

THE BISHOPS OF WINCHESTER, THE KINGS OF WESSEX AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF WINCHESTER IN THE NINTH AND EARLY TENTH CENTURIES

By BARBARA A E YORKE

ABSTRACT

Winchester was developing as a town throughout the ninth century, but not always for the same reasons. In the first half of the ninth century, the bishops, particularly Swithun, seem to have been the major builders in the town, though they made use of royal patronage. In the second half of the ninth century relations between kings of Wessex and bishops of Winchester deteriorated, while the kings adapted Winchester to suit their own needs, first as a burh and then as an administrative centre, taking on some of the functions of *Hamtun*. The culmination of their interest was the founding of the New Minster by Edward the Elder, in the first decade of the tenth century, to act as a place of burial for the new dynasty of kings of England.

In a previous article, I examined the early Saxon history of Winchester and suggested that its development was much affected by rivalries within the West Saxon royal house and by the relationships of the bishops of Winchester with the different royal branches (Yorke 1982, 75-83). That phase in West Saxon history came to an end in the early ninth century when the family of Egbert was able, with the aid of the clergy of Winchester, to establish itself as the only branch of the West Saxon royal house from which kings of Wessex could be chosen. The ensuing relations between the bishops of Winchester and the house of Egbert in the ninth century and first decade of the tenth century are one of the major concerns of this paper. The period is one of great significance in Winchester's history for it saw the revival of town-life, traditionally associated with the reign of Alfred (871-899), and the foundation of the Nunnaminster by Alfred's queen, Ealhswith, and the New Minster, by Alfred's son, Edward the Elder (899-924). Greater understanding of both these developments can be reached through a study of

relations between Winchester's two major patrons, the bishops of Winchester and the kings of Wessex.

The history of Winchester in the first half of the ninth century is extremely badly recorded. However, one Winchester figure who stands out from this period is Bishop Swithun and his career seems to have been of the greatest importance in the development of Winchester (Fig 1). The life of Bishop Swithun is shadowy to say the least; even the dates of his episcopate are uncertain and can be dated only tentatively to c 852-c 862 (O'Donovan 1973, 108). A significant amount was written about Swithun in the later Anglo-Saxon period, but practically all of it is concerned with his activities once dead, that is, with the miracles performed at his tomb from 968 and after the translation of his body in 971. The purpose of these miracles was to justify the drastic action which Bishop Aethelwold took in 964 when he expelled the secular clerks of the Old Minster and replaced them with monks. The authors of the accounts of the miracles - Wulfstan, Lantfred and Aelfric - were all monks of the reformed Old Minster and it is not surprising to find them denying any knowledge of Swithun's earthly career for Swithun had himself been a clerk, and not a monk, and to dwell on this fact would hardly have advanced their cause (Sheerin 1978, 266-8).

We have to wait until the second half of the eleventh century for an account of Swithun's life. His biographer was Goscelin, a professional hagiographer, who provided written lives for Anglo-Saxon saints who did not already possess them and whose cults were regarded with suspicion by the incoming Normans. His *Life of Swithun* is far from being an ideal source, for, when his material was thin, Goscelin resorted to



Fig 1. St Swithun as depicted in the Benedictional of St Aethelwold (BL Add MS 49598, fol 97v). (Photo by permission of the Courtauld Institute.)

hagiographical *topoi* to spin out his narrative (Goscelin 373–80). The question is whether Goscelin had any reliable written or oral traditions concerning Swithun on which to draw. Although the tenth-century recorders of Swithun's miracles pleaded ignorance of his career (Wulfstan epistle, 11 317–28, 75; Lantfred ch 1, 372; Aelfric 60), one of them did admit that some knowledge of Swithun's life survived at Winchester (Wulfstan I, 11 453–4, 100) and the presence of some atypical material in Gosce-

lin's hagiography gives some hope that he may have preserved genuine traditions about Swithun's life.

Goscelin stresses the close relationship between Swithun and King Ecgbert (802–839) and his son and successor, Aethelwulf (839–858) (Goscelin ch 3–6, 376–8). According to Goscelin, Swithun first came to Ecgbert's notice when the former was a priest at Winchester and was entrusted with the education of Aethelwulf, who even became a subdeacon at Winchester. When

Aethelwulf became king Swithun was one of his chief advisors and was appointed by him to the vacant bishopric of Winchester. We are certainly not obliged to accept every detail of this account, but we do know that Ecgbert was concerned to win the support of the clergy of Winchester (Sawyer 281, Birch 423) and was buried at the Old Minster, though the earliest record of this is in a twelfth-century history (*Gesta Regum* II, 107). Aethelwulf was apparently a major patron of the Old Minster, especially in the period of Swithun's episcopate. Unfortunately the majority of charters in his name for Winchester cannot be accepted as genuine as they stand, though some may have a genuine base and have been rewritten at a later date. One that is of particular interest, and for which there are grounds for treating as genuine, as the dubious decimation material associated with it appears to be a later insertion and the grant itself has no anachronistic features, is a grant from Aethelwulf to Swithun and the clergy of Winchester of an estate at Brightwell in Berkshire to help defray the expense of entertaining distinguished foreign visitors (Sawyer 307, Birch 474). In years when there were no such visitors the revenue from the estate was to be given to the poor. The events that took place at the end of Aethelwulf's reign (see below) also suggest that Aethelwulf was especially associated with Swithun and, of course, he was also buried in Winchester (*Chronicle* sa 855, I, 66).

The Brightwell grant gives an indication of how a close relationship between bishop and royal house could stimulate the urban development of Winchester, for the implication is surely that the foreign guests were being entertained in Winchester. Some of the most interesting and original passages in Goscelin's *Life of Swithun* deal with the bishop as builder. According to Goscelin, Swithun built a stone bridge for the citizens of Winchester at the East Gate (Goscelin ch 7, 378) and his claim receives some support from a Latin poem recording the construction of the bridge in 859 (Locke 1912, 129). Unfortunately the poem cannot at the moment be dated closely (Biddle 1976, 271–2); the earliest manuscript containing it dates to the second half of the eleventh century (Ker 1957,

353–4). Goscelin also records that Swithun built or repaired large numbers of churches, though he is not specific about where these were (Goscelin ch 8, 379). Certainly Winchester possessed a number of churches by the end of the ninth century (Sawyer 1443, Birch 605). These indications are slight, but they do suggest that Swithun, like other ninth-century bishops at home and abroad, was active in improving the facilities of his episcopal centre.

Something of Swithun's local and national importance can also be implied from the attention paid to his burial place and the growth of his cult. Once again the evidence is not without ambiguity. All the sources record that Swithun asked to be buried not in the church nor in the priests' cemetery, but in a lowly position before the western doorway, so that the feet of the common people might trample his grave (Wulfstan I, II 455–64, 100–1; Lantfred ch 4, 376–7; Goscelin ch 9, 380). The choice of burial site was interpreted as a sign of his humility. However, whether Swithun wished it or not, his grave soon became anything but self-effacing. The tenth-century writers who spoke of ignorance concerning Swithun in their own day and claimed that the place of burial was forgotten, nevertheless also reveal that it was marked by a number of structures at the time of the first miracles in 968 and 970 which, from the sound of them, would have made the place of sepulture hard to miss (Quirk 1957, 38–41). These included a stone cross on the eastern side of the tomb and a tomb house with a gable roof, erected over the sarcophagus and which is likely to have been connected with a pilgrimage cult established before Bishop Aethelwold adopted Swithun as patron (Figs 1 and 2). The mere fact that the tenth-century reformers promoted Swithun, in preference to monastic or reforming bishops of Winchester more suited to their cause, suggests that his cult was already well developed before the tenth-century reforms (Sheerin 1978, 268–70). Swithun was presumably chosen as it was impossible to ignore him.

Although Swithun's career is shadowy, he was clearly a figure of national importance. In spite of later saintly legend, the indications we have of him are of a man of action rather than an

ascetic. Only one miracle is supposed to have occurred during his lifetime and even that had a practical element. The bishop is said to have made whole the broken eggs of a poor woman who fell crossing his new bridge, presumably on her way to market (Goscelin ch 7, 378). Some of his practical interest was concentrated on developing the facilities of his episcopal centre. Although royal patronage was probably important in enabling him to do this, it nevertheless seems to have been the bishop who was taking the greater interest in Winchester's urban renewal.

Swithun did not continue to enjoy good relations with Aethelwulf's son and successor, Aethelbald (855–860). In 855 Aethelwulf set out on a pilgrimage to Rome, leaving Aethelbald in control (Asser ch 12–13, 9–12). The journey to Rome was a hazardous one and several earlier royal pilgrims had succumbed to plague in the Eternal City. There must have been a strong expectation that Aethelwulf would not return and certainly there was consternation when he showed every intention of doing so in 856 with a young Frankish princess as his new bride. Aethelbald's reaction was to stage a coup and Aethelwulf was obliged to share power with his son until his death in 858. But there seems to have been more behind the rebellion than simply Aethelbald's desire to secure his own share of power. Alfred's biographer believed that the bishop of Sherborne and the ealdorman of Somerset were equally, if not more, to blame (Asser ch 12, 9). The shires of Somerset and Dorset seem to have been the area where the family of Ecgbert had been based before they came to dominate the kingship as it was certainly the area of their ecclesiastical patronage in the eighth century. The coup against Aethelwulf may also have been a reaction from men of the diocese of Sherborne to the attention Ecgbert and Aethelwulf had paid to the diocese of Winchester and, perhaps, to Aethelwulf's advisor, Swithun, bishop of Winchester. Certainly we find a significant change in relations between kings of Wessex and bishops of Winchester during the rest of the ninth century.

Aethelbald and his brothers displayed a marked preference in ecclesiastical patronage

for the diocese of Sherborne. Aethelbald and Aethelbert (860–865) were both buried at Sherborne itself (*Chronicle sa* 860, 67–8) and Aethelred (865–871) was buried in Wimborne minster which had been founded as a double monastery by a member of their branch of the royal house in the reign of Ine (688–726) (*Chronicle sa* 718 and 871, 42–3 and 72–3). Alfred's two new foundations were also in the Sherborne diocese – a nunnery at Shaftesbury (Asser ch 98, 85) and a monastery at Athelney (Asser ch 92, 79). The bishopric of Winchester, on the other hand, had some of its estates confiscated for royal use. In 858, the year of King Aethelwulf's death, Swithun was obliged to lease King Aethelbald an episcopal estate at Farnham for the latter's lifetime (Sawyer 1274, Birch 495). The record of the lease, which would presumably have been drawn up by Swithun, states firmly that when the estate returns to Winchester on Aethelbald's death, it is never again to be alienated.

Swithun's successors of the ninth century found themselves obliged to lose temporarily or permanently further estates to the kings or their officials, and Aethelwulf's sons apparently tried to prevent the Old Minster from receiving estates left to it in Aethelwulf's will. Swithun's successor, Ealhferth (c 862–871×877), was only able to claim a continuing interest in the reversion of two estates at Chiseldon (Wilts.) and Hurstbourne Priors (Hants.) by granting King Alfred property in Berkshire (Sawyer 354, Birch 565). The clergy of the Old Minster never got the estate at Chiseldon as Alfred's son, King Edward and Elder (899–924) obliged them to take a smaller estate in exchange for it (Sawyer 359, Birch 594). Relations, in fact, between Edward and Bishop Denewulf of Winchester (878×879–908) seem to have been particularly bad. When obliged to lease an estate at Beddington (Surrey) to the king, Denewulf wrote into the record of the transaction a passage which amounts, given the conventions of the time, to a major rebuke :

'the bishop and community at Winchester beg that in charity for the love of God and for the holy church you desire no more land of that foundation



Fig 2. Bishop pronouncing benediction in church from the *Benedictional of St Aethelwold* (BL Add MS 49598, fol 118v) – perhaps intended as a representation of Aethelwold within the rebuilt Old Minster in Winchester. (Photo by permission of the Courtauld Institute.)

for it seems to them an unwelcome demand; so that God need blame neither you nor us for the diminishing in our days; for there was a very great injunction of God about that when men gave those lands to the foundation' (Sawyer 1444, Birch 618, trans Whitelock 1979, 543–4).

Land was not the only cause of dispute between kings and bishops of Winchester. Ealhferth had partly been obliged to let Alfred have the estates in Berkshire mentioned above because he could not afford to pay the tribute Alfred was demanding for the Vikings. A sum of fifty pounds in silver seems to have been in question. In the *Preface* which Alfred wrote for his own translation of Pope Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, the king was openly critical of contempor-

ary bishops who let standards of learning fall (Sweet 1871, 2–9, trans Whitelock 1979, 887–90). He names no names, but Denewulf who was bishop of Winchester at the time would seem too have been just the type of prelate he had in mind. From the time of Ealhferth onwards there had been an increasing tendency for Winchester episcopal documents to be written in Old English, instead of Latin. Nearly all Denewulf's reliable charters are in Old English, raising a suspicion that the Latin ones are later rewritings and many of them do show signs of later redrafting. Alfred was particularly critical of bishops who could understand only English. His concern was far more widely based than just a preoccupation with standards of Latin in Wessex. Alfred accepted the contemporary opinion that the Vikings were a scourge sent by God to punish a recalcitrant people, similar to the plagues and defeats in battle with which God had afflicted the Children of Israel. It followed that an essential prerequisite for successfully defeating the Vikings was to make the kingdom pleasing to God again and this could hardly be achieved if bishops were neglecting their pastoral duties in the way which was implied by the neglect of Latin, the recognised language of the Christian church. Although there have been claims that learning and production of manuscripts was revived in Winchester by the end of the ninth century (Parkes 1976, 149–71), there is no clear sign of this revival in episcopal documents until the episcopate of Denewulf's successor, Frithestan (909–932×3).

There were thus strong reasons on both sides for bad feeling between the kings of Wessex and the bishops of Winchester in the latter part of the ninth century. But although the kings might withdraw their patronage from the bishopric, this did not mean that they were not interested in Winchester itself. Indeed, the question of the control of Winchester may have been a cause of additional dispute between kings and bishops. What probably interested the sons of Aethelwulf in Winchester initially were its Roman fortifications. One of the new policies brought in after Aethelwulf's death to combat the increasingly persistent Viking attacks was the provision of fortified bases. The Mercians had used them

against the Vikings in Kent at the end of the eighth century, but the first references to 'fortress work' in West Saxon charters come from the reign of Aethelbald (Brooks 1971, 79-82). Winchester was recognised as a defensive site or 'burh' in the *Burghal Hidage* which it has recently been suggested was drawn up c886 (Davis 1982, 803-10), but this provides only a *terminus ante-quem* for the reutilisation of its defences. It is quite likely that Winchester was already a major defensive centre in 860 when it attracted a substantial Viking raid (*Chronicle sa* 860, 66-8). Asser who wrote the most detailed account of the attack, in c893, records severe destruction of the city and that 'the large army of pagans' made off with a great booty until intercepted by a West Saxon force (Asser ch 18, 17-18). The fact that the Vikings were able to get into the city is not an argument against Winchester being refortified by this time as there are several indications that the fortress system was only moderately successful until the burhs were provided with permanent garrisons, probably in the reign of Alfred (Brooks 1979, 9-10). Whether the street-system, which seems to have been in existence by the early years of the tenth century at the latest (Biddle and Hill 1971, 70-8), was laid out when the garrisons were introduced is harder to say. It could have been an integral part of the defensive system from the start, or, if the destruction of 860 was really as severe as Asser implies, this would have provided an opportunity for replanning the city and providing for its apparently growing population.

Gradually Winchester seems to have acquired other new, royally-inspired, functions. In the eighth and early ninth centuries the local centre of royal administration had apparently been *Hamtun* (Yorke 1982, 80). Ecgbert and Aethelwulf had minted coins there and Aethelwulf had witnessed a number of charters from the *villa regalis de Hamptone*. But as the ninth century progressed the Itchen/Test peninsula became the subject of increasingly severe Viking attacks. Their object was the trading-base of *Hamwic* which, like other trading-bases of north-western Europe, seems to have been put out of commission. These raids must have had a severe

effect on the administrative functions of *Hamtun*, based on the same royal estate. The exact date of the decline of *Hamwic* awaits fuller publication of the recent excavations, but it may well be significant that in 840x842 *Hamwic/Hamtun* was the main focus of Viking interest in southern Hampshire (Holdsworth 1980, 3), while in 860 although the Vikings landed at *Hamtun* (*Gesta Regum* II, 3), it was Winchester which was their objective. There may well be a direct correlation between the decline in the population of *Hamwic* and the growth in that of Winchester, but we must wait for archaeological help in clarifying the situation.

However, the solid indications that royal administration was being transferred to Winchester from *Hamtun* come from the second half of Alfred's reign, that is after his defeat of the great heathen army in 878 and reconquest of London in 886. It was a time when Alfred, although keeping a watchful eye for more Viking attacks, was also trying to rehabilitate his kingdom. In fact, all the close associations of Alfred with Winchester come from the very last years of his reign. Winchester is not mentioned by name in Asser's *Life of Alfred* which was written c893. The first direct reference to Alfred in Winchester (which, incidentally, is also the first contemporary reference to any Anglo-Saxon king doing anything in Winchester besides being buried there) is from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 896. There we read that after an attack on Viking ships operating out of the Isle of Wight, the captured men 'were brought to Winchester to the king, and he ordered them to be hanged' (Whitelock 1961, 58). The same entry records the death of the town-reeve of Winchester, the earliest reference to such an official in the town. At about the same time Alfred seems to have begun minting coins in the town, probably the first Saxon coins to have been minted there (Dolley and Blunt 1961, 86-8). It looks as if Alfred, carrying the policies of his brothers to their logical conclusion, may have been responsible for turning Winchester into a centre of royal administration. In speaking of the improvements Alfred brought to Wessex, Asser wrote:

'of the royal residences in stone, moved at the royal command from the ancient sites and beautifully erected in more suitable places' (Asser ch 91, 77; trans Whitelock 1979, 298).

Although no traces of such a royal residence have yet been found in Winchester, this description fits in well with a transfer of administrative functions from *Hamton* to Winchester.

Whether Winchester was more to Alfred than just a centre of local royal administration is a difficult question to answer. Alfred's brother Aethelbert (860–865) had been the first of the family to amalgamate the eastern shires of Kent, Surrey and Sussex (previously administered as a separate subkingdom) with the main kingdom of Wessex (Asser ch 18, 17). From that time Winchester would have stood at the heart of Wessex, with good connections with other centres from the nexus of Roman roads centred upon it. To speak of a 'capital' would be misleading in a ninth-century context, but Winchester was certainly well-equipped to be a place of special significance to the royal household and by the end of the ninth century performed a number of different functions.

One of the functions of Winchester was to act as a religious centre. The Nunnaminster was founded by Alfred's queen, Ealhswith (893 × 908), probably as a place of retreat for her widowhood. The reasons behind the foundation of New Minster are more complex. It has been suggested that a primary purpose of the foundation was to 'serve as the burh church of the replanned city' (Biddle 1975, 131). Unfortunately we have no contemporary explanation of its foundation. In late Winchester tradition Alfred is credited with the intention of founding the New Minster and with, as a preliminary to this, building a small temporary foundation for the Frankish priest Grimbald (Grierson 1940, 529–61). None of this can be confirmed by contemporary or near-contemporary documents. Even the date of the foundation by Alfred's son, Edward the Elder, lacks certainty. The so-called 'Golden Charter' and other grants in Edward's name to the New Minster are generally regarded as forgeries (Sawyer 360, 365–6, 370, 374; Brooks 1982, 192–4), and the most reliable of the early New Minster records, the Old English account of the acquisition of the

site of the New Minster by King Edward from Bishop Denewulf, is undated, though a date early in Edward's reign is supported by the involvement of Denewulf (d 908) and by the other bishops of the witness list, if the list of Stowe 994 is to be believed (Sawyer 1443, Birch 605 and 1338; Harmer 1914, 110–12). The traditional date for the foundation is 903 the date recorded only in the post-Conquest 'F' version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It probably represents the date of foundation current in Winchester at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, but it is not clear whether it is independent of, or the source of, the date of 903 in the 'Golden Charter' (Sawyer 370, Birch 602), supposedly the foundation charter of Edward the Elder, which is indisputedly a forgery and unlikely to have been drawn up much before 1000 (Brooks 1982, 193–5). It is, of course, quite possible that the 903 date in the 'F' version of the *Chronicle* was taken from the forged 'Golden Charter'.

Although the exact date of foundation remains uncertain, the evidence does suggest that the New Minster was founded fairly early on in Edward's reign. We have no clear statement of why Edward founded the New Minster, but there can be no doubt of the use to which it was immediately put – a burial place for Edward and his family. The body of Edward's father, Alfred, was moved from its initial place of burial in the Old Minster (*Liber Vitae* 5). His mother, Ealhswith, and Grimbald were also buried in the New Minster. By the time of Edward's own burial in the New Minster in 924 (*Chronicle* D, 105; *Liber Vitae* 6), the church also contained Edward's son, Aelfwine, who had predeceased him (*Liber Vitae* 14) and Edward's brother, Aethelweard (*Gesta Regum* II, 130). Another son of Edward, Aelfweard, who died sixteen days after his father, was also buried there (*Chronicle* D sa 924; *Liber Vitae* 6). The evidence seems clear that one of the principal reasons behind the foundation of the New Minster was to provide a fitting burial place for Alfred and his successors.

In his foundation of the New Minster, Edward was making a clear rejection of the Old Minster where some earlier kings of the West Saxon royal house had been buried (Yorke 1982, 80), including, most recently, Ecgbert and

Aethelwulf. As if to emphasise the fact, the New Minster was built only a few feet away from the small, seventh-century church of the Old Minster (Biddle 1975, 128). It was sited on land which had formerly belonged to the Old Minster (Sawyer 1443, Birch 605) and was endowed with at least one estate which had originally been intended for the Old Minster (Chiseldon : Finberg 1964, 135–6). It is very tempting to link the new foundation with the accelerating bad relations between the successors of Aethelwulf and the bishops of Winchester. The new foundation could be seen as a deliberate slight to the older foundation and a reaffirmation of the superiority of royal over episcopal power.

However, these rather unworthy motives are unlikely to be the whole, or even a significant explanation, of Edward's new foundation. The New Minster may also have symbolised for Edward the recent extension of West Saxon power. Ecgbert and Aethelwulf had been patrons of the Old Minster, a foundation of one of the rival branches of the royal house whose rights and interests they had made their own. But Ecgbert and Aethelwulf had been only kings of the West Saxons, albeit of an enlarged kingdom. Alfred and Edward, on the other hand, could and did claim to be 'kings of the English' as the Vikings had destroyed all the rival dynasties, leaving them the only kings of Anglo-Saxon birth in the island. The foundation of the New Minster may have symbolised this new departure. The Old Minster was the foundation of the kings of Wessex : the New Minster that of the kings of England. The two foundations lay side by side, but were distinct : the new kingdom of the English grew out of the West Saxon kingdom, but was to be much more than just the West Saxon kingdom writ large.

It is interesting to see Edward's sister, Aethelflaed, the lady of the Mercians, acting in a similar way in her province. She built as a burial place for herself and her husband, the last semi-independent ruler of Mercia, a new minster in Gloucester, a place with earlier associations with the Hwiccan royal family. From this time Gloucester became a place of special significance to the West Saxon royal house and one of the sites of official crown-wearings later in the

Anglo-Saxon period (Heighway and Hill 1978, 118–23). Winchester, of course, also became a place of great ceremonial significance to the royal family in the late Saxon period.

Relations between the bishops of Winchester and the kings of Wessex were as complex in the ninth and early tenth centuries as they had been in previous centuries. Rivalries between different branches of the royal house were replaced by the hostility of factions centred around different members of the house of Ecgbert. The bishops of Winchester were in favour with Ecgbert and Aethelwulf, but enjoyed poor relations with Aethelwulf's sons. One of the new measures which the latter adopted which would have affected the bishops directly was the building or refurbishment of fortresses against the Vikings. It was this that led to the rapid development of Winchester as a major administrative centre which must have been resented by the bishops as much as new financial burdens or exhortations to improve their standards of learning. Once the potential of Winchester had been recognised, it attracted functions that had once been dispersed more widely through Hampshire, and seems to have annexed some of the attributes of *Hamton*, for instance. That there is some truth in the view that Alfred was responsible for Winchester's development is supported by the flurry of activity in Winchester towards the end of his reign, though in many ways this was merely the continuation of policies initiated by his brothers, who may themselves have benefitted from improvements made by Bishop Swithun. The foundation by Edward of a new minster, intended as a burial place for himself and his family hints at a national significance for Winchester and the beginning of a new role. However, one should not think that relations between the kings of England and Winchester were now set on a course that would be unchanging for the rest of the Anglo-Saxon period. Alfred and Edward had created what they wanted in Winchester and the new bishop, Frithestan, appointed in 909, was a model ecclesiastic. But on Edward's death the faction fighting within the West Saxon royal family reasserted itself and was to reappear at almost every change of monarch during the rest of the

Anglo-Saxon period. In these disputes the role and royal attitudes to Winchester waxed and waned accordingly.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Aelfric Life of St Swithun, *Lives of Three English Saints*, Needham, G I (ed), University of Exeter, 1976.
- Asser *Life of King Alfred*, Stevenson, W H (ed), Oxford, 1904.
- BL Add Ms 49598 The Benedictional of St Aethelwold, British Library Additional Manuscript 49598.
- Birch, W de Gray *Cartularium Saxonicum*, 3 vols, London, 1885–99.
- Chronicle Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, Earle, J and Plummer, C (eds), 2 vols, Oxford, 1892.
- Gesta Regum* William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum*, Stubbs, W (ed), Rolls series 90, London, 1887.
- Goscelin Vita Sancti Swithuni, *Analecta Bollandiana* 7, Sauvage, E P (ed), 1888, 373–80.
- Harmer F 1918 *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Cambridge.
- Lantfred Sancti Swithuni translatio et miracula, Sauvage, E P (ed), *Analecta Bollandiana* 4 1885, 367–410.
- Liber Vitae Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey*, Birch, W de Gray (ed), Hampshire Record Society, 1892.
- Locke, A A 1912 *In Praise of Winchester*, London.
- Sawyer, P *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society, 1968.
- Sweet, H 1871 *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, Early English Text Society, OS 45.
- Whitelock, D (trans and ed) 1961 *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, London.
- Whitelock, D 1979 *English Historical Documents*, I c 500–1042, 2nd edn, Oxford.
- Wulfstan St Swithun, *Frithegod's Monachi Breviloquium Vitae Beati Wilfredi et Wulfstani Cantoris Narratio Metrica de Sancto Swithuno*, Campbell, A (ed), Zurich, 1950.

Secondary Sources

- Biddle, M and Hill, D 1971 Late Saxon Planned Towns, *Antiquaries Journal* 51 70–85.
- Biddle, M 1975 *Felix Urbs Winthonia: Winchester in the Age of Monastic Reform*, in Parsons, D (ed), *Tenth Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, Chichester, 123–40.
- Biddle, M (ed) 1976 *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages* Winchester Studies 1, Oxford.
- Brooks, N 1971 The development of military obligations in eighth- and ninth-century England, in Clemoes, P and Hughes, K, *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, Cambridge, 69–84.
- 1979 England in the Ninth Century: the Crucible of Defeat, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series 29 1–20.
- 1982 The Oldest Document in the College Archives? The Micheldever Forgery, in Custance, R (ed), *Winchester College: Sixth Centenary Essays*, Oxford, 189–228.
- Davis, R H C 1982 Alfred's and Guthrum's Frontier, *English Historical Review* 97 803–10.
- Dolley, R H M and Blunt, C E 1961 The Chronology of the Coins of Aelfred the Great, in Dolley, R H M (ed), *Anglo-Saxon Coins: Studies Presented to Sir Frank Stenton*, London, 77–95.
- Finberg, H P R 1964 The Churls of Hurstbourne, *Lucerna: Studies of Some Problems in the Early History of England*, London, 131–43.
- Grierson, P 1940 Grimbald of St Bertin's, *English Historical Review* 55 529–61.
- Heighway, C and Hill, D 1978 Excavations at Gloucester; Fourth Interim Report: St Oswald's Priory, *Antiquaries Journal* 58 part I 103–32.
- Holdsworth P 1980 *Excavations at Melbourne Street, Southampton, 1971–6*, Southampton Archaeological Research Committee Report 1, CBA 33 London.
- Ker N R 1957 *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford.
- O'Donovan, M A 1973 An interim revision of episcopal dates for the province of Canterbury, 850–950: part II, in Clemoes, P (ed),

- Anglo-Saxon England* **2** Cambridge, 91–113.
- Parkes, M B 1976 The palaeography of the Parker manuscript of the *Chronicle*, laws and *Sedulius*, and historiography at Winchester in the late ninth and tenth centuries, in Clemons, P (ed), *Anglo-Saxon England* **5** Cambridge, 149–71.
- Quirk, R N 1957 Winchester Cathedral in the tenth century, *Archaeological Journal* **114** 28–68.
- Sheerin, D J 1978 The Dedication of the Old Minster, Winchester, in 980, *Revue Bénédictine* **88** 261–73.
- Yorke, B A E 1982 The Foundation of the Old Minster and the Status of Winchester in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries, *Proc* **38** 75–83.

Author: Dr B A E Yorke, King Alfred's College, Winchester, SO22 4NR.

© *Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society.*