Cicero recognised affection and intimacy as aspects of friendship, he did not render either of them essential. As a result, Cicero's conceptualisation of friendship was understood as highly secular, and instrumental, and as such casted a long shadow on the interpretation of *amicitia* and *amicus* in a medieval context.

This idea of *amicitia* as a bond, or alliance between two people or *amici*, is also clear in Latin dictionary entries. *A Latin Dictionary* by Lewis and Short (hereafter *Lewis&Short*) renders *amicus* firstly, as 'friend'; secondly, as 'friend of state, ally'; thirdly, as 'counsellor, courtier, minister of a prince'.[30] Its primary translation for *amicitia* is 'friendship', and its secondary 'a league of friendship, an alliance'. Niermeyer's *Medieval Latin Dictionary* (hereafter *Niermeyer*) is based on medieval sources, albeit mostly continental, in contrast to the aforementioned dictionary. *Niermeyer* lists *amicus* as 'a freeman who has commended himself, who enjoys protection and serves as a dependant'; 'the great men at the king's court, who are his confidants and advisors'; 'kinsman'; 'member of an *amicitia* or a commune'; whereas *amicitia* is rendered as a 'sworn association'; 'commune'; 'giving up a feud'; 'private settlement'; and an expression used for tenure which is not subject to feudal law'.[31] The *Dictionary of Medieval Latin for British Sources* (hereafter *DMLBS*) offers for *amicus* 'friend', 'kinsman', and in combination with *spiritualis* as 'agent (of a friar), proctor'; and for *amicitia* 'friendship, amity', with a connotation of 'worldliness', referring to the Biblical verse James 4:4, and with a secondary translation of a 'friendly settlement' in a legal context.[32] Both *Lewis&Short* and the

---

27 Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, 4:15, pp. 10-11; 17: 61, p. 41; 6:22, p. 16; 7:23, p. 17.

28 Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, 5:18, pp. 13-14; 8:26, pp. 20-21; 14:51, p. 36; 5:19, p. 14.

29 Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, 19:69, p. 46; 20:71, p. 48.

30 *Lewis&Short*, lemma *amicus*, p. 106, and *amicitia*, p. 105.

31 *Niermeyer*, vol. 1: *A-L* (2002), lemma *amicus*, pp. 53-54, and *amicitia*, p. 53.

DMBLS associate *amica* with sexuality: in the first, it is translated as ‘mistress, concubine’ and (rarely) ‘female friend’; in the second, it is rendered as ‘sweetheart, mistress’, ‘female friend’, or figuratively as ‘advocate, patroness’.[33]

These translations show firstly, the importance of the context in which concepts occur for the interpretation of the bond and therefore the limited evidence that can be retrieved from dictionary entries alone, and secondly, that in a British context some nuances and connotations have shifted regarding the interpretation of *amicitia*, *amicus*, and *amica* in comparison to the Ciceronian interpretation. *Amicitia* in its interpretation as a ‘Ciceronian alliance’ is clearly appreciated as being worldly, as also follows from the *DMLBS* interpretation of the notion as ‘worldliness’. This portrayal of *amicitia* as being a secular bond is further rooted in Biblical imagery, and explored in Christian exegesis. In the Old Testament, *amicitia* is represented as a fundamental part of bonding, and is used to define ties between God and his followers in a close rendering of the Ciceronian alliance.[34] It was a positive, virtuous and exalting bond, which bound men to God through love and which could serve as a defence in distress.[35] Alternatively, the Old Testament also offers a more pessimistic view of friends as treacherous beings; if friendship turned sour, it could lead man

---

32 *DMLBS*, vol. 1: *A-L*, ed. by Latham and Howlett (1975-1997), lemma *amicus*, p. 77, and *amicitia*, p. 77. The evidence on *amicus* has been collected and published in 1975 by R. E. Latham; as new research methods have been developed since then, we need to take into account that the evidence of the *DMLBS* on *amicus* and *amicitia* is already dated.

33 In both dictionaries, *amica* is recorded under *amicus*, see *Lewis&Short*, lemma *amicus*, p. 106; *DMLBS*, I, lemma *amicus*, p. 77.

34 For example, see Exodus 33:11: ‘loquebatur autem Dominus ad Mosen facie ad faciem sicut loqui solet homo ad amicum suum cumque ille reverteretur in castra minister eius Iosue filius Nun puer non recedebat de tabernaculo’; 2 Chronicles 20:7: ‘nonne tu Deus noster interfecisti omnes habitatores terrae huius coram populo tuo Israhel et dedisti eam semini Abraham amici tui in sempiternum’; and Isaiah 41:8: ‘et tu Israhel serve meus Iacob quem elegi semen Abraham amici mei.’

35 Proverbs 17:17: ‘omni tempore diligit qui amicus est et frater in angustiis conprobatur’; Sirach 6.14-17: ‘amicus fidelis protectio fortis qui autem invenit illum invenit thesaurum. amico fideli nulla est conparatio et non est digna ponderatio auri et argenti contra bonitatem fidei illius. amicus fidelis medicamentum vitae et inmortalitatis et qui metuunt Dominum inveniunt illum. qui timet Deum aeque habebit amicitiam bonam quoniam secundum illum erit amicus illius’; and Sirach 6:14-15: ‘ne derelinquas amicum antiquum novus enim non erit similis illi vinum novum amicus novus veterescat et cum suavitate bibes illud.’ However, as Carolinne White has warned us, most of these positive statements are found in the so-called Wisdom literature, which is no longer considered canonical, see Carolinne White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 47. For example, David’s friends turn against him in Psalms 34:11-16.

astray. Worldly friendship could end, and additionally, worldly ties and loyalties could endanger man's relationship with God.[36]

The New Testament imagery demonstrates a more spiritual expression of the bond between mankind and God symbolised by Jesus and his sacrifice, which made him a mediator between the worldly and the divine; fear of the Lord was replaced by love and affection through Jesus as leading principle of Christian bonding.[37] The New Testament placed friendship within a context of Christian love and subsequently, *caritas* replaced *amicitia* as a conceptualisation of this bond: harmony within the Christian community was its ultimate goal and friendship, with its ability to disturb harmony –both in the world and between man and God as expressed in James 4:4– had become suspect.[38] Additionally, the two commandments to love God and your neighbour as yourself placed a relationship with God over worldly bonds, creating a hierarchy of friendship –*caritas* representing its spiritual manifestation, and *amicitia* its worldly representation– in an attempt to guarantee peace and harmony within the community.[39]

These biblical examples give some insight into the understanding of the dual nature of friendship in Christian exegesis. The New Testament interpretation had made *amicitia* in a spiritual context problematical, and even questioned the value of the bond amongst men, as it was considered a flexible –and therefore potentially unstable and corrupting– bond. Subsequently, *amicitia* was often associated with the secular world in early Christian exegesis; a notion carried through to the Anglo-Saxon period as demonstrated by Brian McGuire in his discussion of the early medieval period. For example, at Charlemagne's Carolingian court *amicitia* was the bond to negotiate relationships amongst the kings' followers *par excellence*, and exhortations of friendship in letter traditions were solidly embedded in a discourse of favour and loyalty.[40] Even Alcuin, who created a discourse of friendship in which

---

36 For examples, see Psalm 55:12-14; Proverbs 16:28; Proverbs 17:9.

37 1 Corinthians 13:13: 'nunc autem manet fides spes caritas tria haec maior autem his est caritas.'

38 James 4:4: 'adulteri nescitis quia amicitia huius mundi inimica est Dei quicumque ergo voluerit amicus esse saeculi huius inimicus Dei constituitur.'

39 Matthew 22:37-40: 'ait illi Iesus diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo et in tota anima tua et in tota mente tua. hoc est maximum et primum mandatum. secundum autem simile est huic diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum. in his duobus mandatis universa lex pendet et prophetae.'

40 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. 117.

amicitia was, just as *caritas*, an expression of the Christian love for one's neighbour, ultimately embedded his interpretation of friendship within a wider conception of society, in which friendship served to create a political unity within the brotherhood of Christ based on the combination of both Ciceronian and Christian ideas of the nature of *amicitia*.[41]

These connotations of certain concepts can also be explored by using the *DOEC*, to compare our Latin terminology with Old English idiom in the glosses, within a set textual context. The Latin-Old English glosses give an overview of what certain medieval scribes thought to be appropriate translations for notions within a certain context; however, this contextual connection is also its limitation, as being indicative and suggestive rather than prescriptive, and as potentially removed from the textual context of our own sources. For this reason, this evidence will be presented in a generalising manner, to give an overview of the ideas that are preserved within an Anglo-Saxon context without taking this evidence for granted. Naturally, neither the Latin nor the Old English words for friendship can be considered stable, yet it is revealing that *amicitia* is without exception rendered as *freondscipe* in the glosses; and that *freond* is by far the preferred translation for *amicus.*[42] The only blurring of definition is suggested with respect to the bond of kinship; *amicus* is sometimes rendered as *mæg*, as we already encountered in the translation 'kinsman' in the *DMLBS.*[43]

1.2.4 Old English – freond and wine

As the glosses already suggest, *freond* and *freondscipe* are usually considered the closest Old English translations for *amicus* and *amicitia*. However, when considering these words in closer detail, it becomes clear that the Old English terms are less stable in their meaning than their Latin counterparts. The dated evidence of *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* by Bosworth and Toller (hereafter *Bosworth&Toller*) offers for *freondscipe* both 'friendship' and '*amicitia*' as translations. The more recent

---

41 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. 124-127.

42 For example, the glosses on the psalms consequently render *amici mei et proximi mei et notos meos* as *freond 7 nehstan 7 cuþe; amici mei et proximi mei* as either *frynd mine 7 þa nehstan mine* or *frynd mine 7 magas*; *amici tui deus* as *synd frynd þine god*; and the glosses on John render *lazarus amicus* as *lazarus freond*.

43 For example, *parentibus et fratribus et cognatis et amicis* is rendered as *aldrum 7 broðrom 7 friondom 7 megum* in the glosses on John, and *amica mea* is turned into *mego min* in a liturgical text from Durham; *DMLBS*, I, lemma *amicus*, p. 77, as mentioned above.

Dictionary of Old English (hereafter *DOE*) adds to these translations: 'a state/condition of friendship'; 'friendly disposition shown (mainly by a ruler or superior); goodwill, favour, graciousness'; 'fellowship (rendering *collegium*)'.[44]

Bosworth&Toller initially only renders *freond* as 'friend' and '*amicus*', yet Toller has already diversified its meaning in his *Supplement*: 'where mutual affection is felt or possessed'; 'used to a stranger as a mark of goodwill or kindly condescension'; 'relative, kinsman'; 'lover'; 'one who wishes well to another, favours, supports, helps'; in a legal context, 'one who undertakes responsibility on behalf of another'; 'one who is at the same side, or the same party as another'; and 'one who is at good terms with one another, nor at variance'.[45] This is further supported by the evidence of the *DOE*, which renders *freond* as 'friend, intimate, one for whom affection is felt'; 'loyal/beloved/close/faithful friend (with *hold/leof/full/ neah(feald)/(ge)treowan*)'; 'a friend of long standing (with *eald*)'; 'acquaintance, used as a mark of goodwill or kindly condescension, a person one wishes well'; 'someone/something friendly towards another, an institution, *etc*.: help, support'; 'one well-disposed or showing favour to another/something'; 'benefactor, one who befriends an institution'; 'worldly person, sinner (with *middangeardes/þissere worulde*)'; 'anything helpful (of things)'; 'one on good terms with, associate, ally'.[46] The additions, particularly in the *DOE*, suggest that we cannot see friendship separately from the negotiation of favour and goodwill in certain textual settings.

The *Thesaurus* also testifies to a more diverse interpretation of *freond*: it associates the term with 'kinsman, relative'; 'a loving relationship, lover'; 'an acquaintance, friend, associate'; 'comrade'; and even 'legislator'.[47] However, the *Thesaurus* is an imperfect tool as it lists Old English words under modern English descriptive phrases, terms, ideas, and notions with a similar meaning, although none of these can be considered strict synonyms. As a result, the *Thesaurus* is based on modern interpretations of concepts and notions, rather than on a contextual reading of Old English passages and is thus subjective and suggestive rather than objective

---

[44] *DOE*, lemma *freondscipe*. I want to thank Carolyn Twomey at Boston College, Boston MA, for consulting the online *DOE* on my behalf; all mistakes in interpretation resulting from this evidence are naturally my own.

[45] Compare, *Bosworth&Toller*, lemma *freond*, p. 335; *Bosworth&Toller: Supplement*, lemma *freond*, p. 226.

[46] *DOE*, lemma *freond*.

[47] *Thesaurus*, Vol. II: *Index*, p. 986.

and prescriptive. However, it also reveals some of the interaction between different terms in Old English through the eyes of its editors, and thus some of our modern preconceptions 'in action'. This follows especially, when approaching the *Thesaurus* from the modern English perspective: 'friend' as part of a subcategory is listed under the main categories 'emotion' and 'social interaction'. In the first –under 'acquaintance, friend, associate'– it is rendered in Old English as *cuþa*, (*ge*)*fera*, *freond*, and *wine*; in the second –under 'ally, comrade, friend'– as *broþor*, *freond*, *gefylga*, *samodgesiþ*, and *geþofta.*[48] 'Friendship' is only found in the category for 'emotion', and is rendered as *geferræden*, *freondræden*, *freondscipe*, *siblufu*, and *winescype*.[49] Although highly suggestive, the *Thesaurus* shows with these interpretations that the demarcation lines between the concepts of friendship, kinship, companionship, and bonds based on hierarchy were apparently blurred.[50]

Additionally, the *Thesaurus* offers *wine* as a alternative translation for 'friend', which is also confirmed by *Bosworth&Toller*: its primary translation is 'friend', and its secondary translation 'a friendly lord (applied to one who can help, protect)', embeds *wine* in an hierarchical context.[51] However, as we have seen in our discussion of glosses for *amicitia* and *amicus* based on a search in the *DOEC*, neither *wine* nor *winescype* has been offered in the glosses as translation for these two Latin concepts. If we target these two words, we are provided with two further insights: the only two occurrences of *wine* (as 'friend' rather than 'wine') in glosses, are found in

---

48 *Thesaurus*, Vol, I: *Introduction and Thesaurus*, pp. 438, 558.

49 *Thesaurus*, I, p. 438.

50 Above-mentioned terms can be positioned as follows: *cuþa*, *broþor*, and *siblufu* (kinship); (*ge*)*fera*, *geferræden*, (comradeship or association); *gefylga*, *samodgesiþ*, *geþofta* (hierarchical dimension). *Wine* and *winescype* will be discussed in closer detail in the following.

51 *Bosworth&Toller*, lemma *wine*, p. 1233; two more translations are given for *wine*, namely 'lover' as based on *amator* as discussed in the following, and 'applied to an inferior or subordinate, one to who favour or protection may be shewn', as based on the address of Beowulf as *wine min* by Hrothgar. This last instance will be discussed in chapter four below, and I argue for seeing this reference as embedded in the relationship between Beowulf and Hrothgar, see the discussion below, chap. 3, pp. 149-150. The *Thesaurus*, as we have seen, lists *wine* under 'acquaintance, friend, associate', but also under 'follower, a 'loving relationship' and 'care, interest in', see *Thesaurus*, II, p. 1514. Most of these alternative classifications seem flawed to me, as will follow from a discussion of the use of *wine* in *Beowulf* in chapter four, below. In the future, the *DOE* will hopefully correct these misunderstandings/misinterpretations.

Aldhelmian glosses, as an Old English equivalent for the Latin *amator*.[52] *Winescipe* is offered for the Latin Aldhelmian phrase *inseparibili angelicae sodalitatis collegio perfui*, which suggests a translation of 'troop' rather than 'friendship'.[53] *Winescype* only occurs once more in the Old English Corpus, in *Guthlac B*, in which it seems to serve as an indication of status and authority.[54]

From a search in the *DOEC*, and a careful analysis of all the possible returns for *wine* and *freond* in all various spellings it follows that *freond* is more commonly used in prose texts and less current in poetry throughout, and that *wine* in its contextual meaning as 'friend' is a pure poetic term, apart from our two Aldhelmian glosses. For this reason, it may be suggested that we should not put too much weight on the evidence of the Aldhelmian glosses and instead, *wine* needs to be discussed in its poetic context, as complementing *freond* in a demonstration of the nuance in Old English terminology and the conceptualisation of friendship.

1.2.5 Infringing interpretations? –some Old English and Latin terms

Our linguistic observations suggest that our Anglo-Saxon 'friends' were embroiled in three relationships simultaneously: a vertical bond defined by comradeship and association, a horizontal bond defined by hierarchical dimensions –reflected in the secondary translation of *freondscipe* as 'goodwill' or 'graciousness' in the *DOE*– and a blood-relationship. These observations are shared with Manuela Romano, who sees the category of 'friendship' as encroaching on the domains of 'kinship', 'social rank', 'military rank', 'servants', *etc*.[55] This gives us a range of relationships to explore in our sources *within* their textual context, and reminds us of the possibility of intrusion in meaning and interaction in practice between different forms of bonding. This emphasises a need to look beyond terminology when exploring the bond in a historical context, as the interaction between various bonds may add to our understanding of friendship.

---

52 *Lewis&Short*, lemma *amator*, p. 101: 'lover, friend' (in an honourable sense); 'lover, paramour, gallant' (in an dishonourable sense). *DMLBS*, I, lemma *amator*, p. 74: 'lover, adherent, friend' (either sexual or spiritual). *Niermeyer* does not offer an interpretation.

53 As suggested in *Bosworth&Toller*, lemma *winescipe*, p. 1233, and n. 52 above.

54 *Guthlac B*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 1171a-1174b: 'Læst ealle well wære /ond winescype,// word þa wit spræcon,/ leofast manna. //Næfre ic lufan/ sibbe, þeoden, //æt þearfe þine /forlæte asanian.' Citations of verse in footnotes will be presented with // representing line breaks and / representing caesurae.

55 *DOE*, lemma *freondscipe;* Romano, 'Revising Old English Definitions of FRIEND', p. 345.

If we explore this sense of 'relational infringement' in the glosses, and explore some Latin terms that render these various associations, we find that the glosses render *societas* as (*ge)ferscipe*, (*ge)ferræden*, or *geþeodnesse*; *sodalibus* as *geþoftum*; *commilitionibus* as *campgeferum; familiaris* as *hiwcuþ*, *hiredmann*, or *gefera;* and *familiaritas* as *hiwcuþrædnys*, *ferræden*, *hiwcuðnysse*, and *hiredwist. Gesiþa* is usually associated with *comites* and *clientes*, with this last term also solidly connected with terms indicating thegns, such as *ðegnhyssas*, *þenræden* and *cnihten.* Interestingly, one gloss expands upon *cliens*, explaining it to be an *amicus minor*, which proposes an interpretation of *amicus* within a range of hierarchical defined, formal bonds. Finally, *socius* is rendered as (*ge)fera*, with one exception as *freond*, and with one occurrence of *amicus socius* as *freond*.

It is also clear that emotive concepts are not associated with either *freond* or *wine*, contrary to what is suggested in the *Thesaurus*, with the exception of our Aldhelmian glosses that offer *wine* for *amator*; however, four times more often (*h)lufiend/lufigend* are offered as rendering of *amator* instead. *Amor* is consequently rendered as *lufu; dilectio* as *lufu; affectum* and *affectio* as *mægsibbe*, *lufu*, or *hyld*; *caritas* as *(soþ)lufu*; *carus* and *carissimus* as *leof*. Hence, these observations suggest that the *Thesaurus*' main indexation of 'friendship' and 'friend' in the category 'emotion' is the result of a modern preconception rather than an Anglo-Saxon reality. These suggestions seem to refer *freond* and *freondscipe* solidly to a secular interpretation of the bond; our modern idea of friendship as being based on intimacy and love, seems better served by *familiaritas* and *familiaris*, and (*ge)ferscipe/ (ge)ferræden* and (*ge)fera*.[56]

---

[56] *Lewis&Short*, lemma *familiaritas*, p. 724: 'familiarity, intimacy, familiar intercourse, friendship, intimacy, acquaintancy'; lemma *familiaris*, p. 724: 'servant'; 'belonging to a household or family' (private dimension); 'familiar, intimate, a familiar acquaintance, friend'. *Niermeyer*, I, lemma *familiaritas*, p. 537: 'protection of a monastery afforded by the king'; 'the status of a specially privileged dependant (tributary) of a church'; lemma *familiaris*, p. 536: 'manorial dependant'; '*ministerialis*'; with *regis/regalis/regius* 'dinity at the Sicilian court'; 'one who has been received into the community of good deeds of the monastery'. *DMLBS*, I, lemma *familiaritas*, pp. 903-904: 'membership of household, participation to the household life, household'; 'intimate relationship'; 'association, familiarity' (in a bad sense); 'family relationship'; lemma *familaris*, p. 903: 'belonging to a household/retinue, servant'; 'closely associated by kinship or friendship, intimate'; 'well-known, familiar acquaintance'; 'benefactor of a community'. *Bosworth&Toller*, lemma *geferscipe*, p. 391: 'society, fellowship, brotherhood'; 'loving fellowship'; *familiaritas; societas*; lemma *geferræden*, p. 391: 'companionship, fellowship, society, congregation'; 'familiarity, friendship'; *familiaritas*. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, lemma *gefera*, p. 391: 'companion, comrade, associate, fellow, colleague, fellow-disciple, man, servant'; *Bosworth&Toller: Supplement*, lemma *gefera*, p. 325: 'a companion, associate'; 'an associate in work, partner, assistant, colleague'; 'an association in the execution of a plan, a

At this point, it is useful to reflect briefly upon Romano's definitions for both *freond* and *wine* resulting from the most basic terms of her social category of 'friendship':

> **Freond:* (1) person to whom one must always be loyal, (2) especially in adversity (3) even after death, because (4) one's own survival depends on this relationship. (5) If this person fulfils his part of the contract, he receives protection and gifts in exchange, but (6) if the contract is broken, the outcome will be exile and self-destruction. (7) The relationship of *freond* exists at all levels of society and in both directions: from superior to inferior and vice versa, and (8) both within the domains of peace and war.
>
> **Wine:* (1) friend and lord whose functions are mainly restricted to the domain of war. (2) His main obligations are to protect and show generosity to his vassals since (3) he is their only means of survival and vice versa.[57]

Romano's conclusions are based on a full semantic study of the context in which these categories occur. Her conclusions suggest that both *freond* and *wine* are part of a reciprocal relationship, the first embedded in an exchange that may result from a 'contract' or 'agreement' between the two parties from all levels of society, and the second defined by hierarchical terms.

Not all notions and connotations defined by Romano will be reflected in our discussion of friendship, as our sources are from a defined period and embedded in a specific textual context, and additionally, Latin occurrences will be taken into account. However, her observations, and the discussion above result in some starting points for research from the combined outcomes. Firstly, it is clear that *freond* and *amicus* are closely associated and that both terms can thus be studied comparatively, giving a first reference point to start exploring discourses of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England. Secondly, *wine* is an additional point of entry, which should be studied alongside *freond* in poetry to understand the differences in use between the two Old English concepts. Thirdly, both *freond* and *wine* are part of a social process which is essentially reciprocal, and which interacts with other social notions, such as authority and kinship, and should be studied in accordance with these other forms of

---

confederate'; 'a comrade, brother-in-arms'; 'a fellow servant'; 'an follower, adherent, one of a retinue'. *Hiwcuþ* and *hiwcuþrædness* as offered as translation for *familiaris* and *familiaritas* in the glosses seem to have been specifically fabricated to render the Latin notions, as *hiwcuþ* means literally 'well known appearance'.

57 Romano, 'Revising Old English Definitions of FRIEND', pp. 245-246.

bonds. Fourthly, *amicus*, *freond*, and *wine* seem to have been embedded in an overtly secular context. This does not exclude the use of these concepts within religious sources, but its use in religious sources may be affected by the secular connotation of the bond of friendship. Fifthly, Anglo-Saxon friendship vocabulary seems to have been embedded in a discourse of favour in certain settings, and as such, favour and goodwill needs to be taken into account when discussing the notion. And finally, affection and love are different conceptual ideas from *freond*, *wine* and *amicus*, and may be studied in connection, but are not necessarily interconnected to our discussed linguistic qualifiers of late Anglo-Saxon friendship.

1.3 Context and Approach

1.3.1 Interaction with other forms of bonding

If we understand friendship primarily as a *constructed* bond rooted in a form of reciprocity, it also becomes possible to draw boundaries between kinship, friendship, and bonds based on hierarchy without ruling out the possibility of trespassing along these boundaries. Kinship was always understood as defined by birth. Yet this does not prevent any member of society from entering into a constructed tie additional to this bond, just as our modern example of the cousin that becomes a good friend may illustrate. Vertical bonds deriving from hierarchical dimensions could be both understood –a king was a given in Anglo-Saxon society just as a stratified dimension within networks– and also actively constructed. Interaction between these ties and intermingling of their terminology is thus inherent to the nature of these bonds.

Friendship and kinship were intertwined by definition in a tenth- and early eleventh-century context, as kinship extended to other relationships than blood relations only.[58] The most common denotation for kindred in Old English is *mægð*,

---

[58] Lorraine Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', *The British Journal of Society*, 9.3 (1958): 230-250, p. 239; Robin Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 7; Thomas Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', in *The Anglo-Saxons from the Migration Period to the Eighth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. by John Hines (Woodbridge and San Marino: Boydell for the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress, 1997), 171-210, p. 171. For a discussion of the interaction between kinship and friendship in medieval Scandinavian sources, contextualised within sociological and anthropological theory, see also Pragya Vohra, 'Kinship in the Viking Diaspora: Icelanders and their Relations across the North Atlantic' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2008), pp. 22-38.

but many other terms -such as *cynn*, *freondscipe* and *sibbe*- could also be used in situations involving members of the kindred, pedigree or kin relations. These terms were not necessarily interchangeable; the context in which they were used determined their meaning, as is discussed with respect to *cynn* by Thomas Charles-Edwards and already emphasised in our general discussion of Old English terminology for friendship.[59] We only have the means to theorise about the nature of kinship at the higher echelons of society, as the sources of the period do not allow extended reflection on the nature of kinship ties for those who did not possess status, a royally granted office, or substantial landholdings. For this reason, our research of friendship –and of any other social bond within late Anglo-Saxon society– is rooted in élite culture. The role of kin in the negotiation of social status for newborn members of the Anglo-Saxon nobility led naturally to the entanglement of politics and the family in our period of research. As a result, the demarcation of the kingroup was of utter importance.

When a child was born into a noble family, his/her social status would naturally be defined by the father and mother.[60] The child would be the focus of this kingroup, tying two bilateral kingroups together upon birth, a kin structure usually described as 'Ego-centred' in which the child is Ego.[61] Ego knitted his or her parents together, in a constructed marital bond. Marriage in this way created both kinships and friendships.[62] Marriage itself was virilocal and agnatic in orientation: Ego's actively involved kin would firstly derive from the paternal kin, although the maternal kin modestly shared in certain legal obligations and possibly rights.[63] Naturally, Ego's direct sisters and brothers would share the same kingroup, but this

---

[59] Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', pp. 188-191.

[60] William Miller has rightly pointed out that this only applies to members of social standing within networks, as members of lower rank were more likely to be judged by the importance of the social collective to which they belonged, see William Ian Miller, *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking. Feud*, *Law and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 157-158.

[61] Pauline Stafford, 'King and Kin, Lord and Community. England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *Gender*, *Family and the Legitimation of Power. England from the Ninth to Early Twelfth Century*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), VIII, 1-33, p. 13.

[62] Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', p. 181.

[63] Concerning the responsibilities of the legal obligation of the maternal kin see, for example, Af 27, p. 66.

situation was often compromised by the practice of serial monogamy.[64] Half-brothers and half-sisters created problems not only with respect to inheritance practice, it also extended Ego's family relations through his (re)married father/mother to a wider group of affinal relationships. Additionally, Ego could be drawn into forms of constructed kinship with foster parents ('quasi-kinship'), god-parents ('ritual kinship'), and step-parents ('semi-kinship').[65] Not only did these constructed bonds create a tie between the participants directly involved, they could also result in further complications: 'semi-kinship' could have legal implications with respect to inheritance practice, as step-parents may have tried securing their own children's rights over Ego's claims, whereas all three categories restricted Ego's choice of marriage partners.[66]

All these constructed bonds of marriage, god-parenthood, step-parenthood, fostering, and baptismal sponsoring could be interpreted as friendships, rather than kinships, as also reflected in the confusing of terminology in Old English. Lorraine Lancaster and Robin Fleming have observed that membership to a kingroup seems to have been closely defined within two or three generations, as reflected in the use of terminology in Anglo-Saxon sources, legal inheritance patterns, and commemoration practice.[67] However, this did not exclude claiming either kinship or friendship, a

---

[64] A famous example is King Edgar and his third wife Ælfthryth. Edgar's first marriage to Æthelflæd had produced at least one son, the later King Edward 'the Martyr' (975-978). His second marriage, the social status of which is the subject of a fierce scholarly debate, to Wulfthryth produced a daughter Edith, the later abbess of Wilton. His third marriage to Ælfthryth produced two sons Edmund († 970) and the later King Æthelred 'the Unready' (978-1016). Neither was King Edgar Ælfthryth's first husband, as she had previously been married to Æthelwold (†962), the eldest son of Æthelstan 'Half-King' and ealdorman of East Anglia (956-962). This pattern of serial monogamy was not exclusive to the royal family. For instance, see Andrew Wareham's description of the many liaisons of Uhtred of Northumbria and his kin for an aristocratic equivalent in Andrew Wareham, 'Two Models of Marriage: Kinship and the Social Order in England and Normandy', in *Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power. Western Europe in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. by Henk Teunis, Andrew Wareham, and Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, International Medieval Research, 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 107-132, pp. 108-113.

[65] Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', p. 239. These forms of constructed 'kinship' could also be interpreted as friendships, based on the fact that the bond was actively forged in a reciprocal exchange, as acknowledged by Joseph Lynch with respect to Frankish sources, see Joseph H. Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 198.

[66] On marriage prohibitions, see, for example, VI As 12, p. 250; I Cn 7, p. 290; and II Cn 51, p. 346. Additionally, god-parenthood also entitled to wergild under certain circumstances, see Ine 76, p. 122.

[67] Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', pp. 237-238; Fleming, *Kings and Lordship in Conquest England*, pp. 4-5.

choice often motivated by a social drive. If claiming kin was profitable, it could be evoked to meet needs or procure benefits and consequently could interfere with established notions of dependency. At this level, the association between two persons could thus be interpreted as both an understood and a constructed relationship: a bond based on kinship and friendship, and possibly located in hierarchical dimensions based on social interests. Consequently, family relations should be seen as a patchwork of overlapping and co-existing relationships of kinship and friendship, between which the boundaries could not be easily drawn.

When Ego grew up, he or she would be engaged not only in similar kinship constructions, but would also become embroiled in relationships based on (inter)dependency, often situated in hierarchical dimensions. This situation would be different for men and women. If Ego was female, she would probably marry and find herself an additional protector in her new husband and his kin, especially if offspring was produced. However, the document *Be Wifmannes Beweddunge* (*c.* 1030) suggests that her own kinsmen stayed very much involved, and would be expected to offer support and (legal) protection in case the circumstances within the marriage changed.[68] A woman needed her *freondas*, who in this situation could derive from both her close and wider kin, and/or held office in the area where she came from, as they were her only legal protection against accusations and deprivation, if her husband or his kin turned against her.[69] This suggests that the legal system in late Anglo-Saxon England may have been 'a man's world', but that the protection of women was an intrinsic part of its set-up.

Furthermore, as lady of the house, she would lead and organise a household, attend and organise feasts, interact with servants, slaves, male associates of her

[68] For the complete texts, see *Gesetze*, I, pp. 442-443. Felix Liebermann has dated this document to *c.* 970-1060, with a preference for the 1030s, see Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, p. 442. Dorothy Whitelock has pointed out that the emphasis placed on a woman's consent with the marriage and the Norse loanword *sammæle* suggest a slightly later transmission date, making the 1030s plausible, see Whitelock, *EHD*, I, 50, p. 467. Patrick Wormald has concluded that all available evidence points towards a reading of this document within Wulfstan's era, as the archbishop showed a keen interest in expanding the church's influence on marriage practice and as lawsuits were often the result of debated inheritances between two kingroups, see Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*. *Volume I: Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999), p. 386.

[69] *Be Wifmannes Bededdunge*, 7, p. 442: 'Gif hy man ðonne ut of lande lædan wille on oðres þegnes land, ðonne bið hire ræd, ðæt frynd ða forword habban, ðæt hire man nan who to ne do, 7 gif heo gylt gewyrce, ðæt hy moton beon bote nyhst, gif heo næfð, of hwam heo bete.' For an interpretation of *freond* in this context, see the full text of the document, which shows that these *frynd* could either be her *magas*, or a *forespreca.* Additionally, the emphasis on jurisdiction in this clause allows an interpretation of these *frynd* as the local office-holder.

husband, female neighbours. This again would create reciprocal, informal bonds, and more formal bonds based on her household authority. Despite the fact that these bonds may be difficult to map as our source material is usually rooted in a thoroughly male and formal settings –Ælfric's complaints about the behaviour of women at beer-parties offering a rare and partial glimpse into the existence of female feasts– we should approach female interaction, and thus position friendships with women in a gendered examination of the used vocabulary, with all these examples in mind.[70]

If Ego was male, he would establish both public and private bonds with those around him, creating ties of dependency and interdependency. He would find comrades and would be subjected to authority, while serving in the *fyrd* or maintaining bridges or boroughs on behalf of the king; he could serve as a warrantor for his neighbours and associates in court proceedings based on obligations inspired by both horizontal and vertical bonds; he may compete with others for offices and land-holdings from the king; and he might get involved as a patron or pious believer in the local religious communities.[71] In this way, Ego would enter all kind of formal and informal bonds based on both interdependency and dependency, and rooted in both one-way obligations and reciprocity. Relationships based on a form of dependency were similar to friendships actively formed and rooted in the bond between a dyadic pair; subsequently, the language between the two bonds would overlap, as the bonds also naturally interacted with each other.[72] Furthermore,

---

[70] For a discussion and edition of Ælfric's *Letter to Brother Edward*, in which questions regarding female partying in the countryside are raised, see Mary Clayton, 'An Edition of Ælfric's Letter to Brother Edward', in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002): 263-283, p. 282.

[71] For a discussion of the obligations of men, see Richard P. Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 61-63, 88-89; for a discussion of interaction between men at local level, see Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 109-113; for a discussion of the relationship with local church communities, see, for example, John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 341-367.

[72] A similar conclusion is raised by Paul Hyams in his study of the role disputes and dispute settlements, see Paul R. Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 22-23. For a useful semantic study of the entanglement of these bonds in Carolingian sources, reaching similar conclusions, see Dennis Howard Green, *The Carolingian Lord. Semantic Studies on Four Old High German Words: Balder*, *Frô*, *Truhtin*, *Hêrro* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), pp. 108-109.

different forms of association –both formally and informally created– could easily co-exist, without being either exclusive or levelling out inequalities.

All these examples of interface between friendship and other forms of bonding emphasise that friendship as a bond never stood by itself, and was often part of a series of bonds between a dyadic pair within a wider social framework. Friendship was thus not only a reciprocal, but also an additional bond, and often flexible. It created negotiation space within a social structure that originated in the acceptance of understood bonds of kinship, and ruled by hierarchical bonds within a stratified society. As such, friendship was a necessary mechanism to define and balance ties in a society held together by personal bonds of varied nature; it stood not by itself, as informal bonds in society were rooted in various 'units' of social organisation –in Susan Reynolds' terminology 'collectivities' and 'solidarities'– which were characterised by loyalties and reciprocal attitudes, emphasising once again the importance of the role of friendship *in* and *alongside* other forms of bonding in late Anglo-Saxon social networks.[73]

Reynolds' emphasis on the need to research smaller units of social organisation in medieval society within a larger institutional framework has influenced various case studies of particular communities in medieval society, often focussing on religious communities as focal points for the exchange of gifts, obligations, and interests.[74] Additionally, her observations have resulted in an interest in the mechanisms that could create an equilibrium in society between the various 'solidarities'; recourse to violence and dispute settlements have been discussed by Paul Hyams in an Anglo-Saxon context. Friendship provides an alternative angle of research as originating from both formal and informal power at the heart of encroaching social networks, embedded in both horizontal and vertical dimensions.[75] Moreover, Gerd Althoff has argued that friendship, as a social construct, created

---

73 Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

74 In a Frankish context, see Stephen D. White, *Custom*, *Kinship and Gifts to the Saints. The Laudatio Parentum In West-France 1050-1150*, Studies in Legal History (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), pp. 128-129; Barbara Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter. The Social Meaning of Cluny Property* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 202-203; in an Anglo-Saxon context, Andrew Wareham, *Lords and Communities in Early Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), p. 62.

75 Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, pp. 22-25, 88.

order and harmony within medieval society.[76] If friendship indeed contributed to a stable political order, it can be seen as trespassing into the political sphere of formal power negotiation, and may have been part of the formal creation of bonds between the king and his followers. Yet the formal and informal function of friendship, and the flexibility of the bond, could also create problems within the maintenance of social order as the bond was ultimately fragile and unstable.

1.3.2 Friendship and late Anglo-Saxon society

This is where a study of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon society could open up the social organisation of the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom, which needs to be discussed against some contextualisation of this period of Anglo-Saxon history. In the tenth and early eleventh century, the social make up of Anglo-Saxon England changed considerably. Successive conquests under King Edward (899–924), King Æthelstan (924–939), and King Edmund (939–946) had resulted in a much larger and more complex kingdom, which created a need for unification and emphasised the need to find common ground between the kings and their (new) followers in functioning, social networks.[77] These networks supported the administration of the kingdom, communicating and negotiating royal authority through personal bonds, filtered down by the aristocracy in an ongoing dialogue between different levels of the royal administration, in a tiered system which negotiated peace and unity in the expanding kingdom.

This analysis of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom as a relatively coherent and sophisticated entity organised from above –referred to in historiographical surveys as the 'maximum view' of society– has been challenged by scholars questioning the importance of centralised expressions of power, exploring the disintegration of authority in the kingdom during King Æthelred's reign (978–1016) as the result of internal divisions inherent in the social system and the rise in power of aristocratic

---

[76] Gerd Althoff, 'Friendship and Political Order', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 91-105, pp. 91-92.

[77] Influential studies for contextualising this period are, amongst many, Pauline Stafford, *Unification and Conquest. A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London: Arnolds; New York: Routledge, 1989); Henry R. Loyn, *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England, 500-1087* (London: Arnold, 1984); Ann Williams, *Kingship and Government in Pre-Conquest England, c.500-1066* (New York: St Martin's; Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999); Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 228-231; Simon Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12', *ASE*, 36 (2007): 151-220, pp. 152-153.

families, rather than searching for explanations within the royal control.[78] These critics have emphasised that this system eroded as the result of the cumulative wealth of certain members which resulted in an increasing need to generate favours to reward royal followers.

However, Stephen Baxter and Ann Williams have convincingly demonstrated that the late Anglo-Saxon kings had proportionally startling degrees of power over their subjects, and that the mighty aristocratic families compensated for their insecure positions with informal bonds within local networks.[79] Ann Williams' in-depth analysis of the organisations at the grassroots of society –the shires, hundreds, vills, manors and boroughs– through which local power was mediated in the late tenth century has demonstrated that royal authority was interdependent on local power negotiations, suggesting a middle ground between the arguments of the maximum view of institutionalised formal power and the opposing arguments for informal power structures at the grassroots. This conclusion can be strengthened by the arguments of Simon Keynes, who has convincingly demonstrated that the fragmentation of bonds between the king and his followers was highly influential on the disintegration of society from within.[80] A similar situation of 'volcanic' outbursts of friction at the local level as the result of discontent with royal favouritism and court rivalry, has been sketched by Stephen Baxter, who portrays the symbiotic

---

[78] For a discussion of these two views, see Stephen Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia. Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 10-11, 61-62. For examples of the maximum view, see James Campbell, 'Observations on the English Government from the Tenth to the Twelfth Centuries', in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London and Ronceverte: Hambledon, 1986), 150-170, p. 150 [reprinted from *TRHS*, fifth series, 25 (1975): 39-54]; James Campbell, 'The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximum View, in *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London: Hambledon, 2000), 1-30; Patrick Wormald, 'Giving God and King their Due', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text*, *Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 333-355, p. 354 [originally published in *La giustizia nell*'*alto medioevo (secoli IX-XI)*, Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' alto Medioevo, 44 (Spoleto: Settimana di Studio, 1997), 549-90]. For its critics, see for example, Stafford, 'King and Kin, Lord and Community', p. 7; Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, chap. 3, pp. 71-110; Rees Davies, 'The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16.2 (2003): 280-300, pp. 289-290; Simon Keynes, 'Apocalypse Then: England AD 1000', in *Europe around the Year 1000*, ed. by Przemysław Urbańczyk (Warsaw: Widaw DiG, 2001), 247-70, pp. 251-259; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp. xlvii-li.

[79] Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia*, pp. 61-62; Williams, *Kingship and Government*, pp. 107-122, with conclusions on p. 122.

[80] Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 162-163.

relationship between tensions –at court and within localities– through the double-connection of the aristocrats with both levels of power mediation.[81]

These observations point out the existence of a 'middle ground' at which formal and informal power came together and interacted with each other, and it seems to be that at this point of connection, problems arose within the social system. The Anglo-Saxon kingdom was thus less of a 'state' and more of a social construct of interconnected and interacting social units under royal control.[82] Its real functional power lay in the local communities at the grassroots, which were tied together by shared interests, needs, rights and obligations to the royal administration and each other. Hence, it appears to be that the kernel for the tensions within the social system should be sought at the middle ground between 'national' and 'local' administration within the kingdom, at which formal and informal power was negotiated. This is also exactly where we would expect to find references to friendship for its double-connection with both formal and informal bonds. By mapping the various discourses of friendship in the period, we may be able to reflect upon some of the changes underlying the disintegration of bonds at the end of our period of research.

Nonetheless, it should also be acknowledged that those in the overseeing tiers –the king and the bishops– were aware of the fact that the increasingly complex social make up of society presented them with the danger of losing touch with the grassroots of society. In our period of research, we can therefore observe two movements that sought ways to reconnect with society's basis, aiming to prevent the corrosion of society and to create unity. Royal and ecclesiastical concerns coincided and subsequently, during the 940s and 950s initiatives were developed in concordance; two regulating movements can be observed which concurrently tried to impose a more authoritative governing style, based on a conservative interpretation of the 'ideal past'.[83] The royal initiative focused on law-giving and legal administration, creating new units of organisation and representation –for example the hundred and shire courts– and enhancing the royal presence in local communities through royal officials such as the reeve, while embedding their initiatives in

---

[81] Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia*, p. 71.

[82] Reynolds, *Kingship and Communities*, p. 264.

[83] Catherine Cubitt has classified this double-programme of administrative and religious initiatives as a policy which aimed "to unite the kingdom by ideological means", see Catherine Cubitt, 'The Tenth-Century Benedictine Reform in England', *EME*, 6.1 (1997): 77-94, p. 79.

traditions, referring to glorious predecessors who were famous for their military prowess, law-giving initiatives, and piety. The ecclesiastical leaders focused on the religious communities, both monastic and clerical, emphasising those aspects of the religious life that differentiated its members from the lay world in a movement traditionally referred to as the 'Benedictine reform', preparing the grounds for a new interpretation of society in three orders, each with their own designated role within the social system.[84]

However, in doing so, we are restricted by the nature of our sources for the period. Our image of this 'united kingdom' and its administration is an amalgamation of ideas and interpretations based on diverse material offering varied representations. Tenth-century England is thus not only a historical construct, but also a literary construct based on our interpretation of texts of a miscellaneous nature, genre, origin, aim, and function. These various texts give us insights into a set of interlocking pictures, but fail to give us a total view of the kingdom, its social structure or its administration, despite offering representations of facets of society. The study of specific notions within this social construct creates the opportunity for scrutinising the discourses underlying these representations, and this is where research into discourses of friendship may open up our current appreciation of late Anglo-Saxon England. Only by allowing various texts their own voice, we will be able to look into aspects of late Anglo-Saxon society without aiming to portray a 'total view'. Friendship is a particularly interesting notion to study in this context, as it has not been neatly defined and it encompasses a variety of relationships. Its vagueness in

---

[84] For an in-depth introduction to the reform movement, see the collected essays discussing its main representatives; for the 'first generation' of reformers, see *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge and Wolfeboro, NH: Boydell, 1988); *Saint Dunstan: His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 1992); *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt, The Makers of England, 2 (London: Leicester University Press, 1996); for the 'second generation' of reformers, see *Wulfstan*, *Archbishop of York*, ed. by Matthew Townend, The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004); *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2009). For a discussion of the problematic terminology, and the desirability to discuss this 'reform' rather as a 'regularising' or 'monasticising' movement, see Julia Barrow, 'The Ideology of the Tenth-Century English Benedictine 'Reform'', in *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History. The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*, ed. by Patricia Skinner, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 141-154, p. 154. For a discussion of local activity, and the influence of the reform on the ecclesiastical landscape, see Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, pp. 291-367. For a discussion of the idea of a three-ordered society and its connection with tenth-century regularising initiatives, see Timothy E. Powell, 'The 'Three Orders' of Society in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE*, 23 (1994): 103-132, pp. 110-117.

definition is revealing as it will open up a variety of modes of expression and ideas, moving towards the core of social tension and power mediation in late Anglo-Saxon society. In this respect, this study of friendship will be markedly different from earlier studies of Anglo-Saxon England, and of friendship as a topic of research in medieval society, as it does not aim to reveal its function within a larger construct, but rather to reveal variations of its role and function within a given period. Nevertheless, this research will be indebted to earlier research into medieval friendship, which will be outlined in the following.

1.3.3 The historiography of medieval friendship – initiatives and approaches

Medieval friendship research up to the 1980s, especially relating to the period before 1150, has been fragmentary and limited in scope and approach within the wider context of medieval society. However, this underrepresentation of friendship research is about to change; recent initiatives –such as the “Medieval Friendship Networks” funded by the British Academy (2004–2010), and the research group at the University of Freiburg– promise a wealth of forthcoming publications and discussions on the topic of medieval friendship within a wider social context.[85]

Research of medieval friendship traditionally focuses on three topics of interest: friendship’s spiritual dimensions, its close interaction with gender issues, and its interplay with social relations and hierarchical structures as the framework of social systems. These interests have led to three main approaches in the study of friendship. Firstly, debate on the spiritual dimensions of friendship has resulted in studies into the affective and emotive qualities of the relationship and its idealised quantities. Secondly, discussion about the role of friendship in the interaction between the sexes and between same-sex pairs has manifested in debates on the role of sexuality and the question whether gendered vocabulary was used to express the different roles of men and women in medieval society. And finally, an interest in the institutional framework and functioning of administration in societies that did not

---

[85] For an overview of the main topics of discussion in these forthcoming publications, see Julian P. Haseldine, ‘Friendship Structures: Modern & Pre-Modern’, *Political Studies Association Conference Proceedings* (2010): 1-4. For an overview of the approach, goals and interests of the Freiburg project “Freunde, Gönner, Getreue: Praxis und Semantik von Freundschaft und Patronage in historischer, anthropologischer und kulturvergleichender Perspektive”, see http://www.grk-freundschaft.uni-freiburg.de/front-page?set_language=en.

benefit from modern constitutions and communication, has led to a pragmatic approach of friendship in which it is primarily seen as a mechanism of bonding.[86]

A relatively new interest in this context is an approach of friendship as being embedded within a wider social framework, usually referred to as social network theory. These ideas are rooted in the research initiatives mentioned above and have led so far to a collection of essays on various aspects of friendship in a wider social context in *Friendship in Medieval Europe* (1999), the publication of a series of papers read at a session on “Power, Relations and Networks in Medieval Europe” at the International Medieval Congress at the University of Leeds in 2002, and in a forthcoming volume focusing on friendship within a wider social context in medieval Scandinavia.[87] Clearly represented throughout these contributions is the idea that friendship was part of a wider social construct ruled by, in the words of Margaret Mullett “mechanisms which played individuals against and with one another in medieval Europe.”[88] As such, friendship is an important missing link in understanding many of the actual and idealised social realities of early medieval Europe and needs to be explored in further detail.

All four above-mentioned interests and approaches have inspired the approach in this thesis, combined with the realisation that friendship in literature can be as much an idealised concept as a historical construct. However, the nature of most of our source material –lawcodes, royal diplomas, wills, vernacular poetry, and Latin hagiography– and our discussion of the terminology of friendship in an Anglo-

---

86 Julian Haseldine, ‘Introduction: Why Friendship?’, in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), xvii-xxiii, pp. xix-xx.

87 *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999). For the papers read at the Leeds session of 2002, see Margaret Mullett, ‘Power, Relations and Networks in Medieval Europe: Introduction’, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 255-259; Lars Hermanson, ‘Friendship and Politics in Saxo Grammaticus’ *Gesta Danorum*’, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 261-284; Michael Grünbart, ‘*Tis love that has warm’d us*. Reconstructing Networks in 12th Century Byzantium’, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 301-30; and Walter Ysebaert, ‘Medieval Letter-Collections as a Mirror of Circles of Friendship? The Example of Stephen of Tournai, 1128-1203’, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 285-300; *Friendship and Social Networks in Medieval Scandinavia: From the Viking Age to Modern-day Society, c. 1000-1800*, ed. by Jón Viðar Sigurðsson and Thomas Småberg, Early European Research, 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming). I want to thank Jón Viðar Sigurðsson and Thomas Småberg for allowing me to read these articles ahead of publication.

88 Mullett, ‘Power, Relations and Networks in Medieval Europe: Introduction’, p. 259.

Saxon context, focuses our study primarily on the interpretation of friendship as a secular bond, rather than as a manifestation of a spiritual and affective bond. Nevertheless, as will be discussed below, the inclusion of hagiography allows reflection on the function of friendship as a bond active within the association between the secular and religious realm in late Anglo-Saxon England.

This research will be positioned at the intersection of research into friendship as an affective bond –as mainly presented in the research of Julian Haseldine and Patrick McGuire–, and friendship as a political and secular bond, of which approach Gerd Althoff and Jón Viðar Sigurðsson are its main representatives. The most influential thesis exploring this cross-over point between affectionate and instrumental bonding has been formulated by Stephen Jaeger, and this thesis is in many ways indebted to his theory and insightful analysis. However, our focus on a defined period of time, within a particular cultural setting as communicated in two interrelated linguistic modes, together with our approach of friendship through the mapping of discourses has many new insights to offer to both the study of this middle ground in a wider European context, and to the study of late Anglo-Saxon England.

In the following, the main theses within these various research interests will be briefly introduced, offering a historiographical context for the approach undertaken in this doctoral research. Nevertheless, prior to a discussion of medieval friendship research, one Classical study needs to be acknowledged. David Konstan's *Friendship in the Classical World* (1997) has proven to be an inspiration in its methodological approach of friendship research, pointing out the need to be directed by a range of discourses, and to be determined by a range of shifting notions and semantics in response to changes within society.[89] Konstan's idea of friendship as being a "historical invariable" recognises above all that we cannot expect to find either a definition, or a clearly defined one-sided interpretation of the bond within the past, just as we will only find a range of definitions and interpretations of the meaning of friendship in a modern day context.[90] For this reason, we can only aspire to reveal some pieces of the puzzle that is friendship in the Roman Republic and in Anglo-Saxon England. This study aims to portray the contours of an image, rather

[89] See especially his introduction, in which he clearly outlines the limitations of friendship research in a historical context, Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, pp. 1-23.

[90] Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, p. 1.

than unveiling a portrait; yet in its variations, and diversity of discourses, lies its interest for our appreciation of friendship in a late Anglo-Saxon context.

1.3.4 Spiritual and affective friendship

Research of medieval friendship finds its origins in an interest in spiritual friendship, which explores principally the spiritual and affective dimension of friendship. Originally, research of spiritual friendship was heavily influenced by ideas about Christian faith and as such, studies were dedicated to the relationship between the individual and God. An example of this interest is Erik Peterson's study of the 'Gottesfreund', in which fourteenth-century examples of *amici Dei* are placed within traditions of love and friendship as found in the Classical treatises of Aristotle, the Bible and in several theological treatises ranging from Augustine to Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi.*[91] This one-dimensional approach of friendship was challenged by Jean Leclercq, whose study of monastic culture, entitled *l'Amour de Lettres et le Désir de Dieu* (1957), placed friendship in a context of learning within monastic communities, and inspired the use of letter collections for the study of friendship in monastic circles; his book is still a reliable introduction to Benedictine theology and its place within monastic communities, and a starting point for any exploration of Christian love in religious culture in the twelfth century.[92] Importantly, Leclercq has demonstrated the necessity of investigating social relations, including friendship, within a wider social context.

In Leclercq's footsteps, several studies on monastic friendship were published, including R. W. Southern's study of St Anselm in the eleventh century and numerous studies of Aelred of Rievaulx, whose treatise *De Spirituali Amicitia* transformed theological debates of friendship in the twelfth century.[93]

---

91 Erik Peterson, 'Der Gottesfreund. Beiträge zur Geschichte eines religiösen Terminus', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 42 (1923): 161-202.

92 Jean Leclercq, *l'Amour de Lettres et le Désir de Dieu* (Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1957); trans. by Catharine Misrahi, *The Love of Learning and the Desire of God* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961).

93 R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*: A *Study of Monastic Life and Thought, 1059-c.1130*, Birkbeck Lectures 1959 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963). For Aelred of Rievaulx, see John Boswell, *Christianity*, *Social Tolerance*, *and Homosexuality. Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 221-226; Brian Patrick McGuire, *Aelred of Rievaulx. Brother and Lover* (New York: Crossroad, 1994); Marsha L. Dutton, 'Friendship and the Love of God: Augustine's Teaching in the Confessions and Aelred of Rievaulx's Response in Spiritual Friendship', *American Benedictine Review*, 56 (2005): 3-40;

Simultaneously, Leclercq inspired research into the origins of Christian philosophy of friendship, as exemplified by Adèle M. Fiske's research of influential Christian traditions, and more recently, Carolinne White's investigation of the influence of Classical ideas of friendship on the notions as found in the works of the church fathers, supplemented by James McEvoy's analysis of the lasting appeal of Classical ideas to Christian scholars.[94] Recently, an important contribution to spiritual friendship research has been presented by Verena Epp, who has studied friendship imagery in the works of influential fifth- and sixth-century continental scholars.[95] Epp's thesis is deeply indebted to German scholarship on secular friendship, and subsequently, she has anchored her knowledgeable discussion of spiritual friendship within a thoroughly researched context of secular power and social order, reminding us of the intrinsic link between the secular and religious worlds within medieval society and the need to research both realms in unison, rather than in separation.[96]

Nevertheless, the starting point for any study of spiritual and affectionate friendship is still Brian Patrick McGuire's *Friendship and Community* (1988), renowned for its in-depth analysis of changes and continuations in monastic ideas of friendship, yet criticised for its close focus on affective friendship, its interest in homosexual relationships, and its predominant use of letter collections to assess the bond.[97] McGuire has examined associations within the monastic community, and hence our discussion of friendship as a predominant secular relationship is set at the fringes of his discussion. Furthermore, McGuire's use of letter collections as

---

Haseldine, 'The Monastic Culture of Friendship', pp. 177-202; and the introduction by Dutton of the new edition, Aelred of Rievaulx, *De spirituali amicitia*, ed. by Marsha L. Dutton and trans. by Lawrence C. Braceland, Cistercian Fathers Series, 5 (Collegeville, MN: Cistercian, 2010), esp. pp. 22-50.

94 Adèle M. Fiske, *Friends and Friendship in the Monastic Tradition*, Cidoc Cuaderno, 51 (Cuernavaca: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1970); White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century*; McEvoy, 'The Theory of Friendship in the Latin Middle Ages'.

95 Verena Epp, *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler*, *sozialer*, *politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 44 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1999).

96 Epp, *Amicitia*, pp. 3-4, 136-138. She has applied these principles on a Carolingian case study in Verena Epp, 'Rituale frühmittelalterliche *amicitia*', in *Formen und Funktionen Öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, ed. by Gerd Althoff, Vorträge und Forschungen, 51 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001), 11-24, pp. 14-16.

97 For McGuire's defence against criticism, see his new introduction, Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience 350-1250*, 2nd edn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), pp. lvii-lviii. I want to thank Anieke Menninga for providing me with a copy of this new introduction; as mentioned in the above, all references in this study book are referring to the first edition of this book, unless otherwise stated.

prominent sources for discussing friendship, and the absence of important letter collections –especially in England– in our period of research, has resulted in a characterisation of the period *c.*850–1050 as 'the eclipse of monastic friendship' by McGuire.[98]

The absence of substantial letter collections for late Anglo-Saxon England and the relative silence on the relationship in continental letters are a remarkable feature of this period, however, this does not necessarily propose an 'eclipse'; neither within monastic communities, nor in the friendships between monastic communities and the outer world. The observed changes by McGuire need to be contextualised in a wider conceptualisation of society; his results need to be examined within a range of discourses of friendship to determine to what extent, and as the result of which intellectual shifts, the expression of friendship changed in the ninth and tenth centuries. McGuire's discussion is of importance for this study, as it has established that the intellectual framework of friendship was debated within a religious context in our period, indicating the need for the study of a different set of sources to balance McGuire's conclusions.

1.3.5 Affection and gendered discussions of friendship

McGuire's conclusions that homosexual love was an inherent part of affective expressions of friendship in monastic communities have been challenged by various studies, of which Stephen Jaeger's *Ennobling Love* (1999), a study of courtly culture and friendship in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, has been its most influential representative.[99] Jaeger's study has demonstrated the ways in which the use of love, affection, and demonstrative behaviour was part of a public discourse expressing aristocratic behaviour, through which courtiers bound themselves to each other and to their superiors; expressions of love became the ennobling language of favour, within an overtly secular and 'politicised' context.[100] Jaeger's thesis is persuasive,

---

[98] McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. 135. This is not to say that some letters do not exist for the period. For example, see the letters as transmitted from Canterbury *Reliquiae Dunstaniae*, in *Memorials*, pp. 354-436; or the examples of later correspondence as collected by Whitelock, see Dorothy Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, 2nd edn (London and New York, 1979), no. 214-240.

[99] This interpretation is clear throughout, but especially in his chapter on the Cistercian order and Aelred of Rievaulx, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, chap. 7, pp. 296-338; C. Stephen Jaeger, *Ennobling Love. In Search of a Lost Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1999).

[100] Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 18-24.

and will prove fundamental for the discussion of friendship in an aristocratic, court environment as underlying our Anglo-Saxon legal and documentary sources. Nevertheless, Jaeger's thesis is also highly teleological, trying to force both the Carolingian and Ottonian expressions of love and friendship within a mould that is ultimately based on the far more detailed information available for the twelfth- and thirteenth century courts of Europe.

Jaeger's ideas of an ennobling, male, aristocratic behaviour underlying the use of passionate language have inspired David Clark's recent study of male friendship in Old English poetry *Between Medieval Men* (2009), which has focused on the use of sexual tension and erotic imagery to define heterosexual camaraderie.[101] Clark has raised the interesting question as to what extent the language of the Anglo-Saxon 'warrior society' (*sic*) was stylised for both men and women, and he has explored the idea that homosocial behaviour between men could be interpreted as mirroring ambiguous ideas on sexuality, while proposing an interpretation within a male-oriented, hierarchical bond. Clark's insightful discussion of the use of friendship language in the Old English poems *The Wife's Lament*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and *The Husband's Message* underlines one of our most intriguing features of medieval friendship, namely, that its language seems to have been reserved for expressing bonds between men primarily, resulting in an ambiguity in the interpretation of the bond with respect to women.[102] McGuire had already commented on this phenomenon with respect to Boniface's female correspondents, demonstrating that the language of friendship was used in a gendered way, implying that the language of friendship was not suitable for describing the relationship between the sexes.[103]

Yet whereas McGuire has sought the nuance, and Clark the ambiguity, Jaeger went for a frontal attack. He has tried to situate references to friendships with women, and the problematic sexual dimension implied by the very existence of women, within his ennobling, male concept, instead of searching for a discussion of female friendships and their position within networks and discourses of friendship in

---

101 David Clark, *Between Medieval Men. Male Friendship and Desire in Early Medieval English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

102 Clark, *Between Medieval Men*, pp. 22-36.

103 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. 108-111.

their own right.[104] Jaeger is not alone in his denial of women as partners in their own rights within discourses of friendship. This approach seems especially prevalent amongst scholars of the High Middle Ages, as can also be observed, for example, in Erik Kooper's denial of women as potential partners of friendships.[105] Both Jaeger and Kooper seem to have overlooked the fact that women's role within friendships may not have been defined by their sexuality, but rather by their need for male friendship for protection of their more vulnerable position. In order to address these nuances, this study will propose to look at women within male discourses of power and favour without approaching their role and motives from the male point of departure, but rather from a female perspective. A recognition of Clark's observations, combined with ideas of transgression and the importance of sexual abstinence for the creation of a gendered identity within a society defined by gender boundaries –as retrieved from the research of Carol Clover, Pauline Stafford, and Catherine Cubitt,– will shed further light on the role of women in Anglo-Saxon friendship discourses, and on the gendered nature of the language of friendship in an Anglo-Saxon context.[106]

1.3.6 Pragmatic and political friendship

Secular friendship, and in particular its role as a mechanism in the construction of political alliances in hierarchical bonds, has been the focus of German research since the 1980s. Its main representative is Gerd Althoff, whose pioneering study *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter* (1990) is now a first point of reference for any discussion of medieval friendship.[107] Althoff has made several case studies of

---

104 Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, chap. 6, pp. 82-106, see esp. pp. 82-84.

105 Erik Kooper, 'Loving the Unequal Equal: Medieval Theologians and Marital Affection', in *The Olde Daunce: Love, Friendship, Sex, and Marriage in the Medieval World*, ed. by Robert R. Edwards and Stephens Spector (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 44-56; and 260-265.

106 Carol J. Clover, 'Regardless of Sex: Men, Women and Power in Early Northern Europe', *Speculum*, 68.2 (1993): 363-387. Pauline Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen: Gender, Religious Status and Reform in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', *Past & Present*, 163 (1999): 3-35; Catherine Cubitt, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', *Gender in History*, 12.1 (2000): 1-32.

107 Gerd Althoff, *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990); trans. by Christopher Carroll, *Family, Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). All

continental sources from the Merovingian time up to the twelfth century, in which he has established that friendship was a fundamental form of bonding which informally connected persons, institutions, and social groups with each other through interpersonal associations. This social structure, or *Personenverbandstaat*, was upheld by behaviour, gestures, and rituals from within the social networks rather than by institutional rules. Althoff has underlined that friendship was just one bond out of many, and that ties could easily clash; in a continuing process of renegotiation and redefinition of associations, both rulers and their followers found the flexibility to work with and alongside each other.[108] However, Althoff equally has perceived in this flexibility a means of control. He has stressed that in the end kings controlled and oversaw the process of bonding, trying to avoid the clustering of power amongst a small group of followers: ultimately, every member of society was bound by informal *Spielregln*, which guaranteed a healthy balance of power between the various members of society.[109]

Althoff's conclusions are insightful and nuanced, and of the utmost importance for any discussion of medieval friendship within society in the west. However, his focus on friendship as a means of bonding and communication has one important disadvantage: it generalises, and tries to force all references to friendship within one all-embracing conceptualisation. In doing so, he has represented one particular discourse of friendship rather than addressing various layers of the concept. This limitation may have been inspired partly by Althoff's choice of source material, which is predominantly documentary, namely the evidence of charters, diplomas, letters, legal material, and memorial books.[110] Whereas the last source reveals the existence of networks between the laity and religious, all Althoff's other

---

reference in this thesis will be to the English translation. For a quick introduction to Althoff's ideas, see Althoff, 'Friendship and Political Order, pp. 91-105. For more detailed studies of various aspects raised in these works, see Gerd Althoff, 'Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirchung. Emotionen in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters', *FS*, 30 (1996): 60-79; and Gerd Althoff, 'Tränen und Freude. Was Interessiert Mittelalter-Historiker und Emotionen', *FS*, 40 (2006): 1-11 (on the relationship between rituals and medieval communication); Gerd Althoff, '*Amicitiae* [Friendships] as Relationships between States and People', in *Debating the Middle Ages. Issues and Readings*, ed. by Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein (Maldan, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 191-210 (on the institutional role of friendship in establishing relationships).

108 Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp. 4-7.

109 Gerd Althoff, *Amicitiae und pacta. Bündnis*, *Einigung*, *Politik und Gebetsdenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert*, MGH Schriften, 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 1992), pp. 134-137.

110 For a discussion of his source material, see Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Follower*, pp. 16-22.

sources are enmeshed in a hierarchical 'dance of power' between rulers and their followers and subsequently reflect a discourse coloured by these dimensions, as we will also unveil in our discussion of the Anglo-Saxon laws and royal diplomas in chapters two and three. Despite the value of his analysis of legal and documentary sources, Althoff's examination of his (sparse) narrative material is *a priori* shaped by his conclusions rooted in an investigation of a different type of material. This is where our study will readdress this imbalance, firstly by looking at a wider range of source material, and secondly, by allowing all to voice their own discourse without moulding it into one overall conceptualisation of friendship.

Althoff's exposure of friendship as a pragmatic mechanism and as a form of communication is predominant in German studies of friendship and explored in various case studies in further detail, as for example, in the recently published essays of the Symposium des Mediävististenverbandes.[111] In this collection, Hans-Werner Goetz has pointed out that kinship associations in many German eleventh-century sources behave as constructed relationships, rather than as understood bonds, and in this respect contextualise our earlier observations of the interaction between Anglo-Saxon friendships and kin relationships.[112] Additionally, his observation that the terminology of affiliation was focused on wider kinship groups rather than on nuclear families, points out the importance of discussing the fluidity of language as revealing a social phenomenon rooted in encroaching notions of bonds in the medieval period.[113]

Similar approaches have been followed by scholars of Viking Age Iceland, who have studied manifestations of friendship in the sagas as an essential bond within the Icelandic social system. Jesse Byock has portrayed Icelandic society as driven by a need for organised advocacy and mediation, which was inherent to its administrative and institutional structure in the *goðorð*. In the *goðorð* all free farmers of Iceland were bound to their chosen *goði*, their chief and representative in the

---

111 Most recently, see the contributions in *Verwandtschaft*, *Freundschaft*, *Bruderschaft. Soziale Lebens- und Kommunikationsformen in Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz and others (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009). I want to thank Claudia Esch at the Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg for providing me with this material.

112 Hans-Werner Goetz, 'Verwandtschaft im früheren Mittelalter (I): Terminologie und Funktionen', in *Verwandtschaft*, *Freundschaft*, *Bruderschaft. Soziale Lebens- und Kommunikationsformen in Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz and others (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009), 15-36, p. 19.

113 Goetz, 'Verwandschaft im früheren Mittelalter (I)', p. 34.

Alþing, by reciprocal bonds based on loyalty rather than territorial realities.[114] As a result, territorial tensions often resulted in disputes, urging for further bonding and mediation to secure local interests and needs.[115] It is exactly this tension, underlying the need for further association and bonding between groups in Icelandic society, which finds its representation in the work of Jón Viðar Sigurðsson. Sigurðsson has portrayed Icelandic society as based on reciprocal bonds of friendship, and the exchange of loyalties and gifts, which both created flexibility and adaptability within the social system.[116] Friendship associations are characterised by Sigurðsson as an additional form of bonding available to all *þingmenn*, through which further mediation and protection in conflicts outside of their institutional ties with their *goði* could be obtained.[117] Friendship is thus presented in the Icelandic sagas as an essential mechanism of bonding, which tied individuals in a dyadic relationship within an institutionalised framework.

Both the German and the Scandinavian schools of friendship research have powerful lessons to teach for a study of Anglo-Saxon England. This is apparent in both Thomas Charles-Edwards' and Julia Barrow's discussion of the topic in their preliminary studies of Anglo-Saxon friendship in the lawcodes and the charters.[118] Charles-Edwards has focused on the differences in friendships created through the gift of land or through moveable wealth in late Anglo-Saxon England, emphasising that the latter was part of a flexible expression of bond as it created both obligation and reciprocity.[119] Charles-Edwards is mainly interested in the bonds and obligations created between a lord and his retainer, searching for the origins of serfdom rather than explaining the use of friendship in the context of the laws. However, his

---

[114] Jesse L. Byock, *Medieval Iceland. Society, Sagas, and Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), esp. chap. 6, pp. 103-136.

[115] Byock, *Medieval Iceland*, pp. 135-136; see, also for a more detailed discussion of this principle, Jesse L. Byock, *Viking Age Iceland* (London: Penguin, 2001), chap. 10, pp. 185-207.

[116] Jón Viðar Sigurðsson, *Chieftains and Power in the Icelandic Commonwealth*, trans. by Jean Lundskær-Nielsen, The Viking Collection: Studies in Northern Civilization, 12 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1999), pp. 211-213. All references to this book have been taken from the translation.

[117] Jón Viðar Sigurðsson, 'Friendship in the Icelandic Commonwealth', in *From Sagas to Society. Comparative Approaches to Early Iceland*, ed. by Gísli Pálsson (Enfield Lock: Hisarlik, 1992), 205-215, pp. 214-215.

[118] Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth', pp. 180-187; Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 106-123.

[119] Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth', pp. 180-181.

research illustrates the importance of friendship as a bond with both a horizontal and vertical dimension, stressing the importance of reciprocity and gift-giving in the creation of relationships of interdependency, and as such will prove valuable for our own discussion of the discourses of friendship in the lawcodes in chapter two.

Julia Barrow has established that most references to friendship in charters can be found in tenth-century sources, emphasising the variable contexts in which friendship vocabulary occurs. Consequently she has concluded that the language of friendship was drafted for a specific set of circumstances, embedded within the context in which the charters were produced.[120] However, a close examination of her appendix of friendship references has revealed that a high proportion of Barrow's tenth- and eleventh-century evidence, seven out of twelve instances, is part of the corpus of Anglo-Saxon wills.[121] This fact complicates Barrow's argument, as the nature of Anglo-Saxon wills as a unique –mostly in the vernacular– set of charters creates the need for a completely new approach to the material, as will be discussed and exercised in further detail in chapter three.

1.3.7 A balance of power – formal, informal, public, and private dimensions

The historical context and institutional situation in late Anglo-Saxon England differed considerably from the examples from Ottonian Germany, and the idealised reality as presented in the sources of Viking Age Iceland. Anglo-Saxon England notably differed from most of its continental neighbours in its relatively peaceful succession of kings, its fairly small geographical area, and its comparatively rich agrarian resources resulting in prosperity.[122] Whereas Althoff's Germany lacked a strong tradition of central administration, and the Icelandic Commonwealth was founded on the institutional freedom of *þingmenn* to choose a *goðorð* of choice, the

---

120 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107-111.

121 See Barrow's Appendix, in Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 117-123; the tenth- and eleventh-century evidence in this is listed on pp. 122-123. It is unclear to me what the leading criteria were for inclusion into Julia Barrow's Appendix, apart from charters being excluded for being writs.

122 For a further contextualisation of Anglo-Saxon England against the background of European trends and a critical assessment of historical research and alternative approaches, see Timothy Reuter, 'The Making of England and Germany, 850-1050: Points of Comparison and Difference', in *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. by Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 284-299, p. 28; and Chris Wickham, 'Problems of Comparing Rural Societies in Early Medieval Western Europe', *TRHS*, sixth series, 2 (1992): 221-246, p. 225.

Anglo-Saxon kings had negotiated a middle ground between informal and formal power, and in doing so, had established administrative structures based on both formal and informal bonds. The constitutional ties of lordship and obligation between king, nobles, and their respective associates formed the backbone of the Anglo-Saxon social structure, as is emphasised in many prominent studies of late Anglo-Saxon England.[123] However, the question to what extent these 'constitutional ties' were centralised expressions of power, and as such formally acknowledged ties, or rather locally negotiated bonds, and as such informally constructed associations, has only been questioned in further detail by Paul Hyams, Ann Williams and Stephen Baxter.

Paul Hyams is principally interested in the dynamic between friendship and enmity in a society ordered by feud-*like* (his italics) behaviour.[124] His view of society as being shaped by negotiations is clearly influenced by Althoff's idea of a society structured by interpersonal bonds, yet has taken Althoff's argument further by defining the (re)negotiation of ties as a medium of structuring both personal and institutional systems through a balanced system of feuding.[125] His portrayal of friendship in this context is limited as he has identified it solely as the counteraction within a feuding culture, failing to explain the function of friendship in comparison to other forms creating unity within groups as friendship is not discussed as being manifestly different from other relationships. These concerns are closely related to another problem in Hyams' research: his presentation of Anglo-Saxon England as a feuding society is problematical in itself; neither a clear ruling principle of feuding is apparent or defined in the sources for this period, nor was the *fæhðe* a chain reaction of violence based on the lasting hostility between groups, as convincingly argued by Guy Halsall.[126] Although Hyams has demonstrated that formal and informal power

---

[123] For example, see Stafford, *Unification and Conquest*, p. 132; Loyn, *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 101; Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 212-216; Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 80-81; Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, pp. 3-5.

[124] Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, esp. chaps. 1-3, pp. 3-110.

[125] Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, pp. 22-25, 88.

[126] Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, pp. 72-73. I want to thank John Niles for identifying the absence of a ruling principle in the lawcodes of Anglo-Saxon England. John Niles has followed Guy Halsall in defining the 'feud' as a form of customary vengeance based on a principle of honorary revenge, see Guy Halsall, 'Violence and Society: An Introductory Survey', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Guy Halsall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), 1-45, pp. 19-21.

co-exist *within* the same social system, his approach needs to be refined with a more nuanced social conceptualisation and a different line of enquiry.

This nuance is apparent in the contributions by Ann Williams and Stephen Baxter, as already discussed above.[127] Williams' research into the conflicts between the different groups at the roots of social institutions has emphasised that mediating power clearly lay with both formal and informal groups in society.[128] Baxter has explored these ideas in his insightful study *The Earls of Mercia. Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (2007), in which he has investigated power and lordship in the eleventh-century with a case study of the changing fortunes of the Leofwinesons. In this study, Baxter has reconciled formal and informal power structures, arguing that both were intimately connected and that the combined negotiation power of formal and informal bonds were positioned at the heart of the Anglo-Scandinavian administration.[129] Baxter's observations fit into a debate of friendship as either a formal or an informal relationship, related to the question of whether medieval friendship was an overtly public or private relationship.

These questions have recently been reflected upon by Eva Österberg, whose analysis has focused on these two seemingly conflicting dimensions of friendship.[130] Österberg has convincingly argued that the sharp demarcation between public and private spheres of friendship is a modern invention, rather than a medieval reality; public and private overlapped in medieval societies and often friendships were placed in both spheres simultaneously.[131] Her conclusions suggest seeing friendship in a medieval context as a layered relationship that changed according to the social context in which it was used, or to whom was involved, again prompting an approach of friendship research in medieval society through the mapping of discourses. A similar conclusion has been reached by Régine Le Jan, whose study of early-medieval Frankish letter collections has revealed that friendship occurs in multiple forms and needs to be seen as an ultimately flexible bond that was both private and public, pragmatic and affective, formal and informal.[132] These are tantalising

---

127 See above, pp. 27-28.

128 Williams, *Kingship and Government*, pp. 97-107.

129 Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia*, pp. 11-12.

130 Österberg, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics*.

131 Österberg, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics*, pp. 192-193.

conclusions that will be tested against the evidence for late Anglo-Saxon England in the following.

1.3.8 Beyond realities –idealised friendship and social imagery

A final strand of research needs to be acknowledged, by emphasising that although friendship was rooted within 'solidarities' that may have been real, in literary traditions its expression may have been part of idealised social constructs. Friendship as a bond could have figured as a trope, or poetic idealisation, of a created social construct that never existed in both documentary and narrative sources. This proviso is indebted to Reginald Hyatte's observations, whose study of twelfth-century models of an *amicitia perfecta* has warned us of the probable existence of an 'idealised imagery' in literary conceptions of the association.[133] Whereas this 'ideological aspect' is often recognised in literary and narrative sources, this is equally true for documentary sources: our charters and lawcodes also encode ideas within an idealised social imagery, and as such need to be considered afresh as being part of specific ideological discourses of friendship. These warnings will be taken into account when examining the discourses of friendship as found in our vernacular and Latin sourcesas discussed in the chapters below.

1.3.9 Approach and limitations

In this chapter, we have given an overview of those elements and dimensions that feature in this doctoral thesis, investigating documentary and narrative sources with the aim to unveil and discuss the various discourses of friendship. Our period of research is roughly dated from post-dating the Alfredian period *c.* 900, to the death of Æthelred in 1016, also known as 'the long tenth century'. The reasons for this demarcation have been partly directed by our source material, and partly by the fact that this period may be considered as culturally delineated. Alfred's period is ideologically an interesting period of research on its own account, and should be

---

132 Régine Le Jan, 'Le Lien Social entre Antiquité et Haut Moyen Âge: l'Amité dans les Collections de Lettres Gauloises', in *Akkulturation. Probleme einer germanisch-Romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühen Mittelalter*, ed. by Dieter Hägermann, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Jörg Jarnut, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 41 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 528-546, pp. 536-537.

133 Reginald Hyatte, *The Arts of Friendship. The Idealization of Friendship in Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 50 (Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill, 1994), pp. 194-195, 202.

studied separately, whereas the ascension of Cnut introduces not only a new cultural dimension to the late Anglo-Saxon (Anglo-Scandinavian?) society, but his conquest also results in an upheaval of the social élite. Cnut's reign is thus an interesting period for further research, but deserves –just as the Alfredian ideology– a focused approach in its own right.

The dating of this study is thus partly determined by our sources, yet our sources only allow partial insights into the discourses of friendship within this time period. Subsequently, this study will neither address all reigns in this period concisely, nor try to force a teleological interpretation of the evidence. As such, this study will be of limited value for mapping a sequence of events in late Anglo-Saxon England, or for determining cause and consequence within the reigns of the consecutive kings. Yet, as explicitly stated above, it is not the aim of this research to offer an all-embracing view, but to reflect different manifestations and conceptualisations of friendship as present in late Anglo-Saxon England, portraying the contours of an image whilst simultaneously portraying a rich cultural period engrained within a small élite group. The advantage of this approach is that it allows our source material to speak for itself, reflecting a range of cultural and literary expressions that may open up Anglo-Saxon élite culture as a whole.

Despite the advantages of this approach, its limitation is rooted in our choice of sources. The restraints of a doctoral thesis made a selection of sources necessary, and as such, this study only presents a partial representation of the discourses of friendship in the period under scrutiny. A choice has been made for the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes, a selection of charters (royal, Latin diplomas and vernacular wills), a small selection of vernacular poetry situated in an aristocratic setting, and Latin hagiography focussing on the main reformers of the Benedictine monasticising movement. The first two source collections have been chosen as they reflect different aspects of the negotiation of authority and favour between a king, his followers, and his followers amongst themselves and are as such embedded in an aristocratic and court discourse of power. Our selection of vernacular poetry and Latin hagiography both reflect idealised conceptualisations of friendship, in discourses that served a variety of aims but that were all situated within an aristocratic setting, and arguably, addressed a relatively small part of Anglo-Saxon society. All four chapters are thus rooted in representations of an aristocratic circle, and hence, our discourses of friendship are all indicative of an Anglo-Saxon élite culture as expressed in both Old

English and Latin. Even so, other sources of interest can be pointed out for further research, notably the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; Ælfric's letters, saints' *Lives*, and series of *Catholic Homilies*; Wulfstan's homiletic works; elegiac poetic traditions, *etc*.

As our discussion of Anglo-Saxon friendship vocabulary has demonstrated, friendship was a bond that was appreciated as being of a secular nature, and embedded in discourses of favour and goodwill in certain situations. Hence, favour will be part of our discussion of friendship in those chapters addressing the bonds between kings and their followers. Nevertheless, this thesis proposes a study of friendship primarily, and favour will be discussed as a supportive, rather than determinative element of the interpretation of friendship. An additional study of favour, embedded in a discussion of gift-giving and moveable wealth, is –although reflected in suggestions for further discussion and contextualisation– left as a recommendation for further research. However, favour is included in the title of this research, as it emphasises the need to consider Anglo-Saxon friendship a secular, mostly instrumental, pragmatic, and formal bond, rather than an affective notion based on emotions and intimacy.

Additionally, our discussion of the vocabulary of friendship has emphasised that the Anglo-Saxon notion did not stand by itself, but often overlapped with other associations in late Anglo-Saxon society. Kinship and bonds based on hierarchical dimensions interacted with friendship particularly, and all three could be denoted by the use of 'friendship vocabulary', namely *freondscipe*, *freond*, *wine*, *amicitia*, and *amicus.* Infringement of terminology and interaction between bonds will be discussed, while positioning friendship as a bond that was reciprocal, supplementary, and constructed. Naturally, the results of this study would benefit from a similar, in-depth approach of discussions of kinship and relationships of dependency. As far as these studies have been undertaken, this research will be acknowledged in this investigation, yet a close study of all forms of bonding is outside of our reach.

Gender will be discussed throughout, whilst commenting on the role allowed to women in male discourses of friendship and favour, without trying to mould their position and motives within this discourse. It will be demonstrated that women were part of discourses of friendship, and that the vocabulary of these discourses was highly gendered without proposing a gendered interpretation of the concept itself. Women had their own role to play *within* discourses of friendship, yet their limited

visibility makes it difficult to reveal their own particular discourses outside of a male context and as such, only shadows of female friendships can be denoted.

Our sources of late Anglo-Saxon England give an insight into historical and ideological constructs alike, offering a set of interlocking and complementary pictures, but fail to give us a total view of the kingdom, its social structure, its culture, or its administration. Friendship is a particularly rewarding notion to study in this context, as it has not been neatly defined and encompasses a variety of relationships. Its vagueness in definition is revealing when portraying the various discourses on friendship in our different sets of sources. In allowing these sources their own 'voice', we will be able to grasp some of the variety, subtleties, and complexity of late Anglo-Saxon society which was, in this respect, not very much different from our own.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

This first chapter has served to introduce and contextualise the approach taken for this doctoral study of narrative and documentary discourses of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England, embedded in a discussion of modern preconceptions; Anglo-Saxon friendship vocabulary; a wider contextualisation of bonding within Anglo-Saxon society; the historiography of friendship research; and studies of late Anglo-Saxon and early medieval society. Advantages of an approach of friendship as a concept created by a set of interconnected, yet different, discourses of friendship has been pointed out, while simultaneously addressing the limitations proposed by the aims and scope of this doctoral research.

In the second chapter, the collection of texts –traditionally referred to as the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes– will be addressed, exploring discourses of friendship as the outcome of different mentalities in the lawcodes issued in the names of King Alfred and his successor up to King Æthelred, a period that can be dated, with some leniency towards the earlier period, *c.* 900–1016.[134] As the lawcodes were both rooted in an ideological framework and within the communication and negotiation of

---

134 Alfred's reign is dated 871-899, yet his lawcodes are thought to have been issued in the last decade of his reign. Felix Liebermann has suggested a date of *c.* 893 for the creation of Alfred's lawcodes, see Liebermann, *Gesetze*, III, p. 32.

power between the king and his followers, these discourses of friendship will allow the creation of a picture of friendship within the mediation of formal and informal power, of changes in the ideological framework in which the conceptualisation of society and the interaction between the king and his associates was expressed, and in the function of (royal) favour in the creation of friendships. Discourses of friendship and favour will be discussed in the lawcodes in two groups, focusing on the considerable influence of Archbishop Wulfstan of York (1002–1023) on the creation of both a new legal, ideological framework, and the changes in discourses of society, power negotiation, authority and friendship within this shifting mentality.

A selection of charters, focussing on royal diplomas for the period c. 924–1016, and all extant vernacular wills with a focus on those transmitted for the tenth- and early eleventh centuries, will be the subject of discussion in chapter three. The combined study of these two complementary sets of charters, the first negotiating formal royal power from above, the second mediating informal power from within social networks, will position friendship within these two realms of power negotiation, and the intimate connection between publically and privately exercised power in late Anglo-Saxon England. Not only will this comparative approach highlight the prominence of discourses of friendship within situations of informal intercession, it will also demonstrate the reluctance of use in the direct negotiation of power in formal communications. Additionally, some insights into the use of affectionate language in discourses mediating favour will be emphasised as a starting point for future research, while also shedding light on the position of women within a gendered use of language within discourses of friendship.

Chapter four is dedicated to a discussion of poetic discourses of friendship in three poems with an aristocratic outlook, whose world of war, courageous leadership, and battlefield glory are part of archaic, heroic traditions. Whereas *The Battle of Brunanburh* and *The Battle of Maldon* have been created in the late tenth and/or first half of the eleventh century, *Beowulf* is a representative of an older tradition and may serve as its model, whilst also having an established connection with our period of research in its transmission in a copy of *c*. 1000, to contextualise the idealised, heroic models as found in the later battlefield poems. Moreover, the rich social imagery of *Beowulf* also offers a chance to comment on the difference in use of *wine* and *freond* in poetic traditions. Discourses of friendship will be discussed in terms of representing an idealised conception, within a wider context of social bonding, and

changing manifestations of social conduct. The discussion of the various models of friendship and social bonding as transmitted in these three poems will reveal some of the problems inherent to the flexible notion that was friendship, and as such will unveil some of the anxieties and ideological shifts that were existent in to the progressively layered fabric of the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom. Furthermore, our discussion of these poetic conceptions will also create some space for the examination of the position of women in the mediation of power within this increasingly complex society.

The fifth and final chapter will investigate the representations of friendship in three Latin saints' *Lives*, which were all written in the period between *c.* 996–1002. These three lives are all embedded in a different social idealisation, and as such reflect three dissimilar discourses in which friendship was used in alternative ways to communicate ideas of communal identity, interaction between the secular and religious world, and the negotiation of power between the royal court and monastic communities from diverse angles. The varied discourses reflect some of the heterogeneity of religious discourses of the period, whilst simultaneously allowing an insight into the position of friendship, as an overtly lay conception, within these religious discourses. Our analysis will reveal that friendship within religious discourses of bonding was not so much 'in eclipse' as 'in transition'.

In conclusion, the various discourses of friendship will be placed within the context of earlier historical research, demonstrating the vast advantages of discussing friendship as the manifestation of various conceptions of both realities and ideals, which offers a fruitful ground for further research. It will be argued that the value of friendship research does not lay so much in what it reveals of the historical organisation of a society long past, but in its significance for unlocking a set of interconnected insights into cultural representations of mentalities lost in time. Friendship's flexibility, multi-interpretability, and supplementary nature will prove to be its most valuable aspects for revealing ideas and commenting on various issues –as the definition of bonds, gendered vocabulary, ideological shifts, and the negotiation of power– from within the construction of society. Friendship mattered and continues to matter for unveiling new vistas of medieval politics, culture, and experience.

CHAPTER 2

Friendship in the Anglo-Saxon Laws

2.1 Introduction

The first corpus for mapping discourses of friendship in the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom is a collection of texts, traditionally referred to as the Anglo-Saxon laws. The relevance of these texts for a study of friendship is threefold. Firstly, as these texts are written in diverse styles with various aims, and react to different circumstances, they demonstrate the importance of regarding our sources as representations of different mentalities that offer a range of discourses.[1] Secondly, the lawcodes were embedded within a specific ideological framework, expressing ideas and codes of behaviour throughout the period. Consequently, a study of friendship portrayals will reflect developments of notions about society. Thirdly, the close association of these texts with the king and his advisors allows us to explore one of the settings in which the discourse of friendship was used, giving insights into the function of formal and informal power structures in bonding processes, and into a royal and aristocratic worldview within a narrow élite.[2]

As friendship occupied a central position in the entanglement of loyalties as a cross-over point in social networks, it naturally interacted with both kinship and lordship.[3] However, our terminology is imprecise; it is often not clear whether we discuss the role of the kindred, the lord, or associates. Yet, whereas Henry Loyn has classified the fluidity of the terminology as problematical, it will be demonstrated that this vagueness could also be useful for opening up layers of formal and informal

---

[1] Patrick Wormald has argued that the diverse nature of these texts, with its multiple aims and uses, makes it impossible to define what the lawcodes *did*. However, the variety of the material naturally leads to the conclusion of what they *were*: "an index of governing mentalities", see Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 481.

[2] In this respect, I follow Hanna Vollrath, who emphasised as early as 1979 that we need to think of the lawcodes as representations of both a practical and an ideological sphere, see Hanna Vollrath, 'Gesetzgebung und Schriftlichkeit: Das Beispiel der Angelsächsischen Gesetze', *Historiches Jahrbuch*, 99 (1979): 28-54, p. 32.

[3] See above, chap. 1, pp. 19-23; Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', p. 239; Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', p. 171; Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, p. 7.

negotiation within the kingdom, registers of the discourse of friendship, and the ideology behind social change.[4] Ideas on friendship, as reflected in the laws, give us access to pieces of a puzzle; we will not be able to reconstruct the missing pieces, but we may be able to see the contours of an image, reflecting royal aspirations and current notions.

In this chapter, it will be revealed that, by disentangling the representations of friendship in the lawcodes, formal and informal uses of friendship can be mapped in the sources most closely related to the royal administration. In doing so, we will be able to comment on the ideological shift in the way in which the king and his people connected that took place at the end of the century, whilst simultaneously demonstrating that a study of friendship and friendship vocabulary can add to our interpretation of the communication of the bond between a king and his followers. Friendship has been studied within the constraints as defined in chapter one: it is considered to be a bond with secular overtones and defined by reciprocity, rather than as an affectionate relationship rooted in emotions.

Prior to a discussion of the representations of friendship in the various lawcodes, the nature and function of lawcodes within society will be discussed. This examination of the role, function, and representations of friendship in the lawcodes will be highly dependent on earlier research into these texts. However, in offering the lawcodes their own, individual 'voices' –without trying to extrapolate a 'maximum view' of the Anglo-Saxon state– new layers and subtleties of bonding in the kingdom will paint a more inclusive social landscape.[5] A choice has been made for a close focus on the use of the language of friendship and the various settings in which these representations are used, as a study of all forms of bonding in the lawcodes has proven to be too ambitious within the constraints of this study. This approach allows us to reflect upon the nature of friendship as a relationship, while simultaneously demonstrating the flexibility and wide applicability of the language of friendship in discussions of relationships that constituted and reflected the social system.

---

4 H. R. Loyn, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE*, 3 (1974): 197-209, p. 198.

5 James Campbell and Patrick Wormald are advocates of a 'maximum view' of the Anglo-Saxon state, based on a sophisticated and institutionalised administration. Their interpretation has been contested by Rees Davies and Susan Reynolds, amongst others, who emphasise the importance of mediation of both formal and informal power instead. See the discussion in chap. 1, pp. 24-25, with n. 78.

2.1.1 The nature and use of lawcodes

Although the tradition of presenting these legal texts in collections can be dated back to the eleventh century, this practice cannot disguise the fact that our collected 'laws' are a far from homogenous set.[6] This is clear from our current edition, Felix Liebermann's *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, in which royal proclamations, circulating tracts, treaties, local ordinances, and documents addressing specific groups within society are collected and classified under the name 'laws'.[7] Even the more coherent bodies, the lawcodes, have been written in a variety of contexts. They react and interact in different ways with various groups within society, and are aimed at different levels within the administration, while presenting varied traditions and functions of law-giving, and offering a range of insights into their circulation.[8] In fact, some of these lawcodes are not even associated with a specific king or his authority, and are thus incorrectly incorporated into the codes. However, to be in line with common practice, Liebermann's conventional indexation and numeration will be followed.[9]

Furthermore, even though Old English seems to have been the language-of-choice for the dissemination of these proclamations, some of the surviving lawcodes have only been transmitted through the mediation of a twelfth-century compilation known as the *Quadripartitus*, in which the compiler edited, translated, and rearranged his Old English material into a sophisticated Latin collection of laws. As a result, the compiler of the *Quadripartitus* has shaped both the interpretation of lawcodes, and their chance of survival into the present day. It presents us with the

---

[6] For Patrick Wormald's discussion of the earliest manuscripts that only contained lawcodes, which can thus be considered as 'lawbooks', see Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 224.

[7] For an assessment of Liebermann's edition, and its flaws in the presentation of the material, see Richard Dammery, 'Editing the Anglo-Saxon Laws: Felix Liebermann and Beyond', in *The Editing of Old English*, ed. by D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), 251-261, p. 252.

[8] As, for example, explored by Simon Keynes in his study of Æthelstan's lawcodes, see Simon Keynes, 'Royal Government and the Written Word in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 226-257, p. 235.

[9] For example, the *Hundred Ordinance*, known as I Eg in Liebermann's *Gesetze*, is not attributed to any king; II Eg and III Eg are in fact one law; III As is a reaction to legislation by Æthelstan, rather than issued in his name. It is unclear how close IV As is to the proclamations issued at Grately. A series of London local proclamations, in reaction to legislation of Æthelstan, known as the *London Ordinance*, is traditionally classified as VI As. For a discussion of these texts and the reasons for adopting Liebermann's numeration of codes, see Dammery, 'Editing the Anglo-Saxon Laws', pp. 254, 260-261.

unique opportunity to assess the interchange between legal traditions in both English and Latin, reflecting the interpretation of friendship in a twelfth-century context.[10] Additionally, one of Æthelred's lawcodes, his sixth, has survived in both Old English and Latin versions that can both demonstrate the direct involvement of Archbishop Wulfstan of York (1002–1023), giving us a chance to study the expression of his ideological framework in two different 'editions' and languages.[11]

Patrick Wormald and Henry Loyn have tended to emphasise the importance of the royal proclamation, judging the written dissemination of the lawcodes as a casual and merely coincidental process.[12] In reaction to this argument, James Campbell and Simon Keynes have emphasised the circulation of written records, especially in the vernacular, suggesting a specific use for these texts and a level of pragmatic literacy among the laity.[13] These views of the use and audiences of the *written* laws demonstrate, above all, the involvement of the king and his councillors in the dissemination and creation of the surviving lawcodes. Legislation was never actually quoted, as we learn from an investigation of lawsuits and legal procedures in dispute settlements in the charters and wills, yet some of the proceedings seem to have closely followed official directions as found in the lawcodes.[14] Alan Kennedy has emphasised that the laws should be regarded as a royal attempt to maintain order, while simultaneously protecting and expanding royal rights. He has proposed seeing

---

[10] For an introduction to, and an assessment of the importance of, the *Quadripartitus*, see Patrick Wormald, 'Quadripartitus', *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 81-114 [Originally published in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by G. Garnett and J. Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 111-47] and Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 236-244.

[11] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 334-335.

[12] Patrick Wormald, '*Lex Scripta* and *Verbum Regis:* Legislation and Germanic Kingship from Euric to Cnut', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 1-44, pp. 22-24, and pp. 36-38 [originally published in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. by P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (Leeds: Leeds University Press, 1977), 105-138]; Loyn, *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England 500-1087*, pp. 106-118

[13] James Campbell, 'Some Agents and Agencies of the Late Anglo-Saxon State', in *Domesday Studies*, ed. by J. C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987), 201-218, pp. 214-215; Keynes, 'Royal Government and the Written Word in late Anglo-Saxon England', pp. 240-241, and 255-256.

[14] Patrick Wormald, 'Charters, Law and the Settlement of Disputes in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 289-311, pp. 304-205 [Originally published in *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 149–68].

the codes as practical documents for royal officials, allowing officials to bring customary practice in line with the circulated royal vision of society.[15] Although we do not know the exact legal status of these instructions, their connection with royal authority gives them an 'official' status, even if the written legislation only served as announcement of the king's oral proclamation of decrees into the localities, rather than a treasured collection for reference in legal procedures.[16]

The Anglo-Saxon lawcodes are thus not 'laws' in our understanding of the word: they are not necessarily collections of legal notions, but are diverse reflections of both practical measures and conceptual notions, and it is in their diversity that we need to seek their relevance for our discussion of friendship. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss these matters in full, yet it is clear that the codes should be seen as 'living documents', which could be amended over time and could be redrafted to fit ideological purposes. They were part of an ongoing dialogue between the past and the present, repositories of ideas and customs that could be used to shape or to reflect upon contemporary practice. In this respect, the legal traditions are shaped in a similar way as the Anglo-Saxon poetic traditions, reflecting practice but primarily offering models of behaviour and a worldview that was closely associated with the king and his councillors.[17] Whereas literary sources open up the imagery of friendship as a perceived ideal, legal sources can inform us about the way in which its idealised imagery of friendship was anchored within various royal discourses of society and bonding.

2.1.2 Lawcodes and the hand of Archbishop Wulfstan of York

As earlier codes were used to create new codes, and as legal practice was 'recycled', all lawcodes issued between the reigns of King Alfred (871–899) and King Æthelred II (978–1016) will be considered; occurrences and citations using friendship vocabulary in either Old English or Latin are collected in Appendix A, which may serve as a helpful device in the following. Whereas friendship is used in various contexts in the earlier lawcodes, we are able to recognise a different social discourse

---

[15] Alan Kennedy, 'Law and Litigation', *ASE*, 24 (1995): 131-185, pp. 177-178.

[16] Keynes, 'Royal Government and the Written Word', p. 243.

[17] Patrick Wormald and Alan Kennedy have emphasised that these traditions represent the aspirations and ideas of the authorities which compiled these sets, see Wormald, '*Lex Scripta* and *Verbum Regis*', p. 38; Kennedy, 'Law and Litigation', pp. 174-175.

–and a different use of friendship imagery– in the Æthelredian codes which were influenced by Wulfstan, archbishop of York (1002–1023).[18] Subsequently, our discussion of friendship in the lawcodes will be presented in two main groups, as either being 'pre-Wulfstanian' or 'Wulfstanian'. Moreover, some of our surviving 'lawcodes' are not actual royal proclamations; they are part of another court discourse and are therefore only used for contextualisation of the royal discourse, as the non-royal documents need to be assessed within a broader literary context.

Yet even with these divisions at hand, we need to take into account that Wulfstan is also known as an editor of laws: intrusions in his hand have been recognised in the laws of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar by Patrick Wormald.[19] Andy Orchard has classified Wulfstan's practice of 'tinkering' –reshaping and redrafting his own texts, while repeating and recycling information– the very essence of his style.[20] The fact that Wulfstan also tinkered with older versions of the lawcodes, and that he placed his own laws in a direct relationship to these traditions, is thus of importance when considering the available information on friendship within Wulfstan's vision of society.[21]

Wulfstan's importance for the study of late Anglo-Saxon England has only been established in the last century of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, mostly due to the recognition of his hand and his distinctive literary style.[22] His literary activity was

---

18 Wulfstan was first appointed bishop of London (996-1002), and then promoted to the sees of Worcester and York in 1002, held in plurality to 1016. From 1016 onwards, he was only archbishop of York.

19 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 295, 309, 313-315.

20 Andy Orchard, 'Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter', in *The Old English Homily. Precedent*, *Practice*, *and Appropriation*, ed. by Aaron J. Kleist, Studies of the Early Middle Ages, 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 311-341, p. 320.

21 VIII Atr 43, p. 268: 'Ac uton don, swa us þea[r]f is uton niman us to bisnan þæt ærran worldwitan to ræde geræddon, Æþelstan 7 Eadmund 7 Eadgar, þe nihst wæs, hu hi God weorðodon 7 Godes lage heoldon 7 Godes gafel læstan, þa hwile þe hi leofodon.' For a discussion of the presentation and organisation in the manuscripts which contained Wulfstan's law collections, see Mary P. Richards, 'The Manuscript Contexts of the Old English Laws: Tradition and Innovation', in *Studies of Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), 171-192, pp. 177-178.

22 Wulfstan's hand was recognised by Neil Ker, 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. by Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 315-331. His distinctive literary style has been established by Dorothy Whitelock, leading to the attribution of Cnut's Laws and the *Treaty between Edward and Guthrum* to Wulfstan, see Dorothy Whitelock, 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', *English Historical Review*, 56 (1941): 1-21; and Dorothy Whitlock, 'Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws', *English Historical Review*, 30 (1955): 72-85. For a discussion of his style, see Andy Orchard, 'Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*', *ASE*, 21 (1992): 239-264; and

not confined to legislation; his legacy comprises a collection of homilies, additions to the northern recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, a small letter collection, and a semi-homiletic/ semi-legislative programme known as the *Institutes of Polity*.[23] Andrew Rabin has argued that his work was neither purely legislative nor purely homiletic: his understanding of legislation as a way to order society was directly linked to his idea that each person had a personal responsibility –to society and to God– to react to external pressures.[24] These ideas inspired Wulfstan to present "a growing vision of a Holy Society", in which his religious and political thought shaped an ideal of society that was both thoroughly authoritarian and Christian.[25]

Patrick Wormald has suggested interpreting Wulfstan's lawcodes as an attempt to instruct and pacify the kingdom, by directing the king and his people to the path of righteous behaviour by means of a symbolic programme of penance in preparation for the Last Judgment.[26] Wulfstan offers thus an atypical solution to a problem in his lawcodes. The final years of Æthelred's reign had seen the disturbance of the peace, brought about by changes within the social fabric and looming attacks of Viking forces. Wulfstan seeks to re-establish and renegotiate the 'natural bond' between a king and his people, in reaction to immediate needs. His 'solution' expressed a vision of order in society, and was communicated and

---

Joyce Tally Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 10-11. For an overview of the historiography of Wulfstan, see Patrick Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State Builder', *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, ed. by Matthew Townend, The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 9-27, pp. 10-11.

23 Wulfstan's authorship is still debated for many of the homilies, which are in need of a modern editor. For an overview of Wulfstan's work, see Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State Builder', pp. 26-27; and Patrick Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', in *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, ed. by David A. E. Pelteret (New York and London: Garland, 2000), 191-224. Wulfstan's involvement in the composition of the so-called 'Chronicle poems' in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is discussed from a literary perspective by Thomas Bredehoft, *Textual Histories. Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2001), pp. 106-118. Keynes gives a more historical approach of the same matter: Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids', pp. 158-159.

24 Andrew Rabin, 'The Wolf's Testimony to the English: Land and the Witness in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 105.1 (2006): 388-414, pp. 392-393.

25 Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', p. 206.

26 Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids', pp. 187-189; M. K. Lawson, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Homiletic Element in the Laws of Æthelred II and Cnut', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press, 1994), 141-164, pp. 146-148; Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*, p. 74.

preached through all the media available to him: laws, homilies, and even coinage.[27] However, Joyce Lionarons has warned us in her recent study of the homiletic works of Wulfstan that Wulfstan's vision of society and history was not linear, but multi-layered and should be discussed as part of a broader discourse of society.[28] This study of friendship, in a context of a changing discourse of society and interpersonal relations, aims to open up one of the discourses underlying this ideological shift. As lawcodes had both a practical and a conceptual aim, a study of friendship will position Wulfstan's concerns and solutions in their appropriate social setting.

2.2 Discourses of friendship in 'pre-Wulfstanian' lawcodes

2.2.1 Friendship '*in action*' *– representations of society*

Friendship references in the earlier codes adhere to three 'spheres' of interest: mediation, protection, and the administration of society. The first two spheres are of special interest for understanding the terminology of friendship, as *freond/ freondscipe* are in these situations often used alongside references to either kinship and/or lordship. We can observe 'friendship in action' in these references, which informs us on both practice and ideas. The third sphere is more generally defined, yet can open up the way in which friendship was presented as part of the late Anglo-Saxon administration.

Although this first short assessment of the representations of friendship in this set of lawcodes is inherently related to friendship as a practical, regulating measure, it is important to underline that it is also part of a vision of society, in which law-giving was regarded as a specific royal prerogative and duty for the maintenance of peace and order, related to the king's role as God's mediator on earth. This image of kinship and royal authority was firmly based on biblical examples of kingship and on Christian teachings. Its imagery had been refined and mediated in Anglo-Saxon England through the circulation of a seventh-century treatise known as *De duodecim abusiuis saeculi*, the works of Bede, and the literary texts produced at King Alfred's

---

27 See the thorough examination in Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids', esp. pp. 190-201.

28 Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*, p. 5.

court in the ninth century.[29] David Pratt has concluded that a new authoritative dimension was introduced in the ninth and tenth centuries. Kingship was strengthened by the *textual* communication of royal authority through the law-giving tradition, introducing a notion of joint royal and divine authority.[30] The drafting and circulation of lawcodes was thus a combined practical and conceptual communication of the royal authority, and these two aims influence our interpretation of representations of friendship. Furthermore, Paul Kershaw's examination of the centrality of peace-keeping in the political imagery of the early Middle Ages leads to the conclusion that ideas of friendship, within the construction of peace, was part of a royal discourse of kingship and authority.[31] Subsequently, looking into the functions and discourses of friendship within society, we will also be able to highlight aspects of, and changes within, this representation of power.

This is clear from the first law in Alfred's *Domboc*, in which customs are described with regards to oath-giving and pledging.[32] According to Patrick Wormald, it is significant that Alfred's *Domboc* began with regulations on these matters, as both practices were central methods of securing law and order in Anglo-Saxon

---

[29] The most common biblical *exempla* for kings were David, Solomon, Joshua, and Judas Maccabeus. Moses' role as mediator of divine law to the people was prominent in reflections in ideas about the law-giving king. For an overview of models of kingship and Christian kinship, see Hans Hubert Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit*, Bonner historische Forschungen, 32 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1968) and more recently, Paul J. E. Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings. Peace*, *Power and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). For a discussion of the circulation of *De duodecim abusiuis saeculi* in the tenth century, see Michael Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. Basic Readings*, ed. by Mary P. Richards (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 87-167, pp. 117-119. For a discussion of Christian interpretations of kingship in Bede, see Judith McClure, 'Bede's Old Testament kings', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society. Studies presented to J. M. Wallace*-Hadrill, ed. by Patrick Wormald, Donald Bullough, and Roger Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 76-98, p. 90; Patrick Wormald, 'Bede, *Bretwaldas* and the Origins of the *gens Anglorum*', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society*. *Studies presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. by Wormald, Bullough and Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 99-129. For a discussion of the situation at Alfred's court and in the writings of his time, see David Pratt, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 222-238; Janet L. Nelson, 'The Political Ideas of Alfred of Wessex', in *Rulers and Ruling Families in Early Medieval Europe. Alfred*, *Charles the Bald*, *and Others* (Aldershot and Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999), 125-158; Nicole Guenther Discenza, 'The Influence of Gregory the Great on the Alfredian Social Imaginary', in *Rome and the North. The Early Reception of Gregory the Great in Germanic Europe*, ed. by Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Kees Dekker, and D. F. Johnson (Paris, Leuven, and Sterling VA: Peeters, 2001), 67-82.

[30] Pratt, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great*, p. 229.

[31] Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings*, p. 2.

[32] For references to these clauses, see Appendix A.

society.[33] Additionally, Simon Keynes has pointed out that this prominence also communicates Alfred's ideological imagery of authority from the king to his subjects.[34] In order to contextualise these insightful remarks, it is necessary to have a closer look at the instructive use of friendship language, in a wider social context, in this regulation:

1	'Æt ærestan we lærað, þæt mæst ðærf is, þæt æghwelc mon his að 7 his wed wærlice healde.
1.1	Gif hwa to hwæðrum þissa genied sie on woh, oððe to hlafordsearwe oððe to ængum unryhtum fultume, þæt is þonne ryhtre to aleoganne þonne to gelæstanne.
1.2	Gif he þonne þæs weddige þe him riht sie to gelæstanne 7 þæt aleoge, selle mid eaðmedum his wæpn 7 his æhta his freondum to gehealdanne 7 beo feowertig nihta on carcerne on cyninges tune, ðrowige ðær swa biscep him scrife, 7 his mægas hine feden, gif he self mete næbbe.
1.3	Gif he mægas næbbe oððe þone mete næbbe, fede cyninges gerefa hine.
1.4	Gif hine mon togenedan scyle, 7 he elles nylle, gif hine mon gebinde, þolige his wæpna 7 his ierfes.
1.5	Gif hine mon ofslea, licgge he orgilde.
1.6	Gif he ut oðfleo ær þam fierste, 7 hine mon gefo, sie he feowertig nihta on carcerne, swa he ær sceolde.
1.7	Gif he losige, sie he afliemend 7 sie amænsumod of eallum Cristes ciricum.
1.8	Gif þær ðonne oþer mennisc borg sie, bete þone borgbryce swa him ryht wisie, 7 ðone wedbryce swa him his scrift scrife.'[35]

33 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 137, 148, 283.

34 Keynes, 'Royal Government and the Written Word', pp. 230-231. For Alfred's involvement in legislation, see Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, ed. by W. H. Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), 106, pp. 92-95.

35 As 1-1.8, pp. 46-48: 'In the first place we enjoin you, just as it is most needed, that every man shall abide carefully by his oath and pledge. If anyone is wrongfully constrained to promise either of these: to betray his lord or to render aid in an unlawful undertaking, then it is better to be false [to the promise] than to perform it. If, however, he pledges himself to something which it is lawful to carry out and proves false to his pledge, he shall humbly give his weapons and possessions to his friends to be kept, and remain 40 days in prison at a royal manor, and undergo there whatever [sentence] the bishop prescribes for him; and his relatives shall feed him if he himself has no food. If he has no relatives, or [if he] has no food, the king's reeve shall feed him. If he will not submit unless force is used against him, [*i.e.*] if he has to be bound, he shall forfeit his weapons and his property. If he is slain, no wergild shall be paid for him. If he runs away before the term [of imprisonment is completed] and is recaptured, he shall remain in prison 40 days, as he ought to have done at first. If he escapes, he shall be banished, and excommunicated from all the churches of Christ. If, however, other men stand surety for him, he shall pay the compensation [due to them], as the law directs him, and the compensation for breach of pledge, just as his confessor prescribes for him.'

This first law reflect a situation of mediation, in which '*freondas*' mediate on behalf of an associate. These *freondas* had thus a prominent role in this vision of order: they are presented as intermediaries and peacekeepers, securing the weapons and possessions of the accused. Practical measures are thus part of a discourse of power and Christian ideas of kingship.[36] Yet Alfred's provisions also reflect some of the subtleties of the use of friendship language. '*Mægas*' are mentioned as having the duty of feeding the accused in prison, tentatively suggesting that *freondas* and *mægas* have slightly different roles to fulfil and do not necessarily belong to the same group. Their roles may, however, overlap as is demonstrated by the final clause, in which the accused is allowed to make financial provisions if 'other men stand surety for him' ('*Gif þær ðonne oþer mennisc borg sie*'), probably his *freondas* and *mægas*.

Another example is found in Af 42, in which the circulation of proclamations in cases of imprisonment are promised to the man's *mægas* and *freondas*, assumingly indicating two separate groups of associates:

42 'Eac we beodað: se mon se ðe his gefan hamsittendne wite, þæt he ne feohte, ær ðam he him ryhtes bidde.

42.1 Gif he mægnes hæbbe, þæt he his gefan beride 7 inne besitte, gehealde hine VII niht inne 7 hine on ne feohte, gif he inne geðolian wille; 7 þonne ymb VII niht, gif he wille on hand gan 7 wæpenu sellan, gehealde hine XXX nihta gesundne 7 hine his mægum gebodie 7 his friondum.

42.2 Gif he ðonne ciricean geierne, sie ðonne be ðære cirican are, swa we ær bufan cwædon.

42.3 Gif he ðonne þæs mægenes ne hæbbe, þæt he hine inne besitte, ride to þam ealdormen, bidde hine fultumes; gif he him fultuman ne wille, ride to cyninge, ær he feohte.

42.4 Eac swelce, gif mon becume on his gefan, 7 he hine ær hamfæstne ne wite, gif he wille his wæpen sellan, hine mon gehealde XXX nihta 7 hine his freondum gecyðe; gif he ne wille his wæpenu sellan, þonne mot he feohtan on hine. Gif he wille on hond gan 7 his wæpenu sellan, 7 hwa ofer ðæt on him feohte, gielde swa wer swa wunde swa he gewyrce, 7 wite 7 hæbbe his mæg forworht.

42.5 Eac we cweðað, þæt mon mote mid his hlaforde feohtan orwige, gif mon on ðone hlaford fiohte; swa mot se hlaford mid þy men feohtan.

42.6 Æfter þære ilcan wisan mon mot feohtan mid his geborene mæge, gif hine mon on woh onfeohteð, buton wið his hlaforde: þæt we ne liefað.

[36] As also emphasised by David Pratt, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great*, pp. 217-218.

42.7 7 mon mot feohtan orwige, gif he gemeteð oþerne æt his æwum wife, betynedum durum oððe under anre reon, oððe æt his dehter æwumborenre (oððe æt his swistærborenre) oððe æt his medder ðe wære to æwum wife forgifen his fæder.'[37]

In Af 42.4, we again encounter *freondas*, who are informed of their associate's home detainment. The following paragraphs outline who could be expected to act on behalf of the detained man: his dependant ('*mid his hlaforde*'), his lord ('*on ðone hlaforde*'), or his kinsman by blood ('*geborene mæg*'). The emphasis on a kinsman as being 'by blood' sets kinsmen apart, and *freondas* seems thus primarily used to indicate the other men who may act on a confined man's behalf: his dependants and/or his lord. Alfred's *Domboc* suggests the centrality of *freondas* in the maintenance of peace; their identity is deliberately expressed with the inclusive language of friendship, highlighting the importance of *freondas* as mediators.

Edward's lawcodes signalled the ripening of a legislative style; cross-references occur, conditional statements are introduced, and a confident royal authoritative tone expressing the royal 'will' is adopted.[38] Both codes by Edward built on themes covered by Alfred, and consistently create the impression of a 'chain' of laws, communicating a tradition of royal authority based on law-giving. Edward's second lawcode was proclaimed at a council held in Exeter, but nothing is known

---

37 Af 42-42.7, pp. 74-76: 'Also we enjoin, that a man who knows his adversary to be residing at home, shall not have recourse to violence before demanding justice of him. If he has the power to surround his adversary and besiege him, he shall keep him therein seven days without starting a fight against him if he [his adversary] will [consent to] remain inside [his residence]. And if, after seven days, he will submit and hand over his weapons, he shall keep him unscathed for thirty days, and send formal notice of his position to his kinsmen and friends. If, however, he flees to a church, the privileges of the church shall be respected, as we have declared above. If, however, he has not power enough to besiege him in his house, he shall ride to the ealdorman ask him for help. If he will not help him, he shall ride to the king before having recourse to violence. And further, if anyone chances on his enemy, not having known him to be at home, and if he will give up his weapons, he shall be detained for thirty days, and his friends shall be informed [of his position]. If he is not willing to give up his weapons, then violence may be used against him. If he is willing to surrender and hand over his weapons, and anyone after that uses violence against him [the pursuer], he shall pay the sum which he incurs, whether wergild or compensation for wounds, as well as a fine, and his kinsman shall forfeit his claim to protection as a result of his action. We further declare that a man may fight on behalf of his lord, if his lord is attacked. Under similar conditions a lord may fight on behalf of his man. In the same way a man may fight on behalf of his kinsman who is related to him by blood, if he is attacked unjustly, except it be against his lord. This we do not permit. A man may recourse to fight, if he finds another [man] with his wedded wife, within closed doors or under the same blanket; or [if he finds another man] with his legitimate daughter (or sister); or with his mother, if she has been given in lawful wedlock to his father.'

38 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 288-289.

about the circumstances that prompted the event. Friendship language can be found in Edward's second code in a context of oath-giving, formal pledging and loyalty, as we have also encountered in Alfred's code above. For example, in II Ew 3, provisions are made with regards to sureties in cases of theft:

> 'Gif hwa ðifþe betogen sy, þonne niman hine on borh ða þe hine hlaforde befæston, þæt he hine þæs getrywsige; oððe oþere frynd, gif he hæbbe, don þæt sylfe.'[39]

This law again places *freondas* at the heart of a legal process: they can provide surety for an accused thief, just as the *hlaford*. A man without either lord or '*frynd*' had to provide property for surety, or would otherwise be imprisoned until his trial. The contrast drawn between *hlaford* and *freondas* seems, again, to enlarge the groups which were rendered suitable for providing warranty. Whereas in Alfred's *Domboc* friendship vocabulary seems to refer to vertical relationships, in Edward's law relatives and horizontal relationships are hinted at.

During Æthelstan's reign, the legislating tradition reached a new high-point; production is dubbed 'feverish' by Wormald, which vividly illustrates the outburst of legal enthusiasm, inspired by a confident king who tried to live up to the ideal of a law-giving king.[40] Not all so-called 'laws of Æthelstan' are actually royal codes; they differ in origin, status, and form, and, as Simon Keynes has remarked, present us with heterogeneity unknown from the earlier collections of laws.[41] The first Æthelstanian code and the *Ordinance on Charities* are instructions, addressing the reeves and bishops and communicating royal wishes directly to those officials enforcing and negotiating royal authority within localities. Æthelstan's second code – his most extensive legislation as promulgated at a great assembly at Grately– informs us on the practice of law-giving, his target-audience, and the king's desire to establish and maintain peace.[42] Laws were proclaimed in front of powerful witnesses.

---

39 II Ew 3, p. 142: 'If anyone is accused of theft, those who have entrusted him to the lord shall stand surety for him, so that he shall clear himself from the accusation; or if he has any other friends, they may do the same thing.'

40 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 307.

41 Keynes, 'Royal Governance and the Written Word', p. 237.

42 II As Epilogue, p. 166: 'Ealle ðis wæs gesetted on ðam miclan synoþ æt Grætenleage; on þam wæs se ærcebisceop Wulfhelme mid eallum þæm æþelum mannum 7 wiotan, ðe Æþelstan cyning gegadrian.' Note that this epilogue is only preserved in one copy. For a discussion, see Keynes, 'Royal Governance and the Written Word', p. 237 and Sarah Foot, *Æthelstan. The First King of the English* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 137-138.

It follows that law-giving was a demonstrative act, strengthening and communicating the king's authority amongst the foremost of the kingdom. This is confirmed by his fifth code, which reinstated some of the Grately regulations at a council in Exeter. The 'third' code is not an actual royal code, but a reaction of Kentish councillors, who report on the implementation of royal proclamations in their locality. The 'fourth' code is mostly a collection of proclamations, based on provisions made at Thunderfield, Grately, Exeter, and Faversham. Even more varied is the 'sixth' code, better known as the *London Ordinance*. This 'code' is instead an independent record, conveying royal regulations for the benefit of local bodies in authority, negotiating and implementing royal orders within a local setting.[43]

Sarah Foot has remarked in her biography of King Æthelstan that the laws and legal texts of his reign "do not appear like arid or rarefied statements made by dusty lawyers remote from the society for which they legislated, but seem to reflect more closely the immediate preoccupations of a king."[44] These preoccupations reflect an interest in the position of the church and the poor, ordering the payment of tithes and urging the distribution of alms, yet also offer extensive provisions against theft, connecting theft with disloyalty as breach of peace.[45] This emphasis on peace, and the possible disturbance of peace as a direct offence against the king's person, offers an insight into some of the problems of a social system based on interpersonal relationships and a framework for the discussion of the representations of friendship in these laws.

If we disregard the non-royal texts, only Æthelstan's second code informs us on friendship. It focuses on theft and disobedience, and we find in this code a first example of how unjust behaviour could incur the hostility of the king and all his friends (II As 20.7: '*þonne beo he fah wið ðone cyng 7 wið ealle his freond*'), a phrase which will reoccur in later lawcodes.[46] Within the context of disobedience, an interpretation of these *freond* as the king's 'subjects' or 'officials' –those who received the royal favour– seems appropriate.[47] This interpretation does not

43 Keynes, 'Royal Governance and the Written Word', pp. 240-241; Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 295-296.

44 Foot, *Æthelstan*, p. 144.

45 See the discussion by Foot, *Æthelstan*, pp. 141-145.

46 Namely in II As 25, p. 164, II Em 1.3, p. 188 and III Em 2, p. 200.

47 As has also been concluded by Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 107.

necessarily imply a relationship of dependency, but rather of interdependency as the king is equally dependent on his subjects to enforce his rulings; '*all yldestan men*' (II As 20.1) are expected to ride out against their '*geferan*' (II As 20.2) on behalf of the king. This clause therefore illustrates that the multi-interpretable nature of the term *freond* had its own purpose in this context. Its connotation with reciprocity and its extension to wider networks made it useful for expressing delicate relationships of interdependency, especially with those who had entered into an 'official' relationship with the king and who had received, as his officials, favours in return for loyalty. It also demonstrates that the language of friendship could be used to draw boundaries between those who were included within the king's favour and, as such, were part of society ('*freond*'), and those who were excluded from the king's goodwill following hostile behaviour ('*beo he fah*').

These observations of one of the roles of friendship, as a tie based on favour, adding a certain flexibility and expressing the delicacy of the construction of bonds between a king and his subordinates, is close to the conclusions of Stephen White regarding the function of gifts and fiefs in early medieval Normandy and England. White has concluded that gifts –in the form of land and favours– often created ties between a lord and his subordinates that were not so much contractual, but rather subject to constant renegotiation and therefore in need of a flexible model of mediation.[48] Favours and loyalty, both of crucial importance in this form of bonding, are equally flexible and therefore, as Paul Fouracre has concluded with regards to Frankish sources, as much 'agents of social bonding' as the relationships constructed.[49] Æthelstan's second lawcode seems to suggest that in the royal discourse of authority, friendship was considered a tie that provided the necessary flexibility for communicating a 'benign' friendship, the interdependent bond forged between the king and his *freondas*, those receiving his favour.[50] Sarah Foot's remarks regarding Æthelstan's obsession with disloyalty against his person, caused

---

48 Stephen White, 'The Politics of Exchange: Gifts, Fiefs, and Feudalism', in *Medieval Transformations. Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong, Cultures, Beliefs and Traditions, 11 (Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001), 169-188, p. 185.

49 Paul Fouracre, 'The Term *Beneficium* in Frankish Sources: A Society Based on Favours?', in *The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 62-88, p. 65.

50 This idea of a 'benign' friendship is indebted to research by Stephen Jaeger, who has studied the way in which expressions of love constructed a bond based on an 'ennobling love' between the king and his followers, see Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 18, 23.

by the breaking of peace through theft, remind us of a problem inherent to any system based on benign relationships: it is fragile, as it is highly dependent on honour and loyalty. Æthelstan's code, while portraying one of the functions of friendship, simultaneously takes issue with it by emphasising the need for loyalty: a problem in the making is exposed.

A similar focus on a need for peace and concord ('*gesibsumnesse 7 geþwærnesse*') can be recognised in the lawcodes issued in the name of Edmund, communicated by an emphasis on the role of the four pillars of medieval society – kingship, lordship, community and family– as highlighted by Ann Williams.[51] Edmund's legislation is, in the words of Wormald, "an object-lesson in the variety of Anglo-Saxon legal texts."[52] They differ substantially in form, terminology and transmission history, but the heightened rhetorical tone in the codes indicates a new awareness of legislation as an organising construct within society. The first code resembles synodical proceedings in subject-matter and style, and shows ecclesiastical influence. The second code is occupied with the practice of bloodfeud and methods to pursue control over it by the authorities, and is close to a document called *Wergeld*. The third code, issued at Colyton and transmitted in the twelfth-century Latin translation of the *Quadripartitus*, resonates the earlier traditions of Edward and Æthelstan.[53] Simultaneously, Edmund's laws also seek to define peace strictly within the confines of a Christian society, and a Christian interpretation of kingship.[54] Edmund's laws are thus again mainly conceptual in outlook, while simultaneously offering practical measures to fortify this imagery.

Friendship language is used in both Edmund's second and third code and in many ways exemplifies both the traditional and inventive side of Edmund's lawcodes. Edmund's second code on the practice of the 'bloodfeud' ('*fæhþe*') has been at the centre of many debates about the role of kin and obligations within Anglo-Saxon society. The *fæhþe* has recently received attention in the work of Paul Hyams, who has proposed interpreting the feud as a medium to (re)negotiate ties

51 II Em Prologue 1, p. 186; Williams, *Kingship and Government*, pp. 94-95.

52 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 312.

53 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 310-312.

54 This is clear from the opening words of this lawcode, see II Em Prologue, p. 186: 'Eadmund cying cyð eallum folce, ge yldrum ge gingrum, ðe on his anwealde syn, ðæt ic smeade mid minra witena geðeahte, ge hadedra ge læwedra, ærest, hu ic mæhte Cristendomes mæst aræran.'

within society between both formal and informal sources of authority.[55] However, his presentation of Anglo-Saxon England as a feuding society is problematic in itself, as a clear ruling principle of feuding is not apparent or defined in the sources for this period.[56] Guy Halsall has suggested defining the 'feud' as a form of customary vengeance based on a principle of honorary revenge, from which a certain legal allowance could be derived for regulated vengeance to protect the honour of those involved.[57] This alternative approach is useful for our discussion of friendship, as it allows a different interpretation of the function of friendship. It is no longer 'only' a counterbalancing mechanism, but instead it should be interpreted as a 'balancing act' between formal and informal power structures, which were actively negotiated.

This is exactly the cross-over position of the benign relationship encountered in Æthelred's second lawcode, and also Edmund's lawcodes strengthen this interpretation. We have seen how compensation was part of control mechanisms in society; in Edmund's code both *freondas* (II Em 1) and the *mægð* (II Em 1.1) are held responsible for paying compensation in cases of 'feud', to avoid escalation. In this clause, *freondas* could have been used as an alternative term for referring to kin, but could also refer to a wider network of supporters. *Freondas* were thus liable for paying compensation and therefore played an important role in mediating and pacifying conflicts *from within* society –as associates, lord, dependants– but also *from above* as the officials negotiating royal authority. This dimension of friendship's function, as mediating between formal and informal power structures, is further embedded in Edmund's laws. We find another reference to the way in which unjust behaviour, in this case of a kinsman fuelling hostilities between families, could incur the hostility of the king and all his friends (II Em 1.3: '*sy he gefah wið þone cyning 7 wið ealle his frind*').[58] The proximity of the two uses of *freond* in this code emphasises the suitability of the terminology for discussing both horizontal and vertical relationships, and demonstrates the cross-over position that friendship

---

[55] Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, pp. 22-25.

[56] I want to thank John Niles for identifying this problem in Hyams' approach and sharing his thoughts on this matter. Niles pointed out that the *fæhþe* is never even mentioned as an independent notion in the lawcodes. Hyams has recognised this fact, but then has ignored it for constructing his argument, see Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, pp. 72-73.

[57] Halsall, 'Violence and Society', pp. 19-21.

[58] See the discussion above and II As 20, pp. 160-162

occupied between formal and informal power structures, interacting with all areas that Williams has classified as 'the pillars of society'.[59]

Another example of this social imagery can be found in Edmund's third lawcode, which is only preserved in the twelfth-century translation of the *Quadripartitus*:

> 'et qui aliquem eorum infaidiabit qui in ea quaestione fuerint, sit inimicus regis et omnium amicorum eius.'[60]

The twelfth-century compiler of the *Quadripartitus* clearly assumes some formal agency underlying any action of the king's '*amicorum*'. It demonstrates that in a twelfth-century context, Edmund's law was understood as assigning a sense of formal power to the king's associates denoted by *freondas* and translated as *amici.* This also brings Halsall's interpretation of the *fæhþe* to mind; although feuding as regulated vengeance is implied in Edmund's second code, it is never presented as independent notion.[61] In this respect, friendship may be of equal –or even greater– importance as a regulating, legally embedded, principle within the social structures of the kingdom.

Four codes survive in the name of Edgar, each with their own particularities. The first code attributed to Edgar, better known as the *Hundred Ordinance*, may have been proclaimed earlier. Although it bears a clear royal mark but no identification, it is only concerned with the dealings of the hundred courts; it demonstrates the royal interest in legal procedures at all levels of the administration, but does not offer new information on friendship.[62] Edgar's 'second' and 'third' codes are the ecclesiastical and secular parts of one code, proclaimed at a council in Andover. These two codes witness a more rational approach to law-making, based on Carolingian exempla: the division of 'ecclesiastical' and 'secular' codes indicate a clearer perception of the demarcation of –and boundaries within– society, expressing the ideas that also inspired the actions of the reform movement.[63] Furthermore,

---

[59] Williams, *Kingship and Government*, p. 95.

[60] III Em 2, p. 190: 'and he, who will recourse to violence against any of those who have been concerned in that pursuit, will become an enemy of the king and of all his friends.' Again, this is close to the imagery of II As 20, pp. 160-162.

[61] This is also clear in the Latin translation of the *Quadripartitus*; however, the compiler created a Latin verb –*infaidiabo*– to refer to the function of the principle.

[62] Whitelock, *EHD*, I, p. 429.

[63] Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', p. 8.

manuscripts studies have revealed that these codes were heavily redrafted by Archbishop Wulfstan at the end of the century, a connection that needs to be explored in further detail.[64] Edgar was remembered in Æthelred's reign as the king that successfully established peace through his alignment of royal authority with the religious élite, and who was commemorated for his role within the reform movement as a true Christian king, whose kingship was aligned with the role of an ideal abbot as shepherd of his flock.[65] Wulfstan's intrusion in his lawcodes is in this sense interesting, as they connect his vision of society to an ideal associated with the person and the kingship of Edgar.

Simon Keynes has studied the administration of Edgar in further detail, and has emphasised that one of the remarking features of his reign was his apparent strong personal appearance in social networks to keep structures in place, as no ealdormen were appointed in the south during his reign.[66] Apparently, Edgar was less keen on the distribution of his power through networks of interdependency. It is remarkable in this context that his lawcodes, including his secular third code, avoid referring to groups and interdependent ties; no references to either *mæg* or *freond* are found in any of his regulations. In the laws in which the practice of surety is described (III Eg 6-7), a context in which we have encountered friendship vocabulary in the earlier laws, the drafter has chosen to discuss '*borh*' ('surety') itself:

> 6 '7 finde him ælc man þæt he borh habbe; 7 se borh hine to ælcon rihte (ge)læde 7 gehealde.
> 6.1 7 gif hwa ðonne woh wirce 7 utaberste, abere se borh þæt he beran scolde.
> 6.2 Gif hit þonne þeof beo, 7 gif he hine þonne binnan xii monðum gelangian mæge, agife hine to rihte, 7 him man agife þæt he ær geald.'[67]

---

[64] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 313-316.

[65] Edgar's kingship was clearly perceived as a Christian kingship, as follows from the imagery of the *Regularis Concordia*, *Edgar's Establishment of the Monasteries*, and entries in charters in which he is recommended as *Christi uicarius* and *totius Brittanniae gubernator et rector*, see the New Minster Foundation Charter, S 745, *New Minster*, 23, p. 96; and S 690, *Abingdon* 2, 87, p. 355. For a discussion of Edgar as the ideal abbot, treading in the footsteps of St Benedict, see Robert Deshman, '*Benedictus monarcha et monachus*. Early Medieval Ruler Theology and the Anglo-Saxon Reform', *FS*, 22 (1988): 204-240, pp. 206-208.

[66] Simon Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*', in *Edgar*, *King of the English 959-975. New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 3-59, p. 53.

[67] III Eg 6-6.2, p. 202: 'And every man shall see that he has a surety, and this surety shall bring and keep him to [the performance of] every rightful act. And if anyone does wrong and escapes, his surety shall incur what the others should have incurred. If the case be that of a thief and his surety can lay hold of him within twelve months, he shall return him to justice, and what he has paid shall be returned to him.' Note that I have chosen to cite this code from

This creates a focus on the desired outcome, surety, rather than on the agency negotiating this outcome. This change in presentation could be a result of the more rational approach of law-making, whilst simultaneously placing less emphasis on personal ties in favour of a more abstract idea of the negotiation of royal power within localities. Edgar's lawcodes seems to indicate a shift in the discourse of authority, and consequently in its presentation and negotiation of friendship's function within it. It allows for a more confidently authoritative royal voice, which may have inspired Wulfstan's views.[68] A similar use can be observed in Æthelred's first code, proclaimed at Woodstock in Mercia, which is focused on the preservation of 'peace' in a sense of public security ('*eallon folce to friðes boten*)'.[69] The proclamations focus on sureties ('*borh*'), the control of thieving and the use of ordeals to secure justice in a clear echoing of Edgar's third code.

In the 'non-Wulfstanian' lawcodes of Æthelred's reign, friendship language can be found only in his second code. This code is transmitted as a treaty ('*ða friðmal 7 ða forword*') between the king and the Danish fleet, traditionally dated to either 991 or 994, but with a stronger argument for the second date as established by E.V. Gordon and Simon Keynes.[70] It applies friendship vocabulary, but only in one

---

D, rather than the older G2, as this transcription is closely related to Wulfstanian traditions, and as this connection is important for our discussion of the link between Edgar's lawcodes and Wulfstan's imagery; see the discussion in Liebermann, *Gesetze*, III, pp. 133-134, and Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 313-315. Additionally, see also III Eg 7, p. 204: 'And se þe tihtbisig sy 7 folce ungetrywe 7 þas gemot forbuge þrywa, þonne scifte man of þam gemote ða ðe him toridan, 7 finde þonne git borh, gif he mæge' and IV Eg 3, p. 210-1: 'Ðæt is þonne, þæt ic wille, þæt ælc mon sy under borge ge binnan burgum ge buton burgum'; and compare with II Ew 3, p. 142; II As 20, pp. 160-162; and III Em 2, p. 190, as discussed above.

68 This is clear from the chapters of both editions of the *Institutes of Polity* on worldly kingship, see '*cinicge/be earðllicum cyninge*' and the kingdom '*be cinedome/be cynedome*'. See also its chapter on '*be eorlum*', addressing the king's officials, in which we even find a clear reference that warns against bribes (*feo*) and friendship (*freondscipe*) as possible hindering the course of justice, echoing a royal proclamation by Louis the Pious, see Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, ed. and trans. by Karl Jost, *Die Institutes of Polity*, *Civil and Ecclesiastical*: *ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, Schweizer Altenglische Arbeiten, 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959), p. 78.

69 I Atr Prologue, p. 216.

70 For a discussion of the date of the treaty with the Danish fleet, see Simon Keynes, 'The Historical Context of the Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon*, *AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 81-113, pp. 103-107. Keynes has argued for accepting 994 as a far more likely date of this treaty then 991, based on earlier research, see E. V. Gordon, 'The Date of Æthelred's Treaty with the Vikings: Olaf Tryggvason and the Battle of Maldon', *The Modern Language Review*, 32 (1937): 24-32, pp. 25-27.

of the two appending laws, dated by Liebermann *c.* 1000.[71] Wormald has warned us that these clauses are not uncontested and that they may not be from Æthelred's reign at all.[72] Consequently, the evidence on friendship is not necessarily part of the legal discourse of Æthelred's circle, and may have been added by another compiler at a later date.

This assumption seems to be confirmed by the evidence on friendship, which is conservative in its outlook: it reflects earlier practice of warranty in cases of theft. Although its evidence on friendship cannot be placed in a clear ideological context, it still gives an insight into the sophisticated, Anglo-Saxon 'warranty economy', in making provisions for situations in which the accused has died. In these cases, the honour of the accused can be cleared by either his '*yruenoman*' (heir) or his '*frind*', once more emphasising the central role of *freondas* in juridical proceedings.[73] However, it does not produce conclusive evidence on the relationship between the accused and his *freondas*; they could be anyone ranging from more distant kin to his lord, and it thus only underlines Whitelock's conclusion that terminology in the legal codes is hard to translate, or interpret.[74] However, the practical measure also offers an insight into a discourse of friendship that seems to be more old-fashioned in its outlook than we have seen in Edgar's and Æthelred's proclamations so far, and seems to justify Wormald's reservations about these clauses originating from Æthelred's reign.

2.2.2 Negotiating power: formal and informal friendships

Our examples demonstrate that *freond* is often used in a context that also describes other associates, such as a *mæg*, *hlaford* and *gefera.* We have seen that *freondas* is used to refer to kinsmen, to dependants or the lord, and to those receiving the king's favour.[75] This does not only emphasise the flexibility of the term *freond*, but also suggests that the relationship itself is of an additional nature; it implies an active, constructed bond. This creates an image of Anglo-Saxon society as a construct of overlapping and co-existing bonds, a patchwork in which boundaries were not easily

---

71 Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, p. 224.

72 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 321.

73 II Atr 9.2, p. 226.

74 Whitelock, *EHD*, I, p. 363.

75 Af 42.4, p. 76; II As 20.7, p. 160; and II Em 1, pp. 186-188.

drawn between the different forms of association, and subsequently obligations and duties were often intertwined. This created room for manoeuvre for *freondas* to get involved in legal processes as mediators to maintain order, and to warrant the honour of those involved.[76] Consequently, *freondas* operated within formal and informal settings of peacekeeping, negotiating both the social power from within social networks and the royal authority from above. As a result, any discussion of friendship is simultaneously part of a discourse of power and royal authority.

Traditionally, bonding between the king and his followers seems to have taken place through the interpersonal links which were the very essence of friendship relationships. Pauline Stafford has interpreted the existence of these overlapping relationships as a mechanism to delegate power, without risking organised action against royal authority through a principle of 'divide and rule'.[77] However, interdependency rather than dependency fortified these bonds, creating a shared interest in a successful co-operation and a sense of unity between the king and his followers. Simultaneously, with the introduction of a more sophisticated administrative and legal system under Æthelstan and Edmund, a change in the interpretation of friendship within these structures is becoming visible. *Freondas*, as those receiving favours from the king, and *freondscipe*, the king's prerogative, became more closely associated with royal authority and formal power structures.[78]

---

76 For example by safeguarding weapons (Af 1.2, p. 48), by standing surety for thieves (II Ew 3, p. 188), by paying compensation (II Em 1, p. 186), by vouching the honour of a dead man (II Atr 9.2, p. 226).

77 Stafford, *Unification and Conquest*, p. 137.

78 II As 20. 7, p. 160; II As 25, p. 164; II Em 1.3, p. 188; and III Em 2, p. 190. This royal prerogative may have been transferable to officials, or social units, negotiating the royal power. This assumption is based on an interpretation of Æthelred's fourth code, a hybrid code containing miscellaneous directions of both royal and local origin. This hybrid code, or even collection of codes, is only transmitted in the *Quadripartitus* in Latin. We find a reference to the town's *amicitia*, which could be lost upon unlawful entering of a town residence in Æthelstan's 'fourth' code. To secure the town's *amicitia*, the accused can pay a compensation with the king's consent for the disturbance of the peace. *Amicitia* is in this law used as an indication of the town's prerogative, yet by association with the king, just as *freondscipe* is used as a royal prerogative in Æthelstan's codes. Alternatively, *amicitia* is in this context a twelfth-century interpretation of the bond, reflecting an interpretation of friendship as a bond, firmly based on secular favours, referring to authority in a context of administration and society, see IV Atr 4-4.2, p. 234: 'Et diximus: homo qui hamsocnam faciet intra portum sine licentia et summam infracturam aget de placit ungebendeo, uel qui aliquem innocentem affliget in uia regia, si iaceat, iaceat in ungildan ækere. Si pugnet antequam sibi rectum postulet ac uiuat, emendet regis burhbrece quinque libris. Si curet amicitiam ipsius porti, reddat nobis triginta sol. emendationis, si rex hoc concedat nobis.'

This active bonding process was still based on a form of interdependency, negotiating royal authority as a 'benign friendship'.

This conclusion is akin to the conclusions reached by Stephen Jaeger, who differentiated a demonstrative use of expressions of 'ennobling love' in courtly settings, as reflection of an aristocratic pattern of behaviour.[79] Jaeger's conclusions are based on the use of affectionate language as identifying and elevating royal favourites. However, our observations about the use of friendship language in the lawcodes seems to expand the function of Jaeger's 'ennobling' love, as a form of court behaviour, into a discourse of benign friendship, as friendship could negotiate the informal and formal dimension of relationships of favour within the royal administration. The king's 'favourites' became his *freondas*, agents of the royal power within the administration. The vagueness of friendship's terminology, and its flexible association with both horizontal and vertical relationships of informal power, made it suitable for expressing these relationships, while strengthening the social coherence within the kingdom.

However, our discussion of Edgar's lawcodes has enabled us to see the contours of an ideological change in the discourse of authority, departing from the representation of interpersonal links and to a focus on the outcome, rather than on the agencies and agents of mediation. These changes may have been inspired by Edgar's personal charisma, yet are also related to tensions inherent in a system based on interpersonal relationships as argued by Gerd Althoff in his analysis of the tensions between co-operative bonds and lordship in Carolingian and Ottonian sources. He has concluded that co-operative bonds only functioned to strengthen the position of the king, and that, if successfully installed, the king would depart from this co-operative model towards a more authoritative model of bonding as a long-term solution to establish peace. For this reason, Althoff has considered friendship ties as concessions to the king's nobles.[80] If we apply Althoff's analysis on our Anglo-Saxon evidence, we would be left with the observation that the reward system that allows the king and his followers to trust and support each other failed, urging for a new method of bonding and having resulted in a change of register in discussing

---

79 Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 18, 23.

80 Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp. 84-85, 161.

bonding, in which –at least in Edgar's worldview– no place for friendship was reserved in the formal communication of authority.

However, Althoff's examples and conclusions about the reigns of Louis the Pious (781–840) and Charles the Bald (840–877) already suggest some problems with such an analysis of the situation in Anglo-Saxon England. Louis the Pious disentangled himself from informal relationships with his subjects, which resulted in a reign characterised by discord and rebellion. Charles the Bald, in contrast, entered into both formal and informal relationships, and in doing so, negotiated a fragile peace. Althoff has acknowledged the fact that some stronger kings were actually successful in peacekeeping by establishing friendships with their nobles. He has stressed that it was not until a hereditary principle was introduced with regards to fiefs –allowing the king's followers a secure basis for their submission to royal power– that the lordship model seems to have been hugely favoured over a combination of formal and informal bonds.[81] Althoff's observation that reward –and thus royal favour– was at the roots of the tensions between interpersonal bonds and lordship is insightful, but he seems to overlook that exactly this principle also created the joint enterprise of kings and élite. This oversight may be partly the result of his chosen approach of documentary sources as pure evidential rather than also ideological reflections of practice; an evidential approach seeks a teleological interpretation of changed practice, whereas an ideological approach tries to uncover changed discourses in which similar practice may be represented in a new method.

In a system *without* hereditary land, favour was the object of any negotiation between the king and his followers, as has also been emphasised by Thomas Charles-Edwards in his study of the function of moveable wealth in the construction of friendships.[82] Pressure on land would automatically result in tension within the social structure; kings may have sought solutions, by adopting a more authoritative tone, yet as long as favour was not replaced as the leading principle for the creation of bonds, kings were doomed to be unsuccessful in their attempts to create order and stability within the ranks by their authority alone. Discourses may have changed, but practice had not. No sensible king would deliberately seek to cut his interpersonal ties; conversely, they would have been trying to establish as many as possible.

---

[81] Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp. 123-126.

[82] Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth', p. 180.

Interpersonal bonds, of which friendship ties were an important representative, were thus neither allowances, nor the result of a 'divide and rule' principle, but an object of desire for both kings and their followers. These conclusions are fortified by our assessment of the lawcodes, and the discourses of authority and friendship in it. Kingship was rooted in an inclusive model of interdependency over the exclusivity of the one-dimensional bond of lordship.

For instance, Edward's second code is practical in outlook. We have already discussed that in II Ew 3 both *hlaford* and *freond* were regarded suitable for the provision of warranty in cases of theft, followed by a law in which provisions are made to secure the independence of those overseeing dealings with (missing) cattle on estates. II Ew 5 then reads:

> 5 'Gif hwa ðis oferhebbe 7 his að 7 his wæd brece, ðe eal ðeod geseald hæfð, bete swa domboc tæce.
> 5.1 Gif he ðonne nelle, ðolige ure ealra freonscipes 7 ealles ðæs ðe he age.
> 5.2 Gif hine hwa feormige syððan, bete swa seo domboc sæcge, 7 se scyle ðe flyman feormige, gif hit sy herinne; gif hit sy east inne, gif hit sy norð inne, bete be ðam þe þa friðgehwritu sæcgan.'[83]

This law explains that all regulations with regards to sureties, theft and moveable properties were part of a legal system that was created for the benefit of the complete kingdom, which was held together by oath-giving and pledging, establishing the trustworthiness and loyalty of the king's followers. Refusing to adhere to these regulations meant being excluded from society, the accused 'forfeiting the friendship of all of us and all that he possesses' ('*ðolige ure ealra freonscipes 7 ealles ðæs ðe he age*'). Missing out on *freondscipe* was missing out on 'society as a whole', communicating an inclusive vision of society: exclusion from society meant loss of possessions and honour. Without the 'national' *freondscipe*, a royal subject was basically excluded from Anglo-Saxon society as his/her social status was diminished to that of an outlaw.[84] We have seen a similar pattern in Æthelred's second lawcode.

---

[83] II Ew 5-5.2, pp. 142-144: 'If anyone neglects this and breaks his oath and his pledge, which the whole populace has given, he shall make amends as the written laws direct. If, however, he is not willing to do so, he shall forfeit the friendship of all of us, and all that he possesses. If anyone subsequently harbours him, he shall make amends such as the written laws declare of him who harbours a fugitive, if it [the offence] is committed herein [in this region, *i.e.* the area south of the Humber]; if it is committed in the eastern or northern regions [*i.e.* the Danelaw], amends will be made in accordance with the provisions of the treaties.'

[84] See II Ew 5.2, p. 44.

If a thief was killed after repetitive misdeeds, anyone who would try to avenge him would incur the wrath of the king '*wið ealle his freond*'.[85] Being a king's *freond* meant being part of the social structure. This was not considered to be a less valued method of bonding in the reigns of Edward, Æthelstan and Edmund, but as the very essence of the unity within the kingdom: interpersonal bonds, actively forged and sought, were rendered the backbone of society for maintaining order.

Furthermore, *freondscipe* was associated with the king's officials at the grassroots, the reeves, who maintained order on the king's behalf. This can be observed in the proem of Æthelstan's first code in his address of his officials:

> 'Ic Æthelstan cyng, mid geþehte Wulfhelmes [mines] arcebiscopes 7 eac minra oþerra biscopa, cyþe þam gerefan to gehwylcere byrig 7 eow bidde on Godes naman 7 on ealra his haligra 7 eac be minum freondscipe beode, þæt ge ærest of minum agenum gode agyfan þa teoþunga, ægþer ge on cwicum ceape ge on þæs geares eorðwæstmum, swa man rihtast mæge oððe gemetan oððe getellan oððe awegan; 7 þa biscopas þonne þæt ylce don on heora agenum gode, 7 mine ealdormen 7 mine gerefan þæt sylfe.'[86]

In this clause, *freondscipe* refers to the king's favour, and the benign bond based on it, which can be lost. Another example can be found in II As 25, in which insubordinate reeves are commanded to pay fines to the king and bishop; disobedience would result in withdrawal of goodwill ('*ealles þæs he age 7 ure ealra freondscipes*').[87] Serious misbehaviour could thus not only result in the loss of favours, but also in the reeve's exclusion of society: *freondscipe* being a tie that bound the reeve to the king and to the networks that created the social fabric. It also raises the question to what extent this relationship between the king and the reeve should be seen as special. Did the royal *freondscipe* establish a special relationship between the king and his official –his favourite?– and was disobedience of the reeve considered to be a personal offence against the king? If we recall Sarah Foot's

85 II As 20, p. 160.

86 I As Prologue, p. 146: 'I, King Æthelstan, with the advice of my Archbishop, Wulfhelm, and my other bishops also, inform the reeve in every borough, and pray you in the name of God and of all His saints, and command also by my friendship, that you render, in the first place, tithes of my own property, both in livestock and in the yearly fruits of the earth, either measuring, counting, or weighing just as one may do most accurately. And the bishops shall do the same with their own property, and my ealdormen and reeves likewise.' Note that I have chosen to cite this code from G, rather than D; despite D being slightly older, G reflects an older phonology and orthography, and offers various superior readings, see the discussion in Liebermann, *Gesetze*, III, pp. 96-97.

87 II As 25, p. 164.

analysis of Æthelstan’s obsession with disloyalty, it seems a likely explanation.[88] However, more research on the reeve and his position within networks is needed before reaching satisfying conclusions.

We can also find an example in Edgar’s fourth code which, again, demonstrates that Althoff may have been correct in his overall analysis, but that the negotiation between the two systems in Anglo-Saxon England was far more subtle than he has assumed. Edgar’s fourth code is famous for its stipulation on the circulation of lawcodes, referring to the distribution to ealdormen Ælfhere and Æthelwine –two high-placed royal officials– and its address of the Danelaw, offering the Danes considerable legal freedom of organisation.[89] It was proclaimed at ‘Wihtbordesstan’, in times of hardship and plague. This may be of interest in this context, as it demonstrates that Edgar sought a solution for these predicaments in tradition, rather than in invention. In it, the king commands his reeves to uphold his earlier stipulations on the pain of losing his favour (‘*freondscipe* 7 *eallum þam þe hy agon*’).[90] However, these clauses also reflect Wulfstan’s influence on the legal tradition. Wulfstan is the most likely candidate for the addition of the homiletic final clause dating from Æthelred’s reign, in which the spiritual loss is contemplated that would occur from the reeves’ failure in living up to the provision in the preceding clause.[91] It gives another insight into the legal discourse which was created in Æthelred’s years, and which circulated in court circles. With this addition, the royal authority is expanded into the realm of religion. It demonstrates that not royal favour, but obedience to a Christian king was seen as the solution to the problems, giving an insight into the differences in discourses of authority between the Æthelredian circle and its legislating predecessors.

Interpreting these laws explains that *freondscipe* should be understood in the context of a united Anglo-Saxon kingdom as a close-knit society of social networks, tied together by personal bonds of loyalty. *Freondscipe* bound king and subjects

---

[88] Foot, *Æthelstan*, pp. 141-145.

[89] For a reference to ealdormen Ælfhere and Æthelwine, see IV Eg 15.1, p. 214; for the application of this law in the Danelaw and a reference to Oslac *eorl*, see IV Eg 15, p. 214; for the freedom of legislation of the Danes, see IV Eg 2.1, p. 210.

[90] IV Eg 1.5, p. 208.

[91] IV Eg 1.5*a*, p. 208; for the probably identification of Wulfstan’s influence, compare the discussions in Liebermann, *Gesetze*, III, p. 140; and Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 317.

together and represented a dialogue in which favour, authority, and loyalty regulated peace within informal networks, the localities, and the formal bonds created by the royal administration. The king communicated and negotiated his relationship with his officials by it; it bent a relationship based on favour and authority into a benign relationship in which interdependency, rather than dependency, formed the ruling principle. Friendship was both a practical mechanism, and part of the discourse of authority: it was a balancing act, creating room for manoeuvre for both king and followers, and as such a desired bond. His officials, as recipients of royal favour, seem to have been singled out as his 'favourites'.

This last suggestion is difficult to prove based on the type of evidence that can be retrieved from the lawcodes as affectionate language is not part of their imagery; the evidence discussed in chapter three, especially the royal diplomas, may in this respect be more useful. Lawcodes were proclaimed in councils; the king's 'favourites' were thus reminded of their duties in front of other representatives of the king's authority, emphasising their special bond to the king in a public setting. Althoff's conclusions regarding the demonstrative acts that cemented bonds between kings and their subjects as status-enhancing, suggests that receiving the king's friendship would have been of importance within social settings.[92] Unfortunately, Althoff has not explored relationships between the king and officials in further detail, as he considered their relationships as of a highly dyadic nature, without a wider social impact.

However, the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes have suggested that these benign bonds were both dyadic and polyadic, as *freondscipe* also constructed unity within a kingdom based on a binary mechanism of inclusion and exclusion. Friendship was one of the means negotiating this binary system, as has also been argued with respect to gift-giving by Stephen White, and with respect to feuding by Paul Hyams.[93] However, friendship was part of both formal and informal power structures and was therefore also at the very heart of tensions within this structure. Thomas Charles-Edwards has emphasised the importance of honour in this context: dependable friends, could become dependable enemies, and love and hatred alike were the marks

---

92 Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp. 136-138.

93 White, The Politics of Exchange', p. 185; Hyams, *Rancor & Reconciliation*, p. 25.

of honour.[94] Yet this honour was very much intertwined with royal favour; the king's *freondas* secured peace on his behalf, and thus formed the social glue that secured the unity of the kingdom. For this reason, criminal actions, ranging from oath-breaking to theft, could provoke the king's enmity and that of all his *freondas.*[95] Offences were not only directed towards the king, but also to all his *freondas*; subsequently breaking the king's peace was becoming an enemy of society at large.[96]

In summary, the lawcodes drafted before the times of Wulfstan give us important information on the role ascribed to friendship in society. Firstly, we have found evidence of friendship being a practical relationship that supplied mediation and protection to secure order at the grassroots of society, mediating power for the authorities. For this reason, references to friendship exclusively occur in clearly secular rulings, as it was considered to have been a secular relationship. Secondly, we have seen how its flexible, additional nature offered a chance to negotiate delicate relationships of interdependence between lords and followers in the laws of Æthelred and Edmund; it functioned as social glue, created unity in a binary society, and negotiated the terms on which favours were exchanged for loyalty. Again, friendship in this context can be considered to be of essential importance for the maintenance of peace. However, this seems to have been primarily applied to the king's dealings with his officials, and in particular the reeve. The created benign relationship was based on interdependence, but also assumed a form of conditional favouritism. Any system implying favouritism is going to evoke tensions between authority and rights, and it is interesting to observe that this danger was apparently recognised by King Edgar and his circle. In Edgar's laws, friendship seems to have been erased from any conceptual framework of society-building. As we know that Wulfstan partly redrafted Edgar's laws, and was also heavily inspired by the more abstract approach of mediation as found in Edgar's laws for the drafting of his own lawcodes, it is now

---

94 Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Land', p. 180; Charles-Edwards, 'Kinship Revisited', p. 172.

95 II Ew 5.1, p. 144; II As 25, p. 164; II Em 1.3, p. 188; and III Em 2, p. 188.

96 This binary structure was dominant in all layers of society, as can be deduced from an interpretation of the *London Ordinance*, the regulations of the 'peace-guild' of London. In it, society is represented as a two-fold system, based on obligations and rights, expressed by drawing a contrast between *freondscype* and *feondscype* in the seventh ordinance. It gives us an insight into the way in which this control mechanism inspired the active involvement of *freondas*, most likely the patrons of the peace-guild, as the vocabulary of denoting members is radically different. *Freondas* are urged to stand by members of the *friðgegyldum*, see VI As 7, p. 177: 'þæt we wæron ealle swa on anum freondscype swa on anum feondscype'.

time to explore his discourse of friendship, and the role assigned to it in his vision of society.

2.3 Discourses of friendship in 'Wulfstanian' lawcodes

2.3.1 Friendship and Wulfstan's 'Holy Society'

Wulfstan's vision of society was solidly based on ideas of the unity of royal governance and Christianity. In her study of Wulfstan's homiletic writings, Joyce Lionarons has emphasised that his vision of society was multi-layered and aimed at instructing both laity and clergy about the fundamentals of Christianity in an attempt to prepare the country for the Last Judgement.[97] Additionally, Andy Orchard and Patrick Wormald have shown that we cannot really see any of Wulfstan's works in isolation. His works should be seen as 'in progress', unfinished and amalgamated expressions of a developing vision of society.[98] In Wulfstan's portrayal of the ideal Christian society, an abstract vision of power and authority as being directed from above –from God, mediated through his representative on earth, the king– is favoured over a more practical representation of bonding through the negotiation of ties. This is clearly expressed in Wulfstan's portrayal of his ideal Christian society in the *Institutes of Polity*, which was circulated in two 'editions' by Wulfstan:[99]

> 'La, þurh hwæt sceal Godes þeowum and Godes þearfum frið and fultum cuman butan þurh Christ and þurh cristenne cyning?'[100]

Although the Christian king was deeply embedded within the law-giving tradition, Wulfstan's emphasis on the king as the only agency responsible for the mediation of peace and protection is new. Karl Jost has established that some of Wulfstan's

---

97 Lionarons, *The Homiletic Writing of Archbishop Wulfstan*, p. 107.

98 Andy Orchard, 'On Editing Wulfstan', in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), p. 326; Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 464.

99 Karl Jost has suggested a circulation date of *c.* 1008-1010 for *I Polity*, and a later circulation date, probably at the end of Wulfstan's career, for *II Polity*, see Karl Jost, *Institutes of Polity*, pp. 33-34. Although this complicates the information retrieved from this source, both 'editions' will be used for this general discussion of Wulfstanian political thought, as both serve to contextualise the way in which he thought.

100 Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, I, 10, p. 46: 'Indeed, through what agency shall peace and support come to God's servants and God's poor, other than through Christ and through a Christian king?'

sources were closely related to the Carolingian court of Louis the Pious.[101] This connection is also reflected in an address to the royal officials, in which bribes ('*feo*') and friendship ('*freondscipe*') are mentioned as possible hindrances to the course of justice, echoing a royal proclamation by Louis the Pious.[102] Wulfstan seems to have been inspired by these ideas, in order to separate friendship obligations from formal, administrative structures in favour of a strong, authoritative king. This is of particular interest, as Gerd Althoff has established that the sources of Louis's reign also attempted to reshape the discourse of royal authority to create an allowance for the king in his conflicts with his nobles.[103]

Furthermore, friendship vocabulary is used in the *Institutes of Polity* to draw contrasts; for example, the king is reminded to uphold justice equally to '*freondum*' and '*fremdum*'.[104] Additionally, the royal councillors ('*ðeodwitan*') are reminded that they will no longer be part of the (Christian) society ('*gyf he nele freondan*') if they do not comply with God's law:

> 'And se þe nele Godes bodan hyran mid rihte ne godcundre lare gyman, swa he sceolde, he sceall huran feondan gyf he nele freondan.'[105]

Inclusion and exclusion are presented in terms of good and evil, and this is the context in which the language of friendship is used in other occurrences in the *Institutes of Polity*; *freondas* are usually God's servants, often contrasted with *feondas* as the devilish forces opposing God's plan.[106] This short exploration of the *Institutes of Polity* has demonstrated that Wulfstan's vision of society was influenced by ideas and discourses of royal authority which favoured a strong, Christian king, and by suspicion of relationships based on favour that could disturb the execution of royal justice. Additionally, friendship language was evoked to discuss inclusion and

---

101 Jost, *Institutes of Polity*, pp. 36-37, 78.

102 Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, I, 58, p. 78. See also Jost's notes for Louis' proclamation, in which we read *munerum* and *amicitia* for *feo* and *freondscipe*.

103 Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp.121-123.

104 Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, I, 23, p. 54. This reference is a citation of Sedulius Scotus, in which we read *propinquos* for *freondum* and *alienos* for *fremden*, see Jost's notes on this citation.

105 Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, II, 48, p. 64: 'And he, who does not listen to God's commands, as is right, and who does not observe the divine teachings, as he should, will hear fiends, as he will not [hear] friends.'

106 See, for example, Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, I, 65, p. 80; I, 115, p. 150, and II, 222, p. 152.

exclusion of members of society, expressing a confident, Christian worldview. Our next step will be to examine whether and how these ideas were translated into his legislation.

Æthelred's 'Wulfstanian' lawcodes were mostly ecclesiastical in their direction, but also hint towards implementation in a secular context. This is a first indication of Wulfstan's universal worldview, in which secular and religious were jointly held responsible for the kingdom's preparation for the End of Times. The group classified as 'Wulfstanian' lawcodes used for this study is arguably incomplete. Cnut's lawcodes will not be discussed, as this study only extends to representations of friendship up to 1016 for the reasons as discussed in chapter one.[107] However, the so-called *Treaty between Edward and Guthrum* has been included. Dorothy Whitelock has dated this agreement to Æthelred's reign, and Simon Keynes has suggested treating the settlement as Wulfstan's first legal contribution to Æthelred's law-giving tradition, dating the treaty to the period between 1002 and 1008.[108] One question that needs to be considered while looking at this treaty is why this retrospective peace-agreement was circulated and drafted in Æthelred's days.

Æthelred's fifth, sixth and tenth codes refer to the same regulation, as proclaimed at Enham in 1008. They are ecclesiastical in outlook, and homiletic in style.[109] Simon Keynes has suggested interpreting the promulgation of these codes as a reaction to looming disorder and as a royal initiative to reorganise the Anglo-Saxon defence, on the eve of Viking incursions.[110] Most of our friendship references can be found in these three codes and it is therefore important to remember that these regulations aim to offer relief in an urgent situation. The content matter of the fifth and sixth code is closely aligned, but the sixth code –conveyed in Latin and the vernacular with different recensions of the same regulations– seems to be part of the process of explaining the directives proclaimed at Enham, and may have been drafted as a circulation version.[111] Moreover, Patrick Wormald has argued that Æthelred's

---

[107] See above, chap. 1, p. 43.

[108] Whitelock, 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', pp. 17-18; Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids', p. 177.

[109] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 332, 191-192.

[110] Keynes, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids', pp. 177-179.

[111] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 334-335. The Latin and vernacular version are transmitted in the same pontifical, but the Latin version seems to have had another vernacular

tenth code, a small fragment, may have been the closest version to the 'official' text of the Enham code of 1008.[112]

To sum up this muddled transmission history: we possess three codes in Æthelred's name, his fifth (Old English), sixth (Old English and Latin) and tenth (Old English), which reflect the same regulations but in different versions. This summary seems to imply some order, yet especially the Latin and Old English versions of the sixth code complicate matters even further. Although they follow a similar pattern, they are not directly related. Both are closely associated with Wulfstan, but the Latin version is written in a superfluous Latin style, while also referring to the sources influencing the ideas as expressed in the code. Patrick Wormald has suggested interpreting the Latin version as a draft version, which was intended for vernacular exposition, seeing both the Latin and Old English versions as examples of Wulfstan's working method of tinkering and redrafting.[113] This code in particular can thus give an insight into the registers in which Wulfstan was designing his vision of society, communicated in two different languages.

The first clause of the fifth code defines *freondscipe* as the desired outcome of order; 'peace and friendship' ('*frið 7 freondscype*') are named as the result of a bonding process between the king and society, solidly based on loyalty.[114] This statement is also expressed in similar vocabulary in both the Old English version of the sixth code and the tenth code.[115] The Latin version of the sixth code gives us additional information, in an uncompromising tone: '*Fides firma*, *caritas non ficta*, *amictia uera et non falsa inter singulos teneatur*' ('Steadfast faith, unfeigned charity and true rather than false friendship should be held between all').[116] Wulfstan's Latin version seems to echo concerns about the unity within the kingdom: '*uera amicitia*' rather than '*falsa amicitia*' is upheld as a desired outcome for those fluent in Latin.

---

copy as exemplar. Wormald has argued for dating the vernacular version of the sixth code later than the Latin version, while pointing out that it is actually quite close to the Oxford code of 1018. However, he has also acknowledged that the sixth vernacular code ignored important additions in the codes from 1014. Wormald disagrees in this respect with Sisam, as endorsed by Whitelock, *EHD*, I, p. 442, who sees VI Atr as adaptations of V Atr.

112 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 336-337.

113 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 334-335. Wormald has emphasised the similarities with Cnut's codes of 1018.

114 V Atr 1-1.2, p. 236-238.

115 X Atr 2-2.1, p. 270; VI Atr 8-8.2, p. 250.

116 VI Atr 8.2, p. 251.

Uera amicitia is presented at the same level as the two theological virtues of *fides* and *caritas*, placing it in a clear religious context, referring to the bond between the king and his followers within the constraints of a divine order.

In this respect, it seems mostly a device to demarcate two types of *amicitia*: one as forged according to Wulfstan's vision of a Christian society –based on loyalty to the Christian king– and one as forged outside of these limitations. Accordingly, the sixth code communicates a discourse of royal authority, based on submission to the royal might and closer to Wulfstan's homiletic works, indicating the development of his vision into a 'total' concept. This is also apparent in the Old English version. For example, Wulfstan varied between '*frið 7 freondscype*' and '*sibbe 7 some*' ('peace and concord') in the opening clause, strongly emphasising the need for submission to royal power.[117] Both word pairs are typical for the vocabulary of Wulfstan, yet '*sibbe 7 some*' is more commonly used in his homiletic works.[118]

Peace, friendship and concord are thus Wulfstan's desired outcomes at Enham, expressing an aspired ideal of unity within the country in reaction to anxieties over impending Viking invasions. Additionally, it suggests a social reality far removed from this ideal of peace; the Viking raids followed years of unrest amongst the élites in the years 1005 and 1006, in which prominent advisors of the

---

[117] VI Atr 1, p. 246: '7 þæt is þonne ærest þæra biscpa frumræd, þæt we ealle fram synnum georne gecyrran, þæs þe we don magan, 7 ure misdæda andettan georne 7 geornlice betan, 7 ænne God rihtlice lufian 7 weorðian 7 ænne Christendom anrædlice healdan 7 ælcne hæþendom georne forbugan, 7 gebedrædene aræran georne us betweonan, 7 sibbe 7 some lufian georne, 7 anum cynehlaforde holdlice hyran 7 georne hine healdan mid rihtan getrywðan.' The last clause of the Latin version follows this pattern and reads VI Atr 1, *Gesetze*, I, p. 246, p. 247: 'atque pactum pacis et concordie fideliter firmiterque inter se confirmabant.'

[118] A search in the Old English corpus reveals that *frið/friþ 7 freondscipe* occurs only seven times in the complete corpus, of which five are found in Wulfstan's lawcodes. Another occurrence is found in an obscure and little-known prayer from the eleventh century, transmitted in a collection of texts that could be associated with Wulfstan; for a discussion and an edition, see W. H. Stevenson, 'Yorkshire Surveys and Other Eleventh-Century Documents in the York Gospels', *English Historical Review*, 27.105 (1912): 1-25, p. 10. The last occurrence can be found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for 1055, in which the peace settlement between Harald and Ælfstan is described, see *ASC* C, A.D. 1055, p. 116: 'Harald eorl let dician ða dic abutan þæt port þa hwile. Þa on ðam þa spæc man to friðe, 7 Harald eorl 7 ða ðe mid him wæron coman to Bylgelege 7 ðær frið 7 freondscipe hem betweonan gefæstnodan (…).' *Sibbe 7 some* only occurs nine times in the complete corpus, of which eight are found in either homilies or laws drafted by Wulfstan. The last occurrence can be found in S 1449, a Winchester charter dated to 964x975 (?970-975), in which boundaries between the Winchester communities are reassessed, see S 1449, *Charters* (R), 49, p. 102: '7 se abbod Æþelgar mid geðeahte ures cynelafordes 7 þes bysceopes Aþelwoldes 7 ealles þæs hiredes þa ylcan mylne þe se bisceop seolde 7 oðre þæ hi ær ahtun binnan þære byrig to sibbe 7 to some gesealde into nunnan mynstre.'

king had fallen from grace.[119] Both Gerd Althoff and Julia Barrow have argued that friendship language became more visible in times of crisis, reflecting attempts of kings to create peace by entering additional relationships of co-operation through demonstrative acts and language.[120] However, in these lawcodes friendship is not offered as a solution to create peace between the ranks. Rather than resorting to treaties, Wulfstan suggested a total submission to the king. The Enham codes reflect some form of demonstrative speech, but the language of friendship is not part of this discourse other than as the desired outcome. Moreover, Wulfstan seems concerned about the friendships formed within the kingdom, as his Latin reflections in the sixth code seem to reflect a concern about *falsa amicitia*, which do not comply with his worldview.

This suggestion would also offer an explanation for the creation and circulation of the so-called *Treaty between Edward and Guthrum*. In this agreement we find again the reference '*frið 7 freondscipe*' in its prologue:

> 'And þis is seo gerædnis eac, þe Ælfred cyng 7 Guðrum cyng 7 eft Eadward cyng (7 Guðrum) cyng gecuran 7 gecwædon, þa þa Engle 7 Dene to friþe 7 to freondscipe fullice fengon; 7 þa witan eac, þe syððan wæron, oft 7 unseldan þæt seolfe geniwodon 7 mid gode gehihtan.'[121]

The settlement refers to the fact that Alfred and Edward's peace with Guthrum was often reinstated afterwards. Whether this was actually true, is unclear; however an impression of ongoing peace settlements between the West-Saxon kings and Viking leaders is created. The circulation of this treaty in years of Viking incursions could thus have served as a medium to shape the collective memory of the English both north and south of the Humber, reminding them of their unity, and as a medium to assert Æthelred's authority, assuring his followers that the king would follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors. Again, *freondscipe* is resolutely presented as

---

[119] *ASC* C, A.D. 1006, p. 91: 'Her forðferde Ælfric arcebisceop, 7 Ælfeah bisceop feng to æfter him to þam arcestole. 7 on þam ilcan geare wæs Wulfgeate eall his ar ongenumen, 7 Wulfeah 7 Ufegeat wæron ablænde 7 Ælfelm ealdorman ofslagen, 7 Kenulf bisceop forðferde'.

[120] Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107, 113; Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers*, p. 123.

[121] EGu, p. 128: 'This also is the proclamation which King Alfred and King Guthrum and afterwards King Edward (and King Guthrum) enacted and agreed upon, when the English and the Danes unreservedly entered into peace and friendship; the councilors likewise, who have been [in office] since then, often and frequently have repeated the same and have supported it with [further] improvement.'

based on royal agency for the creation of peace and order. Being part of this order is not presented as an option, but as an obligation.

However, Wulfstan's use of friendship language is also instructive for assessing the reasons for favouring royal authority over interpersonal relationships in the negotiation of peace. The fifth code portrays the responsibility of *freondas* in legal procedures. As we have seen in Edmund's second code, *freondas* were traditionally liable for compensation, and kin was entitled to wergild upon death.[122] In Æthelred's fifth code, this right of compensation is denied to a dead man's *freondas*, if the deceased turned against the king during life.[123] This paragraph indicates the tensions that existed between family obligations and rights, and the duty of loyalty to the king. Within this context, the choice of *freond*, rather than the more narrowly defined *mæg* seems to have been deliberate, as its wider social reach in terms of association reminded all Æthelred's subjects to put their loyalty to the king first.

This loyalty to the king had also a religious undertone, in the imagery of the Enham proclamations, in which the love for God was preached as a 'national' duty as, for example, in the sixth code:

> 6 '7 la gyt we willað biddan freonda gehwylcne 7 eal folc eac læran georne, þæt hy inwerdre heortan ænne God lufian 7 ælcne hæþendom georne ascunian.'[124]

The *freondas* in this reference are probably the assembled –the king's council, his court, the bishops, and his officials– as his Latin adaptation reads '*plebis multitudine collectae*'.[125] It is thus used in a similar way as we have seen in II As 20, II Em 1.3 and III Em 2, indicating those men with whom the king had entered a relationship of

---

122 II Em 1, p. 186; *freondas* probably meaning kinsmen in this context. For compensation for kinsmen, II Em 4, p. 188, and II Em 7.1, p. 190.

123 V Atr 31-31.1, p. 244.

124 VI Atr 6, p. 248: 'And now behold, we will beseech all our friends and likewise earnestly enjoin upon the whole nation, to love one God from their inmost heart, and zealously shun all heathen practices.'

125 VI Atr 6, p. 249: 'Post haec igitur archipontifices predicti, conuocata plebis multitudine collectae, regis edicto suprascripti omniumque consensu catholicorum, omnibus communiter predicabant, unum Deum colendum esse debere — Patrem uidelicet et filium et Spiritum sanctum: Patrem siquidem ingenitum, Filium autem ante tempora genitum a Patre, in tempore natum ex matre, Spiritum uero sanctum ab utroque procedentem, Trinitatem siquidem in personis, unitatem in substantia, Deitate coequalem, honore et gloria coeternum. Unum inquiunt Deum unamque spem et unam fidem atque unum baptisma nos colere oportet et omnes paganas superstitiones contempnere.'

mutual reciprocity, a relationship based on interdependency, yet embedded in a more authoritative setting and connected to a moral duty.[126] Whereas the laws of Æthelstan and Edmund suggest interdependency between the king and his *freondas*, these codes of Æthelred bend this interdependency into dependency; if the king's *freondas* do not follow his wishes, order –both Christian and national– is at risk.

A similar use can be found in VI Atr 28, in which '*freonda gehwilc*' are commanded to abide by their oath and pledge ('*að 7 wedd*'), followed by a long list of offences against society and the Christian faith that should be prevented.[127] These *freondas* have a Latin equivalent in '*unusquisque*'.[128] The Old English and Latin versions of the same provision give thus an insight into Wulfstan's vision; everyone should avoid committing these offences, but especially *freondas*, as they are part of the king's Christian order. The inviolable position of the king has a religious undertone; as God's representative on earth, crimes against his person are an offence in the eyes of God.[129] In this respect, the Enham codes are close to the vision of society as presented in the *Institutes of Polity*. The relationship between the king and his people was thus in principle reciprocal, with mutual obligations and duties: the king of guaranteeing peace, and his followers by obeying his will and being loyal. However, Wulfstan's urgency in discussing these matters, whilst reshaping the discourse of royal authority by downplaying the importance of interpersonal relationships, suggests that he is moving away from interpreting the bond between the king and his people as a negotiable bond. Instead, he offers a '*contrat sociale avant la lettre*', based on obedience, loyalty, and religion, stressing royal authority over royal co-operation as method of securing peace.[130]

---

126 See II As 20-20.8, pp. 160-162; II Em 1-1.3, pp. 188-189 and III Em 2, p. 190.

127 VI Atr 28-28.2, p. 254.

128 VI Atr 28, p. 255: 'Uerba et facta unusquisque iuste disponat, iuramenta et uota fideliter compleat.'

129 V Atr 28-31, p. 244. The forfeiture of life upon betrayal of the king was not new, as we have encountered this already in Af 4, p. 50, Af 7, p. 52 and II As 4, p. 152; however, the clear connection between peace, loyalty and a spiritual obligation has not yet been encountered in the royal legislation.

130 This is also clearly expressed in Wulfstan's famous *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, in which Wulfstan disdainfully emphasises the disloyalty shown to Edward the Martyr and Æthelred, see Wulfstan of York, *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, Methuen's Old English library, B.3, 3rd edn (London: Methuen, 1963), pp. 56-58: 'Forþam her syn on lande ungetrywþa micle for Gode 7 for worolde, 7 eac her syn on eared on mistlice wisan hlafordswican manege. 7 ealra mæst hlafordswice se bið on worolde þæt man his hlafordes saule beswice; 7 ful micel hlafordswice eac bið on worolde þæt man his hlaford of life forræde, oððon of lande lifiende drife.; 7 ægþer is gewordon on þysan earde: Eadweard man

However, the above-cited example also opens up the floor for other royal subjects living by *að 7 wedd* as possible *freondas* of the king, namely the religious. This may not be surprising, as his Enham codes were mainly ecclesiastical in their outlook and homiletic of tone, resulting in an even more apparent ideological discourse. Wulfstan creates a vision of society, a discourse of authority, and an interpretation of the role of friendship and interpersonal bonds that is all-embracing, expressing a universal worldview built on the unity of the secular and religious worlds. We have seen a similar use of *freondas* for the religious in the *Institutes of Polity*, and have explored how friendship was used to embrace those included, and those excluded from the royal Christian order.[131] Also in Wulfstan's legal discourse, *freondas* can be both lay and religious. This follows from a reading of VI Atr 42, a clause without either a clear counterpart in the fifth code, and without Latin adaptation:

42 'Eac we <gyt> willað myngian <georne> freonda gehwilcne, ealswa us neod is gelome to donne, þæt gehwa hine sylfne georne beþence,

42.1 7 þæt he fram synnan georne gecyrre 7 oþrum mannum unrihtes styre.

42.2 7 þæt he oft 7 gelome hæbbe on gemynde, þæt mannum is mæst þearf oftost to gemunene, þæt is þæt hy rihtne geleafan anrædlice habban on þone soþan God, þe is wealdend 7 wyrhta ealra gesceafta, 7 þæt hy rihtne Christendom rihtlice healdan 7 þæt hy godcundan lareawan geornlice hyran 7 Godes larum 7 lagum geornlice fylgean,

42.3 7 þæt hy Godes cyrican æghwar georne griðian 7 friþian 7 mid leohte 7 lacum hi gelome gegretan, 7 hy sylfe þær georne to Christe gebiddan.'[132]

forrædde 7 syððan acwealde 7 æfter þam forbærnde, [and Æþelred man dræfde ut of his earde].'

131 See above, pp. 78-79; and Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, I, 65, p. 80; I, 115, p. 150, and II, 222, p. 152.

132 VI Atr 42-42.3, pp. 256-258: 'And likewise we desire [earnestly] to remind each one of our friends, as there is need for us to do frequently, that each diligently thinks about this for themselves. And that they eagerly will turn from sins and will restrain other men from wrong-doing, and that they will frequently and often have in mind what is of supreme importance for men to remember, that is, that they unanimously should have a right belief in the true God, who is the ruler and maker of all created things. And that they should duly keep the true Christian faith, and diligently listen to their spiritual teachers, and zealously follow God's laws and rules. And that they should diligently protect and defend the churches of God everywhere, and frequently visit them with candles and offerings, and there themselves earnestly pray to Christ.' The Latin version of this law is incomplete and abruptly ends after the fortieth clause.

Freondas seems to refer to both the servants of God ('*Godes þeowas*'), as mentioned in VI Atr 41, and to their (secular?) associates, who are mentioned in VI Atr 45 as having the obligation to protect and honour the servants of God ('*7 þæt hy Godes þeowas symle werian 7 weorðian*').[133] This suggests that *freondas* is used as a universal notion, referring to all members of society without making a distinction between the lay and the religious.[134] Again, the vagueness and multi-interpretable nature of friendship makes it a suitable idea to convey delicate social messages: Wulfstan's vision of society envisages a union of secular and religious authority under the direction of God's mediator on earth. This is part of his solution to save the people's souls; the salvational message conveyed in his lawcodes is thus part of a discourse that aims to instruct and prepare the people for the Last Judgement. This also partly explains Wulfstan's interest in the earlier codes of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar; they explored the possibilities of law-making for both the ecclesiastical and secular spheres, and Edgar projected his role as law-giving king into a textual and visionary imagery of a Christian king. *Freondas* should probably be interpreted as those who are part of this salvational path of instruction and preparation in this context. They have a responsibility to lead the people as messengers and mediators and are thus both part of the secular authorities, and of the religious orders. *Freondas* lead, instruct, negotiate justice, are loyal to the king, pray on society's behalf, live a chaste life according to their *að 7 wedd*, and prepare the people for the Last Judgement in their parishes.

This vision is also apparent in Æthelred's eighth and ninth code which, again, addresses ecclesiastical matters. Wormald has established that both codes are versions of the same set of laws as proclaimed in 1014.[135] As the ninth code is only transmitted as a fragment, and does not present any information on friendship, we will only discuss the eighth. A first use of friendship language, in a context of surety provisions, can be found in VIII Atr 22:

---

133 VI Atr 41, p. 256 and VI Atr 45, p. 258.

134 Julia Barrow sees Wulfstan's use as a reference to "every respectable member of society"; I would argue that this should be take further, as his use of friendship language seems to *make* people respectable by an active evocation of their inclusion into Wulfstan's worldview. See Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters, p. 108, and n. 11.

135 Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 336-337.

22 ‘Gif man freondleasne weofodþen mid tihtlan belecge, þe adfultum næbbe, ga to corsnæde, 7 þar þonne æt gefare þæt þæt God wille, buton he on husle ladian mote.’[136]

We learn that the first providers of surety for priests and deacons are their *freondas*, as being ‘*freondleasne*’ would directly lead to ordeal. Initially, these *freondas* would probably seek support within the ecclesiastical community as the provisions for deacons indicate an ecclesiastical support basis (VIII Atr 20: ‘*twegen his gehadan*’).[137] However, priests and deacons were also part of worldly networks.[138] Support could thus be provided by both religious and secular *freondas*, who could be either patrons of the parish, kinsmen, or other associates with the necessary status to provide warranty, as we recall from earlier legal traditions.[139] One of Æthelstan’s laws had laid the responsibility for finding surety for ‘*hlafordleasan mannum*’ with the lordless man’s relatives, suggesting that the natural provider of surety was first and foremost the lord and/or patron.[140]

Additionally, *freondleas* could also be used to refer to orphans; the king, or his representative, would act as warrantor on their behalf, if no one else could stand surety.[141] A similar provision was made on behalf of monks, who had left their worldly kin behind upon entry into a monastery.[142] Moreover, *Að and Hadbot*, a document associated with Wulfstan and part of a collection of legal texts based on ninth-century Mercian directions on status, makes a clear distinction between the religious ‘servants of God’ (‘*Godes þeowas*’) and secular ‘friends of God’ (‘*Godes freondum*’), whose main task is to love and honour God and to protect His

---

136 VIII Atr 22, p. 266: ‘If a friendless minister of the altar is accused with charges, and if he has no oath-helpers, he is to go to the *corsnæd* [=type of ordeal that involves swallowing the host], and then experience there next what God wishes, unless he is allowed to clear himself on the host.’

137 VIII Atr 20, p. 265. This is repeated in VIII Atr 21, p. 266 regarding priests.

138 Compare VIII Atr 23-24, p. 266 (on men in holy orders) and VIII Atr 25, p. 266 (on monks).

139 For the lord as provider of surety, see I Atr 1-1.14, pp. 214-218; II Ew 3, p. 142; III Em 7, p. 190; EGu 12, p. 134. For kin as providers of surety, see II Atr 9, p. 226 (as discussed above); Ine 74, p. 120; II As 2, pp. 150-152; III As 7, p. 170; VI As 12, pp. 182-183.

140 II As 2, p. 150: ‘††Ond we cwædon be þam hlafordleasan mannum, ðe mon nan ryht ætbegytan ne mæg, þæt mon beode††† ðære mægþe, ðæt hi hine to folcryhte gehamette 7 him hlaford finden ††† on folcgemote.’

141 As suggested with respect to widows and orphans (*steopcild*) in VI Atr 47, p. 258 The reference in this law is multi-interpretable, but seems to gain force with a comparison with VI Atr 26, p. 254 in which widows are placed under the king’s protection. For a discussion, see Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, p. 7.

142 For the position of monks, see VIII Atr 25, p. 266

servants.[143] Lay people had thus a duty of protecting churchmen in Wulfstan's vision of society and *freondleas* is again used as an inclusive notion, securing protection for priests and deacons from both religious and secular associates.[144]

Above regulations emphasise that priests and deacons as men of both the religious and secular world, were placed at the demarcation line between the two social spheres. Nevertheless, priest's 'natural' associates were supposedly those in holy orders (VIII Atr 27; '*gehadodra gemanan*'); when committing crimes, it is their fellowship ('*geþerscipe*'), honour ('*gewurðscipe*'), and friendship ('*freondscipe*') from which priests can be banned, and only bishops could end this exclusion.[145] These last directions demonstrate that priests were actively aligned with the religious world and isolated from their secular bonds. It shows Wulfstan's concerns about secular influence on the life and behaviour of clerics, and fits an interpretation of the reform movement as a mechanism to redefine the clerical status and role in society, as argued by Pauline Stafford and Catherine Cubitt.[146]

Simultaneously, it emphasises that this aim was difficult to achieve in a society in which its fabric was upheld by a system of interpersonal bonds and obligations for (legal) protection. Friendship –with its links to favour and protection– was one of the mechanisms through which these personal obligations and ties were

---

143 *Að and Hadbot*, ed. by Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, 1-1.3, pp. 464-466: 'Seofonfealde gifa sind Haliges gastes; and seofon stapas sindon ciriclicra grada 7 haligra hada; and sifon siðan Godes þeowas sculon hergan… dæghwamlice on circan 7 for eal Cristen folc þingian georne. And eallum Godes freondum gebirað swiðe rihte, þæt hi Godes cirican lufian 7 wurðian 7 Godes þeowas friðian 7 nerian. And se þe heom gederige mid worde oððe weorce, seofonfealdre bote gebete hit georne be þam þe seo dæd sy… gif he Godes miltse geearnian wille. Forðam halidom 7 hadas 7 gehalgode Godes hus a man sceal for Godes ege wurðian georne.' For a discussion of *Að and Hadbot* as part of the '*Geþyncðu* group', its legal status and its place in Wulfstan's vision of society, see Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 392-394.

144 In Cnut's legislation, *freondleas* is cut out and instead the regulation focuses on the failure of producing any form of surety rather than leaving it open for discussion whether this surety should be produced by either king, associate, relative or colleague, see II Cn 35, pp. 336-338: 'And freondleas man oððe feorrancuman swa geswenced weorðe þurh freondleaste, þæt he borh næbbe, æt frymtyhtlan, þone gebuge he hengenne 7 þær gebide, oð ðæt he ga to Godes ordale 7 gefare ðær þæt he mæge.'

145 VIII Atr 27-27.1, p. 266: 'Gif mæssepreost ahwar stande on leasre gewitnesse oððe on mænan aðe oððe þeofa gewita 7 geweorhta beo, þonne sy he aworpen of gehadodra gemanan 7 þolige ægðer ge geferscipes ge freondscipes ge æghwilces wurðscipes, buton he wið God 7 wið men þe deoplicor gebete, fullice swa biscop him tæce, 7 him borh finde, þæt he þanan forð æfre swilces geswice. And gif he ladian wille, geladige be dæde mæðe swa mid þryfealdre lade, be þam þe seo dæd sy.

146 Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 12; Cubitt, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', p. 2.

created and, as such, blurred the lines between the worlds. Wulfstan clearly tried to redefine secular involvement in religious life by legally defining boundaries. It seems that *freondscipe*, and subsequently the role of *freondas*, was more closely aligned with national interest to overstep the problems associated with interpersonal relationships of favour and obligation. If everyone was united by loyalty under royal authority, and if the king and his secular and religious *freondas* aimed to maintain peace and to secure salvation, *freondscipe* would become a source for harmony between the two worlds, rather than a source of concern. This desire for unity, and the role of *freondas* within this unity, is also clear from the final clause of Æthelred's eighth code:

> 44 ‘And uton rihtne Cristendom geornlice wurðian 7 ælcne hæðendom mid ealle oferhogian.
>
> 44.1 And uton ænne cynehlaford holdlice healdan; 7 freonda gehwilc mid rihtan getriwðan oðerne lufige 7 healde mid rihte.’[147]

This law was proclaimed in 1014, in reaction to events in preceding years. Thorkell's army had ravaged the kingdom between 1009 and 1012. Æthelred's inability to protect his people had been underlined by the murder of Ælfheah, archbishop of Canterbury (1006–1012), who refused to be taken ransom by the Viking army. Unrest amongst the élite was rife and Svein Forkbeard, king of Denmark and Norway, had taken this opportunity to depose Æthelred as king with considerable Anglo-Saxon support in 1013. However, after Svein's early death in 1014, Æthelred had managed to be reinstated as king, and had negotiated ‘*fulne freondscipe*’ with his people.[148] Wulfstan's solution as portrayed in his 1014 lawcodes, a unity of society based on the unbreakable bond between a Christian king and his people, may have ventilated a powerful discourse. However, it was also far from the realities of Anglo-Saxon politics, as the king had not been able to live up to these high expectations in the past. Wulfstan's lawcodes were thus part of a discourse, in which national

---

147 VIII Atr 44-44.1, p. 268: ‘And let us zealously honour the true Christian faith and utterly despise heathen practices. And let us loyally support one royal lord, and let each of our friends love the other with true fidelity and support him duly.’

148 *ASC* C, A.D. 1014 (for 1016), pp. 98-99: ‘þa sende se cyning his sunu Easdweard hider mid his ærend(d)racum 7 het gretan ealne his leodscype 7 cwæð þæt he him hold hlaford beon wolde 7ælc þæra ðinga betan þe hi ealle ascunudon, 7 ælc þara ðinga forgyfen beon sceolde þe him gedon oþþe gecweden wære, wið þam ðe hi ealle anrædlice butan swicdome to him gecyrdon; 7 man þa fulne freondscipe gefæstnode mid worde 7 mid wedde on ægþre healfe, 7 æfre ælcne deniscne cyng utlah of engla lande gecwædon.’

freondscipe was upheld as an ideal in which all *freondas* would stick together with their king, aiming to reconnect the king with his people and to establish conditions that would secure order.

2.4 The dynamics of friendship and the dynamics of change

Wulfstan was a visionary, and friendship was part of this mental picture. Our study of the lawcodes has demonstrated that friendship research is a useful approach for opening up layers of different discourses that underlay its function and role within the social framework, while simultaneously reflecting discourses of the role and function of friendship itself. By approaching the lawcodes as repositories of ideas and discourses as much as of practice, it has been possible to reflect upon the inventive mentalities that lay behind these measures and that interacted with and reacted to the changes and dynamics within Anglo-Saxon society.

Friendship's discourse changed over the tenth century in the hands of various visionary legislators, who used the fluent notion to mould their views of the relationship between the king and his people. Friendship was a flexible notion that could negotiate both horizontal and vertical relationships of dependence and interdependence; it was for this reason extremely suitable for arbitration, in formal and informal settings, in a society that was based on entangled networks of interlocking dyadic associations with a polyadic interest. This fluidity of language seems to have had purpose: it enlarged the addressed social unit, and therefore created also a more inclusive category. Consequently, friendship could function as social glue between the formal and informal mediations of power, as long as honour could be assured in the exchange of loyalty and favours.

Æthelstan's conquests resulted in a larger kingdom with a more complex social fabric, and with more men that needed to be rewarded for their loyalty. Æthelstan's law-giving initiatives were part of a control mechanism to keep this expanded kingdom together, paired to a religious programme, and the creation of an ever-increasing, sophisticated administration. His conquests and personal charisma seem to have backed his attempts, but his lawcodes already show a development of the function of friendship within the social structure: it is more clearly defined in terms of formal ties within the royal administration. Additionally, his codes reflect a concern with disloyalty against the king's person in a strictly binary presentation of

society, in which *freondscipe* underlies the unity of society as an all-embracing, inclusive notion. His *freondas* are reminded of their duties, upon the danger of forfeiting the royal *freondscipe* or favour. These *freondas* are both 'ennobled' by the king's friendship, and entrusted with a role within the king's administration; as agents of power they are defined by, and act actively upon, the standards set by the king's benign friendship.

Edmund's laws follow this presentation of friendship as part of a national discourse of social unity. His laws reflect a discourse of authority, in which the bonds between the king and his followers is shaped as a benign friendship of interdependency. Yet in the extensive regulations on the *fæhþe*, we can see a royal attempt to define legal allowances for informal mechanisms. This need seems to indicate tensions within the social fabric itself, but does not inspire a complete different interpretation of the function of friendship, or the bonding process between the king and his followers.

However, Edgar's lawcodes show the contours of an ideological change in the discourse of authority, by removing interpersonal ties from the social imagery and by focusing instead on the outcomes of mediation. Edgar's visionary programme is, however, not primarily communicated through his lawcodes; his vision of kingship and his role as Christ's mediator on earth is instead communicated through the sources of the reform movement and in visual imagery on display in the newly reformed Benedictine communities.

Nevertheless, Edgar's lawcodes inspired Wulfstan, whose need for tinkering with some of Edgar's laws opened up the ways in which his vision was built upon Edgar's ideas. Wulfstan distilled an interpretation of the Christian king and his role in society out of biblical imagery, and was additionally inspired by the legal traditions of Æthelstan, Edmund, and Edgar. He reworked and reshaped the ideas in these traditions, and whilst departing from interpersonal bonds as the core of the social structure, he looked in awe at King Edgar's might. Edgar's charisma and successful negotiation with his nobles, based on a more authoritative interpretation of kingship, became an identification point for Wulfstan's discourse of royal authority. He also explored Carolingian sources for inspiration, and seemed to have been particularly interested in ideas that circulated at the court of Louis the Pious. This connection between Wulfstan's vision and Louis' kingship underlines one of the limitations of Althoff's study of co-operative bonds at the ninth-century Carolingian

court. Bonding was never only a balancing, practical mechanism; it was also part of an ideological discourse.[149]

In his laws, Wulfstan created a powerful image, in which loyalty to the king and unity amongst the secular and ecclesiastical spheres created a worldview that was Christian and inclusive, while enveloping the agents and agencies of the royal administration, the Anglo-Saxon people, and the religious orders. This discourse of royal authority was presented as being interlocked with a discourse of salvation: all those participating in Wulfstan's Holy Society had a duty to prepare for the Last Judgement, and to guide those under their wings. *Freondas* are again intermediaries, but their social power is presented in a close association with the formal powers of the royal authority, removing its association with informal power. In this respect, Wulfstan's ideology and universal worldview created a method to define religious practice in terms of a royal service; consequently, friendship could also be applied to a religious setting. Wulfstan's lawcodes show a marked shift in its use for the religious. This shift would not have been possible if *freondscipe* had been a neatly defined term; Wulfstan's lawcodes demonstrate again that friendship's nature as a flexible, dynamic, and fluent notion was useful for defining delicate bonds in a visionary impression of society.

This analysis of Wulfstan's use of the friendship imagery has established that the interpretation of friendship could be bent into a model that fit the reformed and monastic worldview, and as such also questions Stephen Jaeger's emphasis on friendship's unsuitability as an expression of bonding in religious, reform-inspired discourses of the late tenth-century.[150] Yet his work also shows concerns about the close entanglement of friendship with favouritism and obligations based on interpersonal relationships, and the implication that these bonds could introduce secular involvement in the life of the religious. By drawing demarcation lines within society, and by emphasising royal authority as leading principle, Wulfstan steps away from the idea that interpersonal bonds form the backbone of society, to be replaced by a model of Christian kingship based on loyalty and obedience that aimed to guarantee the national *frið 7 freondscipe*. His model of national *freondscipe* based on loyalty, obedience to the king, and religion may have failed to secure the desired

[149] Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, pp. 121-123.

[150] Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, p. 53.

peace during Æthelred's reign. But Wulfstan never stopped reworking and rethinking his ideas, and in 1016, with the ascension of Cnut, he got a second chance to implement and to refine his vision of the Holy Society.

Wulfstan's solution can be considered unique, as he managed to form a discourse of royal authority in which friendship was bent from a possibly negative notion into a positive image of the unity of society. In doing so, Wulfstan did not only negotiate a powerful image of royal authority, but also created a Christian discourse of friendship by tinkering with the overtly secular discourse available. These conclusions demonstrate that the seeds for Christian ideas of friendship as a universal notion were already available in late tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England, and that the origins of the 'renewal' of the Christian discourse of friendship were not only situated in eleventh-century cathedral communities.[151] In his study of monastic friendship of the period, Brian McGuire has already emphasised that Christian discourses of friendship must have been available in the tenth century, but that they had become barely visible.[152] His problems in locating Christian discourses of friendship is partly to be explained by his focus –primarily on bonding within religious communities– and partly by his choice of sources. Friendship in tenth-century England was closely associated with secular authority, and secular authority had aligned its power with Christian ideology. In this environment, developing ideas of both secular and religious nature are jointly communicated by secular sources under religious influence. Wulfstan and the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes offer a unique chance to reflect upon both royal and religious discourses of friendship, and the interaction between the two, but also offer an insight into possible future directions of friendship research.

---

[151] For a discussion of the 'eclipse' of Christian friendship and 'renewal' in the second half of the eleventh century, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, chaps. 4 and 5, esp. pp. 177-181.

[152] McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. 177.

CHAPTER 3

Friendship discourses in Anglo-Saxon Charters

3.1 Introduction

Whereas the laws have given us a chance to look at the various ways in which friendship was discussed in the entourage of the Anglo-Saxon kings and their advisors, documentary sources allow us to see the interaction between the king and his courtiers, and between courtiers amongst themselves. Our discussion of documentary sources will focus on charters, and more precisely on royal diplomas and wills as will be discussed below. The term 'charter' covers a range of documents, written for different purposes and in different forms: they can be leases, wills, agreements, writs, and, most commonly, land grants. A rudimentary differentiation can be made between documents issued by kings and those issued by private persons.[1] Both royal and private charters know a complicated transmission history and the study of these documents has to be a careful undertaking, starting with disentangling the documents before assessing the discourses of friendship in their appropriate contexts. Again, the limitations of a doctoral study prompt a selection, which has been inspired by Julia Barrow's initial study of the Anglo-Saxon charters.

Barrow has established that friendship references and vocabulary are scattered over the corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters, but importantly, that most references to friendship can be found in tenth-century documents. Consequently she has concluded that the language of friendship was used in specific circumstances and settings, which she has associated with the production of the charters.[2] Most of her documents were connected to the communities of the Old and New Minster in Winchester, and therefore by association with the royal court. Consequently, she has concluded that friendship references in the charters are related to the communication and projection of royal authority.[3] However, her study of the Anglo-Saxon charters

---

1 Whitelock, *EHD*, I, p. 376.

2 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107-111.

3 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107, 113.

has overlooked the fact that a high proportion of her tenth-century charters with friendship vocabulary are actually part of the corpus of Anglo-Saxon wills.[4] The fact that a high proportion of Barrow's tenth-century evidence is of such a specific nature may partly explain why her comparison of Anglo-Saxon material with Frankish sources was "a disappointment".[5] It follows that the representation of friendship within the wills needs to be considered within the context of their own genre, as the setting in which they were produced manifestly differs from those produced in the king's name. For this reason, our study of wills will be complemented by a study of royal diplomas, as those are the documents which are most obviously related to royal power. A combined study of royal diplomas and wills explores two directions of the same court discourse, examining the interaction between the king and his dependants, and between the élites amongst themselves. Additionally, this two-fold approach also gives an opportunity to assess the two languages of friendship in which these discourses are communicated, as wills are commonly vernacular documents, whereas the solemn royal diploma is transmitted in Latin.

In the first part of this chapter, royal diplomas will be assessed. If we acknowledge that the terminology of friendship is not fixed, then all forms of bonding and affectionate language should be studied, which is unfortunately beyond the scope of this investigation. Instead, this study will expand upon Barrow's earlier examination of the Anglo-Saxon charters, following her practice of examining the use of friendship language. Where Barrow has discussed the contexts in which the charters were produced, discussing 'the Winchester connection' of some (in her analysis, most) of these charters, this study will instead focus on the use of friendship references in the presentation of diplomas.[6] Most of the earlier references to friendship occur in the proems of diplomas, and consequently are highly formulaic, whereas later instances show a different use. This is, again, a limited approach, yet will reveal other methods to explore this vast corpus in future research. The second part of this chapter will be dedicated to the discussion of wills, exploring the settings in which friendship language is used and exploring the role and function of

---

4 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 117-123; the tenth- and eleventh-century evidence is listed on pp. 122-123.

5 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 112.

6 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107-111. Compare Barrow's investigation with Appendix B, Table 2, which shows that the corpus is both more extensive, and that the range of contexts in which they appear is more varied.

friendship language within a discourse of social exchange. As private documents, the wills offer us a different platform of social interaction, allowing us to reflect upon the formal and informal nature of the negotiation of power, but also considering questions about gender, language, and status. In conclusion, the evidence of the friendship language of diplomas and wills will be contrasted, arguing that the use of friendship language is related to the different functions of these documents, reflecting upon the negotiation of both formal and informal power within the Anglo-Saxon kingdom in a court discourse of bonding.

3.2 Friendship discourses in royal diplomas

3.2.1 Diplomas and their use as evidence

Diplomas form the largest group of surviving charters, and are concerned with the ownership of land, rights, and privileges. [7] They were formal documents, reflecting royal power, and were sought after as confirmation of rights and claims. Some diplomas record the transfer of these rights from one person or institution to another; others confirm rights; and many concern the legal conditions and obligations regarding particular rights or properties. In this respect, royal diplomas were the method *par excellence* to communicate royal favour. Recording changes in rights and property had become increasingly important since a legal distinction was introduced between land held 'by book' (*bocland*), and land held by other rights than title-deed (*folcland*).[8] Pressure on land had augmented the importance of evidence of ownership in the second half of the tenth century, and as a result diplomas were

7 In the following, 'charter' will often be used interchangeably with 'royal diploma'.

8 I Ew 2, p. 140: 'Eac we cwædon, hwæs se wyrðe wære þe oðrum ryhtes wyrnde aðor oððe on boclande oððe on folclande; 7 ðaet he him geandagode of þam folclande, hwonne he him riht worhte beforan ðam gerefan.' The precise nature of *folcland* is not clear and has been subject to debate, especially over the question to what extent royal control of *folcland* influenced inheritance practices regarding *bocland*. For an introduction, see Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford History of England (Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press, 1943); 3rd edn (1971), pp. 309-313; Frederic William Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond. Three Essays in the Early History of England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), pp. 244-258; and Susan Kelly, 'Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word', in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 36-62, pp. 44-45. For a different, yet convincing, interpretation of practice regarding bookland, see A. G. Kennedy, 'Disputes about Bocland', *ASE*, 14 (1985): 175-195, pp. 189-191.

increasingly reproduced, interpolated, and forged.[9] These interpolated and forged charters were not necessarily in support of false claims; however, as the evidence in it is conflated, they have been left out of this discussion.[10] Most charters have been transmitted in monastic cartularies, which were primarily compiled to supply evidence of title for monastic property.[11] Consequently, we can only have a partial view of the survival and use of charters, influenced by religious motivations and the fates of the various archives in time.[12] Research into the transmission of charters has inspired a fierce debate of whether charters were primarily produced in a centralised, royal writing office –and thus formed an intrinsic part of the royal administration– or were generated in local, ecclesiastical scriptoria.[13] Recent research by Simon Keynes, Charles Insley, and Susan Kelly has convincingly demonstrated that our evidence for the existence of a royal agency behind the drafting and circulation of charters does not necessarily exclude regional activity.[14] A mixed tradition of both royal and ecclesiastical writing offices –working for the royal administration, exchanging personnel and reacting to occurring needs– is therefore the most satisfying explanation.

The controversy about the production of charters has inspired questions about the function of charters, and thus about the settings in which friendship language was used. The oral proclamation and the rituals that accompanied it –the royal

---

9 For the increasing pressure on land and resulting tensions, see the excellent overview by Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*', pp. 54-56.

10 Julia Barrow has argued that many of these forgeries were actually produced at the end of the tenth century. This suggestion is of interest, yet requires in-depth research as the production dates of these forgeries are often heavily debated, see Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 108.

11 Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 2-4, 37-39.

12 Many charters are lost, yet sometimes discoveries can be celebrated, see Simon Keynes, 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: Lost and Found', in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 45-66, pp. 50-51.

13 Simon Keynes has been the advocate of the first viewpoint in reaction to earlier studies by Pierre Chaplais, see Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 79-83, 134-153; Pierre Chaplais, 'The Origin and Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diploma', in *Prisca Munimenta. Studies in Archival and Administrative History*, *presented to Dr. A. E. J. Hollaender*, ed. by Felicity Ranger (London: University of London Press, 1973), 28-42, pp. 32-33, 41-42 [Originally published in *Journal of the Society of the Archivists*, 3.2 (1965): 48-61].

14 Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex* admirabilis', pp. 12-13; Charles Insley, 'Charters and Scriptoria in the Anglo-Saxon South West', *EME*, 7.2 (1998): 173-197, pp. 195-196; Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, pp. lxxvi, lxxviii.

confirmation, the oaths, the religious blessing– constituted the legal act.[15] Friendship references in charters are thus part of the communication between the king and his followers, orally declared in front of witnesses in royal councils. The demonstrative setting also reflects upon the language used in the charters and raises the question of whether friendship language fulfilled demonstrative purposes, as has been argued by Julia Barrow[16] However, this question cannot be answered without considering the role of the *written* charters as evidence of the oral act. Frank Stenton has emphasised that written charters served as a permanent token of the demonstrative act, which is also reflected in its form: diplomas were formal and solemn documents, written in Latin, containing formulas and set phrases, following a set of main features that had been antiquated over the years as it recorded the granting of rights for perpetuity.[17] Formulaic features and the use of friendship language in certain parts of the makeup of charters can thus inform us further on the question of whether friendship language was part of the demonstrative function of charters.

Furthermore, Simon Keynes has demonstrated that charters reflect many of the changes –in advisors, in political ideology and in the fabric of the Anglo-Saxon administration– that occurred in the late tenth-century kingdom.[18] The discourse of friendship retracted from charters could thus provide another insight into the changes within the social fabric. Additionally, Sarah Foot has demonstrated that charters present historical narratives, reflecting the collective memory –of events, relationships, or persons– transmitted within particular communities.[19] The formulaic presentation of charters helped to shape these recollections of the past, while simultaneously emphasising the authenticity –and therefore authority –through the use of traditional forms.[20] Her conclusions inspire research of friendship vocabulary within the traditional presentation of charters. That this approach can be rewarding has been proven by Pauline Stafford and Charles Insley. Stafford has distinguished

---

15 Kelly, 'Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word', p. 44.

16 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', pp. 107, 113.

17 F. M. Stenton, *The Latin Charter of the Anglo-Saxon Period* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 49.

18 Keynes, *Diplomas*; Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*'.

19 Sarah Foot, 'Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?', in *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval* West, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 39-65, pp. 63-65.

20 Foot, 'Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?', pp. 40-41.

concerns, themes and interests in the proems of diplomas, revealing a view of history which was motivated by dynastic and salvational concerns.[21] Insley has commented on the Bedan resonances in the proems of certain charter collections, demonstrating that they were part of a dialogue between the king and his subjects, which mediated the royal charisma and its dynastic legitimacy.[22] Reading charters can thus reveal mentalities, and can subsequently provide valuable insights into the function of friendship within these ideological discourses, creating a framework for the discussion of friendship. The connection with past traditions and contemporary events, shaping memory whilst trying to negotiate the future embed charters in an ideological context. Yet charters have also the additional feature of solidly being connected to a court dialogue between the king and his dependants, giving an insight into a setting of major social importance for the negotiation of favour and power.

3.2.2 Friendship in proems

Out of twenty-five occurrences of friendship references in charters issued by Æthelstan and his Anglo-Saxon successors, fourteen can be found in proems as indicated in Appendix B, Table 2. Despite the fact that these numbers are not high when compared to the total number of diplomas –over 750 exemplars– for our period, this number is significant within the total number of diplomas using any form of friendship language. Moreover, as proems 'prepare the ground' for the royal grant as conveyed in the dispositive section, it could be argued that references to friendship in proems are essential parts of the communication between the king and those who receive these favours. Tropes and traditional phrases should in this light be understood as conveying ideologically aimed discourses, with a general appeal and resonance, through the use of a 'standard vocabulary' that was part of the communication between the king and a small group of people that channelled and distributed royal power both formally and informally within their social networks.

---

21 Pauline Stafford, 'Political Ideas in the Late Tenth-Century Charters', in *Law*, *Laity and Solidarities. Essays in Honour of Susan Reynolds*, ed. by Pauline Stafford, Janet L. Nelson, and Jane Martinson (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 68-82, pp. 71-73.

22 Charles Insley, 'Where Did All the Charters Go?', *ANS*, 24, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2001 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 109-127, pp. 116-119, 124.

Julia Barrow has argued that friendship terms were not formulaically used before the introduction of the writ.[23] Nevertheless, two main variations of friendship imagery are used in the proems, which are styled 'type I' and 'type II' in Appendix B, Table 3; 'type I' is found in five diplomas and 'type II' is found in eight diplomas and need to be discussed in closer detail.[24] These formulas were introduced in Edmund's reign and became part of the charter tradition; however, these formulations are relatively little-used and are just one of the many tropes available. Although a relatively high proportion of our friendship references of both 'type I' and 'type II' are found in the archives of Winchester's Old Minster and Abingdon, they also appear in the archives of other communities. This distribution does not exclude the possibility of these charters having been produced in one production centre, as it could be a result of the dissemination of charters.[25]

In diplomas of Edmund's reign, one year stands out: 943, in which three – conceivably four- of our diplomas were drafted; three of these four diplomas share diplomatic features, and a 'type II' friendship expression.[26] This similarity in style and regular use of the same tropes in proems of the 940s has also been observed by Susan Kelly.[27] These close similarities suggest that the same agency, or production centre, is behind all charters with friendship language in the proem, as also our two 'type I' occurrences can also be linked to this collection of charters. Kelly has established the connection between S 467 and S 491, but also warns against assuming connections based on linguistic evidence only.[28] However the witness lists of S 491 and S 487 are also remarkably similar, which strengthens a idea of a possible connection between these two charters, and consequently for charters with proems of 'type I' and with proems of 'type II'. Additionally, some of the events described in S 491 are similar to those in S 482 (A.D. 942).[29]

---

23 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 111.

24 Type I: S 467, S 491, S 649, S 789 and S 849. Type II: S 471, S 482, S 486, S 487, S 503, S 524, S 527, and S 623.

25 Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 33-34.

26 Namely S 486, S487 and S 491. Additionally, Susan Kelly has argued that S 471 has close diplomatic links with S 486, S 487 and S 492, and a compatible witness-list with S 943; it seems therefore plausible that its copyist misread the dating on S 471. S 486, S 487 and S 471 all share a 'type II' friendship formula, see Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, 33, pp. 139-140.

27 Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, 35, p. 147.

28 Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, 37, p. 156, and p. lxxx.

29 Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, 37, p. 157 and 35, p. 147.

This idea of a coherent production behind the diplomas of the 940s is not new: Simon Keynes is, amongst others, in no doubt that one single agency was responsible for the drafting of the great majority of diplomas from the 940s.[30] A first attempt to group the charters of this period has been undertaken by Richard Drögereit in his seminal study; he has established that at least one of our charters (S 527) was associated with an agency styled 'Æthelstan C', and three more (S 467, S 491, and S 524) were connected with a close imitator and student of 'Æthelstan C', indicated as 'Edmund A'.[31] These close associations between the styles of several scribes have been interpreted by Drögereit as proof of the existence of a royal chancellery, as early as at the courts of Æthelstan and Edmund, of which both 'Æthelstan C' and 'Edmund A' would have been part.[32]

The consistent reuse of our 'friendship proem' seems to support his ideas, as can be fortified with the assessment of Simon Keynes of two more diplomas containing our friendship trope in the proem (S 789 and S 849), which have been associated by expressions as found in the charters attributed to followers of the model created by 'Edgar A', an agency which was primarily active between 960 and 963 and which controversially has been identified with Bishop Æthelwold.[33] The model as created by 'Edgar A' had become one of the most imitated in later years, and it may not surprise us that two of our charters reflect this popularity. However, our group of charters with friendship vocabulary in proems demonstrates the

---

30 Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 45, n. 84.

31 For a discussion of 'Æthelstan C' and his style, see Richard Drögereit, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 13 (1935): 335-436, pp. 372-377; for 'Edmund A' and his indebtedness to the style of 'Æthelstan C', see pp. 377-379. These charters can also be found in Drögereit's overview (but have naturally not been assigned a Sawyer number) as found on pp. 434-435, for convenience: S 527 = Hanecanham (for 947); S 467 = Wudutune (for 940); S 491 = Leachamstede (for 943); and S 524 = Ashdown (for 947).

32 Drögereit, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', p. 414.

33 For S 789, see Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*', pp. 16-20; and Simon Keynes, 'A Conspectus of the Charters of King Edgar', in *Edgar, King of the English 959-975. New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 60-80, p. 73. Keynes has suggested seeing its scribe as either trained by the agency of 'Edgar A' or as an imitator. For S 849, see Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 85, n. 6, and for Keynes' assessment of its authenticity, see p. 242. For a discussion of the identification of 'Edgar A' with Æthelwold, see the seminal discussion by Drögereit, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', pp. 394-400, 416-417; for a more recent discussion by Susan Kelly, based on her association of the so-called 'Orthodoxorum charters' with the two oldest authentic charters attributed to 'Edgar A', see Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, pp. cxv-cxxiii, cxxi. However, both Kelly's use of the 'Orthodoxorum charters' and the identification of 'Edgar A' with Æthelwold have been contested by Simon Keynes, who instead has argued for an identification with a Mercian priest, sojourning at Edgar's court, see Keynes, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*', pp. 17-18.

circulation of other models, the 'pick and choose attitude' regarding tropes of those involved in the production of charters, and suggests at least a certain lasting appeal of our proem for later generations. This does not present conclusive evidence to support the 'chancellery argument', but it demonstrates that our formulaic friendship proems are part of a scribal tradition, and a larger ideological discourse communicating royal authority through diplomas, within an organised, administrative setting.

Moreover, as it is plausible that a single agency introduced friendship formulas in proems during Edmund's reign, the question may be raised whether of a specific social meaning or social resonance could be attributed to its introduction and use. Charles Insley had looked into the ideological function of the charters ascribed to 'Edgar A', concluding that these charters are not overtly political, but generally echo two themes: the need to secure salvation through alms-giving, and the necessity to record the decisions and actions of men.[34] Insley emphasises that both these messages express general concerns and are therefore *topoi*. Simultaneously, he has emphasised that these themes position the role of the king within a transitory setting, and that these proems therefore seem to reinforce a royal agenda.

A similar argument can be constructed by exploring the imagery of our friendship proems, whilst remembering that conventional tropes can also be part of an established 'language' for the negotiation of power between those 'higher up' and those more at the grassroots of the Anglo-Saxon social system. These tropes may have expressed the aspirations, rather than the realities, of Edmund's administration and should be interpreted as part of a dialogue between the king and his followers. As it has been argued in the above that most charters of the 940s were related, we have chosen two charters to represent these two types to present the possible appeal and social significance of friendship tropes in Edmund's reign: S 491 (A.D. 943) has been chosen to represent 'type I', S 487 (A.D. 943) to represent 'type II' as it shares a witness list with S 491 and has probably been drafted as a result of the same meeting.[35]

S 487 makes provisions for Ælfswith, a religious woman. She is granted fifteen hides at Burghclere for perpetuity, including the right of free disposal after her death. The proem reads:

---

[34] Insley, 'Where Did All the Charters Go?', p. 115.

[35] For a discussion of the importance of witness lists for locating charters, see Kelly, *Abingdon* 1, p. lxxxi, and Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 37.

> 'In nomine Dei summi et altissimi Jhesu Christi. Manifestum est cunctis quod omnia cælestia et terrestria providentia Dei gubernantur **quæ sollicitudo mortalis vitæ totis nisibus in carorum amicorumque amissione conqueritur ac defletur.** Ideo omnibus sapientibus indagandum est quod multiplici perturbatione diversis erumpnarum secularium subtilis cogitatio hominis ex memoria recedit dicta vel facta. nisi firmis litterarum apicibus et cautela custodie reserventur et ad memoriam frequentativis ammonitionibus revocentur. eo quod contingere solet manente negligentia nubiferis fuscationibus a recto possessoris jure in alienam progeniem declinaverit.'[36]

This proem is self-referential and stresses its function as bearer of memory. It reflects upon the loss of '*carorum amicorumque*,' which are likely to be both kin members and close associates. Additionally, this diploma hints at the dire effects of the failing of memory: it could lead to strife and false claims of other relatives or networks ('*alienam progenium*'). This proem shows some of the tensions and predicaments inherent in the Anglo-Saxon inheritance system, which are not necessarily unique to Edmund's reign. However, we have observed concerns about the mediation of informal and formal power in Edmund's lawcodes, resulting in attempts to embed informal power in a more formal and regulated discourse of royal authority and social unity.[37] The concerns expressed in these proems show a similar uneasiness about the versatility and frailty of interpersonal bonds, and may have been part of a royal discourse that was aiming to unite the people by emphasising harmony.[38]

S 491 is unfortunately far less revealing. In it, Edmund grants Eadric *minister* ten hides at Lechhampstead and a mill on the river Lambourn:

---

[36] S 487, Kemble, 5, 1145, pp. 282-283: 'In the name of God Almighty and the most exalted Jesus Christ. It is manifest to the rest that all divine and earthly events are directed by the providence of God, in the face of which the solitude of a mortal life laments and weeps to all pressures for the loss of beloved ones and friends. Therefore the honeysweet prophecy of the divine calling urges us with certain affirmations to frequent prayers, so that they will continually arrive at the everlasting kingdoms of God for judgment with these fugitives and without doubt with their little transitory possessions.Therefore it will be investigated by all wise men, because the fine meditation of man recedes from memory, (that is) words or deeds, by the complex commotion in diverse matters of distressful worldly events, lest they are spared by the durable letters of records and by a precaution for protection and (lest they) are recalled to commemoration by frequent reminders. For this reason, it happens to befall that as the result of remaining negligence, it (=memory) may modify the right claim of the possessor in favour of another family by the blackening of clouds.' In bold, the expression dubbed 'type II'.

[37] See above, chap. 2, p. 92.

[38] And as such, may have influenced the social imagery of 'Edgar A' proems, see Insley, 'Where Did All the Charters Go?', pp. 115-116.

> 'In nomine Dei summi et altitroni qui omnia de summo celi apice uisibilia et inuisibilia ordinabiliter gubernans atque moderans, presentisque uite curriculo cotidie temporales possessiones et uniuerse diuitiarum facultates nostris humanis obtutibus cernimus deficientes et decrescentes. Sic mutando fragilitas mortalis uite marcescit et rotunda seculorum uolubilitas inanescit **ac in carorum propinquorum amicorumque amissione conqueritur ac defletur**.'[39]

This proem is firmly religious in its outlook: God is presented as overseeing and controlling worldly affairs, which we can only recognise upon contemplation. Human life is transient, resulting in sorrow over the loss of our '*carorum propinquorum amicorumque*'. However, the slightly older S 467 (A.D. 940), which shares with S 491 a 'type I' proem, and which is also associated with the agency of 'Edmund A' has a more elaborate proem, emphasising the possibility of debated inheritance and, in doing so, connecting the motivations expressed in proems containing 'type I' with those containing 'type II'.[40]

Some further attention should be paid to the double presentation of '*carorum (propinquorum*) *amicorumque*' in the tradition of both 'type I' and 'type II' for our understanding of the use of *amicus* in tenth-century England. Lorraine Lancaster has emphasised that *mæg* in Old English may have been used to describe a small group of immediate family, leaving *freond* for further-removed kin, in-laws and those bound to the kin by forms of spiritual kinship such as god-parenthood.[41] We have concluded with respect to *freond* in the lawcodes that this may have been used to enlarge the group of associates, reflecting the flexible and dynamic configuration of kingroups.[42] Furthermore, Pauline Stafford has emphasised that claiming kinship with someone was often a choice motivated by a social drive, which was not

---

39 S 491, *Abingdon* 1, 37, pp. 154-155: 'In name of God almighty who is enthroned in heaven, directing and governing all visible and invisible events in orderly manner from the highest summit of heaven, in the course of the present life we daily separate temporary possessions and the universal faculties of riches with our human contemplations as being faltering and decreasing; So the frailty of a mortal life withers by changing events; and the whirling of worldly affairs begins to become empty by rotating; and it laments and weeps over the loss of beloved relatives and friends.' In bold, the expression dubbed 'type I'.

40 S 467, Kemble, 5, 1137, p. 266. Compare Appendix B, Table 3, for all 'type II' occurrences in S 471, S 486, S 503, S 524, S 527 and S 623, and 'type I' occurrences in S 467, S 649, S 780 and S 849. For the association with 'Edmund A', see the discussion above and Drögereit, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', pp. 377-379, and as listed on p. 435.

41 Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', pp. 237-239. Additionally, Joseph Lynch has found evidence in continental sources for a 'spiritual friendship' referring to bonds based on godparenthood and other spiritual connections, see Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe*, p. 198.

42 See above, chap. 2, p. 69.

necessarily inspired by the blood band alone.[43] All these dimensions may also be reflected in the use of *amicus* as an expanding notion, and could, additionally, reflect concerns about informal power negotiation as suggested with respect to S 487 above. Moreover, as both charters and laws seem to address the same small group of people, namely predominantly the aristocratic élites that negotiated and conveyed royal authority through both formal and informal means within networks, it again suggests the existence of a specific vocabulary for the communication between those in power, and those receiving favour to mediate power on behalf of their lord.

This connotation is also present in our last friendship reference in S 595 (A.D. 956) for Eadwig. While S 595 is not part of our group of formulaic proems, it recalls a very similar imagery. Cyril Hart has established that S 595 cannot be connected to other charters, yet its reference to the desirability of noting down provisions, in this particular case to the aid of '*deuotis mentibus ac fidelibus amicis*', reflects a common theme.[44] S 595 gives another insight into the flexibility of the notion: these '*fidelibus amicis*' could easily have been either kinsmen in general, or loyal retainers of the king. As this expression occurs in a proem, that in general 'prepares the ground' for the royal grant exercised in the dispositive section, it seems to be part of the communication between the king and his dependants in a generalising manner.

In summary, friendship references in proems connect certain charters by evoking tropes, which seem to be deeply embedded in a scribal tradition that was part of the communication between the king and his élites, that negotiated and channelled the royal authority from above into the local networks through both formal and informal means. This scribal tradition was introduced during Edmund's reign, and transmitted through various (connected) agencies, suggesting further evidence for the existence of some form of administrative organisation in the distribution and creation of royal diplomas. These tropes may have possibly been part of a royal discourse, expressing concerns about the negotiation of informal power and the unity of society within the kingdom in Edmund's reign; however, the evidence for this suggestion is limited as ultimately, friendship vocabulary did not function prominently within the complete corpus of extant charters for this period.

---

[43] Pauline Stafford, *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1985), pp. 164-165.

[44] Hart, *ECEE*, p. 161.

3.2.3 Friendship in other parts of diplomas

Apart from these fourteen occurrences of friendship in proems, we can find seven in dispositive sections, one in a witness list, one in a sanction and one in an endorsed lease, as listed in Appendix B, Table 4.[45] These ten references are less obviously interlinked and will prove to be more revealing about certain aspects of friendship within a discourse of the power exchange between the kings and their followers, indicating once more the existence of a formalised language between those *in* power, and those *mediating* power at lower levels within the royal administration.

The only reference to friendship in a witness list is found in S 652 (A.D 958 for 959). A certain Ælfgar, '*amicus regis*', attests a grant by King Eadwig to Ceolward as first secular witness, which indicates a certain status.[46] In the complete corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters, only one more friendship reference in a witness list can be found, namely in a forgery for the Mercian king, Wulfhere.[47] The authenticity of S 652 is uncontested, and the use of *amicus regis* is thus unique. It may have been a scribal variation, but as only Ælfgar is singled out, this seems unlikely. As a result, Ælfgar's identification as *amicus regis* comes across as a statement. In the lawcodes we have seen that the language of friendship was commonly used to refer to those receiving royal favours, and especially to royal officials such as the reeve.[48] The reference to Ælfgar as the king's *amicus* might thus identify him as a royal official.

However, Ælfgar is hard to trace. A related charter, S 660 (A.D 959) shares a witness list with S 652, at which an Ælfgar *minister* is the first thegn to attest.[49] However, as we do not have more material for comparison, Ælfgar's identity cannot be explored in further detail. The prominence of Ælfgar on the witness list and the emphasis on his status as *amicus* might also be a method to single him out as the king's special favourite. Alternatively, the use of *amicus* may have been an indication of recent changes in the relationship between the king and Ælfgar; he may have secured the royal favour only recently, or his loyalties to the king may have

---

[45] Dispositive sections: S 508, S 478, S 633, S 660, S 745, S 853, S 883, S 933 and S 937. Witness list: S 652. See Appendix B, Table 4.

[46] *ECW*, 483, p. 141.

[47] Namely S 68 (A.D. 664).

[48] See above, chap. 2, pp. 74-74; see also Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 107 for her thoughts on *amici* being royal officials.

[49] S 660, *New Minster*, 22, p. 92; the connection between the witness lists, see p. 94. For a discussion of the connection between S 652 and the existence of a centralised production centre under Eadwig, see Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 69, n. 134.

been tested by certain events. Ælfgar's attestation is an intriguing example, either suggesting a demonstrative use of friendship language, or offering an insight into an expression of the benign relationship between the king and his officials. Unfortunately, none of these propositions can be proven; yet it is another pointer towards an interpretation of *amicus* as 'agent' or 'official' within a formal setting.

Our hunt for royal friends could be extended to two charters, which reflect the relationship between King Edmund and two of his dependants. The first diploma, S 478 (A.D. 940), is written in rather elaborate Latin, which at first raises suspicions. However, Susan Kelly has concluded that this unusual formulation does not prevent us from accepting its authenticity as a contemporary document.[50] In the diploma, we find a donation to a certain Eadric, '*amabili vassallo meo Adrico fidelique amico*'.[51] Our second charter, S 508 (A.D. 946), is thematically closely related to S 478. In it, five hides are granted to Æthelhere, '*fideli ministri*.'[52] A closer examination of these diplomas will inform us about the interpretation of friendship within a discourse of the negotiation of royal authority.

If we look at S 478, it is clear that Edmund's grant of two hides to Eadric at Beechingstoke is not unconditional:

> 'Ideo ego Admundus, ex regali progenie Deo annuente regenteque super Angligenas aliasque multas gentes in circuitu habitantes rex ordinatus, amabili uassallo meo Adrico fidelique amico duas terre mansas in perpetuam dono hereditatem, quatinus, temporalium rerum mobili presencia utens, fidelem obedienciam ac pacem laudabilem erga regni ceptra nostri et regale nostrum solium eternabiliter impetret et benigniter seruet.'[53]

Eadric receives this estate in return for his loyalty to the king; his successors may only retain the land if they demonstrate a similar obedience to the king. This condition, binding land to loyalty over generations, has received some scholarly attention. It evokes questions regarding lordship and commendation practice,

---

[50] Kelly, *Shaftesbury*, 12, p. 50. Note, however, that she seems less certain about its authenticity in a later assessment, see Kelly, *Bath and Wells*, 7, p. 90.

[51] S 478, *Shaftesbury*, 12, p. 48.

[52] S 508, Kemble, 2, 408, p. 263.

[53] S 478, *Shaftesbury*, 12, p. 48: 'Therefore, I, Edmund, from royal stock, designated and guided by God, ordained king over the Angles and many other peoples living in the surroundings, give to my beloved follower and loyal friend Eadric two hides in perpetual possession, using the changing presents of temporary affairs, for as long as he obtains his loyal obedience and the praiseworthy peace towards our royal sceptre and our royal throne and serves benignly.'

implying some 'feudal dimension' to the bond between Edmund and Eadric, even more following the use of *vassallus*.[54] William Stevenson has explored the use of *vassallus* in Anglo-Saxon charters and has concluded that it seemingly reflects an authentic Anglo-Saxon use, as the term is rarely used after the Conquest and therefore is unlikely to be forged.[55] Susan Kelly has argued that it is difficult to believe that the drafter, who was probably not regularly involved in charter-production, fabricated this diploma within an ecclesiastical context. She has suggested interpreting the interest and focus on loyalty, also clear from a lengthy proem focusing on (God's) law in the ordering of society, as the result of the beneficiary's relationship with the king, which would fit our interpretation of diplomas as being primarily vehicles of the communication between two layers of the royal administration within Anglo-Saxon society.

Kelly's suggestion creates the possibility that the beneficiary directly committed himself to the king in return for landed property.[56] These observations, strengthened by the rich language of affection, single Eadric out as a 'favourite' of the king. Our examination of Edmund's lawcodes has suggested an interpretation of the royal *freondas* as agents of the royal administration, bound to the king by a benign relationship based on interdependency and reciprocity.[57] This charter seems to portray a similar relationship, while giving an insight into the language of royal favour; the beloved ('*amabili*') and loyal ('*fideli*') Eadric is given his reward for his services, bound to the king by a benign friendship of interdependency.

Interestingly, S 508 also reflects on the relationship of the king with one of his followers, expressed in uncompromising terms:

> 'In nomine Dei summi et altissimi Jhesu Christi. Manifestum est cunctis quod omnia celestia et terrestria providentia Dei gubernantur. quæ sollicitudo mortalis vitæ totis nisibus in carorum amicorumque amissione conqueritur ac defletur. Ideo certis adstipulationibus mellita oracula divinæ clamationis nos frequentativis ortationibus suadet. ut

---

54 *Vassallus* (or in variant spelling *fasallus* or *vasallus*) is only found in four charters, namely S 369, S 559, S 666 and S 755. All but S 559 are thought to be authentic documents; S 559 is thought to be a fabrication of the 960s.

55 W. H. Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred together with the Annals of Saint Neots erroneously ascribed to Asser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 255, n. 2. See also for a discussion of this use of *vassalus*, Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 53-55.

56 Kelly, *Shaftesbury*, 12, pp. 50-51.

57 See above, chap. 2, pp. 64-66.

> cum his fugitivis et sine dubio transitoriis possessiunculis jugiter mansura regna Dei suffragio adipiscenda sunt.'[58]

This charter is very clear about Æthelhere's obligation: it extends beyond the king's life. Edmund is free to 'bequeath' Æthelhere to any of his *amici*, in its broadest sense to his kinsmen or followers. For Richard Abels, both S 478 and S 508 are evidence for the occurrence of a lordship construction that introduced a commendation practice, based on subjects being bound to the land.[59] Diplomas offering an insight into this practice are rare; it is therefore remarkable that both employ friendship language, although in different ways. Eadric is the king's *amicus* for having entered into a special –and mutually beneficial– relationship. Æthelhere is said to have been 'adopted' ('*adoptiuo*'), and could be passed on to one of the king's *amici*, whose identity can range from the king's kinsmen to the king's officials. The first has entered a relationship of interdependency, the second a relationship of dependency; friendship language, and the language of affection, identifies Eadric as being the king's 'favourite', whereas Æthelhere is taken under the king's wings. It confirms Susan Reynolds' thesis that commendation practice negotiated a delicate relationship that was fashioned on a notion of free will and active choice.[60]

These observations confirm Stephen Jaeger's conclusions about the existence of an aristocratic discourse of love which negotiated relationships of a delicate nature between kings and their followers at royal courts, and fortify Thomas Charles-Edwards' analysis of friendship language in the lawcodes.[61] Charles-Edwards has sought in friendship a 'pre-feudal' relationship between the lord and retainer, based on the exchange of loyalties and rights.[62] However, an important condition to this

---

58 S 508, Kemble, 2, 408, p. 263: 'In the name of God Almighty and the most exalted Jesus Christ. It is manifest to the rest that all divine and earthly events are directed by the providence of God, in the face of which the solitude of a mortal life laments and weeps to all pressures for the loss of beloved ones and friends. Therefore the honeysweet prophecy of the divine calling urges us with certain affirmations to frequent prayers, so that they will continually arrive at the everlasting kingdoms of God for judgment with these fugitives and without doubt with their little transitory possessions.'

59 Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 225-226, n. 38.

60 Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals. The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 30.

61 Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 18-53.

62 Charles-Edwards is mainly interested in the bonds and obligations created between a lord and his retainer, searching for the origins of serfdom. This objective may have narrowed his interpretation of the detected relationship, see Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth in Anglo-Saxon England', pp. 180-187.

'pre-feudal' bond of friendship was that it was based on interdependency, rather than dependency as follows from the contrasting evidence of S 478 and S 508. Our study of S 478 and S 508 has suggested that the language of friendship was closely associated with the representation and negation of power in the tenth century, yet also that the language of friendship was used to demarcate between relationships based on dependency and interdependency. S 478 shows that the relationship between the king and his dependants could indeed be classified by using the language of friendship, but additionally demonstrates that the bond between the king and his *amici* was conveyed by the use of affectionate language. Friendship language and affection are thus both used as markers of favour and status, yet are used in slightly different ways. Whereas affectionate language negotiates the bond, friendship language seems to formally communicate the created bond. Eadric is 'elevated' by the king's love, which, in turn, results in a friendship based on interdependency rather than dependency.

Four charters issued by Æthelred II reflect further evidence of friendship and its role in the construction of the relationship between the king and his followers. Three charters – S 857 (A.D. 985), S 937 (*c.* 990x1006, ?999), and S 933 (A.D. 1014)– are part of a large group of charters produced from *c.* 983 to 990, issued by King Æthelred to amend for his 'youthful indiscretions' under the influence of non-ecclesiastical advisors, which had resulted in the forfeiture of church land.[63] A fourth charter, S 883 (A.D. 995), is part of the group of 'discursive' diplomas, issued by the king after 993 in reaction to events during 985 and 993. These charters have in common that they concern forfeited land; for this reason, they explore the history of the king's right to reclaim the land, narrating the events that lead to forfeiture.[64]

S 857 presents the endowment of a certain Alfred, '*meo amico fideli nomine Ælferd*', with a grant of eleven hides at Michelmersh:

> 'Quamobrem ego Æðelredus rex Anglorum praenoscens quorsum praedicta tendant, scilicet ad diligendos homines bonis moribus adornatos, concedo cuidam meo amico fideli nomine Ælferd quandam telluris particulam, id est.xi. mansas in loco uulgari uocitamine æt Miclamersce, quatinus uita comite habeat ac perenniter possideat; cum

63 Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 85-95, 176-177.

64 For a discussion of these charters and the narrative style, see Stenton, *Latin Charters*, pp. 74-82.

> autem interitum communem aduenire cognouerit, cuicunque sibi libuerit haeredi post se commendet in propriam haereditatem.'[65]

The land granted to Alfred is tied to his office ('*uita comite*'). Here, we have a clear link between office-holding and the language of friendship. As long as Alfred finds 'an ordinary death' ('*interitum commune*'), which might be interpreted as the death of a loyal servant, his heirs can keep the land without restrictions. However, the condition is clear: serve me loyally and you will be rewarded.[66]

In S 883, Æthelred grants five hides at Ardley to Æthelwig, his reeve in Buckinghamshire. The land has been forfeited from three brothers –Ælfnoth, Ælfric and Æthelwine– who lost the land, and their lives, for their support to a thief called Leofric. Æthelwig gave the brothers a Christian burial, a decision which enraged their opponent, ealdorman Leofsige. The king decided to side with his reeve:

> '(...) Aþeluuig meus prepositus in Bucingaham et Winsige prepostius 'on' Oxonaforda inter Christanos predictos sepulierunt fratres. Leofsige igitur dux audito hoc uerbo meam adiit presentam, prefatos incusans prepositos, peremptis fratribus non recte inter Christianos sepultis. Ego autem, nolens contristari Aþelwig quia mihi erat carus et preciosus, una simul et sepultos cum Christianis permisi, et predictam terram eidem in heritatem concessi perpetuam.'[67]

This charter is drafted to protect Æthelwig's right to the estate, which he, upon his death may freely bequeath to any of his associates ('*cuicumque amico*'). *Amicus* is used to refer to Æthelwig's associates and does not play any role of interest in the conflict. The relationship between Æthelred and Æthelwig is never defined as a friendship in so many words. Yet, they share a relationship based on affection

---

65 S 857, Kemble, 3, no. 652, p. 218: 'In account of which, I, Æthelred, king of the English, foreknowing where foresaid things extended to, namely to esteemed men adorned with good morals, grant to one of my loyal friends by the name Alfred a particular piece of land, that is, eleven hides at the place which is by common name known as 'at Miclamersce', for as long as he has it for a committed life and may he possess it many years; when, moreover, he will have known to come to a common/public (as the result of his office?) death, it will be free to him to entrust it to any of his heirs in proper possession after him.'

66 Note, however, that the more authoritative tone in this charter and the absence of any form of affectionate language seem to indicate changes in the use of friendship language within the discourse of royal authority. However, to explore this suggestion, a full study of Æthelred's charters is recommended.

67 S 883, *Abingdon* 2, 125, p. 484: 'Æthelwig, my reeve in Buckingham, and Winsige, my reeve in Oxford burried foresaid brothers amongst Christians. Accordingly, Ealdorman Leofsige came to my presence, after having heard this, accusing foresaid men, saying that the killed brothers were not rightly buried amongst Christians. However, as I did not want to upset Æthelwig as he is dear and precious to me, I allowed him a Christian burial and I granted him at the same time foresaid land to be held in perpetuity.'

('*carus*'*;* '*precosius*'), which again suggests the embedment of affectionate language within the communication between the king and his followers. This relationship is defined by royal favour and royal authority; the king supported his reeve over his ealdorman and marked his support with a considerable land grant. Favour and affection go hand-in-hand; the king's reeve is favoured over the king's ealdorman and further research into affectionate language, the reeve, and the interrelationship of these notions with the discourses of friendship and authority is desirable.

This suggestion gains in strength from an assessment of our two remaining diplomas from Æthelred's reign, S 937 and S 933.[68] In S 937, Æthelred's munificence gives us a rare insight in a circle of his close associates –his uncle Ordulf, his kinsman Æthelmær, his thegn Wulfgeat and abbot Wulfgar of Abingdon- who are all commemorated in the language of favour:

> 'Hec prefatarum descriptio terrarum facta est per admonitionem Ordulfi auunculi mei atque Aþelmari consanguinitate mihi conglutinati et Wlfgeati ministri mei dilecti necnon et abbatis mei Wlfgari tota mihi deuotione benigni, qui me frequenti suggestione cum ceterorum fidelium commonuit suasione quatinus Dei omnipotentis hereditatem ex aliqua parte innouare et augere curarem. Quod et feci propter Christi qui me in regno sublimauit amorem et eorum qui me amica assiduitate ad meam exhortantur necessariam et eternam salutem et propter humilem et benignam quam mihi prefatus abba fideliter et gratanter exhibere solet obedientiam.'[69]

The estates serve as tokens of Æthelred's friendship with Abingdon, but also create the remembrance of a closely connected network. The men were close advisors of the king in the 990s, and are remembered in affectionate terms ('*dilecti*'*;* '*tota mihi deuotione benigni*') amongst other '*fidelium*'. The king is persuaded by these men by '*amica*' –translating as friendly, loyal or even beneficial?– assiduity to grant land to

[68] The authenticity of S 937 is not completely beyond doubt, but neither Keynes nor Kelly can find decisive reasons to reject it. Keynes has suggested a date of 999, based on similarities in the witness list with S 896, yet Kelly is unconvinced. Kelly, *Abingdon* 2, 129, p. 506; Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 96, n. 42.

[69] S 937, *Abingdon* 2, 129, pp. 504-505: 'This description of the mentioned lands was made at the admonition of my uncle Ordulf and of Æthelmær, who is bound to me by kinship, and by the thegn Wulfgeat beloved to me, and also by my abbot, Wulfgar, with complete devotion kind to me, who reminded me by frequent suggestion with the loyal followers of the others to the need to what extent I had to undertake this, (that is) to restore and to increase the inheritance of God Almighty from some part, just as I did. I have also done that on account of the love for Christ, who raised me to power, and on account of those who encourage me with friendly assiduity towards my necessity and eternal health; and on account of the humble and kind obedience which the aforementioned abbot is accustomed to present loyally and joyfully to me.'

a religious community for his salvation. This charter allows us another insight in the importance of affection in the communication of favour. However, it has another reference that firmly places friendship at the heart of the relationship between the king and his men, in a recounting the forfeiture history of one of the estates 'at Pyrian':

> 'Tellurem uero ad Pyrian, quam etiam ad idem prefatum concedo monasterium, unam illarum constat esse terrarum quas Adelward Ceolflede filius mihi eternaliter possidendas pro mea donauit amicitia. Omni uulgo longe lateque satis est cognitum qualiter ipse et frater eius contra me rei extiterint, qualiterque ambo meam inimicitiam exigentibus suis reatibus incurrerint.'[70]

After having fallen in disgrace, Æthelweard restored his relationship with Æthelred by the 'gift' of these lands. Interestingly, this instance is our only reference in our total number of diplomas for this period to the king's *amicitia*. In the diplomas, it is presented as a favour that could be obtained or withdrawn, just as we have suggested with respect to *freondscipe* in the lawcodes.[71] This is further emphasised by the retelling of the fact that Æthelweard and his brother had incurred the king's enmity ('*inimicitia*') for their shocking behaviour. The king's *amicitia* was thus part of a dynamic and binary mechanism, which redefined ties and obligations based on an intrinsic interdependency, while offering a flexible structure for the negotiation of ties. However, the frailty of these bonds is also apparent from this example, offering a rare insight into the imperfections of a social system based on the negotiation of informally created, interpersonal bonds as the basis of the formal exercise of power to maintain social order.

This renegotiation of bonds can also be observed in S 933. Æthelred confirms the grant of an estate at Corscombe to Sherborne by Wulfgar, who had respectively bought the estate from ealdorman Eadric with the financial aid of his *amici*, most likely his kinsmen or followers, for the salvation of their souls.[72] Corscombe used to

---

70 S 937, *Abingdon* 2, 129, p. 504: 'The land, namely at 'Pyrian', which I have parted with to the benefit of the same foresaid monastery, as it is well-known to be one of those lands which Æthelward, son of Ceoflæd, gave to me to be held perpetually for my friendship. It is fitting to know for all people far and wide what kind of case he and his brother raised against me, just as how they both incurred my enmity by their examined charges.'

71 See above, chap. 2, pp. 73-74.

72 S 933, *Sherborne*, 15, p.52: 'Hanc uero prefatam terram. xvicim. ut prefati sumus cassatis consistentem. quondam Alfwoldus episcopus rege EADGARO consentiente duorum hominum tempus de ipso monasterio accommodauit. sed sequens post illorum uite terminationem successor Æthelricus uocamine episcopus recte redintegrauit.

belong to Sherborne, but it had been lost to Eadric after Viking incursions. This gift is thus actually a restoration of an earlier loss, yet through the gift a connection is established between Wulfstan, his family, Sherborne, and the king. It reflects the way in which landed property formed the focal point of networks in late Anglo-Saxon England, with religious communities as its focal point. Another example of the mediating role of *amici* can be found in S 660 (A.D. 959), in which Eadwig grants ten hides at Bighton to the New Minster in Winchester.[73] This grant is known in particular for its included lease in favour of a thegn named Ælfric, who has secured this lease '*pro petione amicorum suorum atque eius placbabili munere*' ('upon the petition of his associates and his pleasing gift').[74] This construction illustrates the inventiveness of the social system in late Anglo-Saxon England. With this grant, Eadwig pleased three parties simultaneously with one estate: the community of Winchester –and through them God– with the ownership, Ælfric with the lease of ten hides for life and Ælfric's *amici*, by allowing their associate a secure source of income and social status.

Our last two friendship references in royal diplomas are religious in nature, although used in very different contexts. The first is used in a sanction of one of Eadwig's diplomas, S 633 (A.D. 956). This diploma is part of a set of alliterative charters, which have been connected by Simon Keynes to the bishop of Worcester.[75] In the sanction of this diploma, we find a variation of a traditional Christian image, rendering the soul as '*amicus et custos*', giving an example of how Christian ideas and discourses were implemented in formal communications.[76] Our last reference is

---

necessitudineque postea cogente. ob malorum infestationes direptionesque Danorum duci Eadrico traditione perpetuali tribuit. Labentibus denique annorum curriculis; quidam predicti monasterii famulus nomine Wlfgarus. fauente amicorum amminiculo. multo auri argentique pretio. illam terram ab ipso comparauit Eadrico. atque pro anime sue remedio - supra memorato concessit cenobio.'

73 This diploma has strong connections with two Abingdon charters –S 769 and S 828– probably suggesting a local production centre. See Miller, *New Minster*, 22, p. 93; Kelly, *Abingdon* 2, pp. 432-454.

74 Miller, *New Minster*, 22, p. 91; for a discussion, see p. 93.

75 Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 82, n. 165.

76 In Christian imagery, a friend of God is a 'guardian of the soul' (*custos animae*); this image is discussed by Ambrose, and given a wide circulation through its incorporation in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* as the definition of *amicus*; see Ambrose, *De officiis*, ed. by Maurice Testard, *Sancti Ambroisii Mediolanensis. De officiis*, CCSL, 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), iii.22.133:60-63, p. 203: 'Hic est amicitiae fructus, ut non fides propter amicitiam destruatur. Non potest enim homini amicus esse, qui Deo fuerit infidus. Pietatis custos amicitia est et aequalitatis magistra ut superior inferiori se exhibeat aequalem, inferior superiori'; and

found in the dispositive section of the New Minster refoundation charter, S 745 (A.D. 966). This charter is in many ways a unique document, whose appeal is far beyond that of most other royal diplomas. It was inspired by Æthelwold, the reformist bishop of Winchester and instigator of the expulsion of clerics, and it relates these events. Consequently, the charter is an important witness of the agreement between the church and the king, transmitting an ideal, commemorating an extraordinary event, and shaping our interpretation of history.[77] The bond between the king, God, and the monks is remembered in friendship vocabulary, giving an insight into a different discourse of friendship. The king is presented asking God to elevate 'our friends', '*nostros amicos*', as he has advanced 'God's friends', '*amicos eius*', by suppressing the enemies of the church.[78] The monks of the New Minster are represented as God's friends, but the identity of the king's friends is less clear; they may be either his kin, his associates, his councillors, his agents, or simply, the monks of the New Minster. Yet, so far, this is the *only* reference in which friendship language is used to refer to the religious, and shows how the language of friendship could be used to isolate the religious as a separate group within the social imagery of the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom.[79]

3.2.4 Discourses of friendship in royal diplomas

This study of friendship references in royal diplomas has given us some answers, but has mainly resulted in recommendations for further research. Friendship references in proems are mainly used as tropes, embedded in a scribal tradition that was part of

---

Isidore, *Etymologies*, X.A.4-5:17-21: 'Amicus, per derivationem, quasi animi custos. Dictus autem proprie: amator turpitudinis, quia amore torquetur libidinis: amicus ab hamo, id est, a catena caritatis; unde et hami quod teneant. Amabilis autem, quod sit amore dignus.' For a discussion, see Verena Epp, *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, pp. 243-244.

77 For an introduction of the New Minster refoundation charter, see Alexander R. Rumble, *Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester. Documents Relating to the Topography of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman City and its Minsters*, Winchester Studies, 4.3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 65-73.

78 S 745, ed. by Rumble, *Property and Piety in Early Medieval* Winchester, 4, pp. 82-83: 'Hoc subnixe efflagitans deposco. ut quod in suis egi. hoc agat in mihi ab ipso conlatis. scilicet aduersarios nostros deiciens amicos sublimando prouehat. ut inimicos sancte Dei ecclesiae deprimens. amicos eius monachos uidelicet beatificans iustificaui. De illorum anathemate qui monachis insidiantur.'

79 For a discussion of the use of friendship as an expression of the Christian community, and the problems related to this imagery, see Brian McGuire's excellent introduction to his work on monastic friendship, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. xi-l.

the communication between the king and his élites, mediating royal authority between various layers of the social fabric. These tropes contemplate the frailty of human life, the loss of loved ones, and the problems inherent to succession and may as such have been part of a larger, ideological framework. *Amicus* in proems is used as an expanding notion to denote kin –by blood, by law, and by a spiritual connection– who share in inheritances. It has been suggested that these proems may have expressed a certain level of concern with the mediation of informal and formal power structures in the increasingly complex society of Edmund, but this suggestion is mostly speculative, as our evidence is too sparse. However, most of all, the formulaic use of tropes using friendship references contradicts Julia Barrow's earlier conclusion that friendship terms were not used formulaically before the introduction of the writ, and consequently weakens her argument that each text that included friendship language was drafted for a specific set of circumstances.[80] Instead, it has been tentatively suggested to see these formulas and *topoi* as part of a formalised communication between the king and his followers, and as such, of the channelling of power from the court into the social networks.

Dispositive sections have been proven to be more informative, although the scarcity of evidence, again, prompts further research. Two charters of Edmund's reign reflect bonding practice between the king and his followers. In S 478, we have seen how the king granted land to his *amicus* and *vassallus* Eadric, who is affectionately remembered for his loyalty. In S 508, Æthelhere has commended himself to the king and his successors (*amici*) in exchange for land. These two examples indicate that the use of friendship and affectionate language created a certain allowance for the retainer: it elevated his relationship with the king to a relationship of mutual interdependence and reciprocity. Simultaneously, this benign relationship was also beneficial for the king, who secured his dependant's loyalty through the actively constructed bond. Friendship language in the royal diplomas is thus part of a discourse of power, and seems to communicate the negotiation of status. This suggestion is exemplified by our only use of friendship language in a witness list of King Eadwig's reign. Ælfgar's attestation as the king's *amicus*, first in line of the secular witnesses, seems to indicate a special status: he may have been a royal official, or a special favourite. Unfortunately, we are not able to explore any of

80 Barrow, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', p. 111.

these suggestions in further detail without knowing any further particulars of the relationship between the king and Ælfgar.

Æthelred's charters demonstrate the importance of further research into affectionate language in connection to the negotiation of power. In S 883, Æthelred's support of his reeve Æthelwig of Buckinghamshire –who was *carus* and *preciosus* to the king– illustrates the special place that reeves apparently occupied in social networks at the end of the century. This relationship was styled using affectionate language, shaping it into a benign relationship rather than an authoritative relationship based on lordship. Friendship language and affectionate language seem thus not so much used to underline the king's authority, or to be included in a demonstrative rhetoric, but rather to reflect a court discourse of affection and favour, whilst negotiating a reciprocal relationship. This conclusion is indebted to earlier research by Stephen Jaeger, whose concept of 'ennobling love' is used as the outcome of an aristocratic pattern of behaviour, based on the rules of public sociability at courts.[81] Jaeger's analysis would propose regarding friendship as a highly desired bond that was actively sought by courtiers and strategically granted by the king.

This seems to be the case in another Æthelredian charter, S 937, which has given us a rare insight into the perception of the royal *amicitia* in a court context: it was a favour that could be granted, but which could also be withdrawn. After incurring the royal *inimicitia*, Æthelweard bought the king's *amicitia* with an estate. Apart from the importance of the royal *amicitia* for a noble's status, it also shows the binary nature and frailty of the social system: it was a bond that was liable to constant renegotiation and could thus create unrest as easily as concord between the king and his followers. However, this particular example also highlights the fact that affectionate language and friendship vocabulary were both part of the shaping of bonds of interdependency and favour, but whereas the first was used to establish the bond, the second was the outcome of the negotiated bond. Our preliminary study has demonstrated that friendship language seems to be more rare than affectionate language within this formal medium. To fully understand the interplay between these two dimensions, a separate study of affectionate language is wanted; for now, it

[81] Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 18, 23.

suffices to conclude that friendship language was apparently not considered appropriate in the formal communication of the royal diploma.

Where Julia Barrow has provided a fruitful context for the discussion of friendship references as medium to convey royal authority, above analysis of the tenth-century diplomas contradicts most of her conclusions. The majority of her tenth-century evidence is either part of the corpus of wills, and should be considered as part of a specific genre that was not inevitably connected to the royal court, or is used formulaically in proems, and was therefore not necessarily used in a specific context or drafted for a specific set of circumstances. Consequently, the study of royal diplomas has revealed that friendship language only played a marginal role in the official communication between the king and his followers. The silence on friendship is more revealing than any of the discussions above: in formal communications, friendship is almost untraceable. Further research into the relationship of the king and reeve, and the function of affectionate language in the construction and expression of favour, is needed, and may reveal new insights into the demonstrative use of 'friendship imagery'. It seems that friendship, as a notion with a wide applicability in both informal and formal settings, did not fit the formal expression of royal authority and was thus unlikely to be used demonstratively. This conclusion is particularly interesting with regards to an analysis of the Anglo-Saxon wills, as wills –as documents reflecting private communications of power negotiations– are removed from this formal expression of power in the royal diplomas, and may be able to offer a very different insight into the court discourse of interaction between the king and his dependants.

3.3 Friendship discourses in wills

3.3.1 Wills within power structures

Wills are part of a group of 'private' charters, documents issued by private persons rather than by royal authority. The majority of the Anglo-Saxon wills are written in the vernacular and are, as a collection, unique in Europe for the numbers in which they have survived.[82] Although the presentation is different, wills are still embedded

[82] For a discussion of the rare, continental wills (in Latin), see Timothy Reuter, ''You can't take it with you': Testaments, Hoards, and Moveable Wealth in Europe, 600-1000', in *Treasure in*

in a court discourse, as they were confirmed at councils in front of witnesses, which conveyed the legal act. Wills urged for a formal recognition of certain arrangements, while being an expression of informally negotiated decisions of private persons. In this sense, wills are documents that are part of a reflection process on power structures, and the construction of specific social networks. H. D. Hazeltine and Michael Sheehan, who were mostly interested in the legal standing of the will, see the Anglo-Saxon wills as imperfect legal documents with only symbolic value, forerunners of an awakening tradition of legal disposition by textual means.[83]

However, this view has recently been modified by Kathryn Lowe and Linda Tollerton, who have emphasised the functionality and flexibility of the Anglo-Saxon wills as reactions to changing circumstances.[84] These changing circumstances were thus communicated in a similar setting as royal diplomas, although they were less strictly formalised than royal charters. Nonetheless, Linda Tollerton has established that wills were broadly related to writs and letter-writing traditions, and as such should be seen as part of the correspondence between the king and the powerful men who represented him in the shires.[85] Simultaneously wills demonstrate the existence of an informal and flexible tradition in the vernacular, as proposed by Susan Kelly, which was moved into a more official sphere of the royal administration through incorporation and adaptation.[86]

These recent discoveries make the wills particularly interesting for an analysis of the interaction between formal and informal power structures, as their reactive characteristics, embedded within a court setting, situate wills at the demarcation line between formal and informal expressions of power. Additionally, the relative popularity of will-making in the tenth century suggests that this type of

---

the Medieval West, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000), 11-24, pp. 22-21.

83 H. D. Hazeltine, 'General Preface', in Dorothy Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930): i-xliii, pp. xix-xx.

84 Kathryn A. Lowe, 'The Nature and Effect of the Vernacular Anglo-Saxon Will', *Legal History*, 19.1(1998): 23-61, pp. 47-48; Linda Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2011), pp. 78-79.

85 Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, pp. 22-23. Compare with Michael Sheehan's thesis, who has argued for a informal composition technique in complete scribal freedom: Michael M. Sheehan, *The Will in Medieval England. From the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the End of the Thirteenth Century* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963), pp. 55-56.

86 Kelly, 'Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word', p. 51.

document fitted specific needs and demands of the period. In this context, it is interesting that wills seem to be positioned at a similar intersection between power structures as friendship. Moreover, Tollerton's conclusion that wills were part of an ongoing correspondence between the king and his representatives is of special interest for our study, as we have argued in the above that friendship was the relationship *par excellence* to negotiate informal and formal power structures, and an important notion in the definition of a king's relationship with his officials.[87]

The centrality of friendship within this nexus of formal and informal power is also confirmed by a relatively frequent use of friendship language in the wills. Fifteen wills, out of a total of sixty-nine, have direct references to friendship (*freond* or an variation), of which eleven date from the tenth century, as presented in Appendix C, Tables 5 and 6.[88] Linda Tollerton has emphasised that wills were usually made at important stages during the life-cycle, often reacting to changes within the donors' lives.[89] Male will-making seems to have been prompted by concerns about the position of female dependants and the need to provide for family members, whereas female will-making was often stimulated by widowhood and the need to have the resulting arrangements reacting to this changed status recognised.[90] Subsequently, will-making seems to have been embedded in a particularly gendered

---

87 Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, p. 22, pp. 106-108; See chap. 2, pp. 74-75; and above, pp. 107-108.

88 However, not all scholars agree on the total number of wills within the corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters. I follow Linda Tollerton, see Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, Appendix 1, pp. 285-288. Earlier attempts to compile a full list of have been compiled by Kathryn A. Lowe, Michael Sheehan and Julia Crick: Lowe, 'The Nature and Effect of the Vernacular Anglo-Saxon Will', Appendix, pp. 48-57; Sheehan, *The Will in Medieval Englan*, p. 21 and Julia C. Crick, 'Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity', in *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. by William O. Frazer and Andrew Tyrrell (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000), 193-208; with Appendix, 419-422. From the total of sixty-nine wills, nine wills are dated before *c.* 900, twenty-nine wills are dated between *c.* 931 and 1014, twenty-six to the period from 1017 to 1070 and five wills are roughly dated to the tenth and eleventh centuries. Additionally, the incorporation of lost wills into the *Liber Eliensis* and *Ramsey Chronicle* indicate an even larger distribution. For a discussion of the monastic chronicles as source for further evidence, see Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, pp. 37-42.

89 Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, p. 145, 179. I have followed Tollerton in favouring the more general 'donor' over the modern 'testator/testatrix' to avoid modern associations.

90 For the incentive of male will-making, see Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, chap. 4, pp. 140-165, esp. pp. 164-165. For the motivations behind female will-making, see Julia Crick, 'Men, Women, and Widows: Widowhood in pre-Conquest England', in *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Sandra Cavallo and Lyndan Warner (Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999), 24-36, p. 32; Crick, 'Women, Posthumous Benefaction, and Family Strategy in Pre-Conquest England', pp. 405-407; and Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, pp. 177-179.

negotiation of power, which is another point of interest for our discussion of friendship vocabulary within this context. These conclusions suggest that will-making was part of a process of securing protection and mediation, which would again be one of the settings in which we may expect to find references to friendship. Furthermore, Julia Crick has pointed out that wills created ties and obligations between past and future generations, resulting in reciprocal arrangements by those involved with the present and future generations.[91] This element of reciprocity also evokes relationships based on a mutual interdependency, which may have inspired the use of friendship language.

For all the discussed dimensions of the setting in which wills were used, it seems less surprising that friendship vocabulary is prominently used in wills, as the relationship had a similar bridging function as wills had within the communication between private persons and the royal administration. In the following, friendship will be discussed firstly within the setting of the mediation of power, allowing an insight in the role of friends within the channelling of both formal and informal power on behalf of both male and female donors. Subsequently, we will focus more closely on the gendered aspects of will-making: firstly, by defining methods to use the wills for discussing female bonding –both within and outside a context of a male-orientated social structure– and secondly, by focussing on language as factor within (gendered) discourses of friendship.

3.3.2 Friendship and the mediation of power

Freondas are often presented in wills as overseeing and witnessing arrangements, and as beneficiaries of the arrangements. In this last sense, *freondas* is commonly used to refer to kin, in its widest sense. An example of this use of friendship language can be observed in S 1524 (?s. x), in which Ordnoht and his wife seek confirmation of earlier provisions on behalf of their *freondas*.[92] Another example of the active, mediating role of *freondas* can be found in the agreement between the widow Cynethryth and Eadweald (S 1200; 867x870), which is reached with the help

[91] Crick, 'Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity', p. 201.

[92] S 1524, *Wills*, 5, p. 18.

of their '*friandum*'.[93] These '*friandum*' interceded between the widow and her husband's closest kinsman, securing Cynethryth's income and Eadweald's prospects.

However, the settings in which friendship vocabulary is used can often be informative about the nature of friendship. For example, the will of Ealdred (S 1455; *c.* 990x1005) provides us with information on commendation practice. Ealdred, son of Lyfing, commends himself and his estate at Cliffe to abbot Wulfric of St Augustine's Canterbury upon the advice of his *freondas*.[94] These *freondas* are probably the same men who are witnessing the agreement, namely Ealdred's father Lyfing, the brothers Siweard and Sired, Wulfstan of Saltwood, and another Wulfstan. Here, we find an example of how friendship vocabulary is used to refer to diverse associations based on (in)formal influence: the men could be either Ealdred's kinsmen, neighbours, local lords, the king's agents, *etc.* It is apparent that Ealdred's *freondas* had social power, as they recommended –and probably consented to– his commendation. Charters informing us about commendation are rare, and it is remarkable that we have encountered two royal diplomas and a will reflecting friendship language in relation to the practice.[95] As these three charters do not reflect a similar use of friendship language, we can only accentuate that friendship language was apparently evoked in cases of commendation to evoke social power, which was probably rooted within society rather than imposed from above.[96] This may indicate that commendation was considered as a form of both formal and informal power negotiation, probably as the result of the personal nature of the arrangement, and the active choice informing the practice.

Freondas could not only mediate, they were often part of the conflicts and arrangements that prompted will-making. This can, for example, be noted in the will of Æthelgifu (S 1497; 956x1002), whose right to dispose her lands freely had been

---

93 S 1200, *SEHD*, 7, p. 10.

94 S 1455, Kelly, *St Augustine's*, 31, p. 118.

95 For a discussion of S 478 and S 508, see above pp. 108-111. For a discussion of commendation practice, see Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 150, 225-226; Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, pp. 490-492; and Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 92. In S 478, the commended man becomes the king's *amicus*; in S 508, the king's *amici* can inherit the commended man, and in this will the commended man acts upon the advice of his *freondas*.

96 It appear that the lease of land followed a very similar pattern to that of commendation practice as is suggested by the eleventh-century will of Æthelric. See S 1471, *Charters* (R), 101, p. 188. Note that Robertson suggests that *freondas* in this context may be used as translation of the Old Norse *frændi* ('kin') as the name of Æthelric's son Esbearn suggest a Scandinavian influence, see Robertson, *Charters* (R), p. 437.

contested by her former husband's relatives.[97] In her will, Æthelgifu declares her wishes in front of the king, the queen, and her *freondas*, who witness and benefit from her arrangements.[98] The identity of her *freondas* has to be sought with the beneficiaries. The religious community of St Albans is the main religious beneficiary, but their share is rendered as 'for God' ('*hwæt hio gode wile don*'). Æthelgifu's other beneficiaries were the king *('hwæt hire hlaforde*'), a small group of estate workers –receiving small bequests and manumissions– a larger group of members of her own kingroup –receiving mostly moveable wealth– and her husband's kingroup, obtaining land tied in reversion to St Albans.[99] These last two groups are thus the most likely *freondas*. Æthelgifu's main objective must have been reaching out to her husband's kin in an attempt to create a settlement to avoid further lawsuits, secured by the formal power of the king, queen, and the moral authority of the community of St Albans.[100] This will thus shows us the informal power of *freondas* within social networks, and the need for widows to secure male assertion for their arrangements; to counterbalance these informal power claims, Æthelgifu appeals to the king for support and protection of her arrangements, as will be discussed in further detail below. The king's authority created room-for-manoeuvre for the widow, and her will is an example of the negotiation between formal and informal power structures.

A similar practice can be observed in the will of Ælfflæd (S 1486; 1000x1002), the widow of ealdorman Byrhtnoth of Essex (†991).[101] Ælfflæd seeks

---

97 S 1497, *St Albans*, 7, p. 147: 'Eall se freot 7 all ælmesse þe her gecweden is hyo wile þ[æt] hit beo heore ælmessa for þon hit wæron hire hlafordes begeto 7 heo bit hire cynehlafored him to ælmissan for cynescipe for godes lufan 7 for s*anct*e Marigan þ[æt] git ne læton nænne monnan. Mid feo hire cwide awendan leof hit becwæð hire hlaford hire to sellanne þam þe hyo wolde þe ne gelefde hire hire hlafordes magas þa lædde heo að to Hyccan.xx. hund aða Es Ta þær waes Ælfere on 7 Ælfsige.l.d 7 Byrnric waes þa gerefa 7 ealle þa yldestan men to Bedanforda 7 to Heortforda 7 heora wif ufonan þone cwide 7 þær […] þa of ærdo[.]de…'.

98 S 1497, *St Albans*, 7, p. 144.

99 See the discussion in Crick, who is summarising earlier research by Whitelock and Lord Rendell: Crick, 'Introduction', *St Albans*, pp. 97-98.

100 This was a common practice. For a discussion of female strategies within disputes, see Crick, 'Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity', p. 204; Simon Keynes, 'Crime and Punishment in the Reign of King Æthelred the Unready', in *People and Places in Northern Europe*, *500–1600: Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer*, ed. by Ian Wood and Niels Lund (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), 67–81, pp. 77-78; Kennedy, 'Disputes about Bocland', pp. 180-186 and Kennedy, 'Law and Litigation', pp. 152-157.

101 For further information on Ælfflæd and her affiliations in Essex, Suffolk and East Anglia, see Pauline Stafford, 'Byrhtnoth and Women in the World of *Maldon*: Byrhtnoth and his

the protection and mediation for herself and the religious community of Stoke from Æthelmær, probably the ealdorman of the Western Provinces between *c.* 1005–1015.[102] In return for his advocacy, Æthelmær receives estates at Lawling and Liston. Through this plea, Ælfflæd underlines her dependency on male protection, confirming Linda Tollerton's earlier conclusions that female will-making was often inspired by a need to seek male protection and public approval of arrangements.[103] Yet it is also another example of how formal and informal power were negotiated through will-making, and the importance of friendship vocabulary in this setting. Æthelmær was asked to be a *freod*, *forespraca*, and *mundiend* based on a privately negotiated arrangement, and subsequently promised publicly in front of witnesses to do so. He was also one of the foremost ealdormen of the kingdom. His protection and friendship would have been an expression of both his informal and formal power simultaneously, and it may have been this combination that was sought by Ælfflæd and which resulted in the use of friendship language.

However, not only women sought the protection and mediation of powerful men. Bishop Ælfsige of Winchester (*fl.* 951–958) requests the support of his '*leofan freond*' Ælfheah, the ealdorman of Hampshire (*fl.* 959–972), in exchange for an estate at Crondall in his will (S 1491; 951x958).[104] Additionally, provisions are made for Æthelsige's son, wife, and sister-in-law, and these stipulations may lay behind the need for protection of the arrangements.[105] Clerical marriage was not prohibited in Anglo-Saxon England but subject to strict regulations. However, these marriages had been cause for unease since the seventh century, and the tenth century had seen an increased concern with clerical sexual practice, as has been demonstrated in research

---

Family', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 225-235.

102 S 1486, *Wills*, 15, p. 40. For further information on ealdorman Æthelmær, see Barbara Yorke, 'Æthelmær: The Foundation of the Abbey at Cerne and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *The Cerne Abbey Millennium Lectures*, ed. by Katherine Barker (Cerne Abbas: Cerne Abbey Millennium Committee, 1988), 15-25.

103 Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, p. 178.

104 S 1491, *New Minster*, 18, p. 82: '7 ic gean þæs lands at Crundelan ofer mine dæg Ælfheage, 7 ofer his dæg gange hit into ealden mynstere.' For further information on Ælfheah and his family, see Ann Williams, '*Princeps Merciorum gentis*: the Family, Career, and Connections of Ælfhere, Ealdorman of Mercia', *ASE*, 10 (1982): 143-172, pp. 148-149.

105 Sean Miller gives the name of Godwine for Ælfsige's son, see Miller, *New Minster*, 18, p. 83.

of Catherine Cubitt.[106] An example of this hostility towards clerical marriage can be found in Wulfstan of Winchester's *Life of St Æthelwold*, in which Ælfsige's see of Winchester is portrayed as a place of sin, where clerics lived in scandalous fornication with their wives.[107] Ælfsige's will-making should be interpreted in this context: as a member of the clergy, he tried to protect his family's position, by tying their inheritance to the interests of the New Minster, and by pleading for protection – and rewarding– the influential Ælfheah.

Noticeably, Ælfheah is addressed both affectionately ('*leof*'), and by using friendship rhetoric. This joint use of affectionate and friendship language is also visible in the will of Wulfgeat of Donington (S 1534; *c.* 1000). Wulfgeat asks his lord to be a *freond* to his wife and daughter ('*þæt he beo his wifes freond 7 his dohter*'), aiming to secure the extensive bequests.[108] Additionally, Wulfgeat appoints an intermediary, who is asked to announce these stipulations to his lord and to all Wulfgeat's *freondas*: Æthelsige, who is addressed with '*leof*'.[109] This use of affectionate language to evoke protection and favour is remarkable, as it suggests that affection was part of a discourse of power, which was constructed by the use of formal speech. A similar construction can be observed in S 1511 (957x987; probably 980x987), in which Brihtric and Ælfswith declare their intentions in front of relatives ('*magas*'), making extensive and detailed provisions to various secular and religious parties; the king ('*leofan hlaford*') and the religious ('*Godes freond*') are asked to oversee its observance.[110] This plea for formal intervention could be coupled to an appeal to the church's moral authority. In the will of Brihtric and Ælfswith, it is God's agents, '*Godes freondas*', who are asked to secure the arrangements.

---

106 For the rulings on clerical marriage in Anglo-Saxon England, see Catherine Cubitt, 'The Clergy in Early Anglo-Saxon England', *Historical Research*, 78.201 (2005): 273-287, p. 285; Catherine Cubitt, 'Images of St Peter: the Clergy and Religious Life in Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England. Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. by Paul Cavill (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), 41-54, pp. 50-53. For a discussion of monastic virginity as a model for all, see Cubitt, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', p. 2.

107 *VSÆ*, 16, p. 30.

108 S 1534, *Wills*, 19, p. 54.

109 S 1534, *Wills*, 19, p. 56.

110 S 1511, *Rochester*, 35, p. 51. The Latin version of this charter reads: *Rochester*, 35a, p. 53: 'Ego Brihtricus pro dei amore rogo dominum meum dulcissimum. ut ista nostra donatio inuiolabilis permaneat. nec eam a quoquam uiolari permittat. Similiter rogamus et petimus omnes amicos dei. quatinus nobis adiutores in hac re existant. et quicunque eam aliquatenus uiolare presumpseri'n't; ab ipso domino Christo iudice.'

The use of '*leof*' is, again, relatively common in wills, and partly reflects the similarities in style between wills and letter traditions, as suggested by Linda Tollerton on basis of a comparison with the affective elements as found in the *Fonthill Letter*.[111] This would both enhance the status of wills as more formalised documents and suggests a link between the function of letters and wills. Giles Constable has emphasised in his study of letter traditions that the main aim of letters was the expression of friendship; subsequently, letters became tokens of friendship, but simultaneously marked the honour and favour of the recipient.[112] Wills seem to have been embedded in a similar setting. They did not in so much mark the honour and favour of the addressed 'protector', but they marked the importance of formal, affectionate speech as method to appeal for favours or appeasement of earlier tensions within a male-oriented formal appeal to power.

We have concluded in our discussion of diplomas that affectionate language was used to negotiate the king's favour in his communication with his courtiers.[113] Affectionate language in wills demonstrates that it was considered an appropriate medium to formally appeal for favours, and in doing so, allow another insight into a court discourse of authority, in which both friendship and affection formed part of the negotiation of favour: the first as representing informal power, the second as representing an appeal to formal power. This suggests the existence of a gendered language for the appeal for favour, and also situates friendship vocabulary *and* affectionate language within a gendered context, proposing a gendered impact on the negotiation of formal and informal bonds. This last suggestion will be discussed below, after contextualising methods of female bonding in further detail.

This hierarchical dimension in will-making also explains the high proportion of wills issued by men in power; whereas vulnerable members of society would appeal to their protection, influential men had the responsibility of looking after their dependants. Our oldest will, the ninth-century will of King Alfred (S 1507; 873x888), makes provisions for his soul, and for the salvation of his '*frynd*', for

---

111 See Appendix C, Table 5 for all wills using *leof* to address the evoked authorities; for a combined use of *leof* and friendship vocabulary, see Appendix C, Table 6. For a discussion for the connection with the *Fonthill Letter*, see Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, pp. 23-24.

112 Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections*, p. 16.

113 See above, pp. 111-113.

whom he interceded and will intercede, just as his father has done in the past.[114] These '*frynd*' are likely to be the various beneficiaries of the will –under whom are the religious community of Winchester and his children– but it may have included the king's loyal followers and other associates. The duty to look after your dependants was not a royal prerogative. This is clear from the will of ealdorman Æthelwold (S 1504; 946x947), who makes provisions for his soul in consultation with his *freondas*, who are, again, likely to be the recipients of the various bequests, namely the community of Winchester and Æthelwold's brothers and nephews.[115] Ealdorman Ælfheah's will (S 1485; *c.* 968x971) frees all men that were penally enslaved as retribution upon the estates, which were allocated to his *freondas*. These *freondas* include Ælfheah's wife Ælfswith, their son Ælfweard, various kinsmen, Queen Ælfthryth, and the ætheling.[116] Another example can be found in the will of ealdorman Æthelmær (S 1498; 977x982), ealdorman of Hampshire from 977 to 982. The information in this will is multi-interpretable, as Æthelmær is said to have proclaimed his will in front of '*his cynehlaforde* ⁊ *eallum his freondum*' ('the king and all his associates').[117] It is unclear whether these '*freondum*' are Æthelmær's or the king's associates. The first practice is widely observed in the wills, but an interpretation of royal *freondas* is not improbable, especially as this may have possibly been declared at Æthelmær's deathbed.[118]

Finally, the will of Wulfric 'Spot' (S 1536; 1002x1004), a member of an influential family in northern Mercia and Yorkshire from *c.* 993 onwards, shows the alignment of interests between secular nobles and religious communities. Wulfric's will is exceptional in our collection, as it is as much concerned with the interests of the community at Burton-on-Trent, as with his family's inheritance.[119] This is also

---

[114] S 1507, *New Minster*, 1, p. 5.

[115] S 1504, *SEHD*, 20, p. 33.

[116] S 1485, *Wills*, 9, p. 24. Ælfhere's will is showing a clear interest in the position and connection with Queen Ælfthryth; she is mentioned various times as the legitimate wife of King Edgar. This suggest either a family connection between Ælfhere and Ælfthryth, or another actively forged link between the two families.

[117] S 1498, *New Minster*, 25, p. 117.

[118] See the discussion of the phrase '*<hwæt> his cwyde wæs to his nyhstan dæge*' in Miller, *New Minster*, p. 119.

[119] For an introduction to the will and its importance in the history of Burton-on-Trent, see the introduction by P. H. Sawyer, *Burton*, xv-xxxviii; and for a discussion of Wulfric's family connections and vast estates, see pp. xxxviii-xlvii.For a discussion of the historical context and his relations at the court, see Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 188-193.

the context in which we should interpret the occurrences of friendship language in this will. Wulfric's brother Ælfhelm, ealdorman of Northumbria (*c.* 994–1006), Ufegeat, Ælfhelm's son, and Ælfric, archbishop of Canterbury (995–1005), are asked to be '*freond 7 fultum*' for the community at Burton.[120] A protective network of *freondas* is created by tying the landed interests of influential intermediaries – Archbishop Ælfric, Ælfhelm, Ufegeat, and even King Æthelred–around the community of Burton.[121] Wulfric's will was drafted between 1002 and 1004, a period of Æthelred's reign about which we are relatively less informed; yet, it is clear that discord was simmering, as in 1005 and 1006 strife was rife.[122] Wulfric died in 1004, and only Ufegeat and Wulfheah, the main beneficiaries of Wulfric's will, were still alive in 1006, blinded on the king's command and living in disgrace.[123] Wulfric's will demonstrates the double-function of friendship in this protection process: it protected Burton, yet also the rights of Wulfric's *freondas* within the negotiation of power.

3.3.3 Pious trafficking, moveable wealth and female agency

The above observations about the use of friendship language in wills have given an insight into the situations and settings in which its rhetoric was evoked, namely in situations of the negotiation of formal and informal power. Friendship was embroiled within hierarchical dimensions, and was evoked in situations in which formal and moral authority was sought for protecting arrangements created in informal settings. The social fabric of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom had become more complicated in the course of the tenth century, and land was increasingly contested. As a result, the will became a more frequently used document to protect the interests of both men in

---

[120] S 1536, *Burton*, 29, pp. 54-55.

[121] The king is installed as the ultimate overseer of Burton's rights in a reflection of reform ideals, freeing the community of direct control of both secular and ecclesiastical powers, see S 1536, *Burton*, 29, p. 55: '7 ic wylle þ[æt] se cyning beo hlaford. þæs mynstres ðe ic getimbrede. 7 þære landara þe ic ðynderinn becweden hæbbe gode to lofe. 7 to wurðmynta minan hlaforde 7 for minra sawle. 7 Ælfric arce[bisceop]. 7 Ælfhelm min broðor. þ[æt] hig beon mund. 7 freond. 7 forespreocan. into ðære stowe wið ælcne geborenne mann. Heom to nanre agenre æhta. butan into sa[nctus] Benedictus regole.' For the provision made on behalf of the king as overseer of monastic rights, see *RC*, prologue, 10, p. 7; Ælfric, *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, 63, p. 140; and *EEM*, p. 153.

[122] Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 209-210.

[123] *ASC* C, A.D. 1006, p. 91: 'Her forðferde Ælfric arcebisceop, 7 Ælfeah bisceop feng to æfter him to þam arcestole. 7 on þam ilcan geare wæs Wulfgeate eall his ar ongenumen, 7 Wulfeah 7 Ufegeat wæron ablænde 7 Ælfelm ealdorman ofslagen, 7 Kenulf bisceop forðferde.'

power –with the responsibility to look after those in their charge– and groups in society (widows, religious, lesser thegns) that increasingly needed to secure protection of informal arrangements. For this reason, wills seem to have been drafted in proportionally high numbers for these groups in society, as they aimed to channel protection and support within a gendered and hierarchically layered setting.

Affectionate language seems to have been used concurrently with friendship vocabulary to appeal to the formal, hierarchical dimension of power networks, while simultaneously calling upon the informal, social power that was part of social networks. These conclusions suggest that both affectionate language and friendship vocabulary were part of a court discourse of formal and informal negotiation of favour, that was thoroughly rooted in the secular channelling of hierarchical and social power in Anglo-Saxon society. If friendship language was systematically embedded within the negotiation of power, it would follow that its rhetoric was unsuitable for referring to relationships based on a purely spiritual and moral association, or to relationships that were not rooted in power dimensions. This assumption will be tested in the following to portrayals of the relationship between the lay and the religious, and of relationships that were not necessarily rooted in power dimensions, such as female interaction. These examples will demonstrate the problems of language in this setting, raising questions about the existence of a gendered discourse of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon charters.

Although wills reflect the practice of "pious trafficking" –the gift of lands and goods in exchange for prayers and rights– this relationship is never expressed in the language of friendship.[124] Provisions are usually made 'for their soul'; and often involve specific gifts with a clear objective. For example, Æthelric of Bocking granted an estate to St Paul's in London in his will (S 1501; *c.* 960x994) 'for the provision of lights and for the communication of Christianity to God's people there' ('*to leohten 7 þar on godes folce cristendom to dælenne*').[125] A direct reference to the bond created by these gifts is only found in the eleventh-century will of Oswulf and Æthelgyth (S 1235; 1053x1066), in which we read '*broðorrœddene*', with a Latin

[124] The term "pious trafficking" is borrowed from Megan McLaughlin, who has made an insightful study of the links between lay piety, prayer, and gift-giving in Early Medieval France. See Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints. Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 139-144.

[125] S 1501, *Wills*, 16, p. 42.

translation of '*fraternitas*'.[126] Confraternity had thus its own, marked vocabulary, and was not defined by the language of friendship. This suggests that the relatively high proportion of surviving wills by religious was also embedded in a secular setting, mediating secular interests as we have already seen in our discussion of the will of Bishop Ælfsige above.

An even more interesting case is the evidence of gendered relationships. We have concluded that friendship language was often evoked in situations of hierarchy to balance precarious relationships that were sought for their connection to both formal and informal relationships. Women were in principle excluded from office-holding and could thus not obtain status or social standing from a position in authority, with the possible exception of the Anglo-Saxon queens of the late tenth century.[127] Yet women had an informal power basis, rooted in their role as mothers and their position within kin networks.[128] This informal power made that women could be included in groups of friends ('*freondon*'), benefitting and upholding the provisions declared in ealdorman Ælfheah's will.[129] Nevertheless, as the language of friendship was intertwined with formal power and hierarchy, women are generally excluded from these relationships and unlikely to be addressed as *freond* in their own right. In this sense, the language of friendship is gendered; and wills show particularly the gendered nature of friendship vocabulary. However, this also shows

---

126 S 1235, *St Albans*, 17 and 17A, pp. 220-223, with commentary on the association between Old English and Latin versions of this document. It needs to be emphasised that *broðorrædene* was apparently a personal association, rather than part of a wider social initiative as follows from a comparison with *The London Ordinance* and the tenth-century Old English 'guild regulations'. For a discussion of peaceguilds and their function in society, see Gervase Rosser, 'The Anglo-Saxon Gilds', in *Minsters and Parish Churches. The Local Church in Transition*, *900-1200*, ed. by John Blair, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph, 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1988), 31-34, p. 31.

127 Edward's third wife Eadgifu and Edgar's third wife Ælfthryth both enjoyed considerable influence. However, their status seems to have mainly derived from their positions as mothers. Especially Ælfthryth was elevated to a queenly 'office', as reflected in the use of the regal style *regina* and her role as overseer of nunneries. For a discussion, see Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 20-21 and Pauline Stafford, 'The King's Wife in Wessex 800-1066', *Past and Present*, 91 (1981): 3-27, pp. 3-5. For a discussion of a unique reference to Ælfthryth's 'official' power as *forespraca*, Andrew Rabin, 'Female Advocacy and Royal Protection in Tenth-Century England: the Legal Career of Queen Ælthryth', *Speculum*, 84:2 (2009): 261-288, p. 273.

128 Crick, 'Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity', p. 196.

129 Namely Queen Ælfthryth and Ælfswith, the ealdorman's wife, see S 1485, *Wills*, 9, pp. 21-23. Note, however, that the will of Ælfheah is particularly known for its elaborate imagery of Ælfthryth as Edgar's 'rightful' wife The emphasis placed on Ælfthryth as a 'friend' of Ælfheah may have been another form of underlining her position.

the limitations of research that only focuses on the language of friendship, as the close association of the language of affection and friendship with hierarchy and favour makes it unsuitable for any discussion of female relationships.

A similar conclusion has been reached by David Clark in his research of friendship language in the Old English poetic traditions. He has concluded that friendship terms were embedded in a discourse of lordship, and that subsequently, they were not very suitable for the expression of female bonding.[130] This is where the corpus of wills, as expressions of both formal and informal power, can actually open up another discourse of 'friendship' –relationships based on affection or shared experience– by exploring the networks indicated by the bequests of moveable wealth. Linda Tollerton has shown that the position of churchmen and women shared many similarities, and that these similarities were visible in the types of bequests made in wills: women and churchmen were more likely to bestow movable goods than (lay)men. Tollerton has explained this by looking into the role of moveable wealth in the creation of social identity, as moveable wealth gave both women and churchmen limited freedom to make provisions on their own terms, while simultaneously allowing them to meet their social obligations.[131] The status of women was not necessarily based on land, and moveable wealth could thus express female agency and female status. Moveable wealth equally allowed churchmen to express their identity and to make provisions on their own terms, as landed interests would either stay in their families, or be donated to their communities.[132]

Both women and religious were part of the most vulnerable groups in society and therefore in need of protection of men in power. Religious communities sought protection with the king and magnates of the kingdom and individuals seem to have followed the same practice, as follows from our above conclusions about Æthelsige. However, this equation of women and churchmen does not completely stand, as our research of friendship has revealed that churchmen also derived status and agency from their offices. Religious could thus be observed seeking friendship, as in the will of Bishop Ælfsige, and be sought after as friends, as exemplified by Wulfric's address of Archbishop Ælfric in his search for protection of the community at

---

[130] Clark, *Between Medieval Men*, pp. 33-35.

[131] Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, p. 186.

[132] Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making*, pp. 180-182.

Burton-on-Trent.[133] Where friendship vocabulary could thus be applied with respect to the relationships of (important) churchmen, women in their own right were as good as excluded. However, by tracking bequests of moveable wealth, we should be able to reflect upon female interaction. Bequests cemented friendships, but also family ties. Most bequests, as Tollerton has emphasised, seem to have been of family heirlooms: brooches and clothing that were bequeathed to daughters or granddaughters, adorning the next generation as 'living vessels of display'.[134] Furthermore, household goods such as bed-clothing and tapestries are passed on to the next generation, allowing both sons and daughters to start an independent household. Additionally, armlets and cups are often mentioned, products which would traditionally be used during ceremonies and banquets, displaying family wealth for all to see.[135] Examples of these types of bequests can be found in the will of Wulfwaru.[136] Disposal of moveable wealth was thus also a symbolic act, and part of the tradition and function of will-making, as argued by Timothy Reuter.[137]

However, not all bequests of moveable wealth in wills are handed down to close family members. For example, in the will of Wynflæd (S 1538; 984x1016, probably 984x1001), we find bequests to various women, whose associations with the donor are not clear. Wynflæd makes some traditional bequests to her daughter and granddaughter; after these bequests to identifiable family members, she freely disposes of valuable goods to other women, who receive splendid, and sometimes rather personal, gifts.[138] For example, Ceolthryth is allowed to pick a black tunic to

---

133 S 1491, *New Minster*, 18, p. 82; S 1536, *Charters of Burton Abbey*, 29, p. 55.

134 Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making in*, pp. 202-204.

135 For a discussion of the changes in the display and function of late Anglo-Saxon England, see Robin Fleming, 'The New Wealth, the New Rich and the New Political Style in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *ANS*, 23, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2000 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), 1-22.

136 S 1538, *Bath and Wells*, 21, p. 137: 'And ic geann Godan minre yldran dehter þes landes æt Wunfrod mid mete 7 mid mannum 7 mid eallre tilðe, 7 twegea cuppena on feower pundum 7 anes bendes on ðritigum mancussum goldes 7 twegea preonas 7 anes wifscrudes ealles. And Alfware minre gyngran dehter ic geann ealles þæs wifscrudes þe þer to lafe bið. And Alfware minre gyngran dehter ic geann ealles þæs wifscrudes þe þer to lafe bið. And Wulfmære minum suna 7 Ælfwine minum oðrum suna 7 Alfware minre dehter, heora þreoðra ælcum ic geann twegea cuppena on godum feo. And ic geann Wulfmære minum suna anes heallwahriftes 7 anes beddreafes. Ælfwine minum oðrum suna ic geann anes heallreafes 7 anes burreafes mid beodreafe 7 mid eallum hræglum swa ðer to gebyreð.'

137 Reuter, ''You can't take it with you': Testaments, Hoards and Moveable Wealth in Europe, 600-1000', p. 15

138 Named are Æthelflæd, Ealhhelm's daughter, Ceolthryth, Æthelflæd the White, Wulfflæd, Æthelgifu, Ceolwyn and Eadburg. See S 1539, *Wills*, 3, p. 14.

her own liking, and is promised Wynflæd's best veil and headband ('*an Ceoldryþe hyre blacena tunecena* swa *swa þer hyre leofre beo 7 hyre betsð haliryft 7 hyre betsþan bindan*').[139] These bequests offer us a rare insight into a close-knit female network, in which female servants were also included.[140] Wynflæd's will is exceptionally rich in its imagery, but some further evidence for female interaction can also be found in the will of Ælfgifu (S 1484; 966x975), in which she grants her sister Ælfwaru and her sister-in-law Æthelflæd possessions that she earlier lent to these ladies.[141]

These wills give through the tracking of bequests a rare insight into female interaction, and thus female networks of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England.[142] It demonstrates the gendered nature of tenth-century friendship *language*, and it emphasises its specific use in a hierarchical context of protection and mediation between formal and informal power networks. However, it does not mean that friendship *as a relationship* was gendered; women were part of friendship networks, even of friendship networks defined by the language of friendship. They were just less visible, and often only visible at the receiving end of protection and mediation, just as lesser thegns and people placed within dependant positions such as churchmen. The creation of friendship ties through bequests was equally not a female prerogative; for example, Ælfric Modercope, bequeaths his tent and his best bed-clothes ('*teld 7 min bedreaf þat ic best hauede vt on mi fare mid me*') to Bishop Ælfric (of Elmham?) in S 1490 (probably 1042x1043).[143] Bishop Ælfwold of Crediton promises his kinsman Wulfgar two wall-hangings, two seat-covers and three coats of mail ('*twegra wahryfta 7 twegra setlhrægla 7 þreo byrnan*'), and

---

139 S 1539, *Wills*, 3, p. 14.

140 Wulfwaru is freed to serve whomever she pleases; Wulfflæd is freed upon the condition that she will stay to serve Æthelflæd; and Eadgifu, Ælfhere's daughter is given to the daughter of Ealhhelm.

141 Ælfwaru may keep all possessions lent to her, and Æthelflæd may keep a headband, see S 1484, *Wills*, 8, p. 20.

142 A very different example of female interaction can be found in Ælfric's letter to Edward, in which he complains about the behaviour of women at parties in the countryside. For a discussion and an edition, see Clayton, 'An Edition of Ælfric's Letter to Brother Edward', pp. 263-283.

143 S. 1490, *Wills*, 28, p. 74; for the discussion of his by-name and the identity of bishop Ælfric, see Whitelock, *Wills*, pp. 185-186.

bequeaths to Ordulf a martyrology and a book by Hrabanus Maurus in S 1492 (1008x1012).[144]

This investigation has indicated that we cannot exclude women from the scene. However, their social agency was based on informal power, namely kinship and moveable wealth, rather than formal power. Subsequently they had to seek public, male support to concoct arrangements; these men could be seen as 'translating' female informal influence into male formal power. Pauline Stafford has concluded that the reform movement had marginalised women's negotiation space: women had become more dependent on male support and mediation in settling their affairs, as illustrated by their less active participation in legal actions in the period.[145] This conclusion seems to be affirmed by our examination of the role of friendship as a mechanism that negotiated power and protection by its double-connection to both formal and informal power networks, and of the unsuitability of hierarchical friendships to allow for a discourse of female agency.

3.3.4 Friendship and the limitations of language

Nonetheless, the question remains whether this situation is the result of the ideological orientation of the reform movement, or whether it is just the result of the social changes in the system at large. The fact that not only women, but also other dependent groups in society (religious, lesser thegns) sought the protection of men higher up in the pecking order, seems to suggest that the increasingly complex and layered makeup of society, creating a need for a clear demarcation of boundaries between informal and formal power, was probably the incentive for the greater visibility of this social mechanism –and its documentary representative: the will– in our period of research. Accordingly, it suggests that friendship was not so much gendered as a relationship, but rather that its language was gendered –as rooted in the negotiation of formal and informal power between men– and that its visibility was the result of its applicability in a gendered context, to which we will turn next.

The observations of friendship language in the wills has given an insight into both the function of wills, and in the dimensions of friendship as a relationship in this context. Friendship vocabulary was embedded in a discourse coloured by

---

[144] This Ordulf is most likely King Æthelred's uncle, and Queen Ælfthryth's brother. S 1492, N&S, 10, p. 23-24 and 128-133.

[145] Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', p. 12.

hierarchical dimensions. Men with formal authority –the king, ealdormen– or moral authority –religious communities– witnessed and guaranteed agreements and settlements based on interpersonal relationships. Wills thus allow us to map the interaction between formal and informal power structures, jointly working towards harmony within localities. In this respect, both wills and friendship were instruments for those dependent on protection and mediation for controlling the future; for widows like Æthelgifu and Ælfflæd; for thegns such as Wulfgeat of Donington and Brihtric; but also for clerics, such as Bishop Ælfsige.

This appeal to formal power was often communicated by the use of affectionate language; '*leof*' was both an affectionate address, and an indication of social standing. It is used in situations of hierarchy to mediate a delicate relationship which negotiated protection in return for power. In this respect, the evidence in the wills complements our earlier observations of the use of affectionate language in the royal diplomas. In the diplomas, we have seen how friendship and affection negotiated delicate relationships of commendation: a man who sought it out of free will, was turned into a royal *amicus* in exchange for his submission to the royal authority.[146] The wills reflect an opposite trend: those in need for protection or favours appealed to their superiors with references to affection, based on ties of friendship between the negotiator with both those he was petitioning to, and those he was interceding for. Simultaneously, these conclusions explain why so many wills that reflect the use of friendship languages have been issued by those in need of protection (women, lesser thegns, bishops) and those able to supply this protection; men in power such as, for example, the influential ealdormen Æthelmær and Ælfheah.

Friendship was a relationship that functioned at the crossroads of informal and formal power networks, and its visibility in wills was the result of its connection with both its social power in communities, and of its power within a hierarchical setting. As the kings and their peoples tried to rebalance and renegotiate the power between formal and informal power, both used the appropriate media to communicate their arrangements within both formal and informal settings. The wills turned out to be one of these means for especially those dependent on intercession;

[146] See above, pp. 110-111.

and as a result, wills were more frequently used, offering us a comparatively rich insight into the function of friendship within a discourse of power.

However, our study of friendship in wills has also shows the limitations of research that only focuses on the language of friendship, as the close association of the language of affection and friendship with hierarchy and favour made it unsuitable for any discussion of relationships outside of formal settings. This is where the corpus of wills, as expressions of both formal and informal power, can actually open up another discourse of 'friendship'. Female agency was thoroughly rooted in their informal power, derived from their position in the family. Their affections and bonds can be captured by mapping the exchanges of moveable wealth, demonstrating both the existence of female networks, and the importance of the negotiation of informal power in a society based on interpersonal connections. Moveable wealth and gift-giving were equally important for the maintenance of peace as the more formal, power-based negotiation of friendship. However, relationships without a hierarchical dimension had their own vocabulary, and their own 'language of friendship'. The wills have demonstrated that friendship *as a relationship* was as multi-layered as modern friendship today; yet friendship *language* in the court setting in which charters should be considered was part of a discourse of authority and lordship.

3.4 The negation of formal and informal power in charters

This analysis of friendship discourses in charters has been inspired by Julia Barrow's initial study of this vast corpus, yet has demonstrated that her preliminary findings need to be questioned and to be contextualised in their appropriate social setting and genre. A choice has been made for the study of royal diplomas and wills, as these two types of documentary sources approach the same court discourse of power negotiation from two opposing angles in a correspondence between the king and his dependants. Whereas diplomas allow exploring the royal perspective and royal communication, wills open up some of the undercurrents of the social structure as functional documents reflecting the appeal of dependants to those higher on the social ladder in a nexus of formal/informal and public/private interaction: in this respect, wills and diplomas could be seen as 'talking' to each other, not in a reactive

mood, and not situated in a particular setting, but within the negotiation of social and hierarchical power within late Anglo-Saxon society.

Both diplomas and wills have proven to be documents that received their social and legal authority from the act of witnessing. This created the possibility that these documents were used as demonstrative expressions of power. Despite the fact that diplomas were embedded in the negotiation of power between the king and his dependants, friendship language seems not to have played a role of major importance in the expression of formal power and is only marginally used in the royal diplomas. Simultaneously, friendship seems to have been important in the negotiation between formal and informal power as channelled in the imagery of the wills, and subsequently more prominently used. This relationship was often communicated by using affectionate language, which negotiated favour, loyalty, and status. In this respect, diplomas and wills alike demonstrate that formal and informal power in late Anglo-Saxon England were intimately connected, and that these bonds were expressed through a formalised, court discourses that tried to bend 'authority from above' into an acceptable form of 'authority from within' based on favour, love, and mutual trust through flexible friendship ties. This analysis of the function of friendship fulfils a need at the heart of discourses of power and the negotiation of favour, at the intersection between formal and informal power within late Anglo-Saxon society, and supports the analysis that formal and informal power were intrinsically interlocked as argued by Stephen Baxter based on the power structure of eleventh-century England.[147]

These observations suggest that friendship as a relationship should be predominantly situated within the mediation between social and hierarchical power, based on both informal and formal power: it was used to reflect upon relationships that had both a formal and informal dimension, and, in doing so, *created* and *assumed* a certain allowance, obligation, and reciprocity between those involved. These arrangements were declared in the public setting of the court, but were simultaneously deeply embedded in the 'private' negotiation of informal relationships within the social networks underlying the Anglo-Saxon administration. Our discussion of friendship discourses in these documentary sources thus confirms the earlier conclusions by Eva Österberg and Régine Le Jan, who have argued that

---

147 Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia*, pp. 11-12.

we should reject drawing demarcation lines between public and private spheres of friendship; friendship was a relationship that could be adapted according to its situation, and could be simultaneously private and public, pragmatic and affective, formal and informal.[148]

This multi-applicability and flexible dimension of friendship makes it also a concept that can open gendered dimensions within the negotiation of formal and informal power in late Anglo-Saxon society. The wills have revealed that formal power negotiation was rooted in a male-oriented discourse, using a gendered language to create boundaries between formal and informal power. Subsequently, women needed to 'translate' their social, informal power, through male support in the form of *freondas*, into formal, hierarchical power by using a gendered language of both affection and friendship. This does not make friendship as a relationship gendered. Women were involved in friendships; commonly at the receiving end in a male-female setting, yet involved nonetheless. Friendships outside this protective and hierarchical setting were differently expressed, for example through the disposition of moveable wealth, yet as not many sources have been transmitted exploring this type of evidence, the corpus of wills has provided a unique insight into the 'expression' of this alternative discourse of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England, demonstrating the limiting effect of language within the construction of debates, and terminology as the sole method of research.

[148] Österberg, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics*, pp. 192-193; Le Jan, 'Le Lien Social entre Antiquité et Haut Moyen Âge', pp. 536-537.

CHAPTER 4

Representations of Poetic Friendships

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, three representations of friendship will be discussed, as present in the social imagery of *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, and *The Battle of Maldon* respectively. Attention will be paid to changes in the representation of friendship, the interplay between friendship, kinship, and lordship, and the portrayal of gender. As ties of friendship, kinship, and lordship overlapped, they created dilemmas regarding the prevalence of one bond over another. Friendship has not been discussed in this context; hence, it is a rewarding bond to scrutinise, as it can open up some of the tensions that were inherent in a social system based on personal connections. Although these poems will not offer any insights into the historical setting, as we cannot make historical assumptions based on a literary construction, they may hint at solutions for social concerns within an idealised setting and as such can reflect constructs, models, and social conventions. However, these poetic reflections of values and ideas are not stable; they are directed by the worldview and mindset of their audience, and in this respect, part of an ongoing dialogue between the texts and their readers.[1]

The choice for *Beowulf*, *Brunanburh*, and *Maldon* is directed by the fact that all three poems are situated in an aristocratic world and therefore present a constant social environment to scrutinise the representation of friendship. The aristocratic milieu is, however, also affected by change: whereas *Beowulf* is situated at the court, *Brunanburh* and *Maldon* are situated in the field. Consequently, these poems also offer a chance to examine the importance of the social stage in the representation of friendship within constructs of bonding. *Brunanburh* and *Maldon* originate from our period of research, and as such are important sources for further contextualisation of

---

[1] Roberta Frank, 'Germanic Legend in Old English Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 88-106, pp. 97-98; Carol Braun Pasternack, *The Textuality of Old English Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 18-19, 22-24.

the period. Additionally, these poems demonstrate a continuity in form and style with the older heroic tradition, a literary technique which has been defined by Elizabeth Tyler as "the aesthetics of the familiar".[2] Through the use of conventional formulas and imagery, the poets have created a link between the heroic worlds depicted in the older traditions of *Beowulf*, *Waldere*, *Deor* and *Widsith*, and the tenth-century memory of these two battles, resonating past traditions while establishing new poetic conventions.[3]

The use of heroic models demonstrates the lasting appeal of older traditions, and subsequently proposes a first reason for the examination of *Beowulf's* imagery as our most sophisticated and socially rich representative of these older models.[4] An examination of *Beowulf* is further justified by the fact that our only surviving copy of the poem dates from *c.* 1000, as will be discussed in further detail below.[5] This analysis is in this respect indebted to modern scholarly approaches, which have focused on the study of stable poetic conventions and the intermingling of poetic genres. These approaches have often focused on certain social constructs –such as *comitatus* and the *mead hall*–, which have been used as a point of reference for mapping social conventions.[6] A similar approach can be adopted for the study of

---

2 Elizabeth M. Tyler, *Old English Poetics. The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2006), pp. 150-152; for a discussion of this mechanism in the imagery of *Maldon* and *Brunanburh*, see Elizabeth M. Tyler, 'Poetics and the Past: Making History with Old English Poetry', in *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 225-250, pp. 226-227.

3 Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, p. 153; see also Roberta Frank, 'The Battle of Maldon and Heroic Literature', in *The Battle of Maldon*, *AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 196-207, p. 198.

4 For the embedment of *Beowulf* in a larger framework of a circulating, interwoven legendary tradition, see the discussion in Frank, 'Germanic Legend in Old English Literature', pp. 88-89, 98-100.

5 *Beowulf* survives in only one copy as part of the eleventh-century Nowell Codex, and is written in the hands of two scribes; for a detailed description of the history and construction of the codex, see Kevin S. Kiernan, *Beowulf and the Beowulf Manuscript*. *Revised Edition* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), chap. 2, esp. pp. 120-132. For a discussion of a production date of our surviving copy at *c.* 1000, see David N. Dumville, 'Beowulf Comes Lately: Some Notes on the Palaeography of the Nowell Codex', *Archiv fur das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 225.1 (1988): 49-63, pp. 50 and 58; and D. N. Dumville, 'The *Beowulf*-Manuscript and How not to Date It,' *Medieval English Studies Newsletter*, 39 (1998): 21-27, pp. 26-27.

6 As, for example, in Roberta's Frank groundbreaking revision of the importance of 'dying with their lord' as an early reference to an emerging vassalage system rather than a connection to an imaginary Germanic past, see Frank, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with their Lord', pp. 95-106. Richard Abels has duly underlined the problems with looking at the Maldon warriors as a reference to the Tacitan *comitatus*, but then focuses on the military

friendship within a larger conception of society: while friendship is not necessarily a stable bond in itself, research into its representation in poetic texts can reflect a certain use of the bond within idealised poetic imagery. By mapping the various poetic reflections of friendship, and discussing these models within their social landscape, we will be able to perceive the various discourses of which friendship imagery was a part.

All sources investigated in this study use conventions for the positioning of friendship within a social imagery and our poems are not different. Hence, poetic sources enable us to scrutinise the idealised imagery rendered important by the élite and, in this sense, complement rather than supplement the discourses of friendship as found in our legal and documentary sources. Moreover, as these three poems are not connected with the monastic movement of the tenth century and as they are not necessarily connected to the formal negotiation of power, they are another point of entry for discussing models of friendship within late Anglo-Saxon élite culture, offering another exciting piece of the puzzle that was late Anglo-Saxon friendship.

In the following, the three poems will be discussed consecutively, opening up three different representations of friendship and social conduct. *Beowulf* will allow us to map the language of friendship, positioning the bond within the negotiation of power in a court setting. *Beowulf* is the exception, as friendship vocabulary is only marginally utilised in the social imagery of *Brunanburh* and *Maldon.* This created a need to discuss friendship within a wider context of social bonding and changing manifestations of social conduct to explore this diminished presence of the bond. It will be argued that friendship lost its attraction for the representation of hierarchical bonds within the imagery of the late Anglo-Saxon battlefield poems, and as such open up some of the concerns and anxieties prevalent in social discourses of this period. Additionally, the combined imagery of these three poems will enable us to comment on the importance of the social stage in the presentation of friendship and on the connection between the visibility of friendship language and women.

---

organisation and importance as represented 'in the language of the *comitatus*' of this *fyrd* for interpreting the connections represented, see Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 146-148. A similar approach with respect to the *mead hall* as an all-embracing social construct, preserving communal life and social harmony is found in Hugh Magennis' study of communal life, see Magennis, *Images of Community*, pp. 69-71.

4.2 Beowulf – the lasting resonance of the heroic past

4.2.1 Beowulf – a model of the past

Beowulf is probably the most researched Anglo-Saxon text of the poetic corpus, yet despite an overwhelming interest in its social imagery, no one so far has made a close study of the portrayed models of friendship.[7] Although *Beowulf* was copied in *c.* 1000, scholars have generally accepted an early eighth-century composition date, as convincingly put forward by Michael Lapidge and Robert Fulk. [8] Furthermore, the poet positions his narrative plainly in a remote past, deliberately distancing its imagery from any connection with its audience's present. Hence, the encountered imagery is presenting itself as part of an archaic tradition, turning to a heroic age and a lost world. Consequently, the models and social imagery as transmitted in our copy do not have a direct connection to social discourses as circulating in the late tenth and early eleventh century, but may have been considered valuable all the same for its preservation and manifestation of past ideals. Additionally, the models of conduct and behaviour as transmitted in *Beowulf* are testimony to a wider literary tradition, which seemed to have held a lasting appeal for an Anglo-Saxon audience as attested by the conventional imagery in *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*.[9]

The identification of this late Anglo-Saxon audience is problematic. Eric Stanley has convincingly argued that this copy was probably produced in a production centre outside of the circle of Benedictine communities, implying that its social imagery and discourses should be considered part of a discourse of bonding

---

7 For example, Hugh Magennis has examined the central role of order and harmony in *Beowulf* through a careful mapping of poetic tropes and vigilant analysis of the impact of loyalty, betrayal, order, and lordship in his important study of community and harmony in Anglo-Saxon England. However, friendship is not considered an essential part of this construction, and is barely mentioned, see Magennis, *Images of Community*.

8 Michael Lapidge, 'The Archetype of *Beowulf*', *ASE*, 29 (2000): 5-41, pp. 34-36, supported by metrical evidence as presented by R. D. Fulk, see R. D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), p. 390. Opposing voices favouring a later date can still be heard, for an overview see Roberta Frank, 'A Scandal in Toronto: *The Dating of Beowulf* a Quarter Century on', *Speculum*, 82.4 (2007): 843-864, pp. 853-854. The best introduction to the dating problems in Beowulf is still found in the various contributions of *The Dating of Beowulf*, ed. by Colin Chase, Toronto Old English Series, 6 (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 1981). Two additional influential theses can be found in Dorothy Whitelock, *The Audience of Beowulf* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951) and Patrick Wormald, 'Bede, Beowulf and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy', in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England. Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. by Robert T. Farrell, BAR, 46 (Oxford: BAR, 1978), 32-69, pp. 50-53.

9 Frank, 'Germanic Legend in Old English Literature', pp. 88-89.

and power negotiation outside of this monastic circle.[10] Yet this does not identify its audience as either lay or religious; both laymen and religious may have had access to the imagery, with recitals and public readings as alternative methods of dissemination.[11] *Beowulf* can thus not be pinned down as either a 'secular' or 'religious' product, and drawing boundaries between the two spheres is undesirable, since cultural interaction between the two worlds was extensive and both shared similar interests and values.[12] The poem's position at a cross-over point of traditions partly explains the interplay between heroic themes and Christian values; various traditions are intentionally interlaced, creating a binary text of contrasts and parallels, traditional symbolism, and narrative elements.[13] *Beowulf*'s social stage is situated in an aristocratic and court setting, and its audience –courtiers, warriors and religious– may have identified with certain motifs and features of the poem. However, this does not mean that this recognition was seen as part of a contemporary setting, but rather that these models were still considered in need of preservation, as a reaction to the changing, increasingly complex world that threatened older ways of life and social bonding.

In the following section, a close study of the available models of friendships in *Beowulf* will be presented in order to map some of the bonds that were instilled in its social imagery. Mapping the social imagery as prevalent in *Beowulf* will open up some models of friendship and social conduct rooted in the past. These models may not have had a direct relevance for a tenth-century audience, but they may serve as a

---

10 Eric Stanley, 'The Date of *Beowulf*: Some Doubts and No Conclusions', in *The Dating of Beowulf*, ed. by Colin Chase, Toronto Old English Series, 6 (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 1981), 197-211, p. 210.

11 Kelly, 'Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word', pp. 61-62; Patrick Wormald, 'Anglo-Saxon Society and its Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-22, p. 18; John D. Niles, 'Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History', *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 13-58, pp. 15-16.

12 Wormald, 'Bede, Beowulf and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy', p. 67.

13 For a discussion of these elements, see Peter Clemoes, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 223; Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, *A New Critical History of Old English Literature* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1986), p. 139; Andy Orchard, *A Critical Companion to Beowulf* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003), pp. 130-169; and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'Heroic Values and Christian Ethics', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 107-125, p. 117.

representation of some of the social discourses in circulation in earlier poetic traditions. Friendship is presented as an important medium for establishing social bonds in *Beowulf*'s social imagery and is embedded in a layered construction of bonds of dependency and interdependency.

Firstly, attention will be paid to the use of *wine* and *freond* in *Beowulf*'s social imagery, as the poem offers us an opportunity to examine these two words within a social context. It will be argued that *wine* is rooted in the bond negotiating authority between a lord and his followers, whereas *freond* is defined by interdependency and therefore suitable for negotiating bonds amongst people of all social standing. This analysis will subsequently be tested against the evidence of two relationships portrayed in *Beowulf* in particular, namely the bond between Beowulf and Hrothgar, and between Hrothgar and Æschere. Secondly, a brief exploration of *Beowulf*'s ambivalent depiction of friendship, and relationships based on personal bonds in general, will be presented as this will prove to be essential for the contextualisation of the social imagery found in the late Anglo-Saxon battlefield poems. And thirdly, attention will be paid to the use of friendship language in the portrayal of relationships between men and women, presenting further evidence for the assumption that friendship increased the visibility of women in medieval sources and urging for a more nuanced conception of the 'gendered' use of language in situations of formal and informal power negotiation.

4.2.3 Friendship, affection, and gendered discourses

In the society painted in *Beowulf*, kinship and lordship ties interfere and interact with friendship, competing for loyalty and the fulfilment of obligations. This intermingling of bonds is the result of the flexibility and active function implied in the tie: friendship is not a given, but a negotiated bond between two persons or groups. The *Beowulf* poet shows an appreciation of the infringing connotation of the bond, and of the problems that could arise from the entanglement of these various grounds of obligation, through a precise use of language. However, as a study of all forms of bonding in the poem is beyond the scope of this analysis, this discussion will focus on the use of *wine* and *freond*, opening up a layered construction of bonds of dependency and interdependency.

Wine and *freond* can both be translated as 'friend' in modern English as we have discussed in chapter one, but both words are used in different ways in the

imagery of *Beowulf*.[14] The distinction in use is partly rooted in vernacular traditions: *wine* had poetic resonance, was marked as an archaic word and recognised as such by an Anglo-Saxon audience, whereas *freond* is less common in poetry and more often found in prose.[15] The examination of these two concepts will thus expose two different models of friendship, which may both have influenced ideas of friendship and models of behaviour in later times. The imagery of *Beowulf* offers an opportunity to explore the connotations of both terms in a poetic context, which may shed light on the suitability of *freond* –and the unsuitability of *wine*– for later use in legal sources and a social setting; not because the traditions are necessarily interrelated, but because they reveal ideas, discourses, and notions associated with both concepts which may have influenced later discourses. If we compare all entries on *wine* with *freond* in the poem, a contrast can be drawn in the context in which both words are used, as is schematically summarised in the two tables on the following page:[16]

---

14 See chap. 1, pp. 13-19.

15 For a general idea about the occurrence of both words, a general search in the Old English Corpus reveals that only the hits in the poetic corpus (category A) of *wine* are used in a context in which it means either ‘friend’ or ‘lord’. Apart from the occurrences in poetry, only a couple of prose hits can be established: *trumwine*, in Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, ed. by Malcolm Godden, *Ælfric*’*s Catholic Homilies. The Second Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), x, p. 88:245; *þurgwine* in S 342, *Shaftesbury*, 6, p. 24; *Westseaxena wine* in *ASC* D, A.D. 975, p. 46, and *ASC* E, A.D. 975, p. 59; *wiðrewine* in *ASE* E for 1124, p. 125; and two references in the glosses of Aldhelm, in which *wine* is glossed as a translation for *amator*, see *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels*, *Royal Library*, *1650* (Aldhelm’s De laudibus virginitatis), ed. by Louis Goossens, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der letteren, 36.74 (Brussel: Paleis der Academiën, 1974), 4167, p. 418; and *Old English Glosses: Chiefly Unpublished*, ed. by Arthur S. Napier, Anecdota Oxoniensia, 11 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900), 1, 4292, p. 112. In contrast, *freond* is common in prose texts, yet less common in poetry. See our discussion in chapter one, based on results of the *DOEC.*

16 All citations are taken from *Beowulf*, ed. by Frederick Klaeber, in *Klaeber*’*s Beowulf*, ed. by R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, 4th edn (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2009) (hereafter *Beowulf*), and all translations are taken from *Beowulf: A New Verse Translation*, trans. by R. M. Liuzza (Peterborough Ontario and Letchworth: Broadview, 2000).

Table 1: ***Wine*** **in context in** ***Beowulf***

Reference (in varied spellings)	**Total**	**Context**	**Occurrences (line numbers)**
wine Scyldinga	7	lordship, dependency	30b, 148a, 1183a, 1418a, 2026b, 2101b.
wine Deniga	1	lordship, dependency	350b
winedryhten	4	lordship, dependency	360b, 862a, 2722a, 3175a
freowine folca	3	lordship, dependency	430a, 2357a, 2429a
freawine	1	lordship, dependency	2438a
goldwine gumena	3	lordship, dependency	1171a, 1476a, 1602a
goldwine Geata	2	lordship, dependency	2419a, 2584a
guðwine	2	war, battle	1810a, 2735a
winia bealdor	1	war, battle	2567a
winigea leasum	1	need for protection	1664a
wineleasum	1	need for protection	2613a
winemæg	1	kinship, lordship	65b
mægwine	1	kinship, lordship	2479a
wine (direct address)	4	reverence/respect based on dependency?	457b, 530b, 1704b, 2047a
wine	2	lordship, dependency?	376b, 3096b
Total	**34**		

Table 2: ***Freond*** **in context in** ***Beowulf***

Reference (in varied spellings)	**Total**	**Context**	**Occurrences (line numbers)**
freond	1	protection, support	915a
freond	1	association, peace	1018a
freond	2	referring to kin and/or followers	1306a, 1385a
freond	2	goodwill, support (in situations of exile)	1838a, 2393a
freond (contrasted with *feond*)	1	association, inclusion	1864a
freondscipe	1	peace created through an actively forged bond	2069a
freondlicor	1	benevolence	1027a
freondlaþu	1	invitation to enter a bond	1192b
freondlarum	1	support, counsel	2377b
Total	**12**		

If we contextualise the above-listed evidence according to its social setting, it is clear that both *freond* and *wine* predominantly functioned within the social environment of the heroic courts, rather than within battle scenes. This is a first indication for an

interpretation of friendship as a layered relationship, which mediated complex ties within an intricate environment. This suggestion will be further explored in our examination of the relationships between Beowulf and Hrothgar, and Hrothgar and Æschere below.

Additionally, this overview suggests that *wine* is commonly used in situations in which hierarchical ties are defined in terms of dependency, describing a prearranged rather than an actively negotiated bond. This is apparent from those situations in which *wine* is part of the combination *winedryhten* ('gracious lord'), but also when it is used to identify the lord of a people. For example, the first instance of '*wine Scyldinga*', portraying Scyld, is embedded in language which emphasises his status as a ruler: he is also a '*leof landfruma*' ('beloved land-chief'), a '*leofne þeoden*' ('beloved ruler'), and a '*beaga bryttan*' ('ring-giver'). His companions are referred to as his '*gesiþas*', a standard term for 'retainer' in a hierarchical setting.[17] A vertical dimension to the interpretation of *wine* is also implied in the combination '*goldwine*', which indicates the ability of the addressee to reward followers in exchange for favours. This use can be observed in Wealhtheow's reference to Beowulf as '*goldwine gumena*' ('goldfriend of men'), in which she reminds him of his duty to reward his followers graciously.[18] However, this close connection between friendship and authority based on dependency also implies a certain inflexibility: being a *wine* seems to be presented as a fixed status, and to indicate a hierarchical lord with the duty to remunerate his followers.

Conversely, *freond* is used to refer to the active acts of providing or channelling support, favours, loyalty, and goodwill, and seems to be multi-applicable, flexible, and negotiable. For example, *freond* is used to refer to Hygelac's kinsman ('*mæg Higelaces*'), who is said to be a more pleasant friend ('*freondum gefægra*') in the eyes of Heremod's people, the Scyldings, who had exiled their ruler for his crimes. In this context, *freond* should be understood as either 'supporter' or 'protector', against Heremod's anticipated revenge.[19] The Scyldings and Hygelac's kinsman are in this situation interdependent; they share an interest and actively create an association with each other. A similar example can be found in Eadgils' alliance

---

17 *Beowulf*, 31a; 34b; 35a; 29a, p. 4.

18 *Beowulf*, 1171a; 1173a-1174b, p. 41.

19 *Beowulf*, 913b-915b, p. 32.

with Beowulf, at the end of the poem. The exile becomes Beowulf's *freond* based on the shared interest of both men to depose Onela, who earlier deprived Eadgils from his birthright and who murdered Beowulf's lord, Hygelac's son Heardred.[20] Eadgils gains a powerful friend, yet the use of *freond* indicates that both men were considered united by their shared wish for revenge, and as such of an equal social standing. A third example can be found in the forged alliance ('*freondscipe*') between the Heathobards and the Danes, which is sealed with a marriage between Ingeld and Freawaru.[21] The use of *freondscipe* seems to establish equality between the two parties, based on the mutual interest of securing harmony, and to indicate the active negotiation underlying the agreement.

These examples seem to indicate that the concepts of *freond* and *freondscipe* are embedded in a setting of interdependency, and can be used to down-play hierarchical obligations in terms of reciprocity and equality. Accordingly, the concepts are not necessarily hierarchical in *Beowulf*'s social imagery, and can be used to refer to formal bonds based on dependency, and to social bonds rooted in interdependency and kinships. This assumption can be further tested in the portrayal of the chain-reaction of vengeance between Grendel's mother and Heorot, in which both Grendel, as son of his mother (a horizontal bond based on kinship), and Æschere, retainer of Hrothgar (a vertical association based in a hierarchical setting), are indicated by the use of *freondas*:

> 'Ne wæs gewrixle til,
> þæt hie on ba healfa bicgan scoldon
> freonda feorum.'[22]

The difference between the two terms can be further explored by a comparison of their use in situations of exile and travelling, which create situations of dependency as those who roam the earth need hospitality and protection. This also provides our first case study, as the relationship of Hrothgar and Beowulf is particularly revealing for understanding the different connotations of both *wine* and *freond* in the poem's social imagery. Beowulf is in need of hospitality upon his arrival at Hrothgar's hall. When his coming is announced, Hrothgar contemplates:

---

20 *Beowulf*, 2391a-2396b, p. 82; for the back story, see *Beowulf*, 2379b-2390b, p. 82,

21 *Beowulf*, 2067a-2069a, p. 70.

22 *Beowulf*, 1304b-1306a, p. 45: 'That was no good exchange, that those on both sides should have to bargain with the lives of friends.'

> ‘Ic hine cuðe cnihtwesende;
> wæs his ealdfæder Ecgþeo haten,
> ðæm to ham forgeaf Hreþel Geata
> angan dohtor; is his eaforan nu
> heard her cumen, sohte holdne wine.’[23]

Beowulf is dependent upon Hrothgar’s goodwill, seeking hospitality and protection and is therefore looking in Hrothgar for a *wine* (‘*sohte holdne wine*’). In this setting, *wine* seems to be used similarly as ‘*winigea leasum*’ and ‘*wineleasum*’ in later instances, which are used to describe ‘friendless’ men in need in trying times.[24] Hrothgar’s depiction as *wine* seems thus to be used to portray Beowulf’s dependency upon arrival. This situation of need is probably rooted in the old bond of dependency which had been established between Hrothgar and Beowulf’s father Ecgtheow in former days.[25] Ecgtheow had been received at Hrothgar’s court after being pressed into exile as the result of a conflict (‘*fæhðe*’) with the Wylfings. Hrothgar stepped in on his behalf and paid off (‘*feo*’) the Wylfings, while offering Ecgtheow protection in exchange for oaths of fealty (‘*aþas*’).[26]

Hence, Beowulf’s reliance on Hrothgar’s goodwill is determined by the balance of power created between Hrothgar and Ecgtheow, as also follows from Beowulf’s reaction to an assumed obligation to offer support to Hrothgar, when in need.[27] Additionally, it could be argued that Beowulf’s future also depends on Hrothgar’s reception: if he is not received in favour, and will not fulfil his boast, he will lose his honour. The use of *wine* to indicate Hrothgar therefore proposes a certain distance between the parties involved, suggesting an interpretation as a formal and hierarchical relationship, rooted in traditional conduct.

---

23 *Beowulf*, 372a-376b, pp. 14-15: ‘I knew him when he was nothing but a boy – his old father was called Ecgtheow, to whom Hrethel the Geat gave in marriage his only daughter; now his daring son has come here, sought a loyal friend.’

24 *Winigea leasum:* Beowulf refers in this reference to God, as the one who will always help people without friends. Beowulf is ‘friendless’ at this moment, as his protection –the sword Hrunting- has just failed to live up to expectations and he now finds himself facing Grendel’s mother with his bare hands, see *Beowulf*, 1659a-1664b, p. 56. *Wineleasum*: Eadmund, exiled from Onela’s court, is killed in battle, as he did not secure any protection, see *Beowulf*, 2612b-2619b, p. 89.

25 Hrothgar refers to past deeds (*fyhtum*) and support (*arstafum*) offered to Ecgtheow, *Beowulf*, 457a-458a, p. 18.

26 *Beowulf*, 457a-472b, p. 18.

27 *Beowulf*, 198b-201b, p. 9.

The difference between *wine* and *freond* is further illustrated by noting the redefinition of the relationship between Beowulf and Hrothgar after Beowulf's fulfilment of his boast to protect Heorot against Grendel.[28] As we have seen, their bond is originally determined by Ecgtheow's earlier *aþas*. The bond between Beowulf and Hrothgar is that of a lord and his retainer, further emphasised by the consecutive use of *wine* in direct addresses.[29] This situation changes after Beowulf's heroic deeds and seems to be liable to an active redefinition. With his actions, Beowulf has not only fulfilled his own boast, but has also lived up to his father's promises. He has proven himself worthy, and subsequently Hrothgar offers Beowulf a friendship ('*freod*') on his own terms. In doing so, the king seems to release the warrior from his father's pledge, while accepting him as a more equal partner based on his proven ability to provide solace ('*frofre*') and support ('*helpe*').[30]

It is especially noteworthy for our discussion that this redefinition is also linguistically marked: after this sequence of events, affectionate language and demonstrative behaviour are all of a sudden part of the portrayal of the relationship between Hrothgar and Beowulf. This is nowhere more clear than at Beowulf's departure, which is marked with an overt display of emotions and affection:

> 'Gecyste þa cyning æþelum god,
> þeoden Scyldinga, ðegn betstan
> ond be healse genam; hruron him tearas,
> blondenfeaxum. Him wæs bega wen,
> ealdum infrodum, oþres swiðor,
> þæt hie seoððan no geseon moston,
> modige on meþle. Wæs him se man to þon leof,
> þæt he þone breostwylm forberan ne mehte;
> ac him on hreþre hygebendum fæst
> æfter deorum men dyrne langað
> beorn wið blode.'[31]

---

[28] For Beowulf's promise and formal boast, see *Beowulf*, 432b, p. 17; 632a-638b, p. 23.

[29] *Beowulf*, 376b, p. 15; 457b, p. 18; 1704b, p. 57.

[30] *Beowulf*, 1705b-1709b, p. 58. *Freod* is not commonly used to depict friendship in its own right in Old English poetry, and is rather referring to an absence of hostilities or to divine goodwill. See *Beowulf*, 2476b, p. 85; 2556, p. 87, and compare, for instance, with *Vainglory*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 69a; *Andreas*, ed. by George Philip Krapp, *The Vercelli Book*, ASPR, 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 3-51, 390b, p. 13. Note the emphasis on the combination of strength and wisdom, which are two traditional characterisations of Christian kingship.

[31] *Beowulf*, 1870a-1880a, p. 63: 'Then the good king, of noble kin, kissed that best of thanes and embraced his neck, the Scylding prince; tears were shed by that grey-haired man. He was of two minds – but in his old wisdom knew it was more likely that never again would they see one another, brave in the meeting-place. The man was so dear to him that he could not

The representation of Hrothgar's 'secret longing' ('*dyrne langað*') for his '*deorum men*' reminds us of Stephen Jaeger's assessment of the passionate love between the twelfth-century kings Richard Lionheart of England and Philip Augustus of France: Jaeger has argued that affection and desire functioned as markers of special favour, negotiating aristocratic behaviour through the use of an 'ennobling' display of love.[32] The observed change in the grounds on which the relationship between Beowulf and Hrothgar is based introduces another dimension to Jaeger's idea of 'ennobling love': affectionate language is not only a marker of desired behaviour, but could also create a *freondscipe*, a concept that elevates the status of the association.

Interdependency and reciprocity were thus essential for the creation of a more balanced relationship between two associates, as exemplified by Beowulf and Hrothgar. It also had a wider appeal within the conception of society, as it also extended to their associates, as characterised in *Beowulf* by the inclusion of the Danes and Geats within this bond as established between their representatives.[33] This is apparent from the use of '*leofa*', which replaces *wine* in direct addresses.[34] Both *wine* and *leof* are thus used formally in these examples, but whereas the first indicates a relationship based on dependency, the second refers to the more equal bond of interdependency. These observations with respect to the concept of *freond* and affectionate language in *Beowulf* do not stand alone: they confirm our earlier assumptions with respect to the use of friendship language and affectionate modes in the lawcodes, in which these ideas created a benign relationship based on reciprocity and interdependency.[35]

The more equal nature of a bond based on interdependency is further ingrained in *Beowulf*'s imagery in other situations of exile and hospilitality. For example, Beowulf promises Hrothgar that his son Hrethic will find '*fela freonda*' at

---

hold back the flood in his breast, but in his heart, fast in the bonds of his thought, a deep-felt longing for the dear man burned in his blood.'

32 Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 11-13, 18. For a different explanation of this imagery of 'homosocial desire' in terms of drawing attention to matters of succession, see Clark, *Between Medieval Men*, pp. 132-137.

33 *Beowulf*, 1853a-1865b, pp. 62-63.

34 *Beowulf*, 1758b; 1854b, p. 62. Beowulf has already used *leofa* once to address Hrothgar, when asking for his reward, the prelude to the establishment of their *freod*, see *Beowulf*, 1483a, p. 51.

35 See above, chap. 2, pp. 74-76.

Hygelac's court in future, after having entered aforesaid bond of friendship ('*freod*') with the king. Hrethic's future reception by potential *freondas* is fortified by Beowulf's acceptance of gifts from the king's wife Wealhtheow, given to ascertain this 'friendly invitation' ('*freondlaþu*').[36] Again, we can observe how the terms of hospitality are determined for the younger generation by an earlier bond established by their parents. Hrethric's future welcome is, in contrast to Beowulf's approach of Hrothgar's court, based on interdependency rather than dependency as sealed by an exchange of favours and promises towards this end.

The bonds between Ecgtheow and Hrothgar, Hrothgar and Beowulf, and Beowulf and Hrethric allow us to follow a relationship of friendship over a couple of generations. This has resulted in the conclusion that relationships of friendship are presented as being hereditary in *Beowulf*'s imagery. Furthermore, we can actually see the striking difference between the concept *wine* and the concept *freond* within the social imagery of the poem in the marked redefinition of the association between Hrothgar and Beowulf. These observations are extremely valuable for our understanding of both *wine* and *freond* as semantic terms within poetic imagery: *wine* has occurred as being a bond rooted in the hierarchical dimensions of a bond between a lord and his retainer, whereas *freond* is solidly positioned at the intersection between formal and informal power, between a variety of social ties, varying from kinship to bonds based on hierarchy. Most of all, however, *freond* has proven to be rooted in both reciprocity and interdependency, and bonds between *freondas* seems to have been communicated by using an ennobling language of both favour and affection in *Beowulf*'s imagery.

These ideas can be further explored by examining the portrayal of the bond between Hrothgar and Æschere, which is marked by a lavish display of love and the use of affectionate language. Æschere is said to have been Hrothgar's 'most beloved follower' ('*hæleþa leofost on gesiðes*'), his most prominent thegn ('*aldorþegn*'), and his special favourite ('*deorestan*').[37] This rich depiction of Æschere is embedded in an episode describing his murder by Grendel's mother, who abducted Æschere in revenge for her son's death. The imagery and emotion used to express Hrothgar's

---

36 *Beowulf*, 1834a-1838a, p. 62; 1707a, p. 58; 1192b, p. 42.

37 *Beowulf*, 1296b-1297a, p. 45; 1308a, p. 46; 1309a, p. 46.

sorrow is unmatched in the poem and seems to underline Æschere's special position at Hrothgar's court:

> 'Ne frin þu æfter sælum; sorh is geniwod
> Degea leodum: Dead is Æschere
> Yrmenlafes yldra broþor
> min runwita ond min rædbora
> eaxlgestealla, ðonne we on orlege
> hafelan weredon, þonne hniton feþan
> eoferas cnysedan. Swylc scolde eorl wesan
> æþeling ærgod, swylc Æschere wæs.'[38]

Based on the evidence of the Anglo-Saxon lawcodes, it has been suggested in the above that *freond* and *freondscipe* implied a formal relationship between the king and his officials in a tenth-century setting.[39] Although the imagery of *Beowulf* does not provide historical proof for this suggestion, the portrayal of the bond of Æschere and Hrothgar seems to supply a model which reflects a similar bond between a king and a loyal follower. Æschere is twice referred to as the king's *freond*, and the possibility for a formal interpretation of this bond can be established with a more detailed study of his depiction as *runwita*, *rædbora*, and *eaxlgestealla*.[40]

Runwita ('knower of secrets') and *eaxlgestealla* ('shoulder-companion'), rare words which occur only in poetic traditions, emphasise Æschere's position as the king's confidant and close associate.[41] In contrast, *rædbora* is a more common term in both poetic and prose traditions: it is glossed in Latin as *consiliaris* or *iuriperitus*; it is evoked in texts depicting God as councillor and Jesus as mediator; and it illustrates the interceding role of both worldly and ecclesiastical leaders.[42]

---

[38] *Beowulf*, 1322a-1329b, p. 46: 'Ask not for joys! Sorrow is renewed, for the Danish people: Æschere is dead, elder brother of Yrmenlaf, my confidant and my councillor, my shoulder-companion in every conflict when we defended our heads when the foot soldiers clashed and struck boar-helmets. As a nobleman should be, always excellent, so Æschere was!'

[39] See above, chap. 2, pp. 74-75; this can be furthered by some suggestions as found in the royal diplomas with respect to *amicus*, see above, chap. 3, pp. 108-111.

[40] For reference to Æschere as *freond*, see *Beowulf*, 1306a, p. 45; 1385a, p. 48

[41] *Runwita* only occurs in *Guthlac B*, in which it is used to comment on the saint's wisdom and knowledge of the faith, see *Guthlac B*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 1094a-1095b: *Eaxlgestealla* appears another time in *Beowulf* to describe Heremod's comrade-in-arms, see *Beowulf*, 1714a, p. 58. Furthermore, it is used in Cynewulf's Elene, see *Elene*, ed. by P. O. E. Gradon, *Cynewulf's Elene*, Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies, 2nd edn (Exeter: Exeter University Press; 1996), 64a, p. 29. Finally, *eaxlgestealla* is used in the *Exeter Riddles*, indicating its close association with a court environment, see *Riddles*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 79: 1-3.

[42] For the judging and mediating role of God, for example, see *The Lord's Prayer II*, ed. by Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ASPR, 6 (New York: Columbia

Consequently, *rædbora* seems to be associated with a special social standing within a social organisation, and in prose traditions with office-holding in particular.[43] Hence, the use of *rædbora* seems to offer further ground for an interpretation of *freond* in a tenth-century context as a special royal officer. This suggestion can be strengthened with evidence from Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, in which being a *rædbora* is aligned with being a *freond* in an interpretation of John 15:15.[44] These observations do not necessitate a reading of Æschere as a royal agent in *Beowulf*'s social setting, but his special position at Hrothgar's court could easily be interpreted as such by a tenth-century audience.

Thomas Hill has also paid attention to the representation of Æschere as *runwita*, *rædbora* and *eaxlgestealla*, connecting it with the social imagery of *consilium et auxilium*, which would become a widespread formula to represent the obligations of 'feudal' ties in later days.[45] Correctly, Hill has suggested the characterisation of Æschere as Hrothgar's '*hæleþa leofost on gesiðes*' be viewed in legal and political terms, suggesting an interpretation of this bond as a reflection of a new 'lordship formula'.[46] The friendship between Hrothgar and Æschere is portrayed as a benign bond based on favour between a lord and his retainer, expressed in affectionate language and illustrated by a display of emotions and this model may have inspired later discussions of the bond between a king and his followers, as encountered in the lawcodes. Hrothgar and Æschere offers an idealised model, rather than a reflection of practice, and may have provided a suitable vocabulary to fashion

---

University Press, 1942), pp. 70-74, 35a-38b, pp. 71-72; Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, i: 179, p. 8. For the mediating role of worldly and ecclesiastical rulers, see for example, *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, ed. by Donald Scragg, EETS, o.s. 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), xi: 95, p. 225.

43 Also, compare the bilingual Ely foundation charter in which *rædbora* is rendered as *a secretis*, see compare S 779, *Charters* (R), 48, pp. 98-100 (Old English version), with S 779, Kemble, 3, 563, p. 57. This occurrence will be explored in further detail below, when considering the role of bishop Æthelwold in Edgar's administration. See below, chap. 5, pp. 201-203.

44 *Rædbora* is an addition by Ælfric. Compare: Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, xxxv, p. 300:39-42: 'Ne hate ic eow ðeowan. for ðan þe se ðeowa nat hwæt his hlaford deð; ne nymð se hlaford his ðeowan him to rædboran. Ac nimð his holdan frynd. And him geopenað his willan' with John 15:15: 'iam non dico vos servos quia servus nescit quid facit dominus eius vos autem dixi amicos quia omnia quaecumque audivi a Patre meo nota feci vobis.'

45 *Beowulf*, 1296b-1297a, p. 45. Thomas D. Hill, '*Consilium et Auxilium* and the Lament for Æschere', in *The Haskins Society Journal*, 12, ed. by Stephen Morillo (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 71-82, pp. 73-74.

46 Hill, '*Consilium et Auxilium* and the Lament for Æschere', pp. 74-75, 79-80.

new forms of bonding at a later date, without demanding a direct link between the ideal and reality. Ultimately, the *Beowulf* poet provided his audience, including us, a discourse with a possible wider resonance, which allows us to reflect upon the reuse of traditional imagery.

The bond between Æschere and Hrothgar offers another reason for the change in the relationship between Hrothgar and Beowulf. After Æschere's death, Hrothgar is carried away by his grief. Beowulf needs to remind him of his duty to take revenge pointing out that it is better to avenge a *freond*, than to mourn overmuch.[47] It could be argued that Beowulf partly established his moral worth and his ability to provide comfort, and therefore his equality with the old king, by taking revenge for Æschere's death on the king's behalf: he saves the king's honour, just as the king saved his father's honour in the past. However, this is also a first indication of the problems in a social system based on interpersonal bonds and honour: both parties could fail to live up to expectations and therefore fail 'the system' as a whole. Avenging Æschere is not the only duty that Hrothgar failed to fulfil, as he also neglected to maintain peace on behalf of his people, illustrated by the king's choice of his lady's bedchamber over sleeping in the meadhall to stand a fight.[48] In this respect, the relationship between Hrothgar and Æschere, and his lament for Æschere, could also be understood as an attempt to deconstruct Hrothgar's power. By questioning Hrothgar's masculinity and pointing out his 'effeminate' lament for Æschere, the poet reveals concerns about the need for a strong and successful leader to guarantee peace in a social system built on benign associations.[49]

Æschere and Hrothgar could serve also as an introduction to the ambivalent attitude towards friendship, and interpersonal bonds in general, as transmitted in *Beowulf*'s imagery. A *wine* may secure peace on behalf of his people, yet strict dependency does not leave any flexibility for the negotiation of ties. If a *wine* can no longer protect his people, as in the case of Hrothgar, a more flexible system is needed to mediate power and create harmony. This can be offered by a bond between *freondas*, rooted in an exchange based on reciprocity. On the one hand, the

---

[47] *Beowulf*, 1384a-1385b, p. 47.

[48] *Beowulf*, 662a-665a, p. 24.

[49] This interpretation is indebted to Carol Clover's insightful study of gender roles, in the power of trespassing into the behaviour traditionally assigned to the other gender, in medieval Scandinavian sources, see Clover, 'Regardless of Sex', p. 386.

celebration of the benign relationships between Hrothgar and Beowulf, and Hrothgar and Æschere, seems to indicate a positive view of bonding based on interdependency and reciprocity. On the other hand, throughout *Beowulf*, the poet hints at problems in the social system introduced by this bond of interdependency: what if friendship becomes a destructive force in communities; if personal ties break down; or if different ties underlying this constructed bond result in conflicting loyalties?[50]

This ambiguous attitude can be observed for both relationships based on interdependency and dependency: both flexibility, as supposed by a bond amongst *freondas*, and inflexibility, as ingrained in the bond between a *wine* and his dependants, may offer problems to the negotiation of power. Both are based on honour, loyalty, and obligation and often, men could be encompassed in several relationships simultaneously which may result in conflicting interests and inclusion within or exclusion from society at large. This last dimension can be observed in Beowulf's association with his *freond* Eadgils, whose stay at the Geatish court results in the murder of Beowulf's lord and kinsman Heardred. While the bond between Eadgils and Beowulf fulfils their need for revenge, it creates further internal strife in the Swedish kingdom, illustrating the uncompromising nature of the bond.[51] The poet's reservations are also apparent in the poet's representation of the peace-keeping role of friendship for the maintenance of harmony in communities. After the defeat of Grendel, Heorot is at peace, '*freondum afylled*', and no false treacheries are *yet* concocted.[52] As long as *freondas* are united in their objectives, peace is maintained. Yet when this harmony is disturbed, strife is unavoidable.

The poet's imagery underlines the idea that friendship –based on either dependency or interdependency– could be a destructive force in the creation of communal harmony, partly due to its personal nature which makes it liable to changes.[53] Moreover, the additional nature of the bond of friendship, which could easily co-exist and overlap with other ties, could result in situations of conflicting

---

[50] All these concerns may have held relevance for a tenth-century audience, notably the problem of 'good' kingship, the loyalty of followers and the problems posed by social climbing on the traditional structures of a social system. For a discussion, see W. G. Busse and R. Holtei, '*Beowulf* and the Tenth Century', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 63 (1980-1981): 285-329, pp. 305-306.

[51] *Beowulf*, 2391a-2396b, p. 82.

[52] *Beowulf*, 1011a-1019b, p. 36.

[53] For a discussion of these Österberg, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics*, p. 197.

loyalties. The poet presents alignment of interest as an example to this problem, as exemplified by his use of compounds, based on two different ties of obligation. For example, Hrothgar secured the following of his *winemagas* with his prowess in battle; they acknowledge him as their king, while also being of his bloodline.[54] Although these compounds may have been created as the result of metrical demands in the sentence structure, they reveal the poet's perception of these bonds as ruled by manifestly different obligations.

When king himself, Beowulf is also presented with the shortcomings of both the inflexible bonds based on dependency and of the flexible –yet vulnerable– ties of interdependency. As he fights the dragon that threatens the peace of his people, his men do not live up to their earlier oaths ('*ussum*') and instead take flight into the woods.[55] Friendship is thus presented by the poet as a mechanism that fuels both harmony and discord; its two-sided and personal dimensions make it a frail social construct for the maintenance of social cohesion and harmony. While the *Beowulf* poet portrays these problems in his imagery, he also seeks to present his audience with solutions. These solutions are represented by the behaviour of a retainer towards his lord, which, as we have seen in the above, crosses over with relationships of friendship.

The poet's first solution is represented by Beowulf's unmatched loyalty: he fulfils his father's *aþas*; he presents his lord Hygelac with the treasures earned at Hrothgar's court; he supports his young kinsman Heardred with 'friendly council' ('*freondlarum*'), refusing the crown presented to himself; and he avenges Heardred's death when needed.[56] Beowulf's form of honour and loyalty is rooted in court behaviour, and can therefore be found predominantly in the narratives situated at the courts of Hrothgar and Hygelac. In this respect, Beowulf is the example of a good *freond*, and in his behaviour he characterises a social system based on interpersonal bonds, the negotiation of power rooted in interdependency and benign relationships. Friendship, both exercised by a *wine* and a *freond*, is a fundamental part of this imagery and social system.

---

54 *Beowulf*, 65b, p. 5; compare with the use of *winemæg* in *Beowulf*, 2479a, p. 85.

55 *Beowulf*, 2633a-2638a, p. 90. For their flight, see *Beowulf*, 2596a-2599a, p. 89; for their shameful return, see *Beowulf*, 2845b-2852a, p. 97.

56 *Beowulf*, 372a-376b, pp. 14-15; 2144a-2151b, p.73; 2373a-2379a, pp. 81-82; 235b-2396b, p. 82. Note that this use of *freondlarum* (2377b, p. 82) in the light of our earlier discussion suggests that Beowulf was Heardred's principle adviser, probably even his regent.

However, Beowulf is very much a hero of the past, which is apparent from the alternative model embodied by Wiglaf, Beowulf's kinsman.[57] Wiglaf is the only one of Beowulf's followers who hastens to support his lord, when all others take flight. The bond between the two men is layered: Wiglaf is motivated to come to Beowulf's rescue by ties of kinship ('*sib*'), lordship ('*mondryhten*'), honour ('*are*'), and received favours ('*wicstede weligne*'), reflecting in the evocation of a threefold bond of obligation based on kinship, lordship, and a benign friendship some of the problems of personal ties and the need for alignment of all.[58] Wiglaf's support seems to have been fortified by ideas expressing a Christian notion of love and affection. Beowulf's 'sacrifice' for his people could be interpreted as mirroring Christ's death on the cross, making a new form of bonding possible just as the crucifixion negotiated a new, spiritual bond of Christian love that bound the community together.[59] Wiglaf may have been fashioned after John, who was the only disciple to stay with Jesus, and carefully tends to Beowulf's wounds in an image of kindness; furthermore, he is only interested in the dragon's treasures as a comfort for Beowulf, and later to remind Beowulf's people of his goodness which was worth more than treasure.[60]

Wiglaf as a model of conduct shows an alternative ground for the maintenance of internal cohesion. Crucially, Wiglaf's loyalties and obligations are aligned, and it is this alignment –fortified by a hint of Christian charity– that results in his praiseworthy conduct for the maintenance of order in society. It is interesting, especially with respect to the tenth-century poems as will be discussed below, that the solution as presented in Wiglaf's conduct is situated away from the royal court, away from any form of mediation and negotiation, and therefore away from friendship as a functioning bond within a social system. Alignment of obligations is

---

57 This conclusion is close to Peter Clemoes' interpretation of Wiglaf's unwavering loyalty as an example of his embodiment of a social system, emphasising his 'moral right' with his words and his behaviour: Wiglaf knows that he is acting rightly by living up to his oath, see Clemoes, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, pp. 413-415.

58 *Beowulf*, 2599b-2608b, p. 89. Additionally, affectionate language is used to depict the benign friendship between Beowulf and Wiglaf; the two men address each other as *leofa*, see *Beowulf*, 2663a, p. 91 (Beowulf); 2745a, p. 93 (Wiglaf).

59 This is most succinctly expressed by Paul in his doctrine of the theological virtues, see especially 1 Corinthians 13:13. For a discussion of the New Testament form of bonding, see the comprehensive discussion in McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. xxv-xxix.

60 *Beowulf*, 2720a-2723b, p. 93; 2783a-2787b, p. 85; 3084a-3094a, p. 105. For John attending the crucifixion, see John 19:26. Wiglaf's disinterest in treasure seems to echo the ideas in Matthew 6.19-21, in which the greatest treasure of all is found in love.

in many senses presented as the opposite action of friendship negotiation in *Beowulf*'s imagery, as friendship was the crucial flexible tie negotiating various bonds and interests.

This is also where women come into play. Women are part of the court world of friendship, rather than from the aligned bonds needed in battle. In chapter three, we have argued that occurrences of friendship vocabulary increased the visibility of women in documentary sources, as the role of *freondas* was determined by the centrality within both formal and informal power networks.[61] Again, *Beowulf* offers us a model that seems to confirm this suggestion. All women mentioned in the poem occur in situations in which friendship vocabulary is used. We have already encountered Freawaru, who is mentioned as sealing with her marriage to Ingeld a *freondscipe* between the hostile Heathobards and the Danes.[62]

So too have we briefly met Wealhtheow, who seeks Beowulf's protection with gifts for her sons by Hrothgar.[63] Her presents are the traditional gifts of a lord to his retainer –rings, bracelets, armlets– and are given out of goodwill ('*estum*'), as an 'invitation to friendship' ('*freondlaþu*') on her sons' behalf, and she addresses him formally as *leofa Beowulf* in the language of the earlier discussed benign bond of interdependency.[64] This association is granted, as we have seen that Beowulf promises on his departure that Heardred will always find '*fela freondas*' at Hygelac's court, if needed.[65] Another example is found at the Geatish court upon the death of Hygelac: his widow Hygd secures Beowulf's protection for her son Headred, offering him the throne and treasures, which he politely refuses, with the outcome of gaining his friendly council, goodwill and honour ('*freondlarum*'*;* '*estum*'*;* '*are*') on behalf of her young son.[66]

These examples show the intrinsic connection between mediation on behalf of offspring and female visibility, as made visible by the need for a male advocate or protector. These women are granted agency *within* the context of male bonding on

---

[61] See chap. 3, pp. 134-135.

[62] *Beowulf*, 2067a-2069a, p. 70.

[63] *Beowulf*, 1216b, p. 43.

[64] *Beowulf*, 1192a-1196b, p. 42; 1216b, p. 43.

[65] *Beowulf*, 1838a, p. 62.

[66] *Beowulf*, 2377b-2378a, p. 82; 2369a-2376b, p 82 Beowulf was arguably his nephew's most prominent advisor, which seems to be implied by *freondlarum* (read as *rædbora*?), or even regent.

behalf of their sons through a mediated bond of interdependency, fashioned by the gendered imagery of the lord-retainer bond. Women may have had social power, based on their role as progenitors and thus based on their kinship relations, but they needed to channel this social power through a *freond* for formal recognition.

Whereas conventional studies of female agency in *Beowulf* have often focused on either their marriages as a method to create peace, or on the staged role of women as 'lady with the meadcup' as passive symbols of continuity and social harmony, and whereas feminist approaches have opened up alternative methods to discuss female agency in terms of gendered roles, vocabulary, and behaviour, this study seems to suggest that friendship could be an alternative angle to reflect upon their position within *Beowulf*'s imagery.[67] Wealhtheow's and Hygd's social power did not lay in their meadcups or their marriages, but in their attempts to control their sons' future by securing them a powerful *freond*. In these two acts, both Wealhtheow and Hygd underline the gendered nature of the portrayed discourse of power negotiation, which is male-oriented and based on the idea that formal power can only be mediated in a formal setting by men.[68]

These examples demonstrate therefore not only the close links between *freondas* and women, and the interface between the two notions, but also offer further evidence for interpreting *freondas* as embedded in both formal and informal power negotiation. With their social power based on their position within their families, these women seek the help of *freondas* rather than a *wine*, suggesting once again that the first concept was situated at the intersection of formal and informal power, whereas the second idea was positioned in the static hierarchical bond between a lord and his retainer. In this respect, the concept *wine* assumingly highly gendered, seemingly excluded women altogether. *Freond*, on the other hand, is not necessarily a gendered concept, although it is used in a gendered way in *Beowulf*'s

---

[67] For a concise overview of earlier historiography, see Alexandra Hennessey Olsen, 'Gender Roles', in *A Beowulf Handbook*, ed. by Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles (Lincoln NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 311-324, pp. 311-324. A good introduction to the various approaches can be found in Joyce Hill, '"Þæt wæs geomor ides!" A Female Stereotype Examined', in *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*, ed. by Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 235-247, p. 240. A clear example of the more conventional approach of female agency within *Beowulf's* imagery can be found in, for example, Michael J. Enright, 'Lady with a Mead-Cup: Ritual, Group Cohesion and Hierarchy in the Germanic Warband', *FS*, 22 (1988): 170-203, pp. 200-203..

[68] As based on the ideas of Clover, see Clover, 'Regardless of Sex', pp. 372-373.

social imagery. Just as the vernacular wills have been proven to be rooted in the mediation between formal and informal power in the search for formal approval of informal arrangements, so too does *Beowulf* reflect a social environment in which women will be presented as seeking formal support.[69] In this respect, our sources so far have not excluded women from a role as a *freond*, but they have emphasised the plausibility of the gendered use of the concept in the mediation between formal power, rooted in hierarchical dimensions, and informal power, rooted in unofficial personal ties of association and kinship.

4.2.3 The centrality of friendship

This study of *Beowulf* has demonstrated that friendship and friendship language have an important function within *Beowulf's* social imagery. *Wine* and *freond* represent in *Beowulf* two different models of the negotiation of power through friendship: *wine* refers to an inflexible, static, and highly gendered bond based on dependency, and rooted in a clear hierarchical interpretation of protection and authority 'from above'. *Wine* as an archaic word seems to refer to an ideal of the past; it does not presume to present a reality or contemporary model, but instead offers an idealised model of behaviour. However, flexibility was often needed within a social system based on interpersonal ties: bonds changed, as exemplified by the relationship of Beowulf and Hrothgar, which was in need of redefinition after the killing of Grendel's mother and Beowulf's fulfilment of his boast. The concept *freond* met this need: it is presented in the poem as a bond positioned within both hierarchical and level ties, mediating between both formal and informal power.

It has been suggested that the notion of *freond* introduced a certain equality between two parties; that it was rooted in interdependency and reciprocity; that it was closely connected to a linguistic mode of affection, demonstrative behaviour, and a display of emotions. All these dimensions could be observed in the portrayal of the bond between Æschere and Hrothgar, which also offered a model that may have influenced the use of friendship and affection for the depiction of benign bonds between lords and retainers in later, tenth-century imagery. The implied flexibility, and the cross-over position of *freond* as represented in *Beowulf* for the negotiation of power between both vertical and horizontal bonds of power, made it a suitable

[69] See our discussion of the wills at the cross-over point between formal and informal power in chap. 2, pp. 124-125.

concept for use in more practical situations. This proposes an explanation for the visibility of *freond*, and the invisibility of *wine* in the more practically-oriented prose texts of the tenth and eleventh century, as discussed in chapters two and three. As the imagery of *Beowulf* was part of a larger tradition, it is probable that these portrayed models circulated more widely: although we cannot establish a direct link between these poetic traditions and the tenth-century discourses of friendship, the models of behaviour as propagated by the *Beowulf* poet may have provided their audiences 'food for thought' and the linguistic means to communicate their own contemporary relationships.

Additionally, friendship vocabulary and especially the concept of *freond* have been predominantly positioned at the court, as being rooted in intercession. This connection also highlights the visibility of women around friendship language, which, as has been suggested in the above, was rooted in women's dependency on male mediation within a formal setting such as the court for securing support on behalf of their offspring. In *Beowulf*'s imagery, *wine* occurs as a highly gendered relationship, reserved for the male-oriented bond between a lord and his followers, and the abstract idea of a 'people'.[70] *Freond* is equally used in a gendered way in *Beowulf*, but the pattern of the bond as preserved in the poem's imagery suggest that this notion does not necessarily have to be gendered: as *Beowulf* is presenting a society of warriors, in which aristocrats try to secure favour and aid within the formal court setting, we do not have a chance to reflect upon more informal forms of power negotiation, neither do we have the means.

The social imagery in *Beowulf* is testimony to traditional models of bonding and the mechanisms by which they were established or negotiated, as well as offering an ultimately ambiguous appreciation of these bonds. The poet acknowledges the flawed nature of both the bond between a *wine* and his follower, and the bond between two *freondas.* Whereas the first does not allow for flexibility and renegotiation, the second is vulnerable as a result of the additional nature of the bond, the possibility of clashing obligations, and its liability to renegotiation. The

---

70 Whether this suggestion could be taken further needs to be established with a careful study of the portrayed relationships in other poetic traditions. Famously, the address of Walter as *min wine* in *Waldere* is attributed to his female companion Hildegyth. The speaker is unknown, but is thought to be Hildegyth based on a comparison with its Latin counterpart *Waltharius*. see *Waldere*, ed. by A. Zettersten, in R.D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, *Klaeber's Beowulf and the fight at Finnsburg*, 4th edn (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 2008), Appendix D, pp. 337-339, fragment A, 13, p. 337.

poet hints at a solution in the alignment of obligations, strengthened by a steadfast loyalty and the suggestion of the embrace of an unwavering love to support this bond. However, this solution is presented within a very different social setting, namely that of war and strife, rather than of the interactive stage of the court.

Ultimately the poet is anxious; he foresees a dire future for Beowulf's people, without proper alternatives and he renders hostility, strife, and war ('*orleghwile*') the most probable outcomes.[71] Wiglaf may have buried Beowulf with his treasures, announcing the need for an alternative model of social interaction between a lord and his retainer in certain situations, but the poet is not sure about the feasibility –or even desirability– of the solution suggested.[72] In this respect, *Beowulf* again offers models that may have influenced discourses in later times, as the problems inherent to a model based on personal bonds, honour, loyalty, and favour were still very much a concern for the social élite of late Anglo-Saxon England, as discussed in chapter two with respect to the imagery of the lawcodes reflecting a similar search for alternative models of bonding.[73] *Beowulf* is an ambivalent and older reflection on the problems posed by the different models of bonding, and does not propose a break with the past, revealing some of the ideas that may have influenced the worldview of those discussing friendship and bonding in a tenth-century context.

4.3 Brunanburh – the creation of history

4.3.1 The Battle of Brunanburh – traditions remodelled

King Æthelstan, his half-brother Edmund, and an army from Wessex and Mercia gained an important victory in 937 over a host commanded by King Anlaf (or Olaf) of the Viking kingdom of Dublin, and King Constontinus of the Pictish Scots, at a site known as 'Brunanburh'.[74] Norse, Scottish, Irish, and Welsh sources refer to their

---

71 *Beowulf*, 2911a, p. 99.

72 *Beowulf*, 3163a-3168b, p. 108.

73 See chap. 2, pp. 92-93.

74 For a discussion of the location of this site, see Foot, *Æthelstan*, pp. 172-179; Michael Wood, 'Brunanburh Revisited', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, 20 (1978-1980): 200-217, p. 211; N. J. Higham, 'The Context of *Brunanburh*', in *Names, Places and People. An Onomastic Miscellany in Memory of John McNeal Dodgson*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble and A. D. Mills (Stamford: Watkins, 1997), 144-156, pp. 144-145.

crushing defeat, but the most famous reference to the battle is found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (*ASC*) in the form of a poem in traditional verse form, conventionally known as *The Battle of Brunanburh* (*Brunanburh*).[75] *Brunanburh* is the first known Old English poem composed as the result of an actual historical event, and a testimony to changing literary traditions without proposing a complete break with the past. Subsequently, *Brunanburh* allows a scrutiny of the perception and representation of ties within an imagery that is simultaneously old-fashioned and revolutionary. Its language recalls Old English verse traditions in its metrical style, structure and archaic use of poetic language, reflecting a conservative nostalgia for a time of heroic deeds, and for an idealised Bedan past, while fashioning Æthelstan in the imagery of the powerful overlord known from the traditional Bedan representation of the *bretwalda.*[76] However, this nostalgic language and longing for Bedan prowess are presented at a new stage of social interaction: the battlefield, rather than the court. Additionally, the poem's style –often described as panegyric– and its theme –the celebration of victory– are unconventional, resonating Old Norse themes and skaldic traditions.[77]

All these observations emphasise the constructed nature of the poem, suggesting that it served a specific objective, which would have had resonance with

---

75 For an overview of all sources available, see the comprehensive discussion by P. R. Orton, '*The Battle of Brunanburh*, 40b-44a: Constontinus's Bereavement', *Peritia*, 4 (1985): 243-250, pp. 243-244 and Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 43-80.

76 Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 38-41. For a discussion of Æthelstan as fashioned after the popular imagery of the traditional imagery of the Bedan *bretwalda*, see Sarah Foot, 'Where English Becomes British: Rethinking Contexts for *Brunanburh*', in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicolas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot and Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2008), 127-144, pp. 143-144 and Simon Walker, 'A Context for 'Brunanburh'?', in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages. Essays presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. by Timothy Reuter (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 21-39, p. 29. This evocation of a Bedan past is an intrinsic part of the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition, and Bede's teleological, Christian view of history is arguably the very model after which the *ASC* was modelled, see Windy A. McKinney, 'Creating a *gens Anglorum*: Social and Ethnic Identity in Anglo-Saxon England through the Lens of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2011), pp. 107-109; and Thomas A. Bredehoft, 'History and Memory in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*', in *Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. by David Johnson and Elaine Treharne (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 109-121, pp. 109-112, and p. 120.

77 John D. Niles, 'Skaldic Technique in *Brunanburh*,' in *Anglo-Scandinavian England. Norse-English Relations in the Period before the Conquest*, ed. by John D. Niles and Mark Amodio, English Colloquium Series, 4 (Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1989), 69-78, p. 69; Matthew Townend, 'Pre-Cnut Praise Poetry in Viking Age England', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 51 (2000): 349-370, p. 350.

its audience both within and outside *Brunanburh*'s incorporation into the *ASC*.[78] This objective is generally thought to have been the glorification of the West-Saxon royal house of Cerdic and the creation of a 'national' identity, which both seem to have inspired the composition of the *ASC* in the first place.[79] In his allusion to this imagined past for creating an account of contemporary history, the poet of *Brunanburh* anchored his vision of events in an authoritative and unbroken Anglo-Saxon tradition, presenting a notion of social cohesion and interaction, connected to an 'English' identity.

Brunanburh offers the opportunity to reflect upon the communication of a social discourse in a setting of tenth-century power dimensions, and is in this respect of particular interest for our study of friendship, as in its dynamic interplay between the past and the present, notions of belonging, cohesion, and identity are newly established in a discourse that offered its audience new models of behaviour. As we have already suggested in our discussion of *Beowulf*, the social stage of interaction will prove to be of crucial importance for contextualising the depicted social imagery. Subsequently, we will firstly discuss the battlefield as social stage and its implication for portrayals of bonding, prior to scrutinising those bonds presented in the poem. Friendship will not prove to loom large in *Brunanburh*'s imagery, and this absence will be discussed by paying attention to the imagery of inclusion and exclusion and the desirability of personal bonds for the creation of the social fabric. It will be argued that the poet of *Brunanburh* creates a deliberate contrast between personal bonds based on interdependency and formal bonds based on hierarchy as a unifying concept to create an inclusive idea of 'England'.

---

78 Its survival in the *ASC* is part of a fierce debate over its origins, meaning and transmission, focussing on the question of whether *Brunanburh* was especially composed for incorporation into the *ASC* or whether it enjoyed a separate circulation. For the argument for an anterior circulation, see Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 36, with n. 2; Townend, 'Pre-Cnut Praise Poetry in Viking Age England', pp. 351-353. For the argument for a deliberate composition for the *ASC*, see Bredehoft, 'History and Memory in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*', pp. 109-112; Donald Scragg, 'A Reading of Brunanburh', in *Unlocking the Wordhord. Anglo-Saxon Studies in Memory of Edward B. Irving Jr.*, ed. by Mark C. Amodio and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 109-122, pp. 112-113 and p. 119.

79 For an introduction to this theme, see Alice Sheppard, *Families of the King. Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 4-7; and Foot, 'Where English Becomes British', pp. 127-128.

4.3.2 Social inclusion and exclusion and interpersonal bonds

The inventive side of the poem is represented in its choice of the battlefield as the social stage of interaction, and in its celebration of a victory. The battlefield as stage of interaction automatically excludes women and their role as mediators and representatives of kingroups from the portrayed social construction, which narrows the representation of social ties and removes mediation and friendship from the social action. Moreover, by choosing the battlefield and in contrasting victory with defeat, the poet moves away from any form of negotiation of power: the only available outcome is either winning or losing. In this respect, *Brunanburh*'s social world is far removed from *Beowulf*'s representation of bonding in a court setting. The subsequent absence of abundant friendship language should be explained by paying attention to the deliberate tension between inclusion and exclusion as portrayed by the poet, and should be explored by scrutinising its imagery as the outcome of an equivalence between winning and losing.

The emphasis on the creation of an equivalence between winning and losing to shape the social experience of the poem's 'literary outcome' is considered the main objective of the poet in the research of Dolores Warwick Frese, defined as the creation of an idea of a collective identity of the Christian brotherhood, and sympathy towards the defeated, in a literary expression of Christian love, a notion built on the triumphal assumption to love your neighbour as yourself.[80] Conversely, studies by John Niles and Matthew Townend have demonstrated that the contrast between the triumphal celebration of victory and the scornful delight in defeat, rooted in skaldic verse traditions, have created a unique Old English variety of praise-poetry which relishes in blaming and boasting.[81]

Although the two views of *Brunanburh* as offering a message of comfort and disdain at first sight seem incompatible, they should be interpreted as being aligned. In doing so, the poet has created a model of conduct rooted in the drawing of contrasts which emphasise the connection between victory and the battlefield. For example, the poet evokes in the poem a strong contrast between ideas of belonging

---

80 Dolores Warwick Frese, 'Poetic Prowess in *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*: Winning, Losing and Literary Outcome', in *Interpretations in Old English Literature. Essays in honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. by Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 83-99, pp. 86-89.

81 Niles, 'Skaldic Technique in *Brunanburh*,' p. 71; Townend, 'Pre-Cnut Praise Poetry in Viking Age England', pp. 354, 367-369.

and exclusion, and between collectivism and individuality, and uses these contrasting images to create boundaries between various groups, manipulating the audience's perception of forms of bonding. The soldiers of Wessex ('*Wesseaxe*') and Mercia ('*Myrce*') are presented as united by the leadership of King Æthelstan and Edmund, inspiring the interpretation of the poem as creating an aspired 'national' identity and unity.[82] Nevertheless, the construction of this desired unity also excludes certain groups from the union: after the death of their most prominent followers, Anlaf and Constontinus return to their homes as outcasts, portrayed in language that emphasised their social exclusion. Anlaf ('*Norðmanna bregu*') leaves for Dublin, with only a small part of his force intact ('*litle weorode*') barely managing to save his life.[83] The use of '*litle weorode*' underlines Anlaf's diminished power, evoking literary analogies with other poetic traditions: it recalls King Cynewulf's hopeless situation with his '*lytle werode*' when besieged by the traitorous Cyneheard in the *ASC*, and Christ's loneliness on the cross as illustrated by the use of '*mæte weorode*' in *The Dream of the Rood*.[84]

Anlaf loses the game and as a result, men and luck are left behind. However, Anlaf still has a home ('*Difelin*'*;* '*Hiraland*') to sail to amongst the Dublin Vikings.[85] Conversely, Anlaf's ally Constontinus is deprived of all company:

'Swilce þær eac se froda mid fleame com

---

[82] *ASE* A, A.D. 937, pp. 70-72, 19b-28a, p. 71 and *Brunanburh*, ed. by Alistair Campbell, *The Battle of Brunanburh* (London: Heinemann, 1938), pp. 93-95, 19b-28a, pp. 92-93 (hereafter *Brunanburh*). Bately's transcription will be used for citations, yet following Campbell's line numbering. Page numbers are for Bately, with Campbell in brackets. For a discussion of this 'national' identity, see, amongst others, Foot, 'Where English Becomes British', pp. 127-128; Jayne Carroll, 'Concepts of Power in Anglo-Scandinavian Verse', in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek, International Medieval Research, 14 *(Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 217-233, p. 222. The* victorious leaders return to *Wesseaxena land* rather than 'England', see *Brunanburh*, 59a, p. 72 (p. 94).

[83] *Brunanburh*, 32b-34b, p. 71 (p. 94).

[84] *ASC* A, A.D. 755, p. 39. The combination is used one more time in the *ASC* for 1068. This last instance seems to be modelled on *Brunanburh*, describing the flight of Harold's sons to Ireland after their defeat, see *ASC* D, A.D. 1068, p. 68. *The Dream of the Rood*, ed. by George Philip Krapp, *The Vercelli Book*, ASPR, 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 61-65, 67b-69b, p. 63. A similar use can be observed to describe the lonely state of mind in which the poet found himself, see *The Dream of the Rood*, 122a-124a, p. 65. The only other occurrences of the combination are found in prose texts, see *The Old English Orosius*, ed. by Janet Bately, EETS, s.s. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), ii.5, p. 46: 23; iii.9, p. 46: 11; v.13. p. 130: 9; Ælfric, *Life of St Oswald*, ed. by Walter W. Skeat, *Ælfric*'*s Lives of the Saints*, 4 vols, EETS, o.s. 76, 82, 94 and 1900 (London: Trübner, 1881-1900); vol. 2: EETS, o.s. 94 (1890), pp. 125-143, p. 126: 15; and Ælfric, *Maccabees*, ed. by Skeat, *Ælfric*'*s Lives of the Saints*; vol. 2: EETS, o.s. 94, 67-125, p. 90: 352.

[85] *Brunanburh*, 53a-56a, p. 72 (p. 94).

on his cyþþe norð, Costontinus,
har hildering, hreman ne þorfte
mæcan gemanan: he wæs his mæga sceard
freonda gefylled on folcstede
beslagen æt sæcce, 7 his sunu forlet
on wælstowe wundun <fergrunden>
giungne æt guðe.'[86]

With Constontinus' lonely retreat, the poet conveys several layered messages. It suggests that the old king is completely excluded from society, without kinsmen ('*mæga*') or associates ('*freonda*') to comfort him in his grief for his son. This evocation of family and associates alludes to the roles of these groups within the construction of the social fabric of late Anglo-Saxon society: they are the pillars on which society was built. Constontinus is presented as an exile, he is 'friendless', excluded from the fabric that guaranteed his position in a binary society ruled by principles of in- and exclusion, as we have observed in the social imagery of contemporary lawcodes of Æthelstan's and Edmund's reign.[87]

He is not only exiled, he also seems lost. His home ('*cyþþe norð*') is undefined, an image of estrangement and alienation created by a vague denotation of it being placed in the north, at the fringes of society.[88] Constontinus' forlorn retreat evokes the motif of the solitary travellers who, separated from their kinsmen, friends, protectors, and benefactors, roam the earth in the elegiac traditions of *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*. From these elegiac traditions we are able to grasp the emotional distress caused by exclusion from society; for example, the only hope available to the *eardstapa* in *The Wanderer* is to be found in the comforts of his faith, when exiled from society ('*eðle bidæled*'; '*freondleasne*').[89] This is where Warwick Frese's idea of comfort, and Niles' notion of disdain meet: the poet of *Brunanburh* forged an image of belonging, in sharp contrast with exclusion.

---

86 *Brunanburh*, 37a-44a, p. 71 (p. 94); 'Likewise there too the old Constontinus with flight came into his northern native land; this grey-haired warrior had no cause to exult in the meeting of swords; he was deprived of kinsmen, of friends, killed on the battlefield, deprived by the strife; and he left his son on the slaughter-field, ground down by wounds, young in battle.' All translations are taken from *Old and Middle English. An Anthology*, ed. and trans. by Elaine Treharne, 3rd edn (Oxford and Maldan, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 42-47.

87 See chap. 2, pp. 88-89; see also the use of *freondleas* and *hlafordleas*, see II As 2, p. 222; VIII Atr 22, p. 266; II Cn 35, pp. 336-338.

88 *Brunanburh*, 39a, p. 71 (p. 94).

89 *The Wanderer*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 19a-33b. A similar image of emotional desolation is evoked in *The Seafarer*, in *Exeter Anthology*, 12b-19a. Note the natural emphasis that falls on *winemægum bedroren* as a result of the incomplete verse.

The contrast drawn between the fates of Anlaf and Constontinus may be explained in terms of geographical and cultural closeness, and in the context of a conflict over dominance in Northumbria between the West Saxon kings and the leaders of the York–Dublin axis.[90] Moreover, Constontinus had recognised King Æthelstan's overlordship after earlier campaigns in 934, and his decision to fight against the West Saxon forces may thus be interpreted as a traitor's act.[91] Additionally, as pointed out by Sarah Foot, one of Constontinus' sons is thought to have been either Æthelstan's godson, or his hostage, in the twelfth-century accounts of William of Malmesbury and John of Worcester.[92] Although these twelfth-century accounts cannot be accepted without caution, Constontinus' grief for his son as portrayed in *Brunanburh* may in that light also be interpreted as a lament for the lost tie with his former overlord by breaking his former pledge: the connection between Constontinus and Æthelstan has been severed, and the poet's delight in his defeat may be explained as an uncompromising celebration of royal authority as the only lasting bond. In Constontinus' exclusion, as represented in his loss of all his associates, a frightening example is presented to the audience of *Brunanburh*.

This can be fortified by the contrast drawn between the forces of Wessex and Mercia, who willingly accepted Æthelstan's royal authority, and Anlaf and

---

90 I want to thank Courtnay Konshuh for this reminder; her comments, questions, and remarks brought *Brunanburh* alive in more than one way, for which I am grateful. See also the discussion in Alfred P. Smyth, *Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD 80-1000*, The New History of Scotland (Edinburgh: Arnolds, 1984), pp. 199-202.

91 See a royal diploma issued by Æthelstan in Buckingham, in which Constontinus signs as *subregulus*, S 426, Kemble, 2, 365, pp. 198-200. For a discussion of this charter as part of a collection of charters as produced by the agency styled 'Æthelstan A', see Simon Keynes, 'Regenbald the Chancellor *(sic)*', *ANS*, 10, ed. by R. Allen Brown, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1987 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 185-222, p. 186, with n. 4. For a discussion of Æthelstan's northern campaigns before 937 and the importance of the battle as part of a fight over hegemony in the north, see Higham, 'The Context of *Brunanburh*', pp. 150-151; Foot, *Æthelstan*, pp. 160-169; and Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 340-342.

92 Foot, *Æthelstan*, p. 53; for these references see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thompson and M. Winterbottom, *William of Malmesbury*, *Gesta regum Anglorum. The history of the English Kings*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998-1999); vol. 1: *Text and Translation* (1998), ii.134, p. 214; John of Worcester, *Chronicon ex chronica*, ed. by R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, trans. by Jennifer Bray and P. McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995-1998); vol. 2: *The Annals from 450 to 1066* (1995), pp. 390-391. For a discussion, see Joseph H. Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship. Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp. 222-223. This son is generally thought to have been the elder of Constontinus' sons, rather than the younger who supposedly died at Brunanburh; however, this is mainly conjecture and cannot be supported by further evidence, see Smyth, *Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD 80-1000*, p. 203.

Constontinus, who defied the king and is further illustrated by noting the characterisation of the home journey of the victorious West Saxon princes in a triumphant fraternal unity:

> 'Swilce þa gebroþer begen ætsamne,
> cyning and æþeling, cyþþe sohton,
> Wesseaxena land, wiges hremige.'[93]

This distinction between the exultant unity of the West Saxons and the lonely path of defeated exiles emphasises the poet's indebtedness to older ideas and traditions about the desirability of collectivism over individuality, whilst simultaneously shaping a new basis for this celebrated unity: King Æthelstan and *ætheling* Edmund are allowed to claim the success at Brunanburh as a royal merit, and there is no room for competing forces in this social imagery. Mercia's contribution is not graced with a representative, and no interpersonal bonds are represented in this celebration of royal might. The social imagery of *Brunanburh* is thus radically different from the portrayal of bonds and ties in *Beowulf*, and resolutely presents royal authority as the only bond securing victory and harmony. Hence, the poem projects a social imagery in which royal power is a force that excludes strife and discord; neither kinship ties nor lordship bonds are allowed to play a role of significance in this imagery, emphasising the all-embracing power of royal authority as a guarantor of peace.

4.3.3 The perfect solution – a future in submission

These observations support an interpretation of *Brunanburh* as advocating an uncompromising view; no hope is offered to those defying Æthelstan's triumphal unity, and they are urged to change their ways. Their exclusion from society is definite, as no pity or mercy is shown towards those refusing to embrace Æthelstan's promise of peace. However, the poem's social imagery does not only draw a distinction between triumph and defeat, but also contrasts two models of the distribution of power; submission to royal power is celebrated over power negotiated by interpersonal bonds. Constontinus, who preferred the company of his *mægas* and *freondas* over staying loyal to his lord, is rejected by the poet, marginalising his power to that of an exile.

---

93 *Brunanburh*, 57a-59b, p. 71 (p. 94): 'Likewise, both brothers together, the king and the prince, sought their native land, the country of the West-Saxons, exultant in battle.'

Whereas royal authority guarantees success and victory, interpersonal ties are frail as presented in Constontinus' loss. *Brunanburh* proposes royal authority as an alternative to frail interpersonal bonds; Warwick Frese's 'literary outcome' is aligned with the reality of the battle's outcome, and in doing so, interpersonal bonds are consigned to the past. The loss at Brunanburh represents the incapacity of the northern leaders to halt the advance of West Saxon influence in the north and is an unparalleled victory and moral boost for the West Saxon royal family. In this respect, the incorporation of the poem into the *ASC* could be interpreted as a double-victory for Æthelstan; he had not only crushed his enemies, but also moulded the perception of the outcome with lasting resonance.[94] Constontinus' grief for his lost associates could therefore also be interpreted as a lament for past days and past traditions; by granting the old king interiority, the poet allows the past its rightful position in heroic history while simultaneously offering new alternatives.

Brunanburh offers thus another discourse questioning the desirability of interpersonal bonds as a framework of society, offering royal authority as the answer. Through the poem's incorporation into the *ASC*, it is part of an authoritative, textual tradition with an aura of royal approval. Its triumphant tone and its recognition and adaptation of skaldic traditions of praise-poetry to create a unique Anglo-Saxon celebration of royal authority demonstrate an awareness of changes within the cultural and social make up of its audience. This combination of traditional themes makes *Brunanburh* strikingly conservative and remarkably modern at the same time. Out of a fusion of conservative, yet authoritative, traditions, the poet has created a distinct and unique hybrid poem, proposing an alternative discourse of power negotiation and bonding between the king and his people: friendship and interpersonal bonds are resolutely exiled to the past, while recommending firm royal control as its alternative to secure peace.

The unity of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom was not only threatened by the power of the northern allies, but also faced internal competition for power. The legacy of Æthelstan included wealthy, influential ealdormen such as, for example, Æthelstan 'Half-King'; his successors were consequently plagued by court factions bargaining for as much authority and influence as they could attain, eroding the social unity

[94] As also suggested by Jayne Caroll, see Carroll, 'Concepts of Power in Anglo-Scandinavian Verse', pp. 224-225.

aspired to in *Brunanburh*.[95] The realities of life at court implied a battleground with hidden enemies. *Brunanburh*'*s* commemoration of a harmonious present is consequently situated far away from this complicated world of connections and conflicting prerogatives. Friendship, kinship and ties of obligation are removed to make a place for an all-embracing royal presence, which is made into a historical truth by its presentation within a context of textual authority of traditions and contemporary present. In its resolute celebration of royal authority as the guarantor of peace, *Brunanburh* offers an antidote to the complications that could be awakened by conflicting obligations of kinship, lordship, and friendship.

4.4 Maldon – remembering the past

4.4.1 The Battle of Maldon – nostalgia and remembrance

The Battle of Maldon took place in August 991, and is often seen as a watershed between a period of relative peace and a time of disorder in Æthelred's reign.[96] It ended in a crushing defeat for the English against Viking forces on an unprecedented scale, resulting in the death of ealdorman Byrhtnoth of Essex (956–991), one of England's leading ealdormen, and traumatising the English defence forces. The battle has been recorded in several sources, but most famously in a vernacular poem: *The Battle of Maldon* (*Maldon*) is the only surviving independent battle poem of the Old English corpus, but is unfortunately incomplete and has only been transmitted in an eighteenth-century transcript. [97] The dating is not fixed, yet confined to the last

[95] For a discussion of Æthelstan and his family relations in the mid-tenth century, see Cyril Hart, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his family', *ASE*, 2 (1973): 115-144, pp. 121-122.

[96] For a discussion of the battle's dating, see Alan Kennedy, 'Byrhtnoth's Obits and Twelfth-Century Accounts of the Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 59-78, pp. 59-62. For a discussion of the Battle at Maldon as a watershed in the history of Æthelred's reign see, for example, James Campbell, 'England, c. 991', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 1-17, p. 1; Cyril Hart, 'The Battle of Maldon', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 533-551, pp. 543-545; and Keynes, 'The Historical Context of the Battle of Maldon', pp. 98-99.

[97] *The Battle of Maldon*, ed. by D. G. Scragg, Old and Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981) (hereafter *Maldon*), pp. 2-4. Additionally, the battle of Maldon is mentioned in four versions of the *ASC*, the *Life of St Oswald* by Byrhtferth of Ramsey, and several twelfth-century sources. For a discussion of these sources, see Janet Bately, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon

decade of the tenth and first half of the eleventh century, based on either linguistic evidence, textual connections, or the examination of its social imagery.[98] *Maldon* is written using conventional English poetic tropes and language, and its social imagery comes across as strangely traditional, displaying a 'heroic' ethos in the decision of Byrhtnoth's loyal retainers to stand by their lord against the odds of the battle, often erroneously aligned with the standards reflected in Tacitus' *Germania.*[99] This imagery has inspired many debates on the poet's aim, which is thought to have been either to forge unity, to inspire and provoke action, to emphasise King Æthelred's failure, or to evoke closure with the past.[100]

For our study, we need to find out what the social relevance of this imagery may have held for its audience, unravelling the resonance of this traditional portrayal in the poet's discourse of social power negotiation and the position of friendship in it, questioning the function of Byrhtnoth's 'heroic defeat' within this context. Jonathan Wilcox has emphasised the similarities in the themes of the Æthelredian annals in the *ASC* for 979–1016, written after Cnut's conquest, and *Maldon*: both are concerned

---

Studies, 1991), 37-50; Michael Lapidge, 'The *Life of St Oswald*', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 51-58; and Kennedy, 'Byrhtnoth's Obits and Twelfth-Century Accounts of the Battle of Maldon', 59-78.

98 For the linguistic evidence, compare D. G. Scragg, 'The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction?', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 19-31, p. 23; Giovanni Bonanno, 'The Anglo-Saxon Leader. A Semantic Study on two Old English Words denoting Nobility and Leadership: '*Eorl*' and '*Ealdor*'', (unpublished MA dissertation, University of York, 2008), pp. 37-40; with John McKinnell, 'On the Date of *The Battle of Maldon*', *Medium Ævum*, 44 (1975): 121-136, pp. 127-128. For a discussion of a possible textual connection with the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, see Earl R Anderson, 'The Battle of Maldon: A Reappraisal', in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature. Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. by Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 245-265, pp. 262-263 For a general overview of the dating discussion, see John D. Niles, 'Maldon and Mythopoesis', in *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 203-236, pp. 205-206, with n. 6.

99 This 'heroic ethos' can be found in Tacitus, *Germania*, ed. by Alf Önnerfors, *P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1979-1983); Vol 2: *De origine et situ Germanorum liber* (1983), pp. 11-12. For discussion of the assumed connection, see Rosemary Woolf, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with Their Lord in the *Germania* and in *The Battle of Maldon*,' *ASE*, 5 (1976): 63-81, pp. 77-80. For a discussion of this erroneous explanation of Tacitus' imagery, see Patrick J. Geary, 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', in *Interpreting Late Antiquity. Essays on the Postclassical World*, ed. by Glen Warren Bowersock, Peter Robert Lamont Brown, and Oleg Grabar (Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001), 107-129, pp. 107-108.

100 See, for example, Scragg, 'The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction?', p. 2; Ann Williams, 'The Battle of Maldon and *The Battle of Maldon*: History, Poetry and Propaganda', *Medieval History*, 2.2 (1992): 35-44, pp. 40-41.

with questions of loyalty, betrayal, English failure, and flawed leadership. Even so, while the annals give a clear retrospective and cynical account of the events in Æthelred's reign, *Maldon* is a more positive and idealistic narrative, resonating hope and encouragement.[101] Renée Trilling has suggested seeing the encouraging tone of *Maldon* as an invitation to its audience to recall the bravery and loyalty of the heroic past, negotiating the past and present through individuals and individual action and presenting a nostalgic image of the restorative, rather than retrospective mode: it seeks to redeem the past and as such serves as an ideological concept of restoration.[102]

This tension between the ideal and the reality, presented in a traditional poetic form and alluding to older traditions, needs to be examined in a context of discourses of authority and the negotiation of power. We have seen that the poet of *Brunanburh* discredited the role of interpersonal relationships and friendship in favour of obedience to royal authority for the distribution of power, and that part of this discourse was reflected in its choice for the battlefield as a new social stage of interaction. However, whereas *Brunanburh* shied away from the presentation of bonds between the leaders at the battlefield and their retainers, *Maldon* is created around the celebration of the ties between Byrhtnoth and his followers, yet again one in which friendship language only played a modest role.

This part is therefore set up to try to explain this reluctance of using friendship language, by comparing the modest portrayal of friendship within *Maldon*'s social vocabulary. Just as we have seen in *Brunanburh*, a desire for unity and harmony seems to underlay *Maldon*'s imagery. The poem's representation of interpersonal bonds will reveal once again concerns about the way in which men created bonds with their lords, and will serve to contextualise *Maldon*'s urge for loyalty and leadership as desired behaviour. It will be argued that *Maldon*'s social discourse was based on a desire to recreate some idealised behaviour of the past in

---

101 Jonathan Wilcox, 'The *Battle of Maldon* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 979-1016: A Winning Combination?', *Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Midwest*, 3 (1995): 31-50, pp. 35-36, 45. For the dating of the Æthelredian annals and a discussion of the pessimistic portrayal of the later period of Æthelred's reign as the result of flawed leadership of Æthelred's commanders, see Simon Keynes, 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. by David Hill, BAR, 59 (Oxford: BAR, 1978), 227-253, pp. 230, 235-236.

102 Trilling, *The Aesthetics of Nostalgia*, pp. 168-173. Note that Trilling never takes a clear stand on the dating of *The Battle of Maldon*, yet implies that it was written in a period of contemplation which suggests a date after 1016.

the present, arguing that its celebration of the 'heroic' bond between Byrhtnoth and his retainers was the outcome of a poetic fantasy created for a threatened élite. However, this idealised portrait was simultaneously modern in its emphasis on the alignment of bonds to create a stable social convention within society, rejecting the flexibility inherent to the concept of friendship as a useful mechanism for the construction of bonds.

4.4.2 Friendship and power negotiation

Maldon's social imagery showcases the complexity of social bonds and obligations within networks. Whereas the creation of bonds is completely absent in *Brunanburh*, the imagery of *Maldon* is rooted in the glorification of bonding as a social process. However, friendship is barely mentioned and bonding is mainly expressed through the utterance of words of courage and loyalty.[103] Subsequently, it will be necessary to study the portrayal of bonding and the place of friendship within it, starting with its most famous example to contextualise the poem's social imagery: the decision of Byrhtnoth's loyal retainers to stand by their fallen lord, either dying at his side or avenging him.

> 'Ealle gesawon,
> hearðgeneatas, þæt hyra heorra læg
> þa ðær wendon forð wlance þegenas
> unearge men efston georne:
> hi woldon þa ealle oðer twega
> lif forlæt[a]n oððe leofne gewrecan.'[104]

Roberta Frank has aptly discredited any connection between Tacitus and *The Battle of Maldon*, and instead has argued for interpreting the displayed loyalty and the lasting resonance of traditional motifs in the context of an emerging vassalage system, which presented individual bonds between lords and retainers as a by-product of a voluntary Christian fidelity, tested through the voluntary embrace of

---

[103] *Winas*, *frynd*, and *geferan* are only mentioned once, see *Maldon*, 228b-229b, p. 64; this use will be discussed below.

[104] *Maldon*, 203b-208, p. 63: 'They all saw, the companions of his hearth, that their lord lay dead. Then proud followers pressed forward there: Men lacking cowardice pushed on eagerly they all intended then one or two things to lose their lives or to avenge their beloved leader.' All translations are taken from Donald Scragg, '*The Battle of Maldon*', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 1-36, pp. 19-31.

death, with an affective quality.[105] The deaths of Byrhtnoth and his men could be read, in Frank's interpretation, as suitable for lay 'martyrs', souls saved through the surrender of their worldly lives.[106]

However, an important difference between traditional martyrology models and *Maldon* is the representation of violence; whereas contemporary Christian discourses propagate an abstinence from violence, the 'offer' made by Byrhtnoth and his followers is thoroughly presented within a context of violence and battle.[107] This focus on violence has a gendered implication: by choosing the battlefield as the stage of social interaction, the poet could move his discussion of loyalty and obligation away from discussions of female agency based on kinship ties, while renegotiating the terms at which male bonding took place in this context.[108] This leaves a gendered stage for discussing tensions in the social system, defined in hierarchical terms. Simultaneously it removes those groups most in need of male intercession and protection –women and religious– from the scene. Hence, the poet's choice for the battlefield is one explanation for the modest use of friendship language.

As discussed with respect to *Beowulf*, the individual nature of personal bonds was as much a part of the older negotiation of benign relationships –expressed in affectionate language– between two parties, as it was part of a Christian idea of individual responsibility.[109] While affectionate language is used in the poem, this use

---

105 Frank, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with their Lord', pp. 102-105.

106 Frank, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with their Lord', pp. 104-105.

107 Compare, for example, with the contemporary *Passion of King Edmund*, written by Abbo of Fleury, who refuses to fight his opponents or the ninth-century *Life of Saint Gerald of Aurillac* by Odo of Cluny, in which the laymen instruct his retainers to fight with the backs of their swords and their spears reversed. See Abbo of Fleury, *Passion of St Edmund*, ed. and trans. by Lord Francis Hervey, *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi. The Garland of Saint Edmund King and Martyr* (London: Murray, 1907), viii, p. 26; Odo of Cluny, *The Life of Saint Gerald of Aurillac*, ed. by T. F. X. Noble and T. Mead, trans. by Gerard Sitwell *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (University Park, PA and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 293-363, 8, p. 302. For a discussion of this model of lay sanctity and the uneasy attitude felt towards fighting as part of lay behaviour, see Stuart Airlie, 'The Anxiety of Sanctity: St Gerald of Aurillac and his Maker', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43.3 (1992): 372-395, pp. 384-386 and Janet L. Nelson, 'Monks, Secular Men and *Masculinity*, c. 900', in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Dawn Hadley (New York: Longman, 1998), 121-142, pp. 126-127.

108 As also explored by David Clark and Joseph Harris, see Clark, *Between Medieval Men*, p. 147; Joseph Harris, 'Love and Death in the *Männerbund:* An Essay with Special Reference to the *Bjarkamál* and *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period. Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger Jr.*, ed. by Helen Damico and John Leyerle (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1993), 77-114, pp. 88-89.

109 See above, pp. 158-159.

is relatively restrained. The retainers' decision to die or revenge their '*leofne*' is presented throughout the poem as an exceptional act of bravery and loyalty, rather than of affection; for example Byrhtnoth chose his position on the battlefield with those that he knew most loyal ('*holdost wiste*'), and therefore it was the place he most desired to be ('*leofost wæs*').[110]

Additionally, he is only once remembered as '*leofan men*' in all of the speeches uttered by his followers, and this occurrence may arguably have been an instance of poetic variation: the poet seems to have tried to find as many alternatives as possible for 'lord' to address Byrhtnoth in his retainers' speeches, and '*leofan men*' is used, combined with '*ure mægen*', '*ure ealdor*', and '*minum hlaforde*'.[111] The restrained use of affectionate language combined with the weight attributed to loyalty seems an attempt to merge two ideas of power negotiation: one based on interdependency, and one based on dependency. The poet seems to suggest that loyalty to the lord always needed to prevail over other bonds, without rejecting reciprocal relationships for the construction of these ties in the process. Past traditions are used to negotiate the contemporary unease about relationships based on favour and multiple ties of obligation into an acceptable 'modern' framework.

The utterance of separate speeches by Byrhtnoth's followers suggests an interpretation of their bonds as individually defined.[112] Peter Clemoes has suggested that *Maldon* questions the sense of collective duty to a lord and that the emphasis on several retainers of Byrhtnoth, who one after another are presented in some detail, is the result of a shifting notion to one of individual responsibility.[113] Nonetheless, this suggestion can be challenged with the observation that most of these men accentuate the role of Byrhtnoth as their lord, in their united stand, and the fact that research into their background has revealed that most men named in the poem were related to either Byrhtnoth or his father-in-law Ælfgar of Essex, and otherwise lived in the direct vicinity of the battleground.[114] As a result, most men seem to have been part of

---

110 *Maldon*, 24b and 23b, p. 57.

111 *Maldon*, 319a, p. 67; 313b; 314a; and 318b, p. 67.

112 As also argued by Alice Jorgenson, 'Power, Poetry and Violence: *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek, International Medieval Research, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 235-249, pp. 244-247.

113 Clemoes, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, pp. 411, 416-419.

114 For example, *Maldon*, 222b (*ealdor*); 225b (*hlaford*); 232b (*þeoden*); 240b (*hlaford*); 248b (*winedryhten*); 250b (*wine*); 259a (*frea*); 263b (*winedrihten*); 278a (*sincgyfa*); 289b (*frea*);

a social network with common roots and goals, remembered as part of a collective. These observations propose interpreting the men's speeches as emphasising the collective duty of retainers to their lord, as much as their individual loyalty.

In doing so, the poet aligns personal loyalty with collective duty, offering in the combination a model of social conduct that is rooted in an amalgamation of interdependency and dependency, and this may partly explain why friendship language does not function prominently in *Maldon*'s imagery, as its intercessory function is lost in the merging and alignment of bonds. This is illustrated by Ælfwine, the first of Byrhtnoth's retainer to take a 'heroic' stand, who exhorts his associates to follow his lead:

> 'Ongan þa winas manian,
> frynd and geferan, þæt hi forð eodon.'[115]

This three-fold representation of Ælfwine's fellow-warriors as '*winas (..)*, *frynd and geferan*' may have been part of the poet's poetic license, yet also accentuates the layered basis of the relationship amongst Byrhtnoth's men on both vertical and horizontal hierarchical ties, suggesting the existence of harmonious hierarchical structures. These ties also overlapped; Ælfwine highlights that Byrhtnoth was both his kinsman and his lord ('*min mæg and min hlaford*').[116] This emphasis on the double obligation felt by Ælfwine suggests that his loyalty was inspired by two different –and possibly conflicting– ties.

However, through his exhortation of Byrhtnoth's retainers, Ælfwine makes a heroic choice in the footsteps of Wiglaf: only loyalty to the lord in a context of a collective responsibility could secure peace and create unity of purpose in a group.[117] Out of the obligations inspired by both kinship and lordship, Ælfwine stood by the ealdorman, but it is the bond of lordship which motivated him to remain in the field. In this respect, Byrhtnoth's men are presented with a choice, yet this individual

---

291b (*beahgifa*); 294b (*ðeoden*); 312b (*mægen*); 314a (*ealdor*); 318b (*hlaford*), pp. 64-67. For a discussion of the men's background, see Margaret Locherbie-Cameron, 'The Men named in the Poem', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 238-249, p. 238; Scragg, *Maldon*, pp. 108-110.

115 *Maldon*, 228b-229b, p. 64: 'He [*sc.* Ælfwine] continued to exhort his companions then, his friends and comrades, that they should press forward.'

116 *Maldon*, 224ab, p. 64.

117 Compare to *Beowulf*, 2599b-2608b, p. 89, and see the discussion above, p. 158-159. For an alternative interpretation, stressing the individual nature of Ælfwine's choice, see Clemoes, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, pp. 436-437.

choice is embedded within a discourse urging for unity. Offa's reply to Ælfwine's speech underlines that Byrhtnoth's role within this group has not diminished with his death: his leadership *was* and *is* the pivot of the social network and, as he can no longer actively perform this role, they need to encourage each other in a collective interest ('*us is eallum þearf*').[118]

Byrhtnoth's men take control of their own fate, but are still united by their former bond with Byrhtnoth. They present with their behaviour a model, which could be seen as urging its audience to follow in their footsteps. The poet presents a social ideal, based on an idealised interpretation of what good leadership should inspire: unwavering loyalty, unity amongst retainers, and personal responsibility. Additionally, Ann Williams has concluded that the men's order of appearance, their ranks, and connections suggest that these men speak as representatives of the social groups to which they belong, pleading for unity.[119] Her argument underlines the importance of social hierarchy within the portrayed social group, and as such highlights a longing for a defined, hierarchical order in society. *Maldon* resonates both anxiety and a possible solution to this threat: order, and as such the community, could be restored by recreating unity.[120]

Simultaneously, this imagery also provides good leadership as the condition for a successful outcome, and shows awareness of the problems that may arise when leadership falters. This is presented by the contrast between Ælfwine's 'good' and Odda's kinsmen 'bad' behaviour; the first makes a stand, whereas Godric, Godwig, and Godwine cowardly retreat. Godric is the archetype of a disloyal retainer, repaying earlier favours –the gift of horses– with betrayal; their negotiated bond of reciprocity is proven false.[121] The poet plays with the names of the main protagonists: their names, meaning 'good leader' (Godric), 'good friend' (Godwine) and 'good battle' (Godwig), form a cynical side-commentary on their actual

---

118 *Maldon*, 231b-237a, p. 64.

119 Williams, 'The Battle of Maldon and *The Battle of Maldon*', p. 43. For an alternative interpretation of these men as a "microcosm of the English people", see Niles, 'Maldon and Mythopoesis', p. 208.

120 As also concluded by Tyler, 'Poetics and the Past', pp. 243-244; and Magennis, *Images of Community*, p. 199.

121 Godric is said to have received many a horse from his lord in the past, see *Maldon*, 188ab, p. 63.

performance at Maldon's battlefield, while 'elf friend' (Ælfwine) represents desired behaviour.[122]

Through the contrast drawn between Godric *cum suis* and Ælfwine, the poet subtly points out the main problem of relationships based on loyalty and favour: they are prone to redefinition, may falter at trying times, and are as a result frail, if not supported by unwavering loyalty and honour. This is further emphasised by the fact that this kingroup does not seem to have had an evident connection to Byrhtnoth's interrelated network apart from earlier received favours in exchange for loyalty.[123] The contrast drawn between Godric and Ælfwine presents *Maldon*'s audience with two alternative models of conduct, while upholding traditional hierarchical bonds, within a context of good leadership, as a successful social mechanism to create unity.

Moreover, the layered imagery of the poem is rooted in contemporary concerns and social changes. That betrayal in battle was an actual problem in this time, can be concluded from contemporary legal provisions against fleeing in battle, issued in the names of Æthelred and Cnut.[124] John Niles has pointed out that Godric and his brothers as '*Oddan bearn*' may also have been representatives for those men in England of Scandinavian descent, demonstrating the increasing complexity of the kingdom and the distrust felt towards the men of the Danelaw during Æthelred's reign.[125] Furthermore, the portrayal of Godric as an agent of defeat complements the social imagery of the *ASC*, in which Ælfric and Eadric are held responsible for later defeats against Viking forces.[126]

---

[122] Fred C. Robinson, 'The Significance of Names in Old English Literature', in *The Tomb of Beowulf and other Essays on Old English* (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1993), 185-219, p. 217. On Godric and the importance of his name, see M. S. Griffith, 'Alliterative Licence and the Rhetorical Use of Proper Names in *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of C. B. Hieatt*, ed. by M. J. Toswell (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 60-79, pp. 70- 74.

[123] Locherbie-Cameron, 'The Men named in the Poem', pp. 243-244.

[124] VI Atr 35, p. 256: '7 gif hwa of fyrde butan leafe gewende þe cyning [sylf on] sy, plihte his are'; II Cn 77, p. 364: ' 7 se man, þe ætfleo fram his hlaforde oððe fram his geferan for his yrhþe si hit on scipfyrde, si hit on landfyrde, þolige ealles þæs þe he age 7 his agenes feores; 7 fo se hlaford to þam æht an 7 to his lande, þe he him ær scealde.'

[125] John D. Niles, 'On Stylized Numbers, Odda's Name, and Propaganda', in *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 237-242, pp. 239-241.

[126] *ASC* C, A.D. 1003, pp. 89-90 (Ælfric); A.D. 1016, pp. 100-103 (Eadric).

Following these similarities, Jonathan Wilcox has interpreted Godric, Ælfric and Eadric as the "embodiment of English failure".[127] This idea may also have been part of the imagery underlying *Maldon*; Margaret Locherbie-Cameron has pointed out that Godric was a very common name which became a commonplace representation for the 'stereotypical Englishman' after the Conquest in Norman sources.[128] 'Godric' may thus – just as Ælfric and Eadric– have been chosen to embody the poet's disappointment in the English people as a whole. Alice Sheppard has additionally remarked that Eadric is not only singled out as having betrayed his lord in the *ASC*, but also his people ('*ealre Angelcynnes þeode*').[129] This idea is also reflected in Offa's bitter remark that Godric's retreat deceived all men standing in the field in *Maldon*, as they thought that he was their lord taking flight.[130] In every respect, Byrhtnoth is a worthy example of bravery and loyalty to his retainers; he expresses an intention to stand by his lord, King Æthelred, as defender of the kingdom and protector of the people, and as such shows the way to his followers.[131] Good leadership is thus presented as of eminent importance for the successful functioning of this social system, again reflecting some of the concerns prevalent in Æthelred's years.[132]

4.4.3 A new hope in a return to former behaviour?

Maldon has been interpreted as a commemoration poem, either for Byrhtnoth or for his retainers.[133] Yet additionally, the commemoration of a functioning social network based on different loyalties –fashioned in a social discourse that presented lordship as a solution to create stability and unity in a troubled era– may have served as inspiration for its Anglo-Saxon audience in a country plagued by conflicts based on tensions between different loyalties. *Maldon* urged for unity and harmony, but of a

---

127 Wilcox, '*The Battle of Maldon* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*', p. 39.

128 Locherbie-Cameron, 'The Men named in the Poem', p. 244.

129 Sheppard, *Families of the King*, p. 92; *ASC* C, A.D 1016, p. 102.

130 *Maldon*, 236b-243b, pp. 64-65

131 *Maldon*, 49a-54a, p. 58.

132 *Maldon*, 49a-54a, p. 58.

133 Compare Campbell, 'England, c. 991', p. 2; and Scragg, 'The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction?', p. 30; with Ute Schwab, 'The *Battle of Maldon*: A Memorial poem', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 63-85, pp. 80-83.

specific kind: national unity was promoted based on union within networks, on good leadership, collective responsibility, alignment of obligations, and individual dependability in an attempt to highlight the lasting resonance and importance of traditional bonds and associations within an interpretation of submission to authority.

Roberta Frank was correct in suggesting that *Maldon* was part of a redefinition of the bond between a lord and his retainers, necessitated by changes in the social fabric of society. In *Maldon*, we find an attempt to integrate a collective and individual responsibility which is negotiated through interpersonal bonds, but in which obligation and loyalty prevailed over other forms of bonding. In its emphasis on the alignment of loyalties, *Maldon* thus moves away from both informal mediation of power, and social power as part of kinship relations. In its combination of both a model of alignment of various grounds of obligations, and an uncompromising urge for submission to royal authority, the *Maldon* poet tries to negotiate an acceptable third way with significance for his audience.

Friendship was mostly written out of this model of bonding, as the *Maldon* poet sought the desired ties of obligation in unwavering loyalty based on dependency, rather than in the outcome of a successful negotiation, remediating the grounds on which the exchange took place. This is also represented by the battlefield as stage of social interaction, as those in need of protection and mediation are resolutely denied access to negotiation. The *Maldon* poet tries to forge a solution in its amalgamation of ideas, recommending traditional values and behaviour within a contemporary setting, hoping to restore and encourage certain behaviour. *Maldon* represents the idea that words and ideas sometimes should be remembered over actions, and in the men's speeches resonates either a solution, or a message of hope, as much as a longing for past times. This conclusion does not solve the dating problem of *Maldon*, as it could be interpreted as a reaction to the disintegration of the social fabric at the end of Æthelred's reign, or as a response to the threat to traditional Anglo-Saxon networks by the conquest of Cnut and his followers. However, what is clear from *Maldon* is that a renegotiation of the terms at which bonding took place was considered central by the *Maldon* poet.

4.5 Poetic friendships and the importance of social platforms

Beowulf, *Brunanburh*, and *Maldon* form part of an ongoing dialogue between literary traditions, social conventions, historical notions, and contemporary perceptions of both the past and the present. The social imagery of the three poems resonates a longing for peace, a desire to belong, and a hope to find a solution to pressing social problems which threaten the coherence and unity of the Anglo-Saxon social fabric. Friendship, as a dynamic bond that required action and negotiation, was in this setting an essential bond in discourses of power and hierarchy mediated through interpersonal connections and favour. However, as such, it was also a flawed concept, as its double connection with both horizontal and vertical power dimensions resulted in pressure within an increasingly layered and complex society. The poetic, élite-oriented ties as presented in the poetic traditions tried to negotiate both the past and future by the use of poetic imagery and tropes: it presented ideas, and idealised conduct, and through it, may have found resonance with a tenth-century audience that could read solutions and answers into this imagery.

Friendship could be considered one of these 'social' tropes, a construct that may have carried social relevance as a 'conventional' bond. Our discussion of *Beowulf* has demonstrated that friendship was rooted in court imagery, and was part of the mediation of formal and informal power within a complex society of both formal and informal bonds, rooted in both hierarchical and social power. However, it is also clear from our discussion of *Brunanburh* and *Maldon* that this intermingling construct of various bonds was considered problematical, and did not necessarily provide the desired peace and harmony. *Beowulf* can be used as a diagnosis of social problems, and of the bonds that inspired these concerns, although its model may not necessarily have inspired such a use in later days.

Its imagery presents a close insight into the dynamic role of friendship within the construction of bonds between a lord and his retainer, offering an insight into various models of friendship based on both dependency and interdependency. The precise use of the language of the *Beowulf* poet allows us to position both *wine* and *freond* within his construction of society. It offers an insight into the inflexible, hierarchically defined function of the first concept, and into the flexible, cross-over position of the second. This suggests an explanation for the greater visibility of the concept of *freond* in prose texts in later sources, and for the association between

women and male *freondas* who negotiate on their offspring's behalf. Simultaneously, *Beowulf*'s social imagery is extremely ambivalent. The poet shows awareness of the problematic nature of a social system dependent on strong leadership, and different grounds of obligation, recognising that both notions can falter. In this respect, the mediation of various bonds could not guarantee harmony in the long run, and the poet foresees the future with anxious anticipation, while attempting to find an alternative form of bonding as represented by Wiglaf. Yet ultimately, *Beowulf*'s imagery is reaching out for the past rather than the future, and it is Beowulf, and with him friendship and the mediation of formal and informal power, that is upheld as the heroic ideal.

This ambivalence towards relationships based on interdependency was questioned in *Brunanburh*. This poem resolutely rejected interpersonal bonds, while proposing an alternative model of submission to royal authority for the creation of unity. Friendship and interpersonal bonds are deliberately associated with losing, and as such, are confined to the past. Women, kinship relations, and a need for the mediation of bonds are removed from the scene, by proposing the battlefield as the stage of interaction. The battlefield represents the poet's rejection of mediation: only winning or losing are possible outcomes, and whereas winning is associated with a triumphant royal unity and submission to royal authority, losing is associated with personal association, interiority, scorn, betrayal, and ultimately exclusion from society. Social conventions, such as friendship, are in this way used to create a distinct and confident discourse favouring royal authority, based on a fusion of authoritative traditions, while forging a new bond between the king and his people.

However, this confidence in the future has been lost on the poet creating *Maldon.* After years of social unrest, and tensions within social networks, the *Maldon* poet seeks reassurance in a nostalgic longing for ideals of the past. By trying to renegotiate traditional ties of interdependency into a more clearly hierarchical bond, and by emphasising collective duty at the battlefield, *Maldon* tries to bring the mediated bonds as portrayed in *Beowulf* into the uncompromising setting of winning and losing under triumphant leadership at *Brunanburh*'*s* battlefield. The *Maldon* poet finds hope in a belief in the restorative function of old ideals –such as good leadership and heroic acts of conduct– yet simultaneously realises that these traditional ideals need to be fortified by a prevalence of formal bonds rooted in hierarchy, and by a collective duty combined with personal responsibility.

Subsequently, the poem contains models of behaviour for leaders, for retainers, and for those at the grassroots of society, who are allowed a voice to reiterate their bravery, loyalty, and collective identity. However, in some sense, women are the ultimate losers in this imagery, as in *Maldon*'s restorative model women are as absent as at the battlefield in *Brunanburh*.

The battlefield is in this respect a reflection of the changing social stage in the late tenth-century: women had lost ground in poetic representations. This may have been partly the result of the proposed change in both *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*, which both emphasised the need for strong leadership and submission to authority, and subsequently favoured a model of power distribution based on dependency, rather than interdependency. As women's social power was situated in their role within kinship relations, and within the negotiation of their offspring's future; any model primarily based on the homosocial bond of lordship would limit their function and visibility as mediators. Moreover, by the marginalising role of ties of interdependency –and therefore the diminished discernibility of friendship within the mediation of ties and power– women are less likely to make an appearance in the sources. This may be explained by the fact that they are the main receivers of protection, as we have seen in *Beowulf*, and can be supported in a tenth-century context with the evidence of the vernacular wills. In other words, less talk about friendship and favour results in a less represented female presence in the social imagery of our sources.

This disappearance of women from the scene is not only stimulated by changes within the social fabric, but may also have been influenced by changes in the intellectual views on the acceptable basis of empowerment for both men and women. Catherine Cubitt and Pauline Stafford have demonstrated that the monasticising movement sought to change society according to ideas about 'appropriate behaviour', in which chastity and virginity were celebrated as desirable conduct for all, especially for women: their female agency based on their role as progenitors was further discredited.[134] The visibility of women and friendship is thus closely interlinked: not because friendship was a gendered relationship, but because friendship was the relationship that allowed women to channel their female power within a male-dominated model of power negotiation.

---

[134] Cubitt, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', pp. 22-23; Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 32-35.

This discussion of the available discourses of power negotiation in the poetic traditions of *Beowulf*, *Brunanburh*, and *Maldon* has demonstrated that change within the tenth-century social system was intimately related to a less overtly expressed discourse of friendship and favour. These changes were most likely fuelled by the changes within the kingdom, which had become increasingly layered and complex, resulting in a search for new methods to secure unity and harmony. This setting resulted in both the confident tone of *Brunanburh* –written in a period in which people could still believe that the solution was achieved by submission to royal power in years of strong leadership displayed by the West-Saxon kings– and in the nostalgic, restorative amalgamation of ideals of both past and present in *Maldon.* The *Maldon* poet still sees hope in a return to old-fashioned loyalty combined with favouring bonds based on lordship obligations. Nevertheless, the imagery of *Maldon* is also testimony to a changing interpretation of this heroic model, in its recognition of loyalty and obligation, rather than of friendship and favour, as necessary conditions for the creation of collective unity and individual responsibility.

The poetic traditions show the wavering of friendship within the social system, and the increasing anxieties of a society in transition, while offering various models of conduct as solutions. None of these, however, created the desired peace and harmony during Æthelred's reign, ultimately resulting in Cnut's conquest in 1016. Yet Cnut's peace came at a price, and it was the old élite that paid it; the new king brought not only his own men in need of favours and offices, but also social change that threatened and overhauled the existing networks and élite. *Maldon*'s restorative hope may have been rooted as much in despair about a lost way of life, as in a discourse offering solutions to a social crisis. Friendship as a relationship had become embroiled and discredited in both trends and therefore seems to have been disappearing from the forefront of discussions of social cohesion and the creation of peace.

CHAPTER 5

Friendship in a Religious Landscape

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, discourses of friendship will be discussed in the context of the changing religious ideology of Benedictine monasticism at the end of the century. In the preceding chapters we have seen that friendship was firmly embedded in a secular setting of the negotiation of power in a court environment. Religious members of society were also part of this social interaction, and reciprocity between the secular and religious spheres was negotiated through the exchange of worldly protection and endowment in return for prayers towards salvation. These relationships were often negotiated through personal bonds which simultaneously formed the framework of local networks, connected to the royal administration through the mediation of religion, justice, land, and rights. This interdependence placed religious leaders alongside their lay counterparts, who were pursuing similar objectives: protection, office, and landholdings to secure their positions and of those in their care. At court, and within (local) councils, the secular and religious spheres intermingled, collaborated, and exchanged favours. Consequently, the religious were placed solidly within local and lay life; the friendships formed between these men and their communities, their neighbours, and patrons created a nexus of interaction and collaboration through a tiered system of personal bonds. Through these ties, the secular and religious elite supported the administration of the kingdom, communicating and negotiating royal and spiritual authority through personal bonds in an ongoing dialogue between different layers of society, bound by relationships of favour and friendship.

However, a growing populace and the expansion of the kingdom had created pressure on the availability and negotiation of pastoral care. Concerns about the quality of religious practice in the kingdom resulted in a movement that aimed to establish high liturgical, spiritual and pastoral standards by taking firm control of the instruction of clerical and monastic communities and by returning to a more

regulated and closely-directed religious life.[1] This movement, traditionally known as the 'Benedictine reform movement', found its inspiration in ninth-century Frankish reforms based on a strict observance of the *Rule of St Benedict* (*RSB*) and the idealised monastic past of the times of Bede. It proposed the restoration of an ideal, rather than a radical change, and was highly conservative and nostalgic in its outlook; for these reasons, Julia Barrow has recently suggested discussing the religious movement as either a 'monasticising' or 'regularising' movement rather than a 'reform'.[2] The reorganisation of religious practice based on a stricter adherence to the *RSB* and a closer regulation of the clergy did not only transform the life of the religious, but it also introduced concerns about the association between the secular and regular world. Secular influence was considered undesirable, as it enmeshed religious communities into worldly affairs and reduced the effectiveness of the institutions as houses of prayer.[3] Accordingly, the conditions in which intervention could take place were redefined, while simultaneously fortifying internal relations between religious and ecclesiastical communities. In this context, friendship ties between the secular and religious worlds became morally 'suspect', and for this reason it has been assumed that friendship disappeared from religious discourses as an acceptable bond in a religious setting.[4]

Brian McGuire has therefore concluded that friendship in religious discourses was 'in eclipse', and that reformed sources subsequently abstained from representations of friendship in their imagery.[5] However, Pauline Stafford has shown that boundaries were introduced between the secular and religious worlds ideologically, but that in practice it often meant that lay-religious interaction was represented differently to create an acceptable discourse of Benedictine monasticism.[6] This raises the suspicion that friendship did not really disappear from religious discourses, but rather that it was 'disguised'. Moreover, the monasticising movement was not as homogeneous as often assumed; studies of individual authors

---

[1] Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society,* p. 354.

[2] Barrow, 'The Ideology of the Tenth-Century English Benedictine 'Reform'', p. 154.

[3] Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, p. 354. These ideas were ultimately based on biblical imagery, most clearly expressed in James 4:4.

[4] As, for example, in the work by Brian McGuire, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. 135-138.

[5] McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. 135; and pp. 162-163.

[6] Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 7-8.

and communities have revealed that it was a movement of undercurrents, rooted in communal notions of monasticism, resulting in a variety of 'reformed' discourses.[7] This variety thus reflects different interpretations of the role of social interaction and additionally, it positions discourses of social interaction in the construction of communal identity, as interpretations of monasticism also placed communities within this varied monastic landscape.

In the following pages, these assumptions will be tested through examining the representations of friendship, social interaction, and communal identity in three *Lives*, which were all written between *c.* 996–1002, and which had the three ecclesiastical leaders of the monasticising movement as subject: Æthelwold, Oswald, and Dunstan.[8] Æthelwold, Dunstan, and Oswald represent the entanglement of social networks and overlapping influence spheres –lay, ecclesiastical and monastic– in the tenth century, yet simultaneously, their career and background indicate the heterogeneity of the social landscape of late Anglo-Saxon England. The three saints' *Lives* are very different in their style and presentation of their subjects. Wulfstan of Winchester's *Life of St Æthelwold* is a relatively restrained text, focussing on the saint within communal practice. In contrast, Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Life of St Oswald* is as much an historical narrative as a hagiographical text, written in a pompous style. The *Life of St Dunstan* by the cleric B. stands out for having been written by an outsider of the regulating movement, and for its limited information on Dunstan's career as (arch)bishop. Instead, it offers an insight into Dunstan's younger years, and into the community of Glastonbury in extravagant language. The three *Lives* show the heterogeneity of language and are influenced by different objectives, offering three different settings to explore a variety of discourses of friendship in a religious environment.

---

7 For example, Christopher Jones' study of Ælfric and his position in the monasticising initiatives, see Christopher A. Jones, 'Ælfric and the Limits of 'Benedictine Reform', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 67-108, pp. 103-107.

8 For Dunstan, bishop of London (*c.* 957-959), bishop of Worcester (*c.* 959-961), archbishop of Canterbury (961-988), see B., *The Life of St Dunstan*, ed. and trans. by Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge, *The Early Lives of St Dunstan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), [hereafter *VSD*] and B., *Life of St Dunstan*, in *Memorials*. For Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester (963-984), see Wulfstan of Winchester, *The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. and trans by Michael Lapidge, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), [hereafter *VSÆ*]. For Oswald, bishop of Worcester (961-992), archbishop of York (972-992), see Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Life of St Oswald*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey. The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Press (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), [hereafter *VSO*].

Firstly, Wulfstan of Winchester's *Life of St Æthelwold* will be explored, establishing that the social imagery in this *Life* is indebted to the imagery of the *RSB*, celebrating Winchester's reputation as leading school of Benedictine monasticism. Secondly, this imagery will be contrasted with the representation of personal association and friendship in Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Life of St Oswald*. Ramsey was a very different community from Winchester: it was a new and rural foundation, supported by ties based on personal associations which were essential for the community's existence and identity. These different circumstances also resulted in a very different representation of lay-religious interaction, opening up an alternative discourse of friendship within Benedictine monasticism. Thirdly, B.'s *Life of St Dunstan* allows scrutinising friendship from an alternative (clerical) angle, looking beyond the Benedictine discourses of the monasticising movement. B.'s views of interaction between the religious and secular spheres was part of a discourse of favour and exchange that was influenced by both court conduct and religious practice, and his nostalgic representation of Dunstan's early years will open up the role of women in this interchange. In conclusion, it will be established that discourses of friendship in religious discourses were far from homogeneous, and actually played an important role in the negotiation of communal identity.

5.2 Æthelwold, Winchester and the absence of friendship

5.2.1 Wulfstan and Winchester

Æthelwold's *Life* by Wulfstan of Winchester enjoyed a wide circulation and popularity and was one of the most widely read pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon *Lives*.[9] Wulfstan, also known as Wulfstan *Cantor*, was born in *c.* 960 and given as a child oblate to the Old Minster in Winchester. He attended St Swithun's translation in 971 and studied at the school of the Old Minster with various masters, one of whom was Æthelwold. He was directly involved in the enhancement of Æthelwold's cult in

[9] Wulfstan's *Life* is transmitted in five manuscripts and was already in its own day used as a model, for example for Ælfric's abbreviated version. For a description and the interrelationship of these manuscripts, see the current edition by Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, pp. clxviii-clxxviii. For the identification of Wulfstan *Cantor* as the author of the *Life*, see William of Malmesbury's statement as based on lost evidence: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ii.149.3, p. 242.

Winchester, supplying the necessary liturgical materials.[10] The *Life of St Æthelwold* is his latest datable scholarly achievement and was written between 996 and *c.* 1000.[11] In Wulfstan's days, Winchester was a sparkling centre of commemoration literature; he was inspired by many late-antique examples written by Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, and the author of the anonymous *Passio S. Laurentii*.[12] Additionally, he adopted a chronological framework, probably inspired by a use of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.[13]

However, Wulfstan's *Life* was very different from his literary models, as he primarily focused on Æthelwold's associates and his character, rather than on miracle stories demonstrating his sainthood. This focus on Æthelwold's associations is interesting with respect to our study of friendship, as it suggests that social imagery was important for Wulfstan to communicate a certain message. Moreover, Wulfstan has drawn a picture of Æthelwold as surrounded by followers and associates, but these relationships are never depicted as friendships. In the following, this 'absence of friendship' will be considered within the social imagery as propagated in the textual legacy of the Winchester communities; most surviving texts propagandising the monasticising movement were produced by Æthelwold and his Winchester students, suggesting that its worldview was closely connected to the social identity of the communities of Winchester.[14] This is also clear from Wulfstan's *Life of Æthelwold*, which is modelled on the social imagery of two of the most influential texts underlying the monastic imagery of the Benedictine restoration, the *RSB* and Smaragdus of St Mihiel's commentary on the rule, *Expositio in Regulam*

---

10 Michael Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher,' in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 89-117, p. 117.

11 This dating is based on the incorporation of two of its chapters into a manuscript of Lantfred's *Narratio metrica de S. Swithuno*, dated *c.* 1000, see Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, pp. xiii- xvi.

12 Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, pp. cii-civ.

13 Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, p. cviii. The A-version, or so-called Parker Chronicle, was most likely in Winchester at the end of the tenth century, as has been suggested by Janet Bately, see Bately, *ASC A*, pp. xviii-xiv.

14 For example, see the treatise known as *King Edgar's Establishment of the Monasteries*, which was almost certainly composed to accompany Æthelwold's translation of the *RSB* and the *Regularia concordia*, an agreement on the practice of monastic customs as established at the Council of Winchester which is also closely associated with Æthelwold. For editions, see *King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries*, in *Councils & Synods*, I.I, no. 33, pp. 142-154; trans. by Dorothy Whitelock, in *EHD*, I, 238, pp. 920-923 [hereafter *EEM*] and *Regularia concordia*, ed. and trans. by Dom Thomas Symons, *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (London: Nelson, 1952) [hereafter *RC*].

Benedicti (*Expositio*).[15] Both texts were closely associated with Æthelwold and Winchester: Mechthild Gretsch has demonstrated that Æthelwold used Smaragdus' commentary for his Old English translation of the *RSB*, and Ælfric of Eynsham named the *Expositio* as one of his sources for the *Catholic Homilies*.[16] Additionally, Robert Deshman has established that Æthelwold's Winchester school developed an iconography which visually represented ideas from Smaragdus' *Expositio*.[17] Æthelwold's access to this social imagery is further supported by palaeographical evidence: T.A.M Bishop has associated the surviving tenth-century Anglo-Saxon copy of the *Expositio* with Glastonbury, where Æthelwold was trained under Dunstan's guidance.[18] As these texts functioned prominently in the iconography and textual identity of the Winchester schools, Wulfstan's use of these sources for his portrayal of Æthelwold and his associates may not surprise. Hence, his tour-de-force commemorates not only Æthelwold's life and sainthood, but also projects Winchester's identity within the Benedictine movement.

The Winchester connection is not only celebrated in its chosen imagery, but also in its linguistic presentation. The *Life of St Æthelwold* is written in a clear Latin with a tendency towards verbosity and repetition, yet William of Malmesbury's

---

15 For editions of these texts, see *The Rule of St Benedict*, ed. by Rudolf Hanslik, *Benedicti regula*, CSEL, 75 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1960) [hereafter *RSB*]; and Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, *Expositio*, ed. by Alfredus Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, *Smaragdi Abbatis expositio in regulam S. Benedicti*, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 8 (Siegburg: Schmitt, 1974) [hereafter Smaragdus, *Expositio*].

16 Mechthild Gretsch, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Ubersetzung* (München: Fink, 1973), pp. 257-262 and Mechthild Gretsch, 'Æthelwold's Translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and its Latin Exemplar', *ASE*, 3 (1974): 125-151, pp. 144-146. For a discussion of Æthelwold's authorship, see Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher,' pp. 98-99; D. J. Dales, 'The Spirit of the *Regularis Concordia* and the Hand of St Dunstan', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 45-56, pp. 55-56; Mechthild Gretsch, *The Intellectual Foundation of the English Benedictine Reform*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 226-233. For an edition, see *Old English Benedictine Rule*, ed. by Arnold Schröer, with an appendix by Helmut Gneuss, *Die Angelsächsischen Prosabearbetungen der Benediktinerregel*, 2nd edn (Darmstadt: Wissenschafliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964). For Ælfric's reference, see Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: First Series*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The First Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), Praefatio: 16, p. 173.

17 Deshman, '*Benedictus monarcha et monachus*. Early Medieval Ruler Theology and the Anglo-Saxon Reform', pp. 211-219.

18 T. A. M Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule*, Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), no. 3, p. 2. Alternatively, David Dumville has suggested a production during Dunstan's early years in office at Canterbury, see D. N. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950-1030*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History (Woodbridge and Rochester NY: Boydell, 1993), pp. 142-143.

assessment of Wulfstan's style as *mediocris*, 'unadorned', still stands.[19] In comparison to his fellow-hagiographers Byrhtferth of Ramsey and B., Wulfstan is "a master of restraint".[20] In this respect, Wulfstan's *Life* seems to have shared some of Ælfric's concerns about the clarity of language and meaning of a text.[21] Wulfstan avoided an ostentatious use of archaisms and neologisms, but Michael Lapidge and Rebecca Stephenson have concluded based on his use of repetition and poetic compounds that Wulfstan used a stylistic, elevated register to mark the *Life*'s importance with a sophisticated Latin prose style which enlarges the traditional parameters of the 'hermeneutic style'.[22] Mechthild Gretsch has recently argued that interaction between Latin and Old English in Winchester may be partly to be hold responsible for interest in the structure of Old English vocabulary and its word formation.[23] It seems equally plausible that the regulation and standardisation of Old English as sought by the Winchester school may have influenced the Latin style of some of its pupils, resulting in a Winchester 'voice' and a distinctive linguistic identity of its school at the end of the tenth century.[24] These observations

---

[19] Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, p. cix, but also p. cxi for the acknowledgement of Wulfstan's sobriety and modesty of language, see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ii.149.3, p. 242.

[20] As characterised by Lapidge, see Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, p. cxi.

[21] For a comparison of Ælfric's and Wulfstan's Latin, see Rebecca Stephenson, 'Ælfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin: *Meatim Sed et Rustica* Reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 16 (2006): 111-141, especially pp. 124-132. Stephenson's argument focuses the differences between the two biographers of Æthelwold, yet, in doing so, she portrays Wulfstan's Latin as overtly hermeneutic. I tend to disagree, as I think that Wulfstan's 'repetitions' are part of his social imagery rather than his style, see the discussion below, pp. 195-196.

[22] Michael Lapidge, 'Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Prose', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. by Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge, and J. N. Adams, Proceedings of The British Academy, 129 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2005), 321-337, pp. 334-336; Stephenson 'Ælfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin', pp. 122-123; and Rebecca Stephenson, 'Scapegoating the Secular Clergy: the Hermeneutic Style as a Form of Monastic Self-Definition', *ASE*, 38 (2009): 101-135, pp. 107-112. For the seminal discussion of the 'hermeneutic' style in Anglo-Latin literature see Michael Lapidge, 'The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature', in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 105-150, pp. 105-106 and pp. 111-112 [originally published in: *ASE*, 4 (1975): 67-111].

[23] Mechthild Gretsch, 'Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: the Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 83.1 (2001): 41-87, p. 67.

[24] For a discussion of the Winchester programme of developing a 'standard Old English', see Helmut Gneuss, 'The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester', *ASE*, 1 (1972): 63-83, pp. 75-76; Gretsch, 'Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English', 82-83; Mechthild Gretsch, 'Ælfric, Language and Winchester', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 110-137, pp. 125-127. In this context,

demonstrate that Wulfstan carefully drafted his text within a setting of communal identity; his relatively unembellished Latin may have informed his narrative mode and portrayal of relationships, yet simultaneously it was part of a discourse of (religious) identity. The absence of friendship imagery in his text is thus a deliberate choice, and a discussion of the social imagery of this text will open up a Winchester discourse, firmly based on Wulfstan's aim to celebrate his community's unique position in the Benedictine movement.

5.2.2 Social imagery and identity

As friendship vocabulary is absent in Wulfstan's imagery, it is necessary to look at other portrayals of interaction to contextualise his social imagery. Wulfstan's portrayal of Æthelwold is a celebration of the models as supplied in the *RSB*; he is presented as a perfect Benedictine monk, widely loved for his humility and holiness, and as the ideal abbot, who hardens and heartens the monastic observance of his followers as strict master and loving father.[25] For example, Wulfstan portrays Æthelwold as requesting unreserved obedience, illustrating his strictness by ordering the Abingdon cook Ælfstan to put his hand in boiling water.[26] Even so, the severity of Æthelwold's discipline was tempered by gentleness, terrible as a lion towards malefactors, but meek as a dove to the humble.[27] Wulfstan's dependence on the imagery of the *RSB* and *Expositio* also partly explains his use of extensive literary allusions. Rebecca Stephenson has classified these "diffuse" references as a deliberate display of wisdom, using the clichéd language fitting for a hermeneutic

---

I would argue that Lantfred's style in his florid Latin *Life of St Swithun* is an exception, rather than a prominent representation of the commonly used style at the Winchester school in these years. As Lantfred was probably educated in Fleury, this may not surprise. For Lantfred's connection with Fleury, see Lapidge, 'Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Poetry', p. 332; and Michael Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun*, The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester, Winchester Studies, 4.ii (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Winchester Excavations Committee, 2003), pp. 220-223; and see also Byrhtferth of Ramsey's style as discussed below, p. 206.

25 Æthelwold as ideal monk: *VSÆ*, 9, pp. 14-16. This ideal of humility can be found in *RSB*, 7. 62-63, pp. 55-56 and the dish, as prepared by Æthelwold to nourish soul and body, is described in *RSB*, 39.3, p. 109. Æthelwold as ideal abbot: *VSÆ*, 14, pp. 26-28; and *VSÆ*, 31, pp. 46-48. For the image of an abbot as rigorous master and loving father, see *RSB*, 2.24, p. 25, and Smaragdus, *Expositio*, 2.24: 8-24, p. 72.

26 For the desirability of strict obedience, see *RSB*, 3.8-10, p. 30; *RSB*, 4.61, p. 34.

27 *VSÆ*, 28, p. 44. For the image of the abbot as strict, but loving father, see *RSB*, 2.24, p. 25; Smaragdus, *Expositio*, 2.24: 8-24, p. 72.

biographer.[28] However, these allusions had a function: they embedded Wulfstan's portrait of Æthelwold firmly in the social imagery of the *RSB* and *Expositio*.[29]

The social imagery of the *RSB* was solidly based on the two commandments to love God, and your neighbour, as yourself.[30] This love is generally seen as a unifying force, bringing harmony to the community within a shared love for God. This is also apparent in Wulfstan's portrait. For example, Æthelwold is presented as establishing peace after the disturbances caused by the expulsion of the clerics upon Æthelwold's ascent as bishop in 964 by the acceptance of three former clerics – Wulfsige, Wilstan, and Eadsige– within the monastic community. Michael Lapidge has argued that this last conversion was of special significance: Eadsige was Æthelwold's kinsman, and his conversion and his subsequent appointment as sacristan of Swithun's shrine was considered an important reconciliation between the pro- and anti-Benedictine parties.[31] Æthelwold is thus presented as a peacemaker, who pacified the opposition, binding the community together in harmony with his love and discipline. Another example of Æthelwold's successful peace-bringing policies is found in Wulfstan's depiction of the dedication of the rebuilt Old Minster in 980, which was attended by nine bishops and all prominent lay dignitaries:

> 'Exinde superna pietas sancto pontifici tantam contulit gratiam ut sublimes illi saecularium potestatum principes, duces, tyranni atque iudices et omnes qui ei hactenus contrarii et in uia Dei resistere uidebantur subito uelut oues ex lupis efficerentur et eum miro affectu uererarentur, eiusque genibus colla summittentes ac dexteram illius humiliter exosculantes orantionibus se uiri Dei in omnibus commendarent.'[32]

---

[28] Stephenson 'Ælfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin', pp. 138-139.

[29] For instance, Stephenson's example, *VSÆ*, 28, p. 44 recalls *RSB*, 2.24, p. 25; and Smaragdus, *Expositio*, 2.24: 8-24, p. 72.

[30] *RSB*, prologue, 50, p. 10; *RSB*, 4.1-2, p. 31.

[31] *VSÆ*, 18, p. 33, with n. 3, 4 and 5. For Eadsige's involvement in the cult of St Swithun, see Lantfred of Winchester, *Translatio et miracula S. Swithuni*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun*, The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester, Winchester Studies, 4.ii (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Winchester Excavations Committee, 2003), 252-333, 1, pp. 260-266, and 20, pp. 302-304. For evidence on the kinship tie between Æthelwold and Eadsige, see Ælfric, *Life of St Swithun*, ed. and trans. by Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun*, 591-605, 5, p. 592. Wulfsige and Wilstan are otherwise unknown.

[32] *VSÆ*, 40, pp. 60-62: 'Furthermore, God in his love gave such grace to the holy bishop that those high lay dignitaries, ealdormen, potentates, judges and all who had previously seemed his enemies, standing in God's path, suddenly made, as it were, sheep instead of wolves: they revered him with extraordinary affection, and lowering their necks to his knee and humbly kissing his hands, commended themselves in all things to the prayers of the man of God.'

Affective language and demonstrative behaviour are used to illustrate complete surrender, showing familiarity with court discourses of hierarchical power. This staged capitulation to Æthelwold's might suggests a connection with the disruptive years after King Edgar's death, in which supporters of the rival æthelings Edward and Æthelred had tried to reclaim lands that had been alienated by predecessors in favour of reformed institutions.[33] By inserting this narrative, Wulfstan commemorated Æthelwold's moral triumph, while simultaneously projecting his image as peacemaker and the successful outcome based on a Winchester interpretation of Benedictine monasticism.

This celebration of a Winchester triumph is also reflected in the commemoration of Æthelwold's associates, whose splendid careers in Æthelwold's footsteps are glorified by Wulfstan in the *Life*: Osgar became abbot of Abingdon; Foldbriht was probably the abbot of Pershore; Frithegar might be identified with the abbot of Evesham; Godemann, a former scribe at Æthelwold's court, was rewarded with the abbacy of Thorney; and Byrhtnoth was elevated to the abbacy of Ely.[34] Moreover, many of Æthelwold's associates obtained episcopal honours: the Abingdon monk Ælfstan was elected to Ramsbury (970–981); Æthelgar rose from Selsey (980–988) to the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury (988–990); Ordbriht became bishop of Selsey (988x990–1007x1009); and Ealdwulf succeeded to the combined sees of Worcester and York in 992.[35] Even Nunnaminster was included in this network, as its abbess Æthelthryth was supposedly Æthelwold's former nurse.[36] Wulfstan's glorification of Æthelwold's 'old boys network' reflects communal pride: a vivid image is drawn of a close-knit network of a chain of monasteries –the

---

[33] As can also been seen after Æthelwold's death in 984, see Barbara Yorke, 'Introduction', in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 1-13, pp. 18-19.

[34] For Osgar, see *VSÆ*, 14, p. 26, with n. 3; 17, p. 32 and 21, p. 36, with n. 4; for Foldbriht, see *VSÆ*, 11, p. 20, with n. 3, and also Byrhtferth, *VSO*, iv. 8, pp. 110-116; for Frithegar, see *VSÆ*, 11, p. 20, with n. 4 and Hart, *ECNE*, pp. 335-336; for Godemann, see *VSÆ*, 24, pp. 40-42, with n. 9, p. 41; and for Byrhtnoth, possibly prior of the Old Minster between 964 and Ely's refoundation, see *VSÆ*, 23, p. 38, with n. 6.

[35] For Ælfstan, see *VSÆ*, 14, p. 28, with n. 1. Lapidge has suggested the Old Minster for Ælfstan's abbacy; for Æthelgar, abbot of the New Minster from 964, see *VSÆ*, 20, p. 36, with n. 3; for Ordbriht, abbot of Chertsey from 964 onwards, see *VSÆ*, 11, p. 20, with n. 5, pp. 20-21; for Ealdwulf, abbot of the refounded community of Peterborough, see *VSÆ*, 24, p. 40 with p. 41, n. 7.

[36] *VSÆ*, 2, p. 4 and 22, pp. 36-38 with n. 1, p. 38. Æthelthryth would have been fairly old upon her installation as abbess, if she was indeed Æthelwold's nurse.

Winchester communities, Abingdon, Ely, Peterborough, Thorney– providing the prominent religious leaders of a generation, dominating the intellectual and social landscape based on a shared Winchester education and a personal association with Æthelwold.

In addition, Wulfstan underlined that the advancement of Æthelwold and his followers was not based on favouritism, but on merit. This is exemplified by his rendering of a dream, attributed to Dunstan, which embeds Æthelwold's pre-eminence amongst the reformers, and his students in the movement, in a morally acceptable setting.[37] This shows again awareness of the social imagery of the *RSB*, which rejects favouritism, unless based on merit.[38] This is further exemplified by an inserted story of the fortunes of Æthelstan, a kinsman of Bishop Ælfheah, who was ordained at the same day as Dunstan and Æthelwold. Æthelstan's connections did not prevent his fall from grace, as he was warned on the day of his ordination.[39] Hence, Wulfstan's careful framing disentangles Æthelwold and his heirs from accusations of nepotism, as well as implicitly promoting 'rightful practice'. The *Life* commemorates both Æthelwold and his legacy as communicated by the Winchester school, giving an impression of a monolithic effort and celebrating a specific interpretation of Benedictine monasticism based on the imagery of the *RSB* and *Expositio*.

The importance of the social imagery of the *RSB* is not only visible in the characterisation of Æthelwold and his religious associations, but is also represented in his portrayal of secular connections. Æthelwold's family background is relatively unknown, but his wealth suggests that he was a member of the 'new rich' of Anglo-Saxon England, who earned their money as traders in the developing towns.[40] He seems to have been dependent on royal patronage for the enhancement of his career;

---

[37] *VSÆ*, 38, p. 56.

[38] *RSB*, 2.16-18, p. 24 and 2.22, p. 25.

[39] For Æthelstan: *VSÆ*, 8, p. 12. This prediction is taken up by Wulfstan in the retelling of a visionary dream of Æthelwold, in which Æthelstan is turned into an eel, falling behind, see *VSÆ*, 39, pp. 58-60. Æthelwold's and Dunstan's primacy is celebrated in *VSÆ*, 14, p. 26, and *VSÆ*, 27, p. 42.

[40] Robin Fleming, 'Rural Elites and Urban Communities in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Past & Present*, 141 (1993): 3-37, p. 34. Fleming's conclusions revise earlier assumptions that Æthelwold originated from an important landowning family. For a discussion and an overview of Æthelwold's rich endowment of Ely and Peterborough, see Barbara Yorke, 'Æthelwold and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 65-88, p. 68.

his introduction to court is based on securing King Æthelstan's favour (*gratiam*).[41] After some years at court, Æthelwold was commanded by the king to serve in the household of Ælfheah, bishop of Winchester (934x935–951), by whom he was accepted into clerical orders and later ordained.[42] Æthelstan's patronage had set Æthelwold's ecclesiastical career in motion, but Lapidge and Winterbottom have suggested that Æthelwold's dependency on Æthelstan's patronage initially prevented him from pursuing a monastic career.[43] It demonstrates both Æthelstan's dependency on royal patronage, and the entanglement of religious and court spheres. The reformed and refounded communities offered alternative careers for able men, and simultaneously offered a method for new men –both lay and religious– to express their piety and their status by actively partaking in religious life.[44]

This is even further exemplified by his association with Wulfstan of Dalham, reeve in the fenland shires (*c.* 955x973) and steward of Queen-grandmother Eadgifu's East Anglian estates, who assisted the bishop with the expulsion of clerics from the New Minster in 963.[45] Andrew Wareham has suggested that Wulfstan of Dalham and Æthelwold served simultaneously at Æthelstan's court and supported each other in securing royal patronage.[46] The parallel careers of Æthelwold and Wulfstan of Dalham –the first in the religious orders and the second in the royal administration– demonstrate the involvement of the royal family in the Benedictine movement, and highlight the attempts of one woman to dominate the social networks that underlay Anglo-Saxon politics in the decades following Æthelstan's death: Eadgifu, Edward the Elder's widow and mother to King Edmund (939–946) and King Eadred (946–955). During the reigns of her sons, Eadgifu played a visible role

---

41 *VSÆ*, 7, p. 10;

42 *VSÆ*, 7, p. 10.

43 *VSÆ*, 9, p. 14, with n. 3.

44 Ann Williams, 'Thegnly Piety and Ecclesiastical Patronage in the Late Old English Kingdom', *ANS*, 24, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2001 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 1-24, p. 21.

45 *VSÆ*, 18, p. 32. For a discussion of Wulfstan of Dalham's associations and his exceptional career as royal agent, see Wareham, *Lords and Communities*, pp. 33-36; Lapidge and Winterbottom, *VSÆ*, p. 32, n. 2. Wulfstan of Dalham was remembered as a favourite of King Edgar in Ely, see *Liber Eliensis*, ed. by E. O. Blake, Camden Third Series, 92 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962), ii. 2, p. 73: '…medium se interiecit quidam qui erat regi a secretis nomine Wlstanus de Delham…'. His close association with Ely could likewise be seen in his frequent appearance in the *Liber Eliensis*, see *Liber Eliensis*, ii. 2, 7, 18, 24, 35, 48 and 55.

46 Wareham, *Lords and Communities*, pp. 35-36.

at court and often took a prominent place among the witnesses of royal charters; fostering bonds with the reformers may have been securing her prominent position, as they could morally, practically, and ideologically support royal claims to the throne.[47]

Eadgifu showed a particular interest in Æthelwold: she prevented Æthelwold from going abroad for his studies, and instead persuaded Eadred to appoint him as the new abbot of Abingdon, followed by generous royal endowments of the community by both Eadred and Eadgifu.[48] This special royal favour is expressed by employing affectionate language (‘*delectatus rex magnam circa Dei famulum coepit habere dilectionem*’), underlining that affectionate language was suitable for negotiating relationships of favour in a court environment. The promotion and special favours granted to Æthelwold at the insistence of the royal family could be seen as a balancing act: through entering personal associations based on favour and love, they seem to have tried to negotiate peace in the country. However, another explanation for this emphasis on royal patronage for the enhancement of Æthelwold’s career is available. The Winchester school had elevated the status of the king to that of an ‘overseer’ of monasteries in a reflection of biblical ideas of a Christian kingship as representing divine power on earth, securing an independent position for religious institution from lay interference.[49] By positioning Æthelwold as primarily dependent on royal patronage, Wulfstan underlined another important

---

47 Nicholas Brooks, ‘The Career of St Dunstan’, in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 1-24, p. 12; Cyril Hart, ‘Two Queens of England’, *The Ampleforth Journal*, 82.2 (1977): 10-15 and 54, p. 11. Pauline Stafford has also commented on the unmatched visibility of Eadgifu at her sons’ courts, and has emphasised her central role in securing peace, see Stafford, ‘The King’s Wife’, p. 25. Michael Enright has argued that a queen was a living symbol of continuity, passing on a message of legitimacy and stability at the death of a king. His argument is based on *Beowulf*, although he also finds confirmation for his theory at the Merovingian court, see Enright, ‘The Lady with a Mead-Cup’, pp. 200-203. The role of the queen as an advocate of harmony is well-attested in Merovingian sources, see Janet L. Nelson, ‘Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship’, in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Anne J. Duggan, Proceedings of a Conference held at King’s College London April 1995 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), 301-316, p. 8. For a Carolingian parallel, see Donald A. Bullough, *Friends*, *Neighbours and Fellow-Drinkers: Aspects of Community and Conflict in the Early Medieval West*, H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures, 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 16-17.

48 *VSÆ*, 10, p. 18; 11, p. 18. For a discussion of Eadgifu’s position and the supposed ‘understanding’ between Eadgifu and Æthelstan regarding his inheritance, see Stafford, ‘The King’s Wife’, p. 13, with n. 29; and p. 25.

49 For example, see *RC*, prologue, 3, p. 2; *EEM*, p. 150; *Ælfric*’*s Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, ed. and trans. by Christopher A. Jones, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1, p. 110.

message of the Winchester interpretation of 'correct' Benedictine monasticism, namely that it is free from secular intrusion of lay magnates while the king was elevated to the status of a Christian king with special spiritual prerogatives.

This imagery is, again, taken from the *RSB* and the *Expositio*, which clearly expresses distrust of relationships between the regular and secular world. These concerns were not new, as friendship already held an uncomfortable position in the social imagery in the Bible. Brian McGuire has demonstrated in his research of religious discourses of friendship that the New Testament interpretation had positioned friendship in a context of Christian love: harmony within the Christian community was its ultimate goal and *amicitia* as binding principle had therefore been replaced by an ideal of *caritas*, the love which kept the Christian brotherhood together.[50] This New Testament portrayal had a profound influence on monasticism, as communal living raised the issue of safeguarding of harmony within the community, and the negotiation of ties with the world around it, which is also reflected in the *RSB* and *Expositio*.[51] In the *RSB*, the outside world is portrayed as a place of temptation: monks are discouraged from intermingling with the outside world, or to share experiences of the outer world with their brothers.[52]

Additionally, Smaragdus has painted a vivid picture of a community which was constantly 'under siege' by the world outside its enclosure: guests come and go, pilgrims visit the cloisters, oblates are accepted, travels are undertaken, servants work on the estate and in the kitchen, death and illness attract relatives to take care of their beloved.[53] This negative attitude towards worldly influence was carefully framed into the Winchester discourse of Benedictine monasticism, as, for example, in the prologue of the *RC*.[54] In turn, Wulfstan's dependence on the social imagery of the *RSB* and the *Expositio* also explains his abstinence from describing relationships as friendships, as friendship was bridging those bonds that Benedictine monks were supposed to withdraw from and did not function within the social imagery of the

---

50 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. xvii-xxix; and the discussion above in chap. 1, pp. 10-11.

51 White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century*, pp. 164-165.

52 *RSB*, 50.3, p. 133; 51.1, p. 133; 53.23-24, pp. 138-139

53 Smaragdus, *Expositio*, XXXVI: 6.7: 27-29, p. 249; and 2-4, p. 249.

54 *RC*, prologue, 10, p. 7; Compare with Ælfric, *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, 63, p. 140, and *EEM*, p. 153.

RSB.[55] Even the relationship between King Edgar and Æthelwold, which could be considered as the apogee of the association between the royal family and the saint, is never presented as a friendship, although the connection between the two was clearly based on an exchange of favours, loyalty, and interdependence.[56] Instead, Wulfstan characterised their relationship as based on intimacy and confidentiality, using *familiaritas* to denote the bond between Æthelwold and the king:

> 'De familiaritate euis cum rege. Erat autem uir Dei Ætheluuoldus a secretis Eadgari incliti regis.'[57]

The use of *familiaritas* could be interpreted in two, equally plausible, ways. Firstly, it may indicate that Wulfstan considered Æthelwold to be part of the king's *familia*, his household, probably inspired by his earlier role as the king's tutor.[58] Secondly, it may be related to his reluctance in using friendship imagery for depicting bonds between the religious and secular worlds, shying away from any hints towards a secular, pragmatic connotation as would have been the result of using *amicitia* instead of *familiaritas*. Nevertheless, in this short passage Æthelwold is depicted as the king's foremost councillor, hinted at by the use of '*a secretis*'; a similar construction can be found in the Latin version of the Ely foundation charter, reading in its Old English version '*rædbora*', an image that we have also come across in the portrayal of Hrothgar's relationship with his beloved '*freond*' and retainer Æschere in *Beowulf*.[59]

---

55 However, it is important to stress that although the imagery of the *RSB* is wary of relationships between the secular and regular worlds, these ties are never styled friendships. Instead, the *RSB* has not very much to say about the bond at all, see for a discussion McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. xiv and Haseldine, 'The Monastic Culture of Friendship', p. 180.

56 Edgar promoted Æthelwold to the episcopacy of Winchester in 963 and supported his expulsion of the clerics from the Old and New Minster in Winchester, see *VSÆ*, 16, pp. 28-30. Æthelwold had been Edgar's tutor and his prime advisor, as we learn from the *Life of St Oswald*, see *VSO*, iii. 11, pp. 76-78. In addition, he may have been responsible for the agency behind 'Edgar A', see for a discussion: Yorke, 'Introduction', p. 10; Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher,' p. 92.

57 *VSÆ*, 25, p. 42: 'On his intimacy with the king. The man of God Æthelwold was an intimate of the distinguished King Edgar'. I prefer a translation of 'intimacy' or 'intimate relationship' over 'friendship' for *familiaritas.*

58 *VSO*, iii. 11, pp. 76-78. For a short discussion of *familiaritas*, see chap. 1, p. 17, with n. 56.

59 S 779, Kemble, 563, p. 57: 'sed a secretis noster Atheluuoldus Deique amator diocesi Uuintoniensis civitatis fungens.' Note as well the use of *amator*, rendered as *freond* in Old English. For the Old English version, see *Charters* (R), 48, p. 100: 'Ac Atheluuold bisceop þe his min rædbora & soð Godes freond sealde me to gehwærfe þone ham Heartingas on sixtigum hidum wið þam mynsterlande þe lið into Helig.' This charter, its bilingual survival

However, in comparison to the rich language of favour and affection in *Beowulf*, Æthelwold's important function is 'disguised'; his power with the king is underplayed, moved away from the political and public arena of the court into the king's private sphere. A possible explanation can be found in Gerd Althoff's conclusion with regard to continental practice; he has concluded that the use of *amicitia* to depict social alliances between the tenth-century Frankish kings and their favourites fell out of use, as *amicitia* created a certain notion of equality between the two parties. Consequently, the honour of being a 'friend of the king' ('*amicus regis*') was reluctantly granted.[60] This practice seems to reflect our earlier observations in Edgar's lawcodes, which equally seemed to move away from presenting relationships of interdependency, allowing a more authoritative and independent representation of royal power.[61]

From the outset, this may seem a reasonable explanation for Wulfstan's wariness regarding the presentation of the relationship between Æthelwold and the king. However, Wulfstan's text is part of a religious discourse based on the *RSB* rather than on a court discourse of the negotiation of power; although the underplaying of power relations may have been part of Edgar's methods of diminishing interference in his reign, it cannot explain Wulfstan's desire to focus on intimacy, rather than friendship, between the king and his councillor. Wulfstan chose to depict the association between Æthelwold and Edgar's association as a 'veiled' friendship, a private relationship of intimacy and implied spirituality, rather than of worldly interests. His use of *familiaritas* is an example of the careful drafting of his narrative, embedded in a religious discourse that sought to disentangle the monastic and secular spheres.

5.2.3 Friendship regulated

Wulfstan's adherence to the social imagery of the *RSB* and *Expositio* places his narrative into a specific discourse of Benedictine monasticism. In celebrating a network of interlocked monastic communities, glorifying the careers of Æthelwold and his associates, Wulfstan projected an image of success and presented his

---

and its authenticity have highly been debated in earlier research on the charter, see for a detailed discussion: Kennedy, 'Law and Litigation', pp. 131-183. See chap. 4, pp. 154-156.

60 Althoff, *Family*, *Friends and Followers*, p. 86.

61 See above, chap. 2, pp. 66-68.

audience with a powerful narrative of harmony, of which Æthelwold is both the craftsman and the personification.[62] The social imagery in the *Life of St Æthelwold* should be interpreted as part of the commemoration and the construction of a communal identity. Furthermore, Wulfstan's *Life* may have served as a vehicle to promote the 'Winchester way' of Benedictine monasticism, which pleaded for the retreat of lay interference from the monastic scene and stressed the pacifying results of the alliance between Winchester monasticism and King Edgar's peace, the last a desired outcome for a royal audience troubled by internal strife in the kingdom.

The late 990s had seen a renewed enthusiasm for monasticism; King Æthelred's most prominent advisors of these years seem to have been sympathetic towards the Benedictine model of religious life.[63] However, the king's lay advisors of these years expressed their support through the foundation and endowment of relatively new communities; ealdorman Æthelweard of the Western Shires and his son Æthelmær founded Cerne, ealdorman Ordulf of Kent favoured Tavistock, and Wulfric Spot is known for supporting Burton-on-Trent.[64] By glorifying the heydays of Æthelwold's network, and the unquestioned surrender to the Winchester interpretation of Benedictine monasticism, Wulfstan may have sought to revive the memory of past glory and may have pleaded for a more active role of the king in the safeguarding of monastic independence of secular control whilst simultaneously reminding the royal councillors of the appeasing nature of the successful alliance between Æthelwold and King Edgar. The glorious past and the social imagery of the *RSB* and *Expositio* are used to create a unique Winchester identity based on its active role in the regularising movement in Æthelwold's days, and the absence of friendship language in this imagery is crucial for the delivery of Wulfstan's message.

---

62 Another example of this 'Winchester pride' can be found in Ælfric's *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, which celebrates the connection with Æthelwold, his fame as translator of the *RSB*, and refers to the *RC*. Additionally, Ælfric proudly introduces himself as *alumnus Wintoniensis* in his abbreviated version of Wulfstan's *Life*, see Ælfric, *Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. by Michael Lapidge, Oxford Medieval Texts, in *Wulfstan of Winchester. Life of St Æthelwold* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), Appendix A, pp. 70-80, 1, p. 71.

63 Amongst the king's lay advisors, we find ealdorman Æthelweard of the Western Shires and his son Æthelmær, his uncle Ordulf, and Wulfric Spot. All these men are known for their endowment of newly founded reformed communities, namely Cerne, Tavistock and Burton-on-Trent. Amongst the king's prominent religious advisors were archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury (990-994), a former monk of Glastonbury and former abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury, succeeded by archbishop Ælfric (995-1005), the former abbot of Abingdon. The abbots of the New Minster (Ælfsige, 988-1007), of Abingdon (Wulfgar, 990-1016), and of Glastonbury (Ælfweard, 987-1009) are also prominent in these years.

64 For a discussion, see Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 189-193.

Wulfstan's dependence on the imagery of the *RSB* for portraying Æthelwold demonstrates the existence of specific Winchester discourse, which sought to express its unique identity in a commemoration of its glorious past as a leading, regularising community. This suggestion suggests that the 'Winchester way' was only one of the available religious textual representations of friendship, which could be tested by discussing the social imagery in the *Lives* of Oswald and Dunstan.

5.3 Oswald, Ramsey and the friends of God

5.3.1 Byrhtferth and Ramsey

Oswald's biographer, Byrhtferth, was educated in Ramsey and studied with the Frankish scholar Abbo of Fleury, who visited Ramsey between 985 and 987.[65] In the footsteps of his famous teacher, Byrhtferth would become a hagiographer, a poet, a scholar of computus, and the Ramsey teacher; he is now known as one of the finest scholars of his age.[66] Byrhtferth used Wulfstan's *Life of St Æthelwold* as one of his sources for his narrative, and subsequently the most precise dating for the *Life* is *c.* 997–1002.[67] It is transmitted in a single manuscript, demonstrating its limited circulation and the local orientation of the cult of St Oswald.[68] According to Byrthferth, his *Life* was written to inspire prayers and to obtain Oswald's

---

65 For a discussion of Byrhtferth's authorship, see S. J. Crawford, 'Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Anonymous *Life of St Oswald*', *Speculum Religionis: Being Essays and Studies in Religion and Literature from Plato to Von Hügel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), 99-111; Michael Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth and the *Vita S. Ecgwini*', in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 293-315, p. 295, 313 [originally published in: *Medieval Studies*, 41 (1979): 331-353]. For a study of Abbo's years in Ramsey and his relationship with Byrthferth, see Pierre Riché, *Abbon de Fleury. Un moîne savant et combatif* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 30-43; Elizabeth Dachowski, *First among Abbots. The Career of Abbo of Fleury* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), pp. 63-77. For Abbo's influence on Ramsey library, see Michael Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 120-125, 242-247.

66 Lapidge, *VSO*, pp. xxx-xliv.

67 Lapidge, *VSO*, pp. lxvii-lxviii.

68 This manuscript is MS London BL, Cotton Nero E. i, pt. 1 (fos. 3^r-23^v); for a discussion and dating see, Lapidge, *VSO*, pp. xcvii, and Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. A List of Manuscripts and Manuscripts Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe: Arizona Center of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), 36, p. 30 and 344, p. 65.

mediation.[69] However, the complex nature and extraneous information made it unsuitable for liturgical use, and subsequently the *Life* disappeared into obscurity.[70]

The *Life* is written in a difficult and florid Latin, using Graecisms, an elevated register, and a complex syntax, reflecting some of the traditional characteristics of the 'hermeneutic' tradition.[71] Whereas Wulfstan's Latin was controlled, Byrhtferth's Latin was pretentious. His style was probably partly influenced by the embedment of Ramsey's school in the continental traditions of Fleury, where most of Byrhtferth's teachers had studied.[72] Michael Lapidge has established that Byrhtferth of Ramsey was influenced by the style of Aldhelm, whose verbose Latin prose was strongly influenced by poetic traditions, and Lantfred, who was –again– educated in Fleury.[73] Byrhtferth's ambitions are also reflected in the content of his narrative: the *Life* is as much a biography of Oswald, as of Oda of Canterbury; it incorporates attempts to poetry; it uses various literary models; and it includes extraneous information of both historical and local importance.[74] Byrhtferth's *Life* seems to pay his respects to Bede, whose works reflect a similar interest in computus, hagiography and the recording of local and historical events.[75] In this respect, Byrhtferth's literary style and inspiration is as revealing as Wulfstan's unadorned Latin and focus on the *RSB*. By positioning his own work within Fleury-based traditions, using the mellifluous linguistic Aldhelmian standards, and his indebtedness to Bedan imagery, Byrhtferth emphasised Ramsey's association with the 'cradle of Benedictine monasticism', St Benedict's community in Fleury, while also situating it within a revered Anglo-Saxon tradition of monastic culture.

---

69 *VSO*, p. 6.

70 Lapidge, *VSO*, pp. lxxviii, lciii-lciv.

71 See above, pp. 194-195 and see further Lapidge, 'Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Prose', p. 336; Stephenson, 'Scapegoating the Secular Clergy', pp. 107-112.

72 Abbo, Oswald, and his follower Germanus –who stayed at Ramsey between *c.* 975 and 992– all received their Benedictine training in Fleury.

73 Lapidge, 'Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Prose', p. 335. For a discussion of Lantfred's Fleury background, see Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun*, pp. 220-223.

74 As shown by Lapidge with clear examples of the description of Edgar's coronation and Byrthferth's account of the Battle of Maldon, see Michael Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth and Oswald', in *St Oswald of Worcester*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 64-83, pp. 70-74.

75 Byrhtferth probably used a copy of Bede's *Life of St Cuthbert* as inspiration, which is also filled with *couleur locale* and information on important political events. For a discussion of the parallels between Bede and Byrhtferth, see Lapidge, *VSO*, pp. xxx, xxxiii-xxxv and compare Bede, *Life of St Cuthbert*, ed. and trans. by Bertram Colgrave, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1940).

Michael Lapidge has argued that the celebration of Oswald as an 'icon of Benedictine monasticism' and the ideas of the regulating movement formed the actual purpose in writing the *Life*.[76] However, the iconic value of Byrhtferth's Oswald should rather be sought in a communal discourse of monasticism. Ramsey was a new foundation, heavily dependent upon the patronage and protection of Oswald and a local ealdorman, Æthelwine of East Anglia (962–992). In this respect, Ramsey's foundation history and struggle for patronage is closer to that of those communities which had were established and heavily supported by secular aristocrats –for example Stoke-by-Nayland, Cerne Abbas, Burton-on-Trent, and Tavistock[77] – than to the older, often royal, foundations such as Ely and Winchester. Moreover, Oswald, in contrast to Æthelwold and Dunstan, derived from an influential and rich landowning family from the Danelaw, with a mixed Anglo-Saxon and Viking parentage. His family had been highly successful in securing ecclesiastical careers for some of its members and Oswald followed in the footsteps of his revered kinsmen, Archbishop Oda of Canterbury (941–958), and Archbishop Oskytel of York (958–971).[78]

Oswald's and Æthelwine's rich endowment had made Ramsey prosperous, and its close links with Fleury –and therefore St Benedict himself– had raised Ramsey's profile as an important centre of learning. However, with the successive deaths of its main patrons in 992, Ramsey must have found itself in a vulnerable position. Byrhtferth's *Life of St Oswald* was probably as much concerned with communal identity as Wulfstan's *Life of St Æthelwold*, yet with a different tradition to turn to. Personal association had been essential for the foundation of Ramsey, and, as will be demonstrated below, also functioned prominently in the community's social imagery and construction of identity. The line of reform pursued at Ramsey has received far less attention than the Winchester initiatives, yet Byrhtferth's attempt to model Oswald as the Ramsey personification of Benedictine monasticism

76 Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth and Oswald', p. 66 and p. 82.

77 For a discussion of the connections between these communities and their lay (re)founders, see Stafford, 'Byrhtnoth and Women in the World of *Maldon*', pp. 230-231; and Catherine Cubitt, 'Ælfric's Lay Patrons', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companion to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 165-192, pp. 169-170; Keynes, *Diplomas*, pp. 189-193.

78 Andrew Wareham, 'Saint Oswald's Family and Kin', in *St Oswald of Worcester*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 46-63, pp. 46-47.

offers a chance to explore an alternative interpretation of the interaction between the secular and regular world in a Benedictine environment.

5.3.2 Spiritual friendship as ennobling marker of laymen

Whereas friendship language does not occur in Wulfstan's *Life of St Æthelwold*, ten references can be found in the *Life of St Oswald.*[79] Four instances have unclear antecedents, yet exemplify the importance of friends in social networks as possible source of patronage and council.[80] Two references refer to the relationship between Oswald and Æthelwine, and one entry refers to King Edgar as a venerable friend of St Benedict.[81] The last three occurrences are found in the combination '*amicus Dei*', referring to Oda, Oswald, and Æthelwine, and it is to these references to which we will turn first.[82] The address *amicus Dei* is widespread in medieval texts: in biblical imagery it could either refer to the Old Testament prophets, or to the disciples who had turned into friends of God for their obedience to Christ.[83] Salvation had become an essential part of friendship with God in the New Testament, and subsequently the use of *amicus Dei* was more and more reserved for saints and angels as God's mediators in Christian exegesis.[84] This exclusivity is an indicator of the uneasiness felt towards the concept of friendship, based on the biblical warning in the Epistle of James that friendship with the world could result in enmity of God, which also fuelled the emphasis on a need for the disentanglement of the monastic community from contacts with the secular world as portrayed in the *RSB* and *Expositio*.[85]

---

79 These instances are: *VSO*, i. 5, p. 24; ii. 1, p. 34; ii. 46, p. 46; iii. 4, pp. 56-58; iii. 9, p. 70-72;, iii. 15, p. 86; iii. 17, p. 88; iv. 11, pp. 120-122; iv.14, p. 130 and v. 11, p. 174.

80 Three occurrences refer to Oswald's friends, see *VSO*, ii. 1, p. 34 (referring to Oswald's associates, while sojourning in a clerical community in Winchester); iii. 9, p. 70-72 (intimate friends counselling Oswald about his succession) and v. 11, p. 174 (friends visiting Ramsey for the consecration of the new tower in 991). The last occurrence refers to archbishop Oskytel's friends –including Dunstan– to whom Oswald is introduced after the death of Oda, see *VSO*, iii. 4, pp. 56-58.

81 *VSO*, iii. 15, p. 86 (Oswald); iii. 17, p. 88 (Æthelwine); and iv. 11, pp. 120-122 (Edgar).

82 *VSO*, i. 5, p. 24 (Oda); ii. 46, p. 46 (Oswald) and iv. 14, p. 130 (Æthelwine).

83 For example, see Isaiah 41:8; 2 Chronicles 20:7; and John 15:12-17.

84 As for example in Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmos*, CCSL, 97, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958); Vol 1: libri i-lxx, xiv.4: 111-118, pp. 134-135. For a discussion, see Epp, *Amicitia*, pp. 260-261, and Peterson, 'Der Gottesfreund', pp. 176, 197.

85 James 4:4; James 1:27; and 2 Samuel 16. For the implementation of these Biblical ideas, see, for example, Smaragdus, *Expositio*, IV, 4.4: 7-10 and 15-21, p. 89 (referring to James 4:4 directly); *RSB*, 4.20, p. 32; and Smaragdus, *Expositio*, IV, 4.20: 31-32 and 1, pp. 102-103, referring to James 1: 27.

The representation of the saints Oda and Oswald as *amici Dei* is therefore clearly embedded in Christian theory. Oda was Oswald's paternal uncle, the archbishop of Canterbury, and an active supporter of Benedictine monasticism.[86] Oda's status as friend of God ('*redemptoris amicus*') is illustrated by a miracle emphasising Oda's status as a servant of Christ.[87] Oswald offers another example of Benedictine perfection in his profession as monk in the tradition of saints ('*more sanctorum*'): he is chaste, vigilant in prayers, cheerful, content with fasting, obedient to the communal rule, and attentive.[88] His status as holy man and friend of God is stressed by his portrayal as a soldier of Christ, with obedience to the *RSB* and humility as his weapons, qualifying him as worthy of inclusion to the ranks of the saints:

> 'Erat enim –ut sanctis et ueris amicis Dei usuale est– binis fulcitus columpnis, id est, dilectione Dei et proximi, cui erant quinque sagaciter adiunte, que firmiter domum suam sustentabant ne a uento quassaretur uelut <illa> nutabunda que in paludibus stare cognoscitur.'[89]

Byrhtferth has portrayed Oswald as a true friend of God, supported by the two columns of faith: '*dilectione Dei et proximi*', the love of God and your neighbours. Oswald is a living example of the two commandments: at peace in the world, but with his 'house' ('*domum*') intact –possibly a metaphor for his virginity– protected by his obedience to the *RSB*. The emphasis on Oswald being in the world, protected by his adherence to the rule, shows Byrhtferth's familiarity with the biblical concerns about the intermingling of the religious and secular spheres.

Consequently, Byrhtferth's use of *amicus Dei* to refer to the secular ealdorman Æthelwine is remarkable. The address *amicus Dei* is commonly used in secondary literature to distinguish 'our' Æthelwine from the vast amount of namesakes, and is often falsely attributed to the twelfth-century Worcester

---

[86] For the family relationship, see *VSO*, i. 1, p. 10. For Oda's support, see *VSO*, ii. 3-4; Wareham, 'Saint Oswald's Family and Kin', pp. 46-47.

[87] *VSO*, i. 5, p. 24.

[88] *VSO*, ii., 7, p. 46.

[89] *VSO*, ii., 7, p. 46: 'For Oswald was –as is usual with saints and true friends of God- supported by twin columns, that is, love of God and of his neighbour; five more columns were cleverly adjoined, which firmly supported his house so that it would not be shaken by the wind, like that tottering house which is known to stand in the swamps.' Lapidge prefers a translation of 'the holy and true companions of God', a translation which clearly underlines the links with Christ's disciples.

chronicler.[90] Andrew Wareham has suggested that Æthelwine's brother Ælfwold, rather than Æthelwine, is addressed as *amicus Dei*.[91] However, this suggestion can be rejected on textual evidence, as the combination with '*princeps Orientalium Anglorum*' can only refer to Æthelwine within Byrhtferth's narrative.[92] Cyril Hart has suggested seeing the address as a (mis)translated vernacular by-name or pun: 'Æthelwine' would translate as 'noble friend', yet his patronage and protection of Ramsey made him rather 'God's friend'.[93] While the Anglo-Saxons are known for their onomastic wordplay, Byrhtferth's portrayal of Æthelwine as *amicus Dei* is anchored in the *Life of St Oswald* in more than one way, and requires a more detailed interpretation of the relationship of Oswald and Æthelwine.[94]

Oswald's power base in the Fens was strongly local in focus, and shaped by his connection with Æthelwine and his family. The importance of this personal association for Ramsey's existence is also reflected in Byrhtferth's incorporation of a detailed family-tree of the off-spring of Æthelstan 'Half-King', Æthelwine's father and former ealdorman of Mercia (*c.* 932–956), and in his detailed and lengthy remarks of the family's generous attitude towards monasteries.[95] The relationship between Oswald and Æthelwine had been actively forged at the funeral of one of King Edgar's nobles in the mid-960s, at which Oswald sought protection for his little Westbury congregation.[96] Oswald apparently needed a strong local patron, as he is said to have refused a royal grant of either St Albans, Ely, or Benfleet for hosting his

---

90 As in Hart, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his family', p. 127 and echoed by Janet M. Pope, 'Monks and Nobles in the Anglo-Saxon Monastic Reform', *ANS*, 17, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1994 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), 165-180, p. 168. For this citation, see John of Worcester, *Chronicon ex chronica*, 2, pp. 490-492: 'Atheluuardus dux, filius ducis Estanglorum Atheluuini Dei amici'.

91 Wareham, *Lords and Communities*, p. 20.

92 Byrhtferth relates how Ælfwold refused the office of ealdorman and consistently refers to him as *miles*, whereas Æthelwine is commonly styled *princeps Orientalium Anglorum.* For this refusal, see *VSO*, iii. 12, pp. 84-86; and for Byrhtferth's styles of address, compare *VSO*, iv. 12, p. 124; iv. 14, p. 128; and iii. 14, p. 84. Additionally, as Wareham has acknowledged, Ælfwold also consistently signed diplomas as *miles*.

93 Hart, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his family', p. 127.

94 For a stimulating introduction to the extensive use of puns and onomastic techniques in Old English literature, see Robinson, 'The Significance of Names in Old English Literature'.

95 *VSO*, iii. 14.

96 Lapidge is convinced that this *miles egregius* was the ealdorman Æthelmund of North-West Mercia, who last witnessed in 965 and is buried in Glastonbury. See Lapidge, *VSO*, p. 81, n. 135.

community.[97] These established foundations did not offer the advantages of the new foundation at Ramsey, which benefitted from woodlands and fish ponds, but most of all from a close vicinity to Upwood, Æthelwine's principal residence. Upwood lay only two miles to the north-east of Ramsey, securing direct protection.[98] It is exactly in a context of active protection that we find our reference, hailing Æthelwine for his crucial role in the protection of Ramsey against Ælfhere, ealdorman of Mercia (*fl.* 956–983) in 975:

> 'Defendit pius princeps Orientalium Anglorum omnia loca monasteriorum cum maximo honore, pro qua re 'amicus Dei' dictus est.'[99]

Æthelwine's defence of the monks takes place at a council, in which the ealdorman is chosen as chief commander of the defence troops. Æthelwine is depicted as '*iusti uiri*', and is said 'to have the wisdom of God in him to do Judgment' ('*in eo esset sapientia ad faciendum iudicium*'), a reference to Solomon's judgment in I Kings 3:28.[100] This characterisation of Æthelwine as a 'new Solomon' is developed in greater detail in the *Life.* Just as Solomon built the first temple, Æthelwine supported the erection of God's house at Ramsey. The monastery was adorned with its two towers –representing Oswald and Æthelwine– just as Solomon's temple had been decorated with the pillars Boaz and Jachin, which were thought to represent strength and divine justice.[101]

This likening of Ramsey to Solomon's temple may be another indication of Byrhtferth's admiration of Bede's scholarly achievements, as Bede also wrote a commentary on Solomon's temple and the Book of Kings, while simultaneously

---

97 *VSO*, iii. 12, pp. 78-80. The royal offer presumably was placed during Edgar's Easter Council in 965.

98 *VSO*, iii. 16, p. 88.

99 *VSO*, iv.14, p. 130: 'The holy ealdorman of East Anglia defended all monasteries with the greatest respect, as a result of which he was called 'friend of God''. Lapidge prefers not to translate *amicus Dei*.

100 *VSO*, iv. 13, p. 126. It may be argued that the biblical parallel casts the monks in the role of the innocent child, whereas Æthelwine and Ælfhere present the true and false mother.

101 For the image of Oswald and Æthelwine as the towers of Ramsey, see *VSO*, v. 15, p. 186. For Boaz and Jachin, see 1 Kings 7:15, 7:21 and 2 Kings 11:14; 23:3. For a discussion of the importance of Solomon's temple in the medieval imagery, see Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings*, pp. 58-59.

bringing the two *amici Dei* together as those supporting Ramsey.[102] Moreover, the depiction of saints and religious leaders as standing stones and pillars was a common feature of the reform movement in art and hagiography, as has been pointed out by Robert Deshman, and was in particular associated with an identification of monasticism spiritually and materially with the universal church itself.[103] Moreover, at the consecration of Ramsey's new church in 991 Æthelwine's generosity is directly linked to Solomon's care of his people, emphasising the spiritual nature of the ealdorman's favours.[104] Notably, Solomon was perceived as the personification of wisdom in the imagery of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom.[105] In it, wisdom is presented as a virtue that turns men into friends of God.[106] Byrhtferth had active knowledge of the Book of Wisdom, as his direct quotation in the commemoration of King Edgar as wise and just king proves.[107] All these examples suggest that Byrhtferth deliberately fashioned Æthelwine as *amicus Dei*, reflecting Solomon's wisdom, love of peace, and divine justice, and exalted him as being Oswald's spiritual equal. [108]

Æthelwine is not the only person who is fashioned using popular biblical imagery. His brother Ælfwold is portrayed as the strong arm of God's justice, likened

---

102 For a discussion of the importance and circulation of Bede's *De templo Salomonis* (On the Temple) in our period, see the useful introduction by Jennifer O'Reilly, 'Introduction', in Bede, *On the Temple*, trans. by Seán Connolly, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press), pp. xvii-lv, pp.xlv-xlvi. For another example of the importance of the imagery of building structure in Byrhtferth's imagery, see above-mentioned description of Oswald as held up by two columns, and supported by five columns supporting his house, establishing his status as *amicus Dei*, *VSO*, ii., 7, p. 46, and above, p. 209.

103 Robert Deshman, 'The Imagery of the Living Ecclesia and the English Reform Movement', in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach, with Virginia Darrow Oggins, Studies in Medieval Culture, 20 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1986), 261-282, pp. 275-277.

104 *VSO*, v. 11, p. 174.

105 For a discussion of the circulation of the books of the Bible and the status of the apocryphal texts in our period, see Richard Marsden, 'Wrestling with the Bible: Textual Problems for the Scholar and the Student', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England. Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. by Paul Cavill (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), 69-90, pp. 71-72.

106 Wisdom 7:14.

107 For Byrhtferth's direct quotation, see *VSO*, iv. 11, p. 120. The reference is to Wisdom 4:7. This paragraph will be discussed in further detail below.

108 Note also the Byrhtferth's use of *amicus Dei* for describing King Æthelred in Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Life of St Ecgwine*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey. The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Press (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 205-303, ii. 7, p. 244. For a further understanding of Byrhtferth's use of the combination, further study of his use of the imagery of Solomon is recommended.

to the warrior-kings Judas Maccabeus and David in his defence of the monks.[109] Whereas Æthelwine and Ælfwold fight on behalf of God, their enemy Ælfhere has fallen under the spell of the Devil (‘*antiqui hostis*’).[110] Biblical imagery thus serves as a powerful narrative tool to portray the strife between laymen in familiar terms of a battle between good and evil, while simultaneously offering suitable examples of lay behaviour. It mirrors the constructive nature of the *Life*: by knitting together the three protagonists –Oda, Oswald and Æthelwine– in the use of a shared form of address, the importance of this circle of ‘friends’ is stressed. Æthelwine, *amicus Dei*, and his battle-eager brother Ælfwold, are upheld as lay models for imitation. Æthelwine and Ælfwold’s status is elevated, reflecting fashionable models of lay authority, discussed by Bede, popularised and distributed during the Carolingian Renaissance, and used as a model for kingship in Anglo-Saxon sources from the ninth century onwards.[111] The function of friendship in the construction of exemplary lay models is further emphasised by Byrhtferth’s plea to St Benedict to reserve for the saint’s friend (‘*amicus uenerandus*’), King Edgar, a place at God’s right hand in heaven.[112] Robert Deshman has established that Byrhtferth’s imagery of Edgar was carefully modelled on a Winchester iconography of a monastic and christological kingship.[113] However, Byrhtferth adds to this imagery his own spiritual marker of friendship, as indicator of the king’s moral worth, demonstrating the small, yet significant, role of friendship as an elevating notion in his social imagery.

Janet Pope has suggested that laymen who befriended reformers became honorary ‘friends of God’, a marker of an awakening religious devotion amongst laymen, based on her research of the Anglo-Saxon wills and the evidence provided

---

109 *VSO*, iv. 13, p. 128; and iv. 14, pp. 128-130.

110 *VSO*, iv. 12, p. 126.

111 Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings*, pp. 56-59. For the influence of Solomon as *examplum* for Carolingian rulers, see Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 431-436. For the implementation in Anglo-Saxon England, see Anton Scharer, ‘The Writing of History at King Alfred’s Court’, *EME*, 5.2 (1996): 177-206, p. 186 and Matthew Kempshall, ‘No Bishop, no King: the Ministerial Ideology of Kingship in Asser’s *Res Gesta Ælfredi*’, in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. by Richard Gameson and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 106-127, pp. 113-114. For a comparison of King Alfred with Solomon, see Asser, *Life King Alfred*, 76: 43-47, pp. 60-61.

112 *VSO*, iv. 11, p. 120.

113 Deshman, ‘*Benedictus monarcha et monachus.* Early Medieval Ruler Theology and the Anglo-Saxon Reform’, p. 206.

by the Ramsey Chronicle and the *Liber Eliensis*.[114] Her conclusions are strengthened by the evidence provided in Byrhtferth's *Life*, which additionally places this lay model of conduct as originating from an older, religious discourse. The virtuous nature of this lay model is further embedded in Byrhtferth's discussion of the friendship between Ramsey's founders. Oswald may have sought Æthelwine's friendship for mundane reasons, yet their relationship is carefully portrayed in the language of a virtuous and spiritual friendship. At their first meeting, Æthelwine approaches Oswald for a blessing, and subsequently the two men discuss their salvation.[115] Again, Byrhtferth carefully frames their friendship in an acceptable Christian context, based on the notion that friends should support each other to find salvation in a reflection of friendship as soul-guardianship. The idea of a friend as a 'guardian of the soul' ('*custos animae*') derived from the biblical interpretation of the friendship of David and Jonathan, explored by Ambrose, and given a wide circulation through Isidore of Sevilla's *Etymologiae* and Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*.[116] Moreover, as Alan Thacker has emphasised, Bede's defining understanding of those who lead and teach the flock was of '*custodes animorum*', again suggesting Byrhtferth's indebtedness to Bedan traditions for the formulation of his own model of reform.[117] Their reciprocated address as '*amice*'/ '*amico*' in the following chapters should be understood in this moral setting.[118] Through Æthelwine's offer and Oswald's acceptance of Ramsey, their friendship is sealed and firmly placed in a spiritual context: Ramsey becomes the spiritual token of their friendship.

Affection and love seem also to have been used as markers of social esteem, as a method to mark special persons, events and relationships, establishing a moral standard that enabled the transgression of boundaries between the lay and religious

---

[114] Pope, 'Monks and Nobles in the Anglo-Saxon Monastic Reform', pp. 165-169, p. 170-172.

[115] *VSO*, iii. 13, p. 82.

[116] 1 Samuel 18:1-3; Ambrose, *De officiis*, iii.22.133:60-63, p. 203; Isidore, *Etymologies*, X.A.4-5:17-21; Gregory the Great, *Moralia siue Expositio in Iob*, CCSL, 143, 3 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979-1985); repr 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005); Vol 2: libri xvii-xxxv, xxvii.15.28:4-7, p. 1351. For a discussion of its influence on the works of Bede, anchoring the imagery in an Anglo-Saxon setting, see Epp, *Amicitia*, p. 250.

[117] Alan Thacker, 'Bede's Ideal of Reform', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. by Patrick Wormald, with Donald Bullough and Roger Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 130-153, p. 131.

[118] For these references, see *VSO*, iii. 15, p. 86 (Æthelwine refers to Oswald as *amice*) and iii. 16, p. 88 (Oswald refers to Oswald as *amico*).

spheres. They are all used as forms of communication, delivering a message of importance and moral worth. Oswald is described using as a string of expressions of affection emphasising his characterisation as the pious shepherd: he is widely loved by the poor, the people, the foremost within the country, and the Lord.[119] These images are *topoi* to represent Oswald as the ideal shepherd, but they also emphasise the centrality of the language of affection in indicating a person's moral worth and importance. Joy and sadness mark important events in Oswald's life: he is welcomed into the community of Fleury by Wulfald, who is 'gladdened at heart' ('*letus est corde effectus*'), and his departure is marked by tears and distress.[120] Simultaneously, affectionate language and the display of emotions are part of the language of favour: Oda is said to have loved Oswald exceedingly ('*oppido eum dilexit*'), while granting him the resources to buy a minster in Winchester; Oskytel welcomes Oswald with embraces ('*amplexibus*') at his court and within his patronage in a reflection of Joseph's brotherly love for Benjamin; Dunstan recommends Oswald for the vacant see of Worcester out of spiritual love ('*divina karitate*'); King Edgar grants Oswald his episcopal honours out of love ('*dilexit miro affectu*').[121]

These last examples indicate the entanglement of the secular and religious world in a court environment. Affection negotiated relationships of favour, as indicated by some of the evidence in our discussion of contemporary charters, and as discussed in the research of Stephen Jaeger and Julia Barrow.[122] Byrhtferth's use of these notions underlines the close association between the court and religious communities, and indicates that these influential communities were very much embedded in court culture. Moreover, in his use of these court notions to create an acceptable model of lay-religious interaction through the pairing of affectionate language and friendship as an elevating notion of spiritual worth, Byrhtferth created also an acceptable discourse for use in a religious setting. In this respect, these conclusions contradict Jaeger's argument that a court discourse of favour and friendship was unsuitable to be applied to a Benedictine monastic setting.[123]

---

[119] *VSO*, iii. 6, p. 61.

[120] *VSO*, ii. 5, p. 15; iiii. 3, p. 56.

[121] *VSO*, ii. 1, p. 34; iii. 4, p. 56; iii. 4 and iii. 5, p. 58; iv. 5, p. 102.

[122] See chap. 3, 138; Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 23-24.

[123] Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 52-53; Julia Barrow, 'Demonstrative Behaviour and Political Communication in later Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE*, 36 (2007): 127-150, pp. 146-147.

However, Jaeger's conclusions are based on later evidence, and should therefore not be rejected completely; a change may have been under way, and this Ramsey discourse demonstrates that a gradual change within Benedictine discourses of social interaction should be anticipated.

However, it is also clear that friendship as moral marker is not suitable for discussing relationships *within* monastic communities: Byrhtferth shows wariness about associations based on favour within the precinct. For example, Byrhtferth portrayed the relationship between Oswald and his follower Germanus as a reflection of the love of Christ for his favourite disciple John.[124] In another seemingly superfluous narrative, Byrhtferth relates a miracle story of two unnamed brothers in an unspecified monastery that love each other so desperately that they cannot live without each other; after the death of the elder, the younger is visited in a vision by his deceased colleague and welcomed into heaven. Again, Byrhtferth carefully frames this moving display of affection in the New Testament imagery of Pauline love, which is spiritual rather than worldly.[125] In his reliance on biblical imagery for the portrayal of these relationships, Byrhtferth reflects the *RSB* in the sense that favouritism is only acceptable if based on moral worth.[126]

Although Byrhtferth shows awareness of the dual –and therefore problematic– nature of friendship, he carefully positions friendship and love in an acceptable framework of spiritual love for rendering the important relationship of patronage and personal association with the secular world. Whereas friendship is used to ennoble relationships ultimately based on worldly patronage, love and affection are rendered more suitable to frame relationships that should be free from any implication of favouritism in a monastic setting. As a result, Byrhtferth's

---

124 *VSO*, iii. 7, p. 64, with references to John 13:25 and 20:2. For a discussion of Germanus' career, see Michael Lapidge, 'Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter', in *Words*, *Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by Michael Korhammer with Karl Reichl and Hans Sauer (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1992), 99-129.

125 *VSO*, iv. 9, p. 116, with a citation of 2 Peter 1:7.

126 *RSB*, 2.16-17, p. 24. Note that these ideas of the *RSB* are based on John Cassian's sixteenth *Conlatio de amicitia* in which similar biblical imagery is cited to express an acceptable basis for favouritism. Noteworthy in this context is that John Cassian's *Conlatio* was based on a dialogue with his follower Germanus. As we do not have proof of John Cassian being part of Ramsey's library, we can only speculate whether Byrhtferth was acquainted with his ideas. See John Cassian, *Conlationes*, ed. by Michael Petschenig, CSEL, 13 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), xvi, 14, pp. 448-450. For a discussion of John Cassian's imagery, and its influence on the social imagery of the *RSB*, see McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. 78-82.

religious discourse and social imagery is markedly different from Wulfstan of Winchester's presentation of social interaction in the *Life of St Æthelwold.*

5.3.3 Friendship celebrated

In the above, it has been suggested that Byrhtferth's *Life of St Oswald* was a deliberate attempt to promote a Ramsey identity, embedded in an alternative discourse of Benedictine monasticism. This premise seems to be confirmed by his use of social imagery, reflecting a nuanced discourse of spiritual friendship that could be used to create acceptable and desirable models of lay behaviour in a Benedictine environment. Research by Andrew Wareham and Cyril Hart has demonstrated that Ramsey as a community was heavily dependent on its personal associations with Oswald's kin and local laymen for its endowment and protection.[127] This dependency on local links and its close association with a secular nobleman made Ramsey a very different monastic community from the older, established communities that were part of Winchester's monastic network. Moreover, Ramsey was placed within the close vicinity of two established communities, Ely and Peterborough, which benefitted from important relics, longstanding traditions, and a close association with Æthelwold, who had richly endowed these communities on their refoundation in *c.* 970.[128] Rivalry for patronage, prestige, and endowment between these communities can be anticipated, as benefaction and protection were usually locally generated.[129]

Whereas Wulfstan could commemorate a generation of abbots and bishops in Æthelwold's footsteps, Oswald's associates occupied more modest positions in the great Benedictine networks of the late tenth century; the only two men that were raised to a certain distinction were Germanus and Eadnoth, and these promotions

---

[127] Wareham, 'Saint Oswald's Family and Kin', pp. 52-53; Cyril Hart, 'Eadnoth I of Ramsey and Dorchester', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 613-624, pp. 613-615;

[128] *VSÆ*, 23-24, pp. 38-42.

[129] Tensions existed between the communities, as is apparent from the two opposing narratives of either the 'theft', or 'rescue', of the remains of Ramsey's abbot Eadnoth by Ely at the expense of Ramsey, after the abbot's death in the Battle of *Assandun.* For the Ely account of this 'rescue', see *Liber Eliensis*, ii. 71, p. 171. In contrast, for the Ramsey account of this 'theft', see *Chronica Abbatiae Ramesiensis*, ed. W. M. Macray, Rolls Series, 93 (London: Longman, 1886), 73, pp. 118-119. For a discussion of the fenland rivalries, see Alan Thacker, 'Saint-Making and Relic Collecting by Oswald and his Communities', in *St Oswald of Worcester*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 244-268, p. 259.

probably originated in their personal and local connections.[130] Although Ramsey had acquired some minor relics during its early years in existence, it did not seek to promote associated cults actively, exemplified by Byrhtferth's silence on the translations and/or cults of local saints and relics. Simultaneously, Byrhtferth's *Life* is a first indication of a changing interest in this respect, as studied by Alan Thacker in further detail.[131] Neither did Byrhtferth choose to celebrate Ramsey's *alumni*, but instead, Byrhtferth carefully positioned Ramsey in a Benedictine network based on the personal associations of Oswald: with lay associates, with ecclesiastical leaders, and, importantly, with Fleury which held the relics of St Benedict. This last connection is further fortified through the addition of two acrostic poems by Abbo of Fleury, written in commemoration of Dunstan, and emphasising the connections between Fleury, Ramsey, and the former archbishop. One of these poems asks in its acrostic theme for the protection of Dunstan and his friends ('*amicis*'), implicitly creating a friendship circle and demanding protection for all those included in this network.[132]

The saints Oda and Oswald, supported by the just King Edgar, protected by the wise Æthelwine, and defended by the fierce Ælfwold, form a protective network of virtuous friends around the community of Ramsey. The *Life* proposes the possibility of lay intervention in a Benedictine setting, as long as patronage and association were directed towards the establishment of a spiritual tie. This spiritual friendship became an expression of devotion, while elevating patrons to the status of *amici Dei* through their connection with monastic foundations. Additionally, Byrhtferth emphasises Oswald's personal 'acquaintance' with St Benedict through his earlier stay in Fleury, relating that Oswald established the saint's reputation with King Edgar which inspired his refoundation policy.[133] By carefully framing the moral worth of Oswald's personal associations in the imagery of spiritual friendship,

---

130 Germanus was the titular abbot of the exiled community of Winchcombe from *c.* 969 to *c.* 993, after which he was installed at Cholsey until his death in 1013, assumingly with financial support from Æthelwine. However, upon Germanus' death in 1013, Cholsey was suppressed. For a discussion, see Lapidge, 'Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter', pp. 409-410. Eadnoth became abbot of Ramsey after the death of Oswald, and was later promoted to the episcopacy of Dorchester between 1007 and 1009 and was a member of an influential, local kingroup, see Lapidge, *Byrhtferth*, pp. 180-181, n. 144; and Wareham, 'Saint Oswald's Family and Kin', p. 52.

131 Thacker, 'Saint-Making and Relic Collecting by Oswald and his Communities', pp. 255-257.

132 *VSO*, v. 8, p. 166: "Summe sacer, te summa salus tueatur amicis."

133 *VSO*, iii. 11, p. 76-78.

Byrhtferth created a model that both reflected and honoured Ramsey's identity as a community based on ties between the secular and regular world. In doing so, Byrhtferth's *Life* proposes an alternative model of interaction between lay benefactors and reformed communities, creating a different discourse of friendship in a Benedictine environment.

5.4 Dunstan, favour and patronage

5.4.1 The Cleric B.

The *Life of St Dunstan* was written between 997 and 1002, and used material from the *Lives* of both Æthelwold and Oswald.[134] However, in contrast to the *Lives* of Æthelwold and Oswald, it was not written by a member of Dunstan's reformed community, but by a cleric ('*sacerdos*') only known by his initial 'B.'. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom have meticulously researched B.'s antecedents and have concluded that he was an Anglo-Saxon cleric, who studied at Glastonbury and who left Dunstan's retinue in 960 to join the college of Saint-Martin of Bishop Ebrachar in Liège.[135] At the end of the century B. seems to have been looking for patronage which would allow him to return to England and the *Life of St Dunstan* was part of an attempt to entice the reformed Archbishop Ælfric (995-1005) to support him.[136] While B.'s close personal association with Dunstan has resulted in a

---

[134] Citations are taken from the new edition by Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge (*VSD*). Translations are my own, but the new edition has been used to correct where necessary. For convenience, references to the older edition by William Stubbs (*Memorials*), until recently the only available edition, are also supplied in brackets by chapter number and page number. Note that Winterbottom and Lapidge have taken MS Sankt Gallen, Kantonalsbibliothek, Vadianische Sammlung, 337 as basis for their edition, whereas Stubbs has based his edition on the text of MS Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, 1029 (812). For a discussion of the relationship between the manuscripts underlying this choice, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, pp. lxxxiv-lxxxvii; for a discussion of the dating, see p. lxiv.

[135] Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, pp. lxvii-lxx; Michael Lapidge has earlier suggested the name Byrhthelm for this member of Dunstan's personal retinue, based on charter attestations, see Michael Lapidge, 'B. and the *Vita S. Dunstani*', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 247-259, pp. 257-258.

[136] For B.'s motives in writing the *Life* to obtain patronage from Ælfric, see Brooks, 'The Career of St Dunstan', p. 2; Lapidge, 'B. and the *Vita S. Dunstani*', p. 256; David Rollason, 'The Concept of Sanctity in the Early Lives of St Dunstan', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 261-272, p. 264 and Catherine Cubitt, 'Archbishop Dunstan, A Prophet in Politics?',

lively picture of his early years, his continental stay has unfortunately also resulted in a silence on Dunstan's twenty-eight years as archbishop of Canterbury.[137] Although B.'s *Life* was copied for distribution in Canterbury and sent to Abbo to be rendered in verse, it was soon to be replaced by a neat set of *Lectiones* by Adelard of Ghent.[138] The reasons for this substitution are inherent to the *Life* itself: B.'s saintly portrait was highly unusual in its content matter and style. B.'s depiction of the young saint as a frantic and possessed zealot sharply contrasts with the angelic elderly Dunstan as encountered in Wulfstan of Winchester's *Life of St Æthelwold* and Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Life of St Oswald*.[139] Furthermore, B.'s lavish and over-adorned Latin, overflowing with his own pompous neologisms, is grammatically rustic and erroneous.[140] Although B. clearly intended to elevate his narrative by implementing 'hermeneutic' features, his ambitious attempt resulted in a rather unbalanced style; the *Life* was difficult to understand and unsuitable for liturgical use. Hence, it did not live up to the high standards and expectations of his reformed audience, underlining once more B.'s status as outsider of the Benedictine networks.

However, B.'s position is interesting for our discussion of friendship in religious imagery of the period: he offers us an alternative voice, removed from a Benedictine mould. B.'s objectives for writing his *Life* were less intertwined with the construction of a community's identity or reputation, yet were closely aligned with his status as cleric: B. needed to prove himself worthy of patronage. It was thus in his interest to portray a world in which clerics and monks were living in mutual respect, and for this reason Simon Coates has classified B. as a "man out of his time".[141]

---

in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 145-166, p. 148.

137 Lapidge has attributed B.'s silenceto the fact that he had only limited access to the sources, see Lapidge, 'B. and the *Vita Dunstani*', pp. 250-251.

138 For the letter to Abbo of Fleury concerning B.'s *Life*, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, Appendix III, p. 162; for Adelard of Ghent's *Lectiones*, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, pp. 111-145.

139 Michael Lapidge, 'Dunstan [St Dunstan] (*d.* 988)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press (004), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8288, accessed 13 March 2012].

140 For a discussion of B.'s unique vocabulary and style, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, pp. lxxxvii-cxxii.

141 Simon Coates, 'Perceptions of the Anglo-Saxon Past in the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement', in *The Church Retrospective*, ed. by R. N. Swanton, Papers read at the 1995 summer meeting and the 1996 winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society, (Woodbridge: Boydell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1997), 61-74, p. 72.

However, B. was also aware that he needed to demonstrate his ability to blend in, as his adoption of the popular, 'hermeneutic' style illustrates. B. was thus performing a balancing act between nostalgia and nuance, aiming to forge himself a better future out of it. As our discussion of the *Lives* of Æthelwold and Oswald has shown that (the absence of) friendship played a significant role in the construction of the interaction between Benedictine communities and secular patrons, B.'s balancing act is of special interest for positioning the discourses as found in Benedictine sources. As B. as cleric was negotiating relationships with the world on a daily basis, a less concerned attitude towards the interaction between the secular and regular world may be presumed.[142] B.'s *Life of Dunstan* gives us therefore a unique chance to explore whether this difference in background also translates into an alternative social imagery of friendship and interaction between lay and religious.

5.4.2 Friendship, patronage, and gender

B. refers in the *Life of St Dunstan* eight times to friendship: three times to indicate court politics, once in an antiphon, and four times to address the relationship between Dunstan and the widow Æthelflæd.[143] This quick count already indicates two interesting features of B.'s use of friendship vocabulary. Firstly, B. does not have any objections in using friendship language in a court setting, refraining from Wulfstan's model of presenting these ties as 'veiled' friendships in the *Life of St Æthelwold*.[144] Secondly, B. offers us another chance to reflect upon the use of friendship language with regards to the interaction with a woman, as B. addresses Æthelflæd twice as being Dunstan's '*amica*'.[145] This is remarkable, as we have concluded that friendship vocabulary was used in a gendered way in both the vernacular wills and poetic traditions.[146] However, not only Old English traditions were gendered in this respect. Brian McGuire has demonstrated in his study of the Latin letter collections of

---

[142] Ann Williams has portrayed late Anglo-Saxon England as a place in which many churches needed support to sustain themselves. Thegnly families took the opportunity to get involved in religious life in an expression of faith and as a method to enhance their own status, see Williams, 'Thegnly Piety and Ecclesiastical Patronage in the Late Old English Kingdom', pp. 18-21.

[143] Court politics: *VSD*, 6.6, p. 24; 19.4, p. 62; and 23.1, p. 70. (*Memorials*, 6, p. 12; 19, p. 30; and 23, p. 34). Antiphon: 23.4, p. 74 (*Memorials*, 23, p. 35). Dunstan and Æthelflæd: *VSD*, 11.2, p. 38; 11.4, p. 38; and twice in 11.5, p. 38 (*Memorials*, 11, pp. 18-20).

[144] See above, p. 203.

[145] *VSD*, 11.2, p. 38; 11.5, p. 38 (*Memorials*, 11, p. 19).

[146] See chap. 3, pp. 134-137; and chap. 4, pp. 160-162.

Boniface, Lull and Alcuin that the language of friendship was not commonly used to address women; instead, references to *caritas* and spiritual kinship were used to avoid sexual and hierarchical connotations.[147]

Dunstan's background is debated. Traditionally, he is seen as originating from a thegnly family, with strong Glastonbury connections which may have advanced his prospects.[148] Dunstan was raised at Æthelstan's court, and his elder brother Wulfric obtained rich estates from Edmund and Eadred.[149] Additionally, his family may have been connected by blood to the royal family and to the bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, and possibly Worcester.[150] However, Julia Barrow has questioned Dunstan's thegnly background and has found evidence for identifying Dunstan's father with a Winchester cleric, adding an interesting dimension to any discussion of his views of the clerical life.[151] Dunstan's rise to fame seems to have aroused envy in court circles from the start; while ordained in the clerical orders, his reputation resulted in a position at Æthelred's court.[152] However, court factions – amongst them Dunstan's own kinsman– plotted against the man of God and drove him away, harassing him by throwing him into a muddy pool. Fortunately, Dunstan found his way to a neighbouring estate of a friend ('*quondam amicorum*') at which he hoped to wash.[153]

Friendship and enmity counterbalance each other in this passage, demonstrating a dualistic worldview of good and evil, in which friendship represents

---

[147] McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, pp. 111 and 125.

[148] Michael Lapidge has suggested a possible identification for his father Heorstan as a royal thegn by this name, witnessing a charter of Æthelstan, dated between 925 and 933 (S 1417), see Lapidge, 'Dunstan [St Dunstan] (*d.* 988)'.

[149] Wulfric is identified in the B.'s *Life* as *praepositus* of the Glastonbury estates: *VSD*, 18.1, p. 58 (*Memorials*, 18, p. 28). This profitable office and connection with Glastonbury makes him a suitable candidate for an identification with the man named Wulfric, who received substantial estates in Wiltshire and Surrey substantial in the 940s, and who subsequently endowed the Glastonbury community generously, see Lapidge, 'Dunstan [St Dunstan] (*d.* 988)'.

[150] Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, pp. xv-xvi, xxvii; Brooks, 'The Career of St Dunstan', pp. 5-11. However, the identification of Dunstan's blood-relatives is purely based on his *Lives*, which may have over-advertised his 'noble' blood.

[151] Julia Barrow, 'Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, *c.* 900-1200', *ANS*, 30, ed. by C. P. Lewis, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 41-61, p. 54, with n. 85. She will develop this identification in a forthcoming volume on the Anglo-Saxon clerical life. I want to thank Professor Barrow for sharing some of her ideas in private communication.

[152] *VSD*, 5.3, p. 18 (*Memorials*, 5, p. 10).

[153] *VSD*, 6, pp. 20-22 (*Memorials*, 6, pp. 11-13).

charity and trust. Simultaneously it shows the importance of friendship –and enmity– in a binary, secular society; enmity resulted in Dunstan's exclusion from court, and friendship allowed him to cleanse himself from the mud and false insults, and to re-establish himself within society. In this passage, we can actually perceive the mechanics of inclusion and exclusion through friendship and enmity, underlying a binary society as envisaged in the lawcodes.[154] The jealousy of the courtiers seems to be based on favours granted to Dunstan, although none of these are mentioned in this passage. Nevertheless, B. emphasises that the young cleric never pursued worldly gain, which he considered empty ('*uanos fauores*') in comparison to the spiritual gift of wisdom.[155]

Although Dunstan is said to have sought spiritual rather than worldly gain, he apparently intended to follow a secular career as suggested by his initial rejection of the monkish habit and his intention to marry; even so, illness redirected his life, and he was ordained by his kinsman Ælfheah of Winchester.[156] Yet his ordination as a monk did not hinder his career. After the death of King Æthelstan, Dunstan is said to have been summoned by King Edmund to serve as a royal councillor ('*et etiam ipse inter regios proceratus et palatinos principes admumeraretur electus*'). B. has embedded Dunstan's acceptance of this high honour in a series of biblical citations, justifying his position of power and his participation in both a contemplative and practical life.[157] In B.'s portrayal of Dunstan's position at court, and his interaction with his fellow-courtiers, we encounter a young man who seems to have been firstly a courtier, and only secondly a Benedictine monk. It may not surprise that Dunstan's further promotion inspired again fierce opposition and slander, resulting in a second discharge from court. However, this time his expulsion was backed by the king, who in great rage ordered Dunstan to be stripped from his rank and honour ('*iussit eum ablata dignitate etiam omni honore priuari*'), condemning him to a state of exile that

---

154 See chap. 2, p. 76.

155 *VSD*, 5.3, p. 18 (*Memorials*, 5, p. 10).

156 *VSD*, 8.2-8.3, p. 26 (*Memorials*, 8, pp. 14-15); for Æthelwold's ordination on the same day, see *VSÆ*, 8, p. 12.

157 *VSD*, 13.1, p. 42 (*Memorials*, 13, p. 21); the biblical citations, as established by Winterbottom and Lapidge, are referring to 1 Peter 2:13-14; Rom 13:1-2; Rom 13:7; and Act 26:24. For the image of Dunstan as holding the two reins (*duos habenas*) of the laws of both the contemplative and practical life, see *VSD*, 13.5, p. 44 (*Memorials*, 13, p. 23).

urged him to seek the support of outsiders.[158] In this episode of Dunstan's life, we find a reflection of practice envisaged in Æthelstan's and Edmund's lawcode; when the royal goodwill was lost, society at large turned against the culprit.[159] Thomas Charles-Edwards has emphasised that love and hatred were often used as the marks of honour in situations of in- and exclusion of society.[160] B. instead chose emotion and demonstrative gestures to mark the fall from grace, and the successive reinstatement of Dunstan's position. He is sent away in great anger ('*magno furore*'), but after a miraculous event that showed the king his erroneous behaviour, he re-established Dunstan in his former position –with the added honour of the abbacy of Glastonbury– with prayers, tears, and kisses.[161]

This display of demonstrative gestures and emotions demonstrates B.'s awareness of court discourses of hierarchy and power negotiation. This could be further exemplified with a reference to the relationship between Dunstan and the famous Æthelstan 'Half-King', ealdorman of East Anglia (*fl.* 932–956). While riding in the royal retinue, the abbot and the ealdorman witness an apparition of the devil, which prompts the troubled ealdorman to seek advice on a dream.[162] The association between Dunstan and Æthelstan 'Half-King' is well-attested; in 956, the prominent noble even retires to Glastonbury after King Eadwig's ascension to the throne.[163] However, in his rendering of the dialogue between the abbot and ealdorman, B. has the former addressing the second by using an affectionate 'dear' ('*mi dilecte*'), indicating not only the relationship between the two men, the abbot's esteem for the ealdorman, or the ealdorman's rank, but also the biographer's awareness of the proper court forms of address, embedded in the language of favour and affection.

Dunstan's heydays of court influence are found at King Eadred's court. Eadred was Edmund's sickly brother, who is presented as the saint's 'beloved king'

---

[158] *VSD,* 13.6, p. 46 (*Memorials*, 13, p. 23); for Dunstan's search for foreign support, see *VSD*, 13.7, p. 46, with n. 137, p. 47.

[159] II As 20.7; II As 25; II Em 1.3 and III Em 2, and for a discussion, see chap. 2, pp. 73-74.

[160] Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth', p. 180; Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', p. 172.

[161] *VSD*, 13.6, p. 46; 14.5-6, p. 50 (*Memorials*, 13, p. 23; 14, p. 25).

[162] *VSD*, 31, pp. 90-94 (*Memorials*, 31, pp. 44-45)

[163] For a discussion of the connection between Æthelstan 'Half-King', Dunstan, and Glastonbury, see Hart, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his family', p. 118; and *VSD*, p. 92, n. 269.

('*rex Eadredus dilectus Dunstani*').[164] Eadred maintained a close association with Dunstan, probably on the advice of his mother Eadgifu, who seems to have been an equally loyal supporter of Dunstan as she was of Æthelwold.[165] Whereas Edmund had entrusted Dunstan with the richest monastery in the kingdom, and a seat on his council, Eadred went even further and entrusted Dunstan with the royal treasure. This event is portrayed by B. through a splendid display of love and affection:[166]

> 'Hic itaque in sublimitate regia roboratus beatum patrem Dunstanum tanto caritatis ardore dilexit, ut nullum poene ex primatu sibi pretulisset. At contra uir Dei, ut diligenti se uicem amoris ab intimo cordis affectu rependeret, omnium sibi carissimum solita appellatione regem acclamauit. Ex hac quippe caritatis fiducia, commisit illi rex optima quaeque suorum suppellectilium, quam plures scilicet rurales cartulas, etiam ueteres praecedentium regum thesauros, necnon et diuersas propriae adeptionis suae gazas, sub munimine monasterii sui fideliter custodiendum.'[167]

The extensive display of affection in the passage marks the relationship between Dunstan and Eadred as 'one in a kind', which is further strengthened by B.'s portrayal of Dunstan's rejection of episcopal honour during Eadred's reign. The king is said to have wanted to raise 'the one whom he loved more highly than all others' ('*quoniam quem pre ceteris altius amabat*') even after his initial rejection, and thus asks his mother to persuade '*nostrum specialem amicum Dunstanu*' to reconsider the offer over a meal.[168] The rejection of this episcopacy has been understood by Nicholas Brooks as an example of a humility *topos*, indicating Dunstan's moral

---

164 For a description of Edmund's murder, see *ASC* D, A.D. 946, p. 44. For a description of Eadred's sorry state, see *VSD*, 20.3-4, p. 64 (*Memorials*, 20, p. 31).

165 See the discussion above, pp. 199-200; Cyril Hart has research Eadgifu's gifts to Dunstan and has demonstrated that she gave a large amount of her landed interest in Kent to the reformer, see Hart, 'Two Queens of England', p. 12.

166 Dunstan is not the only one entrusted with parts of the royal treasure, as follows from *VSD*, 20.4, p. 64 (*Memorials*, 20, p. 31): 'Per hoc enim uir Dei Dunstanus uelut alii reglium gazarum custodes ibat, ut quas causa custodiendi secum habuerat regi reportaret.'

167 *VSD*, 19, p. 60 (*Memorials*, 19, p. 29): 'When he was firmly installed on the throne, he started to love the blessed father Dunstan with such an ardent affection that he preferred almost no one of his nobles over him. For his part, the man of God, wishing to balance his love in return out of the sincere affection of his loving heart, used often to applaud the king by name as the most beloved of all men to him. Out of this trust based on love, the king committed his dearest/most valuable possessions and documents to him, namely: many land charters, additionally the ancient treasures of his royal predecessors as well as various assets of his own acquiring, to be guarded loyally behind the fortification of his monastery.'

168 *VSD*, 19.3-4, p. 62 (*Memorials*, 19, p. 30).

worth.[169] However, another interpretation is possible, as suggested by the research of Simon Keynes into the so-called 'Dunstan B' charters. This confirms the close involvement of Dunstan in the royal administration in the absence of the king at council, suggesting a regency period in which Dunstan had far-reaching responsibilities.[170] Dunstan's status as mediator of royal power seems to be confirmed by the reference to Dunstan as *specialis amicus* in B.'s *Life*, which is another indication that friendship was intertwined with the delegation of royal power to royal officials.[171] Dunstan's special relationship with Eadred is expressed through a rich vocabulary of affection and trust, emphasising the importance of their relationship. In this setting, friendship is both a marker of royal favour, and of Dunstan's official status as representative of the ill king.

Eadred's successor, his nephew Eadwig, was eager to disentangle himself from the influential party around Dunstan upon his ascension to the throne in 955. He built a court party of his own choice, granting key-positions of authority to the relatives of his royal bride Ælfgifu.[172] Tension between the factions rose, and after a disastrous coronation meal in which Dunstan found himself in direct conflict with the king and his mother-in-law, Dunstan was expelled from court, followed by his supporters ('*quicunque amicorum*').[173] B. represents Dunstan in his exile in Flanders as tormented by the betrayal of his own students from Glastonbury; in his dreams, he has visions of the monastery in which his monks are unable to finish their antiphon,

---

169 Brooks, 'The Career of St Dunstan', p. 3.

170 Simon Keynes, 'The Dunstan B Charters', *ASE*, 23 (1994): 165-193, pp. 185-186. This suggestion could be fortified with further evidence as found in Adelard of Ghent's *Lectiones*, in which Dunstan is said not wanting to leave the king as 'he held the king so dear that he was not willing to leave him' (*regem diligens*, *nec eis abesse volens*), see Adelard of Ghent, *Lectiones*, iiii, ed. by Winterbottom and Lapidge, p. 120 (Adelard of Ghent, in *Memorials*, Lectio IIII, p. 57).

171 As we have also encountered in the imagery of the laws and charters, see chap. 2, pp. 73-74; and chap. 3, p. 110. Additionally, this imagery could also be distilled from the textual representation of the bond between Æschere and Hrothgar, see chap. 4, pp. 154-156.

172 For example, Ælfhere had been appointed as ealdorman of Mercia in 956 and Ælfheah was raised to the office of royal seneschal, prior to his appointment as ealdorman of central Wessex in 959, see Williams, '*Princeps Merciorum gentis:* the Family, Career, and Connections of Ælfhere', pp. 146-147; Hart, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his Family', pp. 126-127; Yorke, 'Æthelwold and the Politics of the Tenth Century', p. 75.

173 For a description of the coronation meal, at which Dunstan and his kinsman Cynesige disturb the newly crowned king in his private quarters, to find him seemingly involved in a wicked threesome with his wife and mother in law, see *VSD*, 21.2-3, pp. 66-68 (*Memorials*, 21, pp. 32-33). For Dunstan's expulsion of court, and the fate of everyone who supported him, see *VSD*, 22.3, and 23.1, p. 70 (*Memorials*, 22-23, pp. 33-34).

which are explained to him as a sign that they will fail in their attempt to remove him from the abbacy.[174] B. cites in this complaint Job's complaint of his treacherous friends and brothers, recommending Dunstan –in a reflection of Job's example– as God's true friend ('*amicum uerum*'), whilst reproaching his treacherous students in biblical terms.[175] B. seems particularly disappointed in Dunstan's students; Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge have suggested that B. may have stayed behind during Dunstan's years in exile, witnessing their betrayal.[176] His negative opinion of Dunstan's followers may explain why B. never discusses any of them in further detail; the absence of any reference to Dunstan's former pupil and co-reformer Æthelwold is especially striking.[177] The only men referred to by B. are the prior Ceolwig, a monk named Ælfsige, and a deacon named Wulfred, of whom only the last is properly introduced as Dunstan's former superior ('*prelatus*') and his intimate confidant ('*familiaris amator*').[178] This may even indicate that Wulfred was Dunstan's former confessor. The portrayal of Wulfred shows both the level of esteem and intimacy between the two men, but also underlines that B. considered friendship primarily a relationship negating hierarchical dimensions.

This discussion of friendship, enmity, and affection has demonstrated that B. considered friendship foremost as a relationship embedded in a court discourse of favour and power, in which both the religious and secular élite expressed and negotiated royal benevolence. B.'s representation of Dunstan's early career demonstrates his ease with these court notions: interaction with Dunstan's squabbling and envious peers is presented in the language of a discourse of favour and disgrace, of friendship and enmity, marked by demonstrative gestures and

---

[174] *VSD*, 24.3-4, pp. 72-74 (*Memorials*, 24, pp. 34-35). For his treacherous pupils, see also *VSD*, 23.3, p. 20 (*Memorials*, 23, p. 24).

[175] *VSD*, 24.3-4, pp. 72-74 (*Memorials*, 24, pp. 34-35). See Job 6:25-27; this connection has been noted by Stubbs, but is not included in the edition by Lapidge and Winterbottom.

[176] Winterbottom and Lapidge, *The Early Lives of St Dunstan*, p. lxxvi.

[177] Æthelwold seems not to have fallen out with King Eadwig; the education of Edgar seems to have been entrusted to Æthelwold in these years, the union between Eadwig and Ælfgifu seems to have been accepted as legitimate in Abingdon sources, and Æthelwold benefits from Ælfgifu's will, see for a discussion: Yorke, 'Æthelwold and the Politics of the Tenth Century', p. 80; and Shashi Jayakumar, 'Eadwig and Edgar: Politics, Propaganda, Faction', in *Edgar*, *King of the English 959-975: New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 83-103, pp. 97-98.

[178] Ceolwig is only mentioned as confirming one of Dunstan's visions, and Ælfsige is the subject of one of Dunstan's visions; see *VSD*, 34.2-3, p. 98 and 35.1, p. 98 (*Memorials*, 34-35, p. 47). For the portrayal of Wulfred, see *VSD*, 9.1, p. 30 (*Memorials*, 9, p. 15).

emotions. Simultaneously, B. showed awareness of the possible objections that could be raised against this representation of one of the foremost Benedictine leaders: he emphasised several times that Dunstan did not seek secular power, and that he did not wanted to be burdened with worldly affairs.[179] While he may have originally fancied the idea of marriage, his steadfast belief in the Lord drew him safely away from the marriage chamber, just as Christ's favourite apostle John had eschewed marriage and preserved his virginity at the last moment.[180] B. shows an awareness of the Benedictine emphasis on the abstinence of an active role in the world, but he does not translate this into a concerned attitude towards associations between the secular and religious spheres.

However, B.'s emphasis on Dunstan's virginity brings to mind the friendship between Dunstan and the widow Æthelflæd, a so-called vowess who lived in sexual abstinence in a small community of female attendants in the vicinity of a monastery which provided spiritual guidance and protection.[181] The moral excellence of Æthelflæd is carefully constructed: she is introduced in connection to one of Dunstan's visions, and she is highly praised for her desire to live a celibate life.[182] She is said to have loved Dunstan over all others ('*pre ceteris modis mirabilibus adamauit*') for religious reasons and for a tie of kinship between the two ('*causa religionis*, *simul etiam propinquitatis*'); this bond of kinship is often interpreted literally, which would lead to the conclusion that Dunstan was related to the royal family, as Æthelflæd is also portrayed as King Æthelstan's niece ('*rex nepti*').[183] However, Nicholas Brooks has warned for caution: he has highlighted that hagiographers in general have the tendency to exalt the nobility of their subjects, and

---

179 For example, the reference to Wulfric –Dunstan's brother– who as estate manager made sure that neither Dunstan nor his monks needed to engage themselves in worldly affairs (*inepta rei saecularis discursione*), see *VSD*, 18, p. 58 (*Memorials*, 18, p. 28).

180 *VSD*, 8.3, p. 28, with n. 80 (*Memorials*), 8, p. 14.

181 For a discussion of this practice, see Sarah Foot, *Veiled Women,* 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); vol. 1: *I: The Disappearance of Nuns from Anglo-Saxon England,* chaps. 4-6, pp. 84-198, with a detailed analysis of the reasons for living in the vicinity of male houses for religious women on pp. 172-173 and her short overview 'Unveiling Anglo-Saxon Nuns', in *Woman and Religion in Medieval England*, ed. by Diana Wood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 13-31, pp. 25-26. In Carolingian sources a similar practice is observed, although the Latin sources show some variation in terminology, see Janet L. Nelson, 'The Wary Widow', in *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 82-113, p. 90.

182 *VSD*, 9.4-5, p. 32; 10.1, p. 34 (*Memorials*, 9-10, pp. 16-17).

183 *VSD*, 10.2-3, p. 34, with n. 93 (*Memorials*, 10, p. 17); for a discussion of this view, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, *VSD*, p. xv, and *VSD*, n. 90, p. 33.

has suggested interpreting this kinship as an adoptive kinship, based on Æthelflæd's support and interest in the religious man.[184]

However, another explanation is available: the bond between Dunstan and Æthelflæd could also be interpreted as a spiritual kinship, *propinquitas* meaning in the first place a form of proximity in space, but also emotionally.[185] This suggestion would also fit the overt use of friendship language in the following chapters: if Æthelflæd was Dunstan's spiritual kinswoman, the use of *amica* and *amicus* would underline the constructed and additional nature of a spiritual bond, characterised by several stories with religious undertones: Æthelflæd witnessed the realisation of one of Dunstan's miracles, she performed her own miracle of everlasting supplies of mead during a royal visit, and they both observed the white dove that brings notice of her death.[186] The dove –symbol of love, hope and peace and often seen as representing the Holy Ghost– and Æthelflæd's handmaidens ('*ancillulas*') are all included in a portrayal of a 'friendship circle' ('*familiari amico*'; '*amicis meis*'), again proposing a spiritual interpretation of friendship.[187] When her end is near, Æthelflæd is said to have entrusted Dunstan with her funeral arrangements, intertwined with his pastoral duties, as if she was his special friend ('*singularis amicae*').[188] Although it could be argued that friendship language is used to draw special attention to their blood relationship –as friendship terms can also refer to kinship ties–, the emphasis on the spiritual nature of their bond advocates the interpretation of their bond as a 'spiritual kinship'.[189] Hence, 'spiritual friendship'

[184] Brooks, 'The Career of St Dunstan', pp. 6-7.

[185] For a discussion of spiritual kinship as form of 'quasi-kinship', see the useful discussion by Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', p. 239.

[186] For Dunstan's vision, see *VSD*, 9, pp. 30-34 (*Memorials*, 9, pp. 15-17). For Æthelflæd's involvement in the miraculous supply of mead, see *VSD*, 10, pp. 34-36 (*Memorials*, 10, pp. 17-18). For the miraculous visit of the dove, which Dunstan observes flying towards Æthelflæd's dwellings upon entering the church to say his prayers, and which he hears conserving with the Æthelflæd upon his return to her, as if it was an intimate friend (*quodam familiari amico*); see *VSD*, c 11.1-4, pp. 36-38 (*Memorials*, 11, pp. 18-19).

[187] *VSD*, 11.2 and 11.5, p. 38 (*Memorials*, 11, p. 19).

[188] *VSD*, 11.5, p. 38 (*Memorials*, 11, pp. 19-20).

[189] For a discussion of the blurring of lines between kinship and friendship, see chap. 1, pp. 19-22; and Charles-Edwards, 'Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited', pp. 188-191; Stafford, 'King and Kin, Lord and Community', pp. 13-18; and Lancaster, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', pp. 238-239.

may actually be a better definition, as friendship also emphasises the constructed and additional nature of the association.[190]

Furthermore, the prominence of friendship language for describing the bond between Dunstan and Æthelflæd can also be positioned in a discourse of favouritism. The widow's moral status as a religious woman, and the spiritual association between her and the religious man, ensure that their friendship is not 'tainted' by any implications of sexuality. Her sexual abstinence has transformed her status and has empowered her, contrasting favourably with the wanton behaviour of Eadwig's mother-in-law, Æthelgifu.[191] These observations mirror some of our conclusions regarding female empowerment as discussed in chapter three. Sexual abstinence could be interpreted as ennobling and thus of empowerment, as also argued by Stephen Jaeger, but this empowerment was not part of a negative view of womanhood in general; women could be noble in their own right in B.'s imagery, in which sexual abstinence was regarded positively.[192]

As a vowess, Æthelflæd is clearly considered chaste and worthy, and her social identity and agency seems to have been defined by her sexual abstinence rather than by her womanhood: she has become 'gender-neutral', resulting in manoeuvre space, as discussed in fuller detail by Pauline Stafford.[193] This abstinence has also made her into a suitable friend for the saint. Nevertheless, her moral excellence has not removed her social, pragmatic power within the male-oriented society organised by favour, advocacy and interdependency: Æthelflæd could still freely dispose of her property, and she was still part of court networks, as illustrated by King Æthelstan's visit to her dwellings. Hence, Æthelflæd's status as Dunstan's *amica* seems also to indicate her ability to meddle in worldly affairs: she may have acted as a mediator on his behalf, prompting the interest shown by Æthelstan and Eadgifu in the young Dunstan, and she may have graced her protégé with gifts and favours, enabling him to rise to greater prominence. In this context, *amica* might also be translated as either 'patroness' or 'advocate', rendering her central role in

---

190 A similar conclusion is reached by Joseph Lynch based on continental sources of the period, see Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe*, p. 198.

191 *VSD*, 21, pp. 66-68 (*Memorials*, 21, pp. 32-33).

192 Stephen Jaeger's discussion of ennobling love for women is deeply embedded in the presumption that women were considered bad by default; he sees in the use of ennobling language an attempt to make women more like men, see Jaeger, *Ennobling Love*, pp. 82-106.

193 Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries, and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 6-12.

Dunstan's life.[194] Moreover, Æthelflæd was probably not Dunstan's only female benefactor, as B. also introduces the rich Æthelwynn who bestowed him with a richly decorated stole for liturgical use.[195] Æthelflæd is singled out as his special associate – probably inspired by her royal blood and high status– but her worldly social power is carefully represented as of a spiritual quality.

Pauline Stafford and Catherine Cubitt have convincingly demonstrated in their research that the reforming movement tried aggressively to remove women from a position of social power within social networks in their discourses and textual representation of society.[196] However, B.'s imagery actually allows us looking beyond –or even behind– this narrowing reform rhetoric, hinting at the existence of another discourse of female social power within a predominantly male environment, in which women could actively engage and even perform a role of importance as patronesses and *amicae* on behalf of the religious. Simultaneously, B.'s careful fashioning of Æthelflæd's social power within a discourse of spiritual friendship accentuates his awareness of the potentially negative, sexually-loaded interpretation of the notion of *amica* in a less open-minded environment.

5.4.3 Friendship mediated

Æthelflæd's status does not only transgress the boundaries between the genders, but also between the religious and secular spheres; B.'s use of friendship language thus offers a unique opportunity to take a look behind the Benedictine scenes, although we need to take into account that any literary discourse –including B.'s– might be ahistorical. However, his suggestive female model of social power is also hinted at in the visibility of Queen Eadgifu in not only his own *Life*, but also as vaguely outlined in Wulfstan's *Life of St Æthelwold* which was very much embedded in Benedictine discourses that sought stricter boundaries between the religious and secular world and between the genders.[197] B.'s portrayal of Æthelflæd as Dunstan's spiritual and

---

[194] And in this respect, Ælfflæd's position may be compared with Ælfthryth's position as *forespræca* in S 1511, *Rochester*, 35, p. 50; for a general discussion of female advocacy, see Andrew Rabin, 'Female Advocacy and Royal Protection in Tenth-Century England: the Legal Career of Queen Ælfthryth', *Speculum*, 84.2 (2009): 261-288.

[195] For Æthelwynn, see *VSD*, 12, pp. 40-42 (*Memorials*, *c.* 12, pp. 20-21). For a discussion of the involvement of these two women, see Brooks, 'The Career of St Dunstan', p. 7.

[196] Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 6-12; Cubitt, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', pp. 18-19.

[197] Stafford, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen', pp. 32-35.

supportive *amica* seems thus to counterbalance the insistent, yet highly subjective, discourses of diminished female agency as could be retrieved from the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine community, and as such offers another opening to peek through some of the layers of the late Anglo-Saxon social fabric.

B.'s account of Dunstan's life may have been slightly naïve, and based on a rose-tinted memory of the happy days of Dunstan; yet the insights into the interaction between leading ecclesiastics and their king, and the role of women within a dominant male court culture, is extremely valuable for our understanding of the interplay of favour, power, and friendship. Friendship was for B. embedded in a court discourse, which played an important role in the advance of Dunstan's career who at some point even was the king's *specialis amicus*, his leading representative. B. seems aware that Dunstan's prominent role at the royal court needed some explanation, and he therefore embeds his prominent role in a setting which justifies Dunstan's involvement in worldly affairs as a divinely inspired duty of supporting the king based on moral obligation and spiritual love. B. tried to live up to the standards of the reformed communities in his slightly ridiculous Latin style, yet his social imagery reflects his clerical mindset. Simon Coates was correct in classifying B. as a "man out of his time" for his idealised portrayal of the close collaboration between the secular and religious spheres.[198] Nonetheless, his portrayal gives us a unique, and nuanced, insight into the Benedictine monasticising movement and the associations that negotiated royal favour and religious office, defying any notion of a single-directed monasticising movement and nuancing Dunstan's role –and probably his views– as representive of the 'ideal' Benedictine monk.

5.5 Religious discourses of friendship

The evidence of the three *Lives* commemorating the actions and sainthood of Æthelwold, Oswald and Dunstan opens up three different representations of friendship and its role in religious discourses of social interaction between the secular and religious world. Wulfstan of Winchester carefully drafted a discourse celebrating Winchester's glorious past as a leading centre of Benedictine

---

[198] Coates, 'Perceptions of the Anglo-Saxon Past in the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement', p. 72.

monasticism in the heydays of reform, by presenting his audience with an exemplary abbot and monk, who personified the rulings of the *RSB* and Smaragdus' *Expositio*. Wulfstan's discourse was unique and was therefore also presented in a Latin that aimed for a superior prose style which was both distinctive and distinguished. Furthermore, he created a powerful guide to success and harmony, by glorifying the careers of Æthelwold's successors, emphasising the appeasing nature of Æthelwold's interpretation of Benedictine monasticism, and highlighting the potential gain of a spiritual alliance between the king and Æthelwold's successors which removed monasticism from lay interference. This is further emphasised by Wulfstan's use of language, which refrained from the use of friendship vocabulary in the presentation of social bonds in the footsteps of the *RSB*. This Winchester message may have found receptive ground in the late 990s of Æthelred's reign, a period of relative peace in the kingdom, highlighting the special position and authority of the king in a Christian discourse. However, this peace was fragile and the humiliating defeats against the Vikings of the early 990s must have been fresh on the mind of the king and his foremost councillors. Nostalgia for the glory days of Æthelwold and Edgar may thus be anticipated, just as concerns about lay interference on monastic life must have worried the uncompromising supporters of the demarcation of society in Winchester.

Meanwhile, the community of Ramsey had concerns of its own. After the death of their foremost protectors and benefactors, the community found itself in a vulnerable position; not only in worldly matters, as the Fens had proven to be vulnerable to both lay meddling and Viking attacks, but also in the justification of its very existence as beloved 'token of affection' of the personal association between a secular and an ecclesiastical ruler within a Benedictine environment that was seemingly hostile to too close an associations between the two spheres. Ramsey constructed its identity based on its close connection to the St Benedict's community in Fleury and on the commemoration of these spiritual bonds of friendship which formed a protective circle of moral worth around the community. Simultaneously, Byrhtferth seems to have been eager to place his scholarship in revered Anglo-Saxon traditions, by recalling Bedan literary examples in the elevated linguistic register of Aldhelm. Moreover, Byrhtferth created with the *Life of St Oswald* not only a celebration of its founder Oswald, but also fashioned an ennobling discourse of

spiritual friendship whilst creating an acceptable model of close contact between the religious and secular world.

Hence, Byrhtferth's portrayal may be seen as challenging the view that the Benedictine monasticising movement was homogenous in its dismissal of secular interference in religious affairs, which is also underlined by the enthusiasm and extensive support of certain lay men for both religious matters, and the support for and foundation of several new Benedictine communities in our period.[199] In his *Life of St Oswald*, Byrhtferth seeks an acceptable model to frame this religious lay enthusiasm within an acceptable spiritual framework, based on Biblical traditions and Bedan imagery which was also still acceptable within the restraints as posed by the *RSB*. As it happens, the silence on friendship in the *RSB* reflects a certain caution, rather than a complete rejection of the bond, as had already insightfully been observed by Brian McGuire.[200] Byrhtferth's careful fashioning of the bond is thus an excellent example of the flexibility of the notion for the use in a specific context.

Whereas Wulfstan aimed to offer a solution for the protection of the realm, and Byrhtferth sought the protection of its community, B. desperately needed personal protection and patronage. His focus on the early days of Dunstan's life may even have been deliberate in this context, as these years provided a suitable context for discussing favour and patronage in an intermingling of various social spheres. The *Life of St Dunstan* is a striking portrayal of the intermingling of the secular, clerical, and religious worlds in a court discourse of the exchange of favours and office, in which women empowered by sexual abstinence could play a role of importance. His representation of ties underlines the importance of context for understanding the religious discourses of the late tenth century, and also questions the idealised portrayals of the associations between the religious and lay world as found in Wulfstan's and Byrhtferth's narratives.

B.'s discourse of friendship is firmly indebted to a court discourse of power negotiation, demonstrative gestures, and affectionate language, whilst simultaneously allowing an insight into a religious (clerical) discourse of the negotiation of power between the religious and secular spheres. B. has tried to fashion his tale in an

---

199 For a discussion of lay enthusiasm for the monasticising movement, see the insightful discussion of the lay network around Ælfric and his community at Cerne Abbas in Cubitt, 'Ælfric's Lay Patrons', 165-192, pp. 169-170; 188-192.

200 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. xiv.

acceptable mould that should secure him a safe future, showing awareness of the concerns raised against the involvement of religious men in worldly affairs without questioning the acceptability of contact between the two spheres. Hence, friendship is neither suspect nor problematical for B., and is a carefree presence in his social imagery. He presents his narrative in a grand and flamboyant Latin, reflecting his continental studies, highlighting his association with Dunstan's prestigious Glastonbury school, and trying to impress his desired patrons.

The three *Lives* offer food for thought when considering both Latin traditions and discourses of Benedictine monasticism in the late tenth century. Foremost, they stress the variety of available traditions, the versatility of communal discourses of monastic practice, and the vivacity and heterogeneity of religious culture at the very end of the tenth century. In diverse voices, all three *Lives* glorify the near past: of Æthelwold's successful collaboration with Edgar which had created peace; of Ramsey's security in its close association with the Friends of God; and of Dunstan's younger days of unrestrained intermingling of the secular, regular, and clerical spheres. In all three narratives, apprehension about the future can be read between the lines, which may not surprise in an unsettled reign at the eve of the turn of a millennium. However, most of all these discourses show a religious world trying to redefine their bonds with the secular world, and the traditional importance of friendship in the negotiation of these ties.

Friendship as a relationship of importance in late Anglo-Saxon élite culture was not so much 'in eclipse', as at the heart of the negotiation of a delicate bond between the religious and secular spheres.[201] Brian McGuire's argument is still of value, as his argument is based on the negotiation of bonds within the cloisters; both *Lives* of Æthelwold and Oswald reflect concerns about these ties and attempts to fashion these bonds in the acceptable imagery of the *RSB* and Bible, whereas the imagery of B.'s *Life* abstains from any commentary, probably fuelled by the cleric's disappointment in Dunstan's followers. Friendship is thus indeed removed from discussions of bonding *within* the communities. However, the bond does not disappear, as it still plays a considerable role in the negotiation of ties with the outside world. In answer to concerns about the interaction between the secular and religious realms, discourses of friendship were variable: Wulfstan refrained from

201 McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, p. 135; and pp. 162-163.

using its imagery, Byrhtferth remodelled it within the parameters of Christian discourses of spiritual love and soul-guardianship, and B. confidently presented it as a bond negotiating power and favour between the king and his religious followers. Friendship is thus not ‘in eclipse’, but ‘in transition’; not necessarily to a new definition or conceptualisation, but instead as reflecting its malleable character as historical and conceptual variable.

CONCLUSION

This study has established that friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England was an important reciprocal relationship that both functioned within the social mechanisms of society and was part of an ideological conception of the kingdom and its people. Friendship may have been an affectionate bond in our period of research, but this is not the main representation of the bond that we have encountered in our source material. Instead, we have opened up a reciprocal, predominantly secular relationship, whose multi-interpretable, flexible, reciprocal, and adaptable nature functioned to mediate and channel a layered and complex social system of personal bonds at different levels of power negotiation. Friendship functioned at the cross-over point between formal and informal power mediation and, in doing so, introduced the flexible means by which the social system negotiated and adapted to change. Hence, friendship was positioned at the heart of this structure and has been surprisingly overlooked as a point of entry for the study of Anglo-Saxon social interaction.

Friendship's adaptability to change and its flexible nature accuentuates the need to discuss it in terms of discourses and textual representations, rather than in terms of a definition or one interpretation of its nature, role, and form. By unveiling a variety of discourses within a range of different source sets, and a range of interpretations of friendship's function and role within the social conception of late Anglo-Saxon society in these sources, we have established that friendship as a flexible notion can be used to reveal an assortment of issues and ideas. The textual representation of friendship has given us insights into the ideological communication of power and authority within formal and informal networks; it has shed light upon public and private dimensions of these forms of negotiation within the social élite; and it has revealed some of the idealised modes of interaction between men and women, the laity and religious, and authoritative figures and their dependants.

In the first chapter, we have established the need for a close study of friendship as a notion liable to change. This flexible dimension to the interpretation of the idea of friendship creates the need for a nuanced historical analysis of the tie within a wider conception of society. A discussion of the semantic range of terms in both Latin and Old English has demonstrated that friendship was part of a complex system in which multiple bonds interacted and overlapped with each other.

Friendship could be found at the crossroads of vertical and horizontal orientated bonds within the realms of both social and hierarchical power. It has been argued that this position within formal and informal power negotiation made friendship an important mechanism within the social structure of late Anglo-Saxon society. As a result, friendship should be seen as a constructed bond based on a form of mutual reciprocity, which created the necessary flexibility to mediate between formal and informal layers of a social fabric upheld by personal networks based on dependency and interdependency.

Chapter two has revealed that friendship was part of ideological discourses of the conception of society, and functioned as an instrumental bond that could mediate relationships between the king and his followers, and within networks that were both interdependent and interconnected. Friendship has been exposed as part of the 'social glue' that held society together; it could create boundaries between inclusion and exclusion; it could organise warranty, surety, and protection; it could be a desired outcome to strive for. Its flexibility as a notion also revealed itself in a fluidity of language, enlarging the social unit that could be addressed, and subsequently creating an inclusive category that could encompass kinsmen, neighbours, lords, associates, the people in the kingdom, royal agents, and even religious depending on the context in which it was used.

Despite the fact that the conceptualisation of friendship did not follow a teleological pattern, we can perceive a development in social thought within the lawcodes, of which the various uses and discourses of friendship can be considered indicative. Our analysis of Alfred's laws has positioned friendship mostly as an instrumental bond for the mediation of justice and power within social networks. Æthelstan's and Edmund's legislation seems to craft the contours for a more formal interpretation of the bond within the unity of society. Then Edgar's silence on friendship has suggested an ideological change in ideas underlying the notion of society and the function of interpersonal bonds within this construct, cumulating in Wulfstan's conception of the bond as an integral part of formal power and a national and moral duty within a salvational and universal worldview.

Whereas the lawcodes seem to suggest a 'formalising' of the idea of friendship in the late tenth and early eleventh century within the abstraction of society, the charters discussed in chapter three have demonstrated an opposite trend. Friendship functions prominently in the informal mediation within the imagery of

wills, yet it is hardly represented in formal communication between the king and his followers in the royal diplomas. It seems that friendship did not fit formal expressions of royal authority in direct communication between the king and specific followers, and was subsequently only sparsely used. Further research into affective language and the communication of favour may shed further light on this absence of friendship vocabulary, but provisionally it may be concluded that the honour of becoming a royal *amicus* was granted outside of formal written communication.

This invisibility forms a sharp contrast with the visibility of *freondas* in the textual representation of the wills. It has been suggested that the function of wills as documents negotiating informal arrangements into a more formalised setting is closely related to the function of *freondas* as intercessors and advocates on behalf of dependants at the cross-over point of formal and informal power. Subsequently, the relative visibility of women in these sources can be explained by focussing on their need for male support in the formal negotiation of women's informal social power. Additionally, it has been argued that the language of friendship was used in a gendered way, as it was based in a discourse of the negotiation of male-oriented formal power. However, it has also been emphasised that friendship as a relationship was not necessarily gendered, suggesting that exchanges of moveable wealth and gift-giving form possible points of entry for the mapping of an alternative 'language of friendship', through which informal friendships based on social power rather than hierarchical power may be unveiled.

Chapter four has explored our first set of narrative sources, starting with a close examination of the language of friendship in the archaic poem *Beowulf*. Although *Beowulf*'s imagery is rooted in a heroic past, and its imagery is deliberately fashioned to reflect older traditions, its rich social imagery has offered us a model to untangle two different concepts of friendship positioned at the heart of the negotiation of power. It has been suggested in this study that *wine* should be used to discuss a hierarchical bond between a lord and his follower, whereas *freond* should be positioned within the mediation and negotiation of bonds in a less formalised setting. This analysis of the difference in connotation of two concepts of friendship may offer a useful model for discussing the visibility of *freond*, and the invisibility of *wine*, in documentary sources. Documentary sources were very much concerned with the negotiation of power as we have established above, and are thus in need of a flexible notion to present the channelling and negotiation of authority. *Freond* offered a

suitable linguistic mode to present and discuss this relationship, while *wine* was confined to an almost exclusive poetic use. Consequently, *wine*'s imagery comes across as both stilted and archaic. However, it is important to stress that *wine* was also considered a social convention that was rendered important for preservation, as is revealed by its common use as a suffix in proper names.

However, *Beowulf*'s discourses of friendship also open up some of the problems that could arise within a social system built upon the negotiation of power through interpersonal ties, as is apparent from a comparison with the imagery of the two battlefield poems *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*. These two late Anglo-Saxon poems tellingly present their heroic tales at a new social stage, which does not automatically propose a need for mediation. Friendship in *Brunanburh* is marginalised as a bond that functions within the social imagery of losing, whereas ties based on authority are celebrated in the imagery of the triumphant kings of the House of Cerdic. *Maldon* focuses on the need for alignment of loyalties and obligation at the battlefield, celebrating a nostalgic remembrance of a functioning social network that lived up to the heroic ideals, yet was still defeated by the frailty that was inherent in the social construction of the network in the first place.

None of these three poems reflect a historical reality, but all three accentuate some of the problems that could arise in a society built on personal bonds, honour, and loyalty. Friendship, as the bond *par excellence* for negotiating these interpersonal bonds appears as being both glorified and questioned: it is an important part in the construction of society, yet is also representative of the shortcomings of a society based on the negotiation of bonds at a formal and informal level. As such, the textual representations of friendship in these three poems open up some of the anxieties and concerns circulating amongst the late Anglo-Saxon élite, and in doing so, nuance the representation of the bond as a functional mechanism in favour of an interpretation of it as being a social construct, convention, and ideological notion.

This change in social stage and the diminished role of friendship in its social imagery has another implication: women seem to disappear from the scene. This may be partly explained by the fact that women were in need of mediation, as their social, informal power needed to be negotiated by male supporters within a more formal setting. It has been suggested that the visibility of women and friendship language is closely interconnected, based on the observation that friendship was the relationship that allowed women to channel their female power within a dominant male model of

formal, hierarchically defined power negotiation. The poetic discourse in this respect complements and supplements our understanding of the construction of male-oriented discourses in formal power negotiation.

While the wills have revealed the need for male protection and arbitration within formal power structures, the battlefield poems reveal the other side of the coin: if formal power completely replaces informal negotiation, women disappear from the scene in social discourses. The combined evidence of the poetic sources and the wills of the late Anglo-Saxon period strongly suggest that social changes affected the negotiation of power, and therefore especially the position of women within the social structure. Further research is needed to move this suggestion forward, yet the combined evidence of two very different textual traditions offer a strong hint in this direction. Friendship is indicative of these changes, as it was very much ingrained in the channelling of informal power into formal power structures, and therefore also opened up a 'hidden' world of friendship between women and intercessors.

However, it has also been emphasised with respect to the evidence in the wills that this function of friendship was not necessarily gendered, as other vulnerable groups –in particular churchmen and lesser thegns– can also be observed seeking mediation through bonds of friendship. Hence, it needs to be underlined once more that friendship as a bond was not necessarily gendered, but rather rooted in its strong connection with the social power that was commonly associated with groups in dependable positions. This last suggestion is of particular interest along with some of the evidence contained in chapter five, in which we have encountered a religious monk Dunstan, possibly of low social status, who was dependent on the patronage and support of a woman of royal blood, his *amica* Æthelflæd. This unique insight seems to confirm our earlier insistence on the gendered flexibility of the bond of friendship, as here we find a chaste woman who seemingly played a role of importance as intercessor and advocate within the predominantly male formal hierarchy, offering informal mediation on behalf of those who sought her advocacy.

Chapter five has further established that friendship functioned within the social imagery of three contemporary saints' *Lives* at different levels. Furthermore, it has shed light on friendship as a means of constructing monastic and communal identity, through the portrayal of the interaction between the secular and religious world in the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom. The absence of friendship vocabulary in Wulfstan of Winchester's *Life of St Æthelwold* has revealed a use of social

conventions as transmitted in the *RSB*. This deliberate reluctance to discuss bonds between the religious and secular spheres is ultimately rooted in a biblical concern about the impeding influence of secular concerns on the tranquillity and withdrawal of the spiritual brotherhood of Christ as created within the monastic precinct. However, the contrast formed by the imagery in Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Life of St Oswald* has served to contextualise the heterogeneity of the monasticising movement's social worldview. It has been established that Byrhtferth created an ennobling marker for laymen, in his careful fashioning of Oswald's lay associate Æthelwine as *amicus Dei* in a reflection of Bedan imagery and Biblical models. In doing so, Oswald has created a model of (spiritual) friendship, which could serve as an acceptable example for the interface between the lay and religious spheres of late Anglo-Saxon society.

Additionally, the imagery as preserved in B.'s *Life of St Dunstan* has allowed us to look beyond the Benedictine discourses so prominently represented in the religious sources as transmitted for our period of research. B. does not only position Dunstan within a court culture of power negotiation, in which the religious man could even be a special royal *amicus*, or official, but also demonstrates that he was dependent on female patronage as discussed above. This positions Dunstan clearly within a nexus of both formal and informal power negotiation, but also within the interaction between the monastic, ecclesiastical, and court spheres. This observation, fortified by the evidence in the two other *Lives* portraying Oswald as being closely connected to a lay noble and Æthelwold as being associated with a court party, emphasises the interlaced nature of late Anglo-Saxon élite culture.

Although the ecclesiastical and liturgical sources produced in this period by the monasticising movement are eager to create boundaries between the secular and religious spheres in their textual representation, friendship as a means of research has allowed us to look beyond these constructs and instead has helped us to see élite culture as inherently interwoven. Both textual representations of friendship trying to arrange boundaries between the two worlds and discourses trying to present an acceptable model are in this respect revealing as they ultimately underline that friendship could be considered an all-embracing notion: in the ideological conception of society, as reflected in the Wulfstanian lawcodes, in its function as a mechanism to mediate power between the king and other lay lords and their (religious) dependants,

as communicated in charters and wills, and in the idealised imagery of hagiographical sources such as Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Life of St Oswald*.

Anglo-Saxon England has proven to be an extremely interesting case study, as the availability of sources in both Latin and the vernacular, and the combined evidence of documentary and narrative sources, have enabled us to portray a wide and multilingual range of conceptual notions interacting with and reacting to each other within a narrowly defined élite. The availability of vernacular sources has resulted in a wider visibility of the notion of friendship as both were a fundamental part of the communication of secular culture. This is illustrated by our source material: the vernacular lawcodes communicate formal power between the king and his dependants, the vernacular wills are a flexible means to channel informal social power into a more formal framework, and our vernacular poetry reflects an aristrocratic world filled with idealised, social conceptions about the mediation of power. In all three source sets, we have encountered friendship vocabulary within these communications and conceptualisations of power.

However, as our Latin source material also reflects the embedment of the religious élite within this aristocratic world of power mediation and friendship, we have also been able to position friendship within the heart of the conceptualisation of society in the interaction between the two spheres. The various chapters and the numerous reflections on friendship have thus revealed the existence of a set of complementing and interlocking pictures, which hint at a larger framework in which friendship had multiple and flexible functions. Together, the discussed pictures do not so much reveal a portrait of friendship in a landscape, but rather give an impression of a flexible concept within a layered and complex fabric.

Discussing friendship as a historical variable has proven to be revealing in the sense that it allows us to reflect upon various aspects of the bond within society, both as an ideological notion that could be used to shape cultural expressions and reflect historical mentalities, and as a means of commenting upon the actual mechanisms that created the backbone of the late Anglo-Saxon kingdom. Friendship was an overtly secular notion that functioned in the middle ground of social systems that were both formally and informally constructed. By exploring narrative and documentary sources in unison, we have been able not only to see many of Gerd Althoff's conclusions about the practical function of friendship within interpersonal networks in action, but also to disclose some of the subtleties of the ideological

concepts and ideas within medieval culture that fuelled the conceptual construct that was late Anglo-Saxon England in a range of mentalities.

This study is highly dependent on the insightful observations by Stephen Jaeger with respect to affectionate modes, which argue for seeing in affection an ennobling factor that could be used to create a middle ground between formal and informal power negotiation through the shaping of aristocratic behaviour. However, whereas Jaeger has emphasised the uniformity and durability of these modes over a long period of time, this study has sought to emphasise the variety and adaptability of the bonds underlying these strategies of power negotiation. Moreover, by focussing on one cultural system, and by mapping the variety in representations of the bond of friendship as part of an interwoven power structure that also interacted with hierarchical and equalising notions, we have been able to take a closer look at a range of social aspects influenced by these ideological ideas. Consequently, some of Jaeger's conclusions with respect to women and religious have been either questioned or nuanced, demonstrating the advantages of a close textual study of small social entities within a larger understanding of early medieval culture and society.

Additionally, this analysis has stressed that friendship research does not necessarily require letters and letter-collections to reveal affective modes, especially when we take to heart that those sources are embedded in the formal expression and negotiation of relationships. Mapping the social strategies and communicative modes embraced in, for example, poetry and charters may as well open up these types of bonds and may offer new insights into affectionate relationships. These recommendations need to be considered in the context of the possible existence of gendered vocabulary in particular, and need to be combined with the existing evidence on religious discourses of bonding. Religious and secular modes of expression and negotiation of friendship in late Anglo-Saxon England have so far been exposed as much more intertwined than formerly presumed in studies focusing on only one of the two spheres. It has been revealed that even documentary sources may reflect religious discourses, and therefore the adoption of a different approach in friendship research may revise some of our teleological arguments as prevalent in, for example, the important –yet in this respect narrowly defined– contribution of Brian Patrick McGuire.

This study of late Anglo-Saxon friendship within society does not presume to be complete. Even for our own period of research, many more sources may offer

further pieces to our complex and intriguing puzzle. Further research in the charters and poetic sources may offer further insights into the use of affectionate modes of language as supplementing our conclusions regarding friendship. Particularly interesting would be an extension of this research into Cnut's reign, as his conquest resulted in an upheaval of the social system and its élite, while also adding a third language and a different cultural flavour to the interesting mix that is eleventh-century English society. Continental studies of friendship may not have a similar multi-linguistic mix for the study of early medieval Europe, but many of the suggestions and assumptions proposed in this study may be tested and implemented in the study of Continental sources.

Friendship poses an intriguing case for exploring medieval society and medieval culture. It is a challenge in its flexibility, its multi-applicability, its position at the cross-over point of formal and informal, public and private, and inclusive and exclusive nature. The real challenge to the researcher is neither to make assumptions, nor to seek one all-embracing interpretation or answer. However, this multi-faceted nature also rewards us with a closer understanding of many fascinating aspects of medieval society, disclosing a culture that is both foreign and well-known. And in this challenge fuelled by intrigue, we also find the true beauty and rewards of medieval friendship research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Abbo of Fleury, *Passion of St Edmund*, ed. and trans. by Lord Francis Hervey, *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi. The Garland of Saint Edmund King and Martyr* (London: Murray, 1907).

Adelard of Ghent, *Lectiones in Depositione S. Dunstani*, ed. and trans. by Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge, *The Early Lives of St Dunstan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: First Series*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The First Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, ed. by Malcolm Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The Second Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

Ælfric, *Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. by Michael Lapidge, Oxford Medieval Texts, in *Wulfstan of Winchester. Life of St Æthelwold* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), Appendix A, pp. 70-80.

Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham, ed. and trans. by Christopher A. Jones, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Ælfric's Lives of the Saints, ed. by Walter W. Skeat, 4 vols, EETS, o.s. 76, 82, 94, and 114 (London: Trübner, 1881-1900).

Aelred of Rievaulx, *De spirituali amicitia*, ed. by Marsha L. Dutton and trans. by Lawrence C. Braceland, Cistercian Fathers Series, 5 (Collegeville, MN: Cistercian, 2010).

Alcuin, *Pippini regalis et noblissimi iuvenis disputatio cum Albino scholastico*, ed. by J. P. Migne, *Alcuinus Opera Omnia*, PL, 101 (Paris: PL, 1851), 0975 - 0980B.

Ambrose, *De officiis*, ed. by Maurice Testard, *Sancti Ambroisii Mediolanensis. De officiis*, CCSL, 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000).

Anglo-Saxon Charters, ed. and trans. by A. J. Robertson, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956).

Anglo-Saxon Wills, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, ed. by W. H. Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959).

B., *The Life of St Dunstan*, ed. and trans. by Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge, *The Early Lives of St Dunstan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Bede, *Life of St Cuthbert*, ed. and trans. by Bertram Colgrave, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1940).

Beowulf, ed. by Frederick Klaeber, in *Klaeber's Beowulf*, ed. by R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, 4th edn (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2009)

Beowulf: A New Verse Translation, trans. by R. M. Liuzza (Peterborough Ontario and Letchworth: Broadview, 2000).

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, ed. by Robert Weber and others, 4th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Life of St Ecgwine*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey. The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Press (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Life of St Oswald*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey. The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Press (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Cartularium Saxonicum: A *Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, ed. by W. de Gray Birch, 3 vols (London: Whiting, 1885–1893).

Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmos*, CCSL, 97, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958).

Charters of Abingdon Abbey: Part 1, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 7 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2000).

Charters of Abingdon Abbey: Part 2, ed. by S. E. Kelly, British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters, 8 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2001).

Charters of Bath and Wells, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 13 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2007).

Charters of Burton Abbey, ed. by P. H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1979).

Charters of Rochester, ed. by A. Campbell, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1973).

Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey, ed. by S. E. Kelly, British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters, 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1996).

Charters of Sherborne, ed. by M. A. Donovan, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1988).

Charters of St Albans, ed. by Julia Crick, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 12 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2007).

Charters of St Augustine'*s Abbey*, *Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanet*, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1995).

Charters of the New Minster, ed. by Sean Miller, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2001).

Chronica Abbatiae Ramesiensis, ed. W. M. Macray, Rolls Series, 93 (London: Longman, 1886).

Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, ed. by H. E. Gould and J. L. Whiteley (Wuconda: Colchazy-Carducci, 1999).

Codex diplomatorum ævi Saxonici, ed. by John Mitchell Kemble (London: Bentley, Wilson and Filey, 1839).

Councils & Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, ed. by F. M. Powicke and others, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964–81); vol. 1: *Volume I*, *A.D. 871-1204*, *Part I*, *871-1066*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock (1981).

Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen, ed. and trans. by Felix Liebermann, 3 vols (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1903-1916).

Elene, ed. by P. O. E. Gradon, *Cynewulf's Elene*, Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies, 2nd edn (Exeter: Exeter University Press; 1996).

English Historical Documents, trans. by Dorothy Whitelock and others, 12 vols (London and New York: Eyre Methuen, Oxford University Press, and Routledge: 1955–1996); vol. 1: *Volume I*, *c. 500-1042*, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1979).

Gregory the Great, *Moralia siue Expositio in Iob*, CCSL, 143, 3 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979-1985); repr 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005).

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum liber XX*, ed. by W. M. Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

John Cassian, *Conlationes*, ed. by Michael Petschenig, CSEL, 13 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004).

John of Worcester, *Chronicon ex chronica*, ed. by R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, trans. by Jennifer Bray and P. McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995-1998).

King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries, in *Councils & Synods*, I.I, no. 33, pp. 142-154.

Lantfred of Winchester, *Translatio et miracula S. Swithuni*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun*, The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester, Winchester Studies, 4.ii (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Winchester Excavations Committee, 2003).

Liber Eliensis, ed. by E. O. Blake, Camden Third Series, 92 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962).

Memorials of Saint Dunstan, *Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 63 (London: Longman, 1874).

Odo of Cluny, *The Life of Saint Gerald of Aurillac*, ed. by T. F. X. Noble and T. Mead, trans. by Gerard Sitwell *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (University Park, PA and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

Old and Middle English. An Anthology, ed. and trans. by Elaine Treharne, 3rd edn (Oxford and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

Old English Benedictine Rule, ed. by Arnold Schröer, with an appendix by Helmut Gneuss, *Die Angelsächsischen Prosabearbetungen der Benediktinerregel*, 2nd edn (Darmstadt: Wissenschafliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964).

Old English Glosses: Chiefly Unpublished, ed. by Arthur S. Napier, Anecdota Oxoniensia, 11 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900).

Regularia concordia, ed. and trans. by Dom Thomas Symons, *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (London: Nelson, 1952).

Rule of St Benedict, ed. by Rudolf Hanslik, *Benedicti regula*, CSEL, 75 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1960).

Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, ed. and trans. by F. E. Harmer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, *Expositio*, ed. by Alfredus Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, *Smaragdi Abbatis expositio in regulam S. Benedicti*, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 8 (Siegburg: Schmitt, 1974).

Tacitus, *Germania*, ed. by Alf Önnerfors, *P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1979-1983).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 3: MS. A*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Janet Bately (Cambridge: Brewer, 1986).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 5: MS. C*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Cambridge: Brewer, 2001).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 6: MS. D*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by G. P. Cubbin (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 7: MS. E*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Susan Irvine (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004).

The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems, ed. by Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, ASPR, 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 70-74.

The Battle of Brunanburh, ed. by Alistair Campbell (London: Heinemann, 1938).

The Battle of Maldon, ed. by D. G. Scragg, Old and Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981).

The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents Now in the Bodleian Library, ed. by A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895).

The Cult of St Swithun, The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester, Winchester Studies, 4.ii (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Winchester Excavations Committee, 2003).

The Early Charters of Eastern England, ed. by Cyril Hart, Studies in Early English History, 5 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966).

The Early Charters of Wessex, ed. by Herbert Patrick Reginald Finberg, Studies in Early English History (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1964).

The Epic of Gilgamesh. An English Version, trans. by Nancy Katharine Sandars, Penguin Classics, 100 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964).

The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry, The Exeter DVD, 2nd edn (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2006).

The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version. With Revisions and Footnotes by Bishop Richard Challoner, *1749-52* (Baltimore: Murphy, 1899), as available at http://www.drbo.org.

The Laws of the Earliest English Kings, ed. and trans. by F. L. Attenborough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922).

The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I, ed. and trans. by A. J. Robertson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925).

The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, *Royal Library*, *1650* (Aldhelm's De laudibus virginitatis), ed. by Louis Goossens, Verhandelingen van de

Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der letteren, 36.74 (Brussel: Paleis der Academiën, 1974).

The Old English Orosius, ed. by Janet Bately, EETS, s.s. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

The Vercelli Book, ed. by George Philip Krapp, ASPR, 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932).

The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, ed. by Donald Scragg, EETS, o.s. 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Thoreau, Henry David, *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*, ed. by Carl F. Hovede. William L. Howarth, and Elizabeth Hall Witherell (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004).

Waldere, ed. by A. Zettersten, in R.D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, *Klaeber's Beowulf and the fight at Finnsburg*, 4th edn (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 2008), Appendix D, pp. 337-339.

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thompson and M. Winterbottom, *William of Malmesbury*, *Gesta Regum Anglorum. The history of the English Kings*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998-1999).

Wulfstan of Winchester, *The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Wulfstan of York, *Institutes of Polity*, ed. and trans. by Karl Jost, *Die Institutes of Polity*, *Civil and Ecclesiastical*: *ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, Schweizer Altenglische Arbeiten, 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959).

Wulfstan of York, *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, Methuen's Old English library, B.3, 3rd edn (London: Methuen, 1963).

Secondary Literature

Abels, Richard P., *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988).

Airlie, Stuart, 'The Anxiety of Sanctity: St Gerald of Aurillac and his Maker', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43.3 (1992): 372-395.

Allan, Graham A., *Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Althoff, Gerd, *Amicitiae und pacta. Bündnis*, *Einigung*, *Politik und Gebetsdenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert*, MGH Schriften, 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 1992).

-----------, *Verwandte*, *Freunde und Getreue. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990); trans. by Christopher Carroll, *Family*, *Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

----------, 'Tränen und Freude. Was Interessiert Mittelalter-Historiker und Emotionen', *FS*, 40 (2006): 1-11.

----------, 'Friendship and Political Order', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 91-105.

----------, '*Amicitiae* [Friendships] as Relationships between States and People', in *Debating the Middle Ages. Issues and Readings*, ed. by Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein (Maldan, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 191-210.

----------, 'Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirchung. Emotionen in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters', *FS*, 30 (1996): 60-79.

Anderson, Earl R, 'The Battle of Maldon: A Reappraisal', in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature. Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. by Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 245-265.

Anton, Hans Hubert, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit*, Bonner historische Forschungen, 32 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1968).

Barrow, Julia, 'The Ideology of the Tenth-Century English Benedictine 'Reform'', in *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History. The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*, ed. by Patricia Skinner, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 141-154.

----------, 'Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, *c.* 900-1200', *ANS*, 30, ed. by C. P. Lewis, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 41-61.

----------, 'Demonstrative Behaviour and Political Communication in later Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE*, 36 (2007): 127-150.

----------, 'Friends and Friendship in Anglo-Saxon Charters', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 106-123.

Bately, Janet, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 37-50.

Baxter, Stephen, *The Earls of Mercia. Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Bishop, T. A. M, *English Caroline Minuscule*, Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

Blair, John, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Bonanno, Giovanni, 'The Anglo-Saxon Leader. A Semantic Study on two Old English Words denoting Nobility and Leadership: '*Eorl*' and '*Ealdor*'', (unpublished MA dissertation, University of York, 2008).

Boswell, John, *Christianity*, *Social Tolerance*, *and Homosexuality. Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Braun Pasternack, Carol, *The Textuality of Old English Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Bredehoft, Thomas, *Textual Histories. Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

----------, 'History and Memory in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*', in *Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. by David Johnson and Elaine Treharne (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 109-121.

Brooks, Nicholas, 'The Career of St Dunstan', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 1-24.

----------, and Catherine Cubitt, eds., *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, The Makers of England, 2 (London: Leicester University Press, 1996).

Bullough, Donald A., *Friends*, *Neighbours and Fellow-Drinkers: Aspects of Community and Conflict in the Early Medieval West*, H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures, 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Burt, Donald, 'Friendship and Subordination in Earthly Societies', in *Christianity and Society. The Social World of Early Christianity*, ed. by Everett Ferguson (New York and London: Garland, 1999), 313-355.

Busse, W. G., and R. Holtei, '*Beowulf* and the Tenth Century', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 63 (1980-1981): 285-329.

Byock, Jesse L., *Viking Age Iceland* (London: Penguin, 2001).

----------, *Medieval Iceland. Society*, *Sagas*, *and Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Campbell, James, 'The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximum View, in *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London: Hambledon, 2000), 1-30.

----------, 'England, c. 991', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 1-17.

----------, ‘Some Agents and Agencies of the Late Anglo-Saxon State’, in *Domesday Studies*, ed. by J. C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987), 201-218.

----------, ‘Observations on the English Government from the Tenth to the Twelfth Centuries’, in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London and Ronceverte: Hambledon, 1986), 150-170, p. 150 [reprinted from *TRHS*, fifth series, 25 (1975): 39-54].

Carroll, Jayne, ‘Concepts of Power in Anglo-Scandinavian Verse’, in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek, International Medieval Research, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 217-233.

Cassidy, E. G., ‘He Who Has Friends Can Have no Friend: Classical and Christian Perspectives on the Limits of Friendship’, in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 45-67.

Chaplais, Pierre, ‘The Origin and Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diploma’, in *Prisca Munimenta. Studies in Archival and Administrative History, presented to Dr. A. E. J. Hollaender*, ed. by Felicity Ranger (London: University of London Press, 1973), 28-42 [Originally published in *Journal of the Society of the Archivists*, 3.2 (1965): 48-61].

Charles-Edwards, T. M., ‘Anglo-Saxon Kinship Revisited’, in *The Anglo-Saxons from the Migration Period to the Eighth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. by John Hines (Woodbridge and San Marino: Boydell for the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress, 1997), 171-210.

----------, ‘The Distinction between Land and Moveable Wealth in Anglo-Saxon England’, in *Medieval Settlement. Continuity and Change*, ed. by P. H. Sawyer (London: Arnold, 1979), 180-187.

Clark, David, *Between Medieval Men. Male Friendship and Desire in Early Medieval English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Chase Colin, ed., *The Dating of Beowulf*, Toronto Old English Series, 6 (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 1981).

Clayton, Mary, ‘An Edition of Ælfric’s Letter to Brother Edward’, in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 263-283.

Clemoes, Peter, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Clover, Carol J., ‘Regardless of Sex: Men, Women and Power in Early Northern Europe’, *Speculum*, 68.2 (1993): 363-387.

Coates, Simon, 'Perceptions of the Anglo-Saxon Past in the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement', in *The Church Retrospective*, ed. by R. N. Swanton, Papers read at the 1995 summer meeting and the 1996 winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society (Woodbridge: Boydell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1997), 61-74.

Constable, Giles, *Letters and Letter-Collections*, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976).

Crawford, S. J., 'Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Anonymous *Life of St Oswald*', *Speculum Religionis: Being Essays and Studies in Religion and Literature from Plato to Von Hügel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), 99-111.

Crick, Julia C., 'Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity', in *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. by William O. Frazer and Andrew Tyrrell (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000), 193-208; with Appendix, 419-422.

----------, 'Men, Women, and Widows: Widowhood in pre-Conquest England', in *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Sandra Cavallo and Lyndan Warner (Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999), 24-36.

Cubitt, Catherine, 'Ælfric's Lay Patrons', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companion to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 165-192.

----------, 'Archbishop Dunstan, A Prophet in Politics?', in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 145-166.

----------, 'The Clergy in Early Anglo-Saxon England', *Historical Research*, 78.201 (2005): 273-287.

----------, 'Images of St Peter: the Clergy and Religious Life in Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England. Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. by Paul Cavill (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), 41-54.

----------, 'Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', *Gender in History*, 12.1 (2000): 1-32.

----------, 'The Tenth-Century Benedictine Reform in England', *EME*, 6.1 (1997): 77-94.

Dachowski, Elizabeth, *First among Abbots. The Career of Abbo of Fleury* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008).

Dales, D. J., 'The Spirit of the *Regularis Concordia* and the Hand of St Dunstan', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 45-56.

Dammery, Richard, 'Editing the Anglo-Saxon Laws: Felix Liebermann and Beyond', in *The Editing of Old English*, ed. by D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), 251-261.

Davies, Rees, 'The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16.2 (2003): 280-300.

Deshman, Robert, '*Benedictus monarcha et monachus*. Early Medieval Ruler Theology and the Anglo-Saxon Reform', *FS*, 22 (1988): 204-240.

----------, 'The Imagery of the Living Ecclesia and the English Reform Movement', in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach, with Virginia Darrow Oggins, Studies in Medieval Culture, 20 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1986), 261-282.

Drögereit, Richard, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 13 (1935): 335-436.

Dumville, D. N., *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism*, *A.D. 950-1030*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 1993).

----------, 'The *Beowulf*-Manuscript and How not to Date It,' *Medieval English Studies Newsletter*, 39 (1998): 21-27.

----------, 'Beowulf Comes Lately: Some Notes on the Palaeography of the Nowell Codex', *Archiv fur das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 225.1 (1988): 49-63.

Dutton, Marsha L., 'Friendship and the Love of God: Augustine's Teaching in the Confessions and Aelred of Rievaulx's Response in Spiritual Friendship', *American Benedictine Review*, 56 (2005): 3-40.

Enright, Michael J., 'Lady with a Mead-Cup: Ritual, Group Cohesion and Hierarchy in the Germanic Warband', *FS*, 22 (1988): 170-203.

Epp, Verena, *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler*, *sozialer*, *politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 44 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1999).

----------, 'Rituale frühmittelalterliche *amicitia*', in *Formen und Funktionen Öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, ed. by Gerd Althoff, Vorträge und Forschungen, 51 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001), 11-24.

Fiske, Adèle M., *Friends and Friendship in the Monastic Tradition*, Cidoc Cuaderno, 51 (Cuernavaca: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1970).

Fleming, Robin, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

----------, 'The New Wealth, the New Rich and the New Political Style in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *ANS*, 23, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2000 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), 1-22.

----------, 'Rural Elites and Urban Communities in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Past & Present*, 141 (1993): 3-37.

Foot, Sarah, *Æthelstan. The First King of the English* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011).

----------, *Veiled Women,* 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); vol. 1: *I: The Disappearance of Nuns from Anglo-Saxon England*.

----------, 'Where English Becomes British: Rethinking Contexts for *Brunanburh*', in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicolas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 127-144.

----------, 'Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?', in *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval* West, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 39-65.

----------, 'Unveiling Anglo-Saxon Nuns', in *Woman and Religion in Medieval England*, ed. by Diana Wood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 13-31.

Fouracre, Paul, 'The Term *Beneficium* in Frankish Sources: A Society Based on Favours?', in *The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 62-88.

Frank, Roberta, 'A Scandal in Toronto: *The Dating of Beowulf* a Quarter Century on', *Speculum*, 82.4 (2007): 843-864.

----------, 'Germanic Legend in Old English Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 88-106.

----------, 'The Battle of Maldon and Heroic Literature', in *The Battle of Maldon*, *AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 196-207.

----------, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with their Lord in the *Battle of Maldon:* Anachronism or Nouvelle Vague', in *People and Places in Northern Europe, 500-1600. Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer*, ed. by Ian Wood and Niels Lund (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), 95-106.

Fulk, R. D., *A History of Old English Meter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992).

Geary, Patrick J., 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', in *Interpreting Late Antiquity. Essays on the Postclassical World*, ed. by Glen Warren Bowersock, Peter Robert Lamont Brown, and Oleg Grabar (Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Gneuss, Helmut, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. A List of Manuscripts and Manuscripts Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe: Arizona Center of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001).

----------, 'The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester', *ASE*, 1 (1972): 63-83.

Goetz, Hans-Werner, 'Verwandtschaft im früheren Mittelalter (I): Terminologie und Funktionen', in *Verwandtschaft*, *Freundschaft*, *Bruderschaft. Soziale Lebens- und Kommunikationsformen in Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz and others (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009), 15-36.

----------, and others, eds., *Verwandtschaft*, *Freundschaft*, *Bruderschaft. Soziale Lebens- und Kommunikationsformen in Mittelalter* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009).

Gordon, E. V., 'The Date of Æthelred's Treaty with the Vikings: Olaf Tryggvason and the Battle of Maldon', *The Modern Language Review*, 32 (1937): 24-32.

Green, Dennis Howard, *The Carolingian Lord. Semantic Studies on Four Old High German Words: Balder*, *Frô*, *Truhtin*, *Hêrro* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

Greenfield, Stanley B., and Daniel G. Calder, *A New Critical History of Old English Literature* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1986).

Gretsch, Mechthild, *The Intellectual Foundation of the English Benedictine Reform*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

----------, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Ubersetzung* (München: Fink, 1973).

----------, 'Ælfric, Language and Winchester', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 110-137.

----------, 'Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: the Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 83.1 (2001): 41-87.

----------, 'Æthelwold's Translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and its Latin Exemplar', *ASE*, 3 (1974): 125-151.

Griffith, M. S., 'Alliterative Licence and the Rhetorical Use of Proper Names in *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages. Essays*

in Honour of C. B. Hieatt, ed. by M. J. Toswell (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 60-79.

Grünbart, Michael, '*Tis love that has warm*'*d us*. Reconstructing Networks in 12th Century Byzantium', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 301-304.

Guenther Discenza, Nicole, 'The Influence of Gregory the Great on the Alfredian Social Imaginary', in *Rome and the North. The Early Reception of Gregory the Great in Germanic Europe*, ed. by Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Kees Dekker, and D. F. Johnson (Paris, Leuven, and Sterling VA: Peeters, 2001), 67-82.

Halsall, Guy, 'Violence and Society: An Introductory Survey', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Guy Halsall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), 1-45.

Harris, Joseph, 'Love and Death in the *Männerbund:* An Essay with Special Reference to the *Bjarkamál* and *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period. Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger Jr.*, ed. by Helen Damico and John Leyerle (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1993), 77-114.

Hart, Cyril, 'Eadnoth I of Ramsey and Dorchester', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 613-624.

----------, 'The Battle of Maldon', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 533-551.

----------, 'Two Queens of England', *The Ampleforth Journal*, 82.2 (1977): 10-15 and 54.

----------, 'Æthelstan 'Half-King' and his family', *ASE*, 2 (1973): 115-144.

Haseldine, Julian P., 'Friendship Structures: Modern & Pre-Modern', *Political Studies Association Conference Proceedings* (2010): 1-4.

----------, 'The Monastic Culture of Friendship', in *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, ed. by James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 177-202.

----------, 'Introduction: Why Friendship?', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), xvii-xxiii.

----------, ed., *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).

Hazeltine, H. D., 'General Preface', in Dorothy Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

Hennessey Olsen, Alexandra, 'Gender Roles', in *A Beowulf Handbook*, ed. by Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles (Lincoln NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 311-324.

Hermanson, Lars, 'Friendship and Politics in Saxo Grammaticus' *Gesta Danorum*', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 261-284.

Higham, N. J., 'The Context of *Brunanburh*', in *Names*, *Places and People. An Onomastic Miscellany in Memory of John McNeal Dodgson*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble and A. D. Mills (Stamford: Watkins, 1997), 144-156.

Hill, Joyce, 'Confronting *Germania Latina*: Changing Responses to Old English Biblical Verse', in *Latin Culture and Medieval Germanic Europe*, ed. by Richard North and Tette Hofstra (Groningen: Forsten, 1992), 71-88.

----------, '"Þæt wæs geomor ides!" A Female Stereotype Examined', in *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*, ed. by Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 235-247.

Hill, Thomas D., '*Consilium et Auxilium* and the Lament for Æschere', in *The Haskins Society Journal*, 12, ed. by Stephen Morillo (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 71-82.

Hyams, Paul R., *Rancor & Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003).

Hyatte, Reginald, *The Arts of Friendship. The Idealization of Friendship in Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 50 (Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill, 1994).

Insley, Charles, 'Where Did All the Charters Go?', *ANS*, 24, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2001 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 109-127.

----------, 'Charters and Scriptoria in the Anglo-Saxon South West', *EME*, 7.2 (1998): 173-197.

Jaeger, C. Stephen, *Ennobling Love. In Search of a Lost Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1999).

Jayakumar, Shashi, 'Eadwig and Edgar: Politics, Propaganda, Faction', in *Edgar, King of the English 959-975: New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 83-103.

Jones, Christopher A., 'Ælfric and the Limits of 'Benedictine Reform', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to Christian Traditions (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 67-108.

Jorgenson, Alice, 'Power, Poetry and Violence: *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek, International Medieval Research, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 235-249.

Kelly, Susan, 'Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word', in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 36-62.

Kempshall, Matthew, 'No Bishop, no King: the Ministerial Ideology of Kingship in Asser's *Res Gesta Ælfredi*', in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. by Richard Gameson and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 106-127.

Kennedy, A. G., 'Law and Litigation in the *Libellus Æthelwoldi episcopi*', *ASE*, 24 (1995): 131-185.

----------, 'Byrhtnoth's Obits and Twelfth-Century Accounts of the Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 59-78.

----------, 'Disputes about Bocland', *ASE*, 14 (1985): 175-195.

Ker, Neil, 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. by Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 315-331.

Kershaw, Paul J. E., *Peaceful Kings. Peace*, *Power and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Keynes, Simon, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred* '*The Unready*'*. A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life & Thought, Third Series, 13 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

----------, 'A Conspectus of the Charters of King Edgar', in *Edgar*, *King of the English 959-975. New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 60-80.

----------, 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: Lost and Found', in *Myth*, *Rulership*, *Church and Charters. Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 45-66.

----------, 'Edgar, *rex admirabilis*', in *Edgar*, *King of the English 959-975. New Interpretations*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 3-59.

----------, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids of 1006-7 and 1009-12', *ASE*, 36 (2007): 151-220.

----------, 'Apocalypse Then: England AD 1000', in *Europe around the Year 1000*, ed. by Przemysław Urbańczyk (Warsaw: Widaw DiG, 2001), 247-70.

----------, 'The Dunstan B Charters', *ASE*, 23 (1994): 165-193.

----------, 'Crime and Punishment in the Reign of King Æthelred the Unready', in *People and Places in Northern Europe*, *500–1600: Essays in Honour of*

Peter Hayes Sawyer, ed. by Ian Wood and Niels Lund (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), 67–81.

----------, 'The Historical Context of the Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon, AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 81-113.

----------, 'Royal Government and the Written Word in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 226-257.

----------, 'Regenbald the Chancellor *(sic)*', *ANS*, 10, ed. by R. Allen Brown, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1987 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 185-222.

----------, 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. by David Hill, BAR, 59 (Oxford: BAR, 1978), 227-253.

Kiernan, Kevin S., *Beowulf and the Beowulf Manuscript*. *Revised Edition* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).

Konstan, David, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Key Themes in Ancient History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Kooper, Erik, 'Loving the Unequal Equal: Medieval Theologians and Marital Affection', in *The Olde Daunce: Love*, *Friendship*, *Sex*, *and Marriage in the Medieval World*, ed. by Robert R. Edwards and Stephens Spector (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 44-56; and 260-265.

Lancaster, Lorraine, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon Society (I)', *The British Journal of Society*, 9.3 (1958): 230-250.

Lapidge, Michael, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

----------, 'Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Prose', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. by Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge, and J. N. Adams, Proceedings of The British Academy, 129 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2005), 321-337.

----------, 'The Archetype of *Beowulf*', *ASE*, 29 (2000): 5-41.

----------, 'Byrhtferth and Oswald', in *St Oswald of Worcester*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 64-83.

----------, 'Surviving Booklists in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. Basic Readings*, ed. by Mary P. Richards (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 87-167.

----------, 'Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter', in *Words*, *Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by Michael Korhammer with Karl Reichl and Hans Sauer (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1992), 99-129.

----------, 'B. and the *Vita S. Dunstani*', in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 247-259.

----------, 'The *Life of St Oswald*', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991).

----------, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher,' in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 89-117.

----------, 'Byrhtferth and the *Vita S. Ecgwini*', in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 293-315 [originally published in: *Medieval Studies*, 41 (1979): 331-353].

----------, 'The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature', in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 105-150 [originally published in: *ASE*, 4 (1975): 67-111].

Lawson, M. K., 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Homiletic Element in the Laws of Æthelred II and Cnut', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England*, *Denmark and Norway*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press, 1994), 141-164.

Le Jan, Régine, 'Le Lien Social entre Antiquité et Haut Moyen Âge: l'Amité dans les Collections de Lettres Gauloises', in *Akkulturation. Probleme einer germanisch-Romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühen Mittelalter*, ed. by Dieter Hägermann, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Jörg Jarnut, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 41 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 528-546.

Leclercq, Jean, *l'Amour de Lettres et le Désir de Dieu* (Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1957); trans. by Catharine Misrahi, *The Love of Learning and the Desire of God* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961).

Lionarons, Joyce Tally, *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2010).

Locherbie-Cameron, Margaret, 'The Men named in the Poem', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 238-249.

Lowe, Kathryn A., 'The Nature and Effect of the Vernacular Anglo-Saxon Will', *Legal History*, 19.1 (1998): 23-61.

Loyn, Henry R., *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England*, *500-1087* (London: Arnold, 1984).

----------, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE*, 3 (1974): 197-209.

Lynch, Joseph H., *Christianizing Kinship. Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998).

----------, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

Magennis, Hugh, and Mary Swan, eds., *A Companion to Ælfric*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Maitland, Frederic William, *Domesday Book and Beyond. Three Essays in the Early History of England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).

Marsden, Richard, 'Wrestling with the Bible: Textual Problems for the Scholar and the Student', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England. Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. by Paul Cavill (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), 69-90.

McClure, Judith, 'Bede's Old Testament kings', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society. Studies presented to J. M. Wallace*-Hadrill, ed. by Patrick Wormald, Donald Bullough, and Roger Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 76-98.

McEvoy, James, 'Theory of Friendship in the Latin Middle Ages: Hermeneutics, Contextualization and the Transmission and Reception of Ancient Texts and Ideas, from *c.* AD 350 to *c*. 1500', in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine, Key Themes in Ancient History (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 3-44.

McGuire, Brian Patrick, *Aelred of Rievaulx. Brother and Lover* (New York: Crossroad, 1994).

----------, *Friendship and Community*, Cistercian Studies, 95 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1988); 2nd edn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010).

McKinnell, John, 'On the Date of *The Battle of Maldon*', *Medium Ævum*, 44 (1975): 121-136.

McKinney, Windy A., 'Creating a *gens Anglorum*: Social and Ethnic Identity in Anglo-Saxon England through the Lens of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2011).

McLaughlin, Megan, *Consorting with Saints. Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

Miller, William Ian, *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking. Feud*, *Law and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

Mullett, Margaret, 'Power, Relations and Networks in Medieval Europe: Introduction', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis* (2005): 255-259.

Nelson, Janet L., 'The Political Ideas of Alfred of Wessex', in *Rulers and Ruling Families in Early Medieval Europe. Alfred, Charles the Bald, and Others* (Aldershot and Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999), 125-158.

----------, 'Monks, Secular Men and *Masculinity*, c. 900', in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Dawn Hadley (New York: Longman, 1998), 121-142.

----------, 'Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship', in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Anne J. Duggan, Proceedings of a Conference held at King's College London April 1995 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), 301-316.

----------, 'The Wary Widow', in *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 82-113.

Niles, John D., 'Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History', *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 13-58.

----------, 'Maldon and Mythopoesis', in *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 203-236.

----------, 'On Stylized Numbers, Odda's Name, and Propaganda', in *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 237-242.

----------, 'Skaldic Technique in *Brunanburh*,' in *Anglo-Scandinavian England. Norse-English Relations in the Period before the Conquest*, ed. by John D. Niles and Mark Amodio, English Colloquium Series, 4 (Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1989), 69-78.

O'Brien O'Keeffe, Katherine, 'Heroic Values and Christian Ethics', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 107-125.

O'Reilly, Jennifer, 'Introduction', in Bede, *On the Temple*, trans. by Seán Connolly, Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).

Orchard, Andy, *A Critical Companion to Beowulf* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003).

----------, 'Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter', in *The Old English Homily. Precedent*, *Practice*, *and Appropriation*, ed. by Aaron J. Kleist, Studies of the Early Middle Ages, 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 311-341.

----------, ‘On Editing Wulfstan’, in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002).

----------, ‘Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*’, *ASE*, 21 (1992): 239-264.

Orton, P. R., ‘*The Battle of Brunanburh*, 40b-44a: Constontinus’s Bereavement’, *Peritia*, 4 (1985): 243-250.

Österberg, Eva, *Friendship and Love*, *Ethics and Politics. Studies in Mediaeval and Early Modern History*, The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lectures (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2010).

Sawyer, P. H., *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Guides and handbooks, 8 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1968); revised and updated version by Susan Kelly, Rebecca Rushforth, and others, *The* ‘*Electronic Sawyer*’: *Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, British Academy-Royal Historical Society Joint Committee on Anglo-Saxon Charters (2007–), as found at http://www.esawyer.org.uk.

Pahl, Ray, *On Friendship*, Themes for the Twenty-First Century (Cambridge and Maldan, MA: Polity, 2000).

Peterson, Erik, ‘Der Gottesfreund. Beiträge zur Geschichte eines religiösen Terminus’, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 42 (1923): 161-202.

Pope, Janet M., ‘Monks and Nobles in the Anglo-Saxon Monastic Reform’, *ANS*, 17, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1994 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), 165-180.

Powell, Timothy E., ‘The ‘Three Orders’ of Society in Anglo-Saxon England’, *ASE*, 23 (1994): 103-132.

Pratt, David, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Rabin, Andrew, ‘Female Advocacy and Royal Protection in Tenth-Century England: the Legal Career of Queen Ælthryth’, *Speculum*, 84.2 (2009): 261-288.

----------, ‘The Wolf’s Testimony to the English: Land and the Witness in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 105.1 (2006): 388-414.

Ramsay, Nigel, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown, eds., *Saint Dunstan: His Life*, *Times and Cult* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 1992).

Reuter, Timothy, ‘The Making of England and Germany, 850-1050: Points of Comparison and Difference’, in *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. by Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 284-299.

----------, ‘‘You can’t take it with you’: Testaments, Hoards, and Moveable Wealth in Europe, 600-1000’, in *Treasure in the Medieval West*, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000), 11-24.

Reynolds, Susan, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

----------, *Fiefs and Vassals. The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Richards, Mary P., ‘The Manuscript Contexts of the Old English Laws: Tradition and Innovation’, in *Studies of Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), 171-192.

Riché, Pierre, *Abbon de Fleury. Un moîne savant et combatif* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004).

Robinson, Fred C., ‘The Significance of Names in Old English Literature’, in *The Tomb of Beowulf and other Essays on Old English* (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1993), 185-219.

Rollason, David, ‘The Concept of Sanctity in the Early Lives of St Dunstan’, in *St Dunstan. His Life*, *Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks, and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 261-272.

Romano, Manuela, ‘The Scope of the Metaphor for Friendship in Old English and Old Norse: A Contrastive Analysis’, *RESLA/ Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (1998-99): 305-314.

----------, ‘Revising Old English Definitions of FRIEND: A Cognitive Account’, *General Session and Parasession on the Role of Learnability in Grammatical Theory*, ed. by Jan Johnson, Matthew L. Juge, and Jeri L. Moxley, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 1996), 340-351.

Rosenwein, Barbara, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter. The Social Meaning of Cluny Property* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989).

Rosser, Gervase, ‘The Anglo-Saxon Gilds’, in *Minsters and Parish Churches. The Local Church in Transition*, *900-1200*, ed. by John Blair, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph, 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1988), 31-34.

Rumble, Alexander R., *Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester. Documents Relating to the Topography of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman City and its Minsters*, Winchester Studies, 4.3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Scharer, Anton, ‘The Writing of History at King Alfred’s Court’, *EME*, 5.2 (1996): 177-206.

Schwab, Ute, 'The *Battle of Maldon*: A Memorial poem', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 63-85.

Scragg, D. G., 'A Reading of Brunanburh', in *Unlocking the Wordhord. Anglo-Saxon Studies in Memory of Edward B. Irving Jr.*, ed. by Mark C. Amodio and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 109-122.

----------, 'The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction?', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 19-31.

----------, '*The Battle of Maldon*', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell for the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991), 1-36.

Sheehan, Michael M., *The Will in Medieval England. From the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the End of the Thirteenth Century* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963).

Sheppard, Alice, *Families of the King. Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

Sigurðsson, Jón Viðar, *Chieftains and Power in the Icelandic Commonwealth*, trans. by Jean Lundskær-Nielsen, The Viking Collection: Studies in Northern Civilization, 12 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1999).

----------, 'Friendship in the Icelandic Commonwealth', in *From Sagas to Society. Comparative Approaches to Early Iceland*, ed. by Gísli Pálsson (Enfield Lock: Hisarlik, 1992), 205-215.

----------, and Thomas Småberg, eds., *Friendship and Social Networks in Medieval Scandinavia: From the Viking Age to Modern-day Society, c. 1000-1800*, Early European Research, 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming).

Simon Walker, 'A Context for 'Brunanburh'?', in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages. Essays presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. by Timothy Reuter (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 21-39.

Smyth, Alfred P., *Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD 80-1000*, The New History of Scotland (Edinburgh: Arnolds, 1984).

Southern, R. W., *Saint Anselm and his Biographer: A Study of Monastic Life and Thought, 1059-c.1130*, Birkbeck Lectures 1959 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

Stafford, Pauline, *Unification and Conquest. A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London: Arnolds; New York: Routledge, 1989).

----------, *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1985).

----------, 'King and Kin, Lord and Community. England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *Gender, Family and the Legitimation of Power. England from the Ninth to Early Twelfth Century*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), VIII, 1-33.

----------, 'Political Ideas in the Late Tenth-Century Charters', in *Law, Laity and Solidarities. Essays in Honour of Susan Reynolds*, ed. by Pauline Stafford, Janet L. Nelson, and Jane Martinson (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 68-82.

----------, 'Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen: Gender, Religious Status and Reform in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', *Past & Present*, 163 (1999): 3-35.

----------, 'Byrhtnoth and Women in the World of *Maldon*: Byrhtnoth and his Family', in *The Battle of Maldon. Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1993), 225-235.

----------, 'The King's Wife in Wessex 800-1066', *Past and Present*, 91 (1981): 3-27.

Stanley, Eric, 'The Date of *Beowulf*: Some Doubts and No Conclusions', in *The Dating of Beowulf*, ed. by Colin Chase, Toronto Old English Series, 6 (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 1981), 197-211.

Stenton, Frank M., *The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955).

----------, *Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford History of England (Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press, 1943); 3rd edn (1971).

Stephenson, Rebecca, 'Scapegoating the Secular Clergy: the Hermeneutic Style as a Form of Monastic Self-Definition', *ASE*, 38 (2009): 101-135.

----------, 'Ælfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin: *Meatim Sed et Rustica* Reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 16 (2006): 111-141.

Stevenson, W. H., 'Yorkshire Surveys and Other Eleventh-Century Documents in the York Gospels', *English Historical Review*, 27.105 (1912): 1-25.

Suttles, Gerald D., 'Friendship as a Social Institution', in *Social Relationships*, ed. by G. J. McCall and others (Chicago: Aldine, 1970), 95-135.

Thacker, Alan, 'Saint-Making and Relic Collecting by Oswald and his Communities', in *St Oswald of Worcester. Life and Influence*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 244-268.

----------, 'Bede's Ideal of Reform', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. by Patrick

Wormald, with Donald Bullough and Roger Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 130-153.

Tollerton, Linda, *Wills and Will-Making in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2011).

Townend, Matthew, 'Pre-Cnut Praise Poetry in Viking Age England', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 51 (2000): 349-370.

----------, ed., *Wulfstan*, *Archbishop of York*, The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004).

Tucker, Nicholas, 'The Rise and Rise of Harry Potter', *Children's Literature in Education*, 30.4 (1999): 221-234.

Tyler, Elizabeth M., *Old English Poetics. The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2006).

----------, 'Poetics and the Past: Making History with Old English Poetry', in *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 225-250.

Vernon, Mark, *The Philosophy of Friendship* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Vohra, Pragya, 'Kinship in the Viking Diaspora: Icelanders and their Relations across the North Atlantic' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2008).

Vollrath, Hanna, 'Gesetzgebung und Schriftlichkeit: Das Beispiel der Angelsächsischen Gesetze', *Historiches Jahrbuch*, 99 (1979): 28-54.

Walker, Simon, 'A Context for 'Brunanburh'?', in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages. Essays presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. by Timothy Reuter (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1992), 21-39.

Wareham, Andrew, *Lords and Communities in Early Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005).

----------, 'Two Models of Marriage: Kinship and the Social Order in England and Normandy', in *Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power. Western Europe in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. by Henk Teunis, Andrew Wareham, and Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, International Medieval Research, 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 107-132.

----------, 'Saint Oswald's Family and Kin', in *St Oswald of Worcester*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 46-63.

Warwick Frese, Dolores, 'Poetic Prowess in *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*: Winning, Losing and Literary Outcome', in *Interpretations in Old English Literature.*

Essays in honour of Stanley B. Greenfield, ed. by Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 83-99.

Wellman, Barry, Peter J. Carrington, and Alan Hall, 'Networks as Personal Communities', in *Social Structures. A Network Approach*, ed. by Barry Wellman and S. D. Berkowitz, Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences, 2 (Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 130-184.

White, Carolinne, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

White, Stephen D., *Custom*, *Kinship and Gifts to the Saints. The Laudatio Parentum In West-France 1050-1150*, Studies in Legal History (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

----------, 'The Politics of Exchange: Gifts, Fiefs, and Feudalism', in *Medieval Transformations. Texts*, *Power*, *and Gifts in Context*, ed. by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong, Cultures, Beliefs and Traditions, 11 (Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001), 169-188.

Whitelock, Dorothy, *The Audience of Beowulf* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951).

----------, 'Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws', *English Historical Review*, 30 (1955): 72-85.

----------, 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', *English Historical Review*, 56 (1941): 1-21.

Wickham, Chris, 'Problems of Comparing Rural Societies in Early Medieval Western Europe', *TRHS*, sixth series, 2 (1992): 221-246.

Wilcox, Jonathan, 'The *Battle of Maldon* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 979-1016: A Winning Combination?', *Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Midwest*, 3 (1995): 31-50.

Williams, Ann, *Kingship and Government in Pre-Conquest England*, *c.500-1066* (New York: St Martin's and Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999).

----------, 'Thegnly Piety and Ecclesiastical Patronage in the Late Old English Kingdom', *ANS*, 24, ed. by John Gillingham, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2001 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 1-24.

----------, 'The Battle of Maldon and *The Battle of Maldon*: History, Poetry and Propaganda', *Medieval History*, 2.2 (1992): 35-44.

----------, '*Princeps Merciorum gentis*: the Family, Career, and Connections of Ælfhere, Ealdorman of Mercia', *ASE*, 10 (1982): 143-172.

Wiseman, Jacqueline P., 'Friendship: Bonds and Binds in a Voluntary Relationship', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3 (1986): 191-211.

Wood, Michael, 'Brunanburh Revisited', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, 20 (1978-1980): 200-217.

Woolf, Rosemary, 'The Ideal of Men Dying with Their Lord in the *Germania* and in *The Battle of Maldon*,' *ASE*, 5 (1976): 63-81.

Wormald, Patrick, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century. Volume I: Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999).

----------, 'Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State Builder', *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, ed. by Matthew Townend, The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 9-27.

----------, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', in *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, ed. by David A. E. Pelteret (New York and London: Garland, 2000), 191-224.

----------, 'Giving God and King their Due', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 333-355 [originally published in *La giustizia nell'alto medioevo (secoli IX-XI)*, Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' alto Medioevo, 44 (Spoleto: Settimana di Studio, 1997), 549-90].

----------, 'Quadripartitus', *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 81-114 [Originally published in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by G. Garnett and J. Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 111-47].

----------, 'Anglo-Saxon Society and its Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-22.

----------, 'Charters, Law and the Settlement of Disputes in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 289-311 [Originally published in *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 149–68].

----------, 'Bede, *Bretwaldas* and the Origins of the *gens Anglorum*', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society. Studies presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. by Wormald, Bullough and Collins (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 99-129.

----------, 'Bede, Beowulf and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy', in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England. Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary*

of the Birth of Bede given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974, ed. by Robert T. Farrell, BAR, 46 (Oxford: BAR, 1978), 32-69.

----------, '*Lex Scripta* and *Verbum Regis:* Legislation and Germanic Kingship from Euric to Cnut', in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West. Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1999), 1-44 [originally published in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. by P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (Leeds: Leeds University Press, 1977), 105-138].

Yorke, Barbara, 'Æthelmær: The Foundation of the Abbey at Cerne and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *The Cerne Abbey Millennium Lectures*, ed. by Katherine Barker (Cerne Abbas: Cerne Abbey Millennium Committee, 1988), 15-25.

----------, 'Æthelwold and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 65-88.

----------, 'Introduction', in *Bishop Æthelwold. His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), 1-13.

----------, ed., *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence* (Woodbridge and Wolfeboro, NH: Boydell, 1988).

Ysebaert, Walter, 'Medieval Letter-Collections as a Mirror of Circles of Friendship? The Example of Stephen of Tournai, 1128-1203', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire/ Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis (2005): 285-300.*

Dictionaries and Research Tools

A Latin Dictionary, *Founded on Andrews*' *Edition of Freund*'*s Latin Dictionary: Revised*, *Enlarged*, *and in Great Part Rewritten*, ed. by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879).

A Thesaurus of Old English in Two Volumes, ed. by Jane Roberts and Christian Kay, with Lynne Grundy, London Medieval Studies, 11, 2 vols (London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, King's College London, 1995).

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller, ed. by Joseph Bosworth and T. Northworth Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1898).

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller: Supplement, ed. by T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921).

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, ed. by R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1975–).

Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney, with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang, 2009 Release, University of Toronto (2009), as accessible under license at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca.

Dictionary of Old English, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney and others (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1994–), as accessible under license at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca.

Niermeyer Mediae Latiantis Lexicon Minus: Lexique Latin mediéval–Medieval Latin Dictionary–Mittellateinische Wörterbuch, ed. by J. F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft, rev. by J. W. J. Burgers, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002).

ABBREVIATIONS

British Academy Charter Volumes

Abingdon 1	*Charters of Abingdon Abbey: Part 1*, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 7 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2000).
Abingdon 2	*Charters of Abingdon Abbey: Part* 2, ed. by S. E. Kelly, British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters, 8 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2001).
Bath and Wells	*Charters of Bath and Wells*, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 13 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2007).
Burton	*Charters of Burton Abbey*, ed. by P. H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1979).
New Minster	*Charters of the New Minster*, ed. by Sean Miller, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2001).
Rochester	*Charters of Rochester*, ed. by A. Campbell, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1973).
Shaftesbury	*Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey*, ed. by S. E. Kelly, British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters, 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1996).
Sherborne	*Charters of Sherborne*, ed. by M. A. Donovan, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1988).
St Albans	*Charters of St Albans*, ed. by Julia Crick, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 12 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2007).
St Augustine'*s*	*Charters of St Augustine*'*s Abbey*, *Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanet*, ed. by S. E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1995).

Charters and Wills

Birch	*Cartularium Saxonicum*: A *Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, ed. by W. de Gray Birch, 3 vols (London: Whiting, 1885–1893).
Charters (R)	*Anglo-Saxon Charters*, ed. and trans. by A. J. Robertson, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956).
ECEE	*The Early Charters of Eastern England*, ed. by Cyril Hart, Studies in Early English History, 5 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966).
ECW	*The Early Charters of Wessex*, ed. by Herbert Patrick Reginald Finberg, Studies in Early English History (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1964).
Kemble	*Codex diplomatorum ævi Saxonici*, ed. by John Mitchell Kemble (London: Bentley, Wilson, and Filey, 1839).
Keynes, *Diplomas*	Keynes, Simon, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred* '*The Unready*'. *A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life & Thought, Third Series, 13 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
N&S	*The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents Now in the Bodleian Library*, ed. by A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895).
S	Sawyer, P. H., *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Guides and handbooks, 8 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1968); revised and updated version by Susan Kelly, Rebecca Rushforth, and others, *The* '*Electronic Sawyer*': *Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, British Academy-Royal Historical Society Joint Committee on Anglo-Saxon Charters (2007–), as accessible at http://www.esawyer.org.uk.
SEHD	*Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. and trans. by F. E. Harmer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).
Wills	*Anglo-Saxon Wills*, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

Other primary sources

ASC A — *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 3: MS. A*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Janet Bately (Cambridge: Brewer, 1986).

ASC C — *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 5: MS. C*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Cambridge: Brewer, 2001).

ASC D — *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 6: MS. D*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by G. P. Cubbin (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996).

ASC E — *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *a Collaborative Edition. Vol. 7: MS. E*, *a Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices*, ed. by Susan Irvine (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004).

Councils & Synods, I.I — *Councils & Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*, ed. by F. M. Powicke and others, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964–81); vol. 1: *Volume I*, *A.D. 871-1204*, *Part I*, *871-1066*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock (1981).

EEM — *King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries*, in *Councils & Synods*, I.I, no. 33, pp. 142-154.

EHD, I — *English Historical Documents*, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock and others, 12 vols (London and New York: Eyre Methuen, Oxford University Press, and Routledge: 1955–1996); vol. 1: *Volume I*, *c. 500-1042*, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1979).

Exeter Anthology — *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry*, ed. by Bernard J. Muir and software by Nick Kennedy, The Exeter DVD, 2nd edn (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2006).

Gesetze, I — *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, ed. and trans. by Felix Liebermann, 3 vols (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1903-1916); vol. 1: *Text und Übersetzung* (1903).

Gesetze, III — *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, ed. and trans. by Felix Liebermann, 3 vols (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1903-1916); vol. 3: *Einleitung zu jedum Stück; Erklärungen zu einzelnen Stellen* (1916).

Memorials — *Memorials of Saint Dunstan*, *Archbishop of*

Canterbury, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 63 (London: Longman, 1874).

RC — *Regularia concordia*, ed. and trans. by Dom Thomas Symons, *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (London: Nelson, 1952).

RSB — *Rule of St Benedict*, ed. by Rudolf Hanslik, *Benedicti regula*, CSEL, 75 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1960).

VSÆ — Wulfstan of Winchester, *The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

VSD — B., *The Life of St Dunstan*, ed. and trans. by Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge, *The Early Lives of St Dunstan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

VSO — Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Life of St Oswald*, ed. and trans. by Michael Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey. The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Series and journals

ANS — *Anglo-Norman Studies*

ASE — *Anglo-Saxon England*

ASPR — Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records

BAR — British Archaeological Reports

CCSL — Corpus Christianorum Series Latina

CSEL — Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum

EETS — Early English Text Society
- o.s. — Original series
- s.s. — Supplementary series

EME — *Early Medieval Europe*

FS — *Frühmittelalterliche Studien: Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster*

PL — Patrologia Latina

TRHS — *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Dictionaries and Research Tools

Bosworth&Toller	*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller*, ed. by Joseph Bosworth and T. Northworth Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1898).
Bosworth&Toller: Supplement	*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller: Supplement*, ed. by T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921).
DMLBS	*Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, ed. by R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1975–).
DOE	*Dictionary of Old English*, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney and others (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1994–), as accessible under license at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca.
DOEC	*Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, ed. by Antonette diPaulo Heaney, with John Price Wilkin, and Xin Xiang, 2009 Release, University of Toronto (2009), as accessible at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca.
Lewis&Short	*A Latin Dictionary*, *Founded on Andrews*' *Edition of Freund*'*s Latin Dictionary: Revised*, *Enlarged*, *and in Great Part Rewritten*, ed. by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879).
Niermeyer	*Niermeyer Mediae Latiantis Lexicon Minus: Lexique Latin mediéval–Medieval Latin Dictionary–Mittellateinische Wörterbuch*, ed. by J. F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft, rev. by J. W. J. Burgers, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002).
Thesaurus	*A Thesaurus of Old English in Two Volumes*, ed. by Jane Roberts and Christian Kay, with Lynne Grundy, London Medieval Studies, 11, 2 vols (London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, King's College London, 1995).