

Twelfth-century Epistolary Language of Friendship Reconsidered. The Case of Guibert of Gembloux

Sara Moens

Sara Moens, Vriendschapstaal in de twaalfde eeuw opnieuw onder de loep. De briefverzameling van Guibertus van Gembloers

De twaalfde eeuw wordt door historici beschouwd als de bloeiperiode van de vriendschapscultus. De precieze interpretatie van de opbloei van vriendschap en haar literaire manifestaties is echter onderhevig aan discussie. De onderzoekers van dit amicitia-debat neigen tegenwoordig naar de “network approach” die focust op het gebruik van vriendschapstaal. Deze kwantitatieve aanpak wordt toegepast op de laat twaalfde eeuwse briefverzameling van een benedictijner monnik, Guibertus van Gembloers, aangevuld met een kwalitatieve studie van vier casussen. Guibertus’ correspondentie getuigt van een spirituele invulling van vriendschap, die binnen een horizontaal netwerk en onder een monastieke elite als een identificerend discours fungeert.

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Moens Sara. Twelfth-century Epistolary Language of Friendship Reconsidered. The Case of Guibert of Gembloux. In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire, tome 88, fasc. 4, 2010. Histoire médiévale, moderne et contemporaine. pp. 983-1017;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2010.7967>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/rbph_0035-0818_2010_num_88_4_7967

Fichier pdf généré le 18/04/2018

Twelfth-century Epistolary Language of Friendship Reconsidered. The Case of Guibert of Gembloux*

Sara MOENS

Ph. D. Fellow of the Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen), Ghent University

The place and role of friendship in religious milieus is a subject of research that has fascinated medievalists for some time. The twelfth century, in particular, seems to have given rise to a friendship cult. The rediscovery of ancient texts – particularly Cicero's *Laelius de amicitia* – in the wake of what is known as the twelfth-century Renaissance played an essential role in this development. The legacy of the classical era, influenced by the doctrines of the church fathers, was reinterpreted to suit the needs of the twelfth century. In religious milieus this led to the cultivation of friendship as an abstract concept and to concrete bonds of friendship. The cult was presumably learned and handed down through instruction in the *ars dictaminis*, or art of letter-writing.

Research into medieval *amicitia* has entered into a more active phase since the 1970s, apart from a few notable precedents⁽¹⁾. This research has focused on the intellectual concept of friendship and the ways in which classical notions of friendship were adopted and adapted by Christian writers⁽²⁾. In particular, the Cistercian interpretation of spiritual friendship and its literary manifestation has attracted the attention of scholars⁽³⁾. One of the most

* I am greatly indebted to Jeroen Deploige for his valuable comments and advice, to Hendrik Mispelon for his help translating some of the Latin citations, and to Irene Schaudies for her translation into English of this article. This article is based on my unpublished dissertation entitled *Netwerkvorming, vriendschap en hagiografische fascinaties in de twaalfde en dertiende eeuw op basis van de correspondentie van Guibertus van Gemblours* (Ghent University, 2008).

(1) See for example Jean LECLERCQ, "L'amitié dans les lettres au Moyen Âge", in *Revue du Moyen Âge latin*, vol. 2, 1946, p. 63-70.

(2) See for example Reginald HYATTE, *The Arts of Friendship. The Idealization of Friendship in Medieval and Early Renaissance Literature*, Leiden, Brill, 1994 or James McEVOY, "The 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 Julian HASELDINE, ed., *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, Stroud, Sutton, 1999, p. 3-44.

(3) See for example Charles DUMONT, "Aelred of Rievaulx's Spiritual Friendship", in John R. SOMMERFELDT, ed., *Cistercian Ideals and Reality*, Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 1978; Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, *The Difficult Saint. Bernard of Clairvaux and His Tradition*, Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 1991; Richard UPSHER SMITH, "Was Bernard a Friend? A Question Revisited", in *Analecta Cisterciensia*, t. 53, 1997, p. 15-43; Gillian KNIGHT, *The Correspondence between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux. A Semantic and Structural Analysis*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002; Damien BOQUET, *L'ordre de l'affect. Autour de l'anthropologie affective d'Aelred de Rievaulx*, Caen, Publications du CRAHM, 2005.

important contributions to the history of friendship in monastic circles is made by Brian Patrick McGuire, who situates the fullest and deepest expression of this cult within the development of Cistercian spirituality in the period 1120-1180⁽⁴⁾. Since the 1990s, a new branch of research – or, in Margaret Mullett's words, a "new agenda" for the study of friendship⁽⁵⁾ – has been devoted to investigating *amicitia* using a lexicographical approach. On the basis of so-called "friendship terminology" used by important twelfth-century figures, historians have attempted to analyze the mechanisms of the cult's functioning. These scholars have often pointed to the existence of friendship ties and friendship networks⁽⁶⁾. Research of this kind is often founded on a thorough study of letter collections left to us by particular individuals. Studies of this kind share a common methodology, which is primarily quantitative: they combine a prosopographic analysis of the recipients of a given correspondence with the contents of the letters (divided into rough categories such as "requests for assistance", "friendship letters", etc.). This prosopographic overview is then confronted with a number of linguistic indicators that refer to the language of friendship (for example, "the use of *tu*", "reflections on friendship", etc.).

Scholars were often forced to conclude, however, that the use of the language of friendship did not immediately provide an argument for the existence of intimate friendship ties – more often than not, it was allied to some pragmatic request. This state of affairs gave rise to what we might call the "*amicitia* debate"⁽⁷⁾: is it possible to discover friendships through the vocabulary in letters? The question of what other motives could also lead to the use of friendship-related language posed itself as highly pertinent as well. This led to an emphasis on network analysis: it was observed that the language of friendship was often used to enter into pragmatic friendships, political alliances and systems of patronage⁽⁸⁾. By taking a closer look at

(4) Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, *Friendship and Community. The Monastic Experience 350-1250*, Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 1988, p. 180-295.

(5) Margaret MULLETT, "Power, Relations and Networks in Medieval Europe : Introduction", in *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis/Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, t. 83, 2005, p. 257.

(6) John McLoughlin examined the letters of John of Salisbury for the cultivation of friendship ties; Julian Haseldine analysed the friendship circle of Peter of Celle on the basis of his correspondence; Walter Ysebaert studied the correspondence of Stephen of Tournai in order to trace friendships and networks; to name but a few prominent examples. See John MCLOUGHLIN, "*Amicitia* in Practice: John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180) and His Circle", in Daniel WILLIAMS, ed., *England in the Twelfth Century. Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1990, p. 165-181; Julian HASELDINE, "Understanding the Language of *Amicitia*. The Friendship Circle of Peter of Celle (c. 1115-1183)", in *Journal of Medieval History*, t. 20, 1994, p. 243-258; Walter YSEBAERT, "Medieval Letter-Collections as a Mirror of Circles of Friendship? The Example of Stephen of Tournai, 1128-1203", in *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis/Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, t. 83, 2005, p. 285-300; Walter YSEBAERT, "Ami, client et intermédiaire. Étienne de Tournai et ses réseaux de relations (1167-1192)", in *Sacris Erudiri*, t. 40, 2001, p. 415-467.

(7) A good overview of the different positions taken in this debate can be found in Julian HASELDINE, "Friends, Friendship and Networks in the Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux", in *Cîteaux*, 2006, t. 57, 3-4, p. 243-249.

(8) MCLOUGHLIN, "*Amicitia* in Practice", *op. cit.*, p. 165-167; Ian ROBINSON, "The Friendship Network of Gregory VII", in *History*, t. 63, 1978, p. 1-22; Gerd ALTHOFF,

the discourse of friendship and its social meaning, Haseldine has likewise discerned that the language of friendship could also be used with an eye toward reconciling different monastic lifestyles⁽⁹⁾. One line of thought within this type of argumentation holds that a discourse of friendship existed within the monastic world that functioned as a sort of learned writing behaviour that identified the user as a member of the monastic elite. This friendship discourse could also be manipulated to serve as a sort of *captatio benevolentiae* to introduce a harsher letter of reprimand, a full-blown criticism⁽¹⁰⁾ or a defence against accusations⁽¹¹⁾. A more controversial topic is the path explored by John Boswell, who argues that the language of friendship points to the existence of a homosexual subculture within cloistered communities⁽¹²⁾. Finally, some see the language of friendship as a purely literary instrument, learned in the cathedral schools of the twelfth century in the *artes dictandi*, without seeing in it a deeper, underlying relationship⁽¹³⁾.

In this article, I will contribute to the *amicitia* debate by applying the tried and tested methodology of the “network approach”⁽¹⁴⁾ to friendship (cf. Haseldine, McLoughlin, Ysebaert) to one specific letter collection, while at the same time attending to expressions of friendship that have not been recorded using specific *amicitia* terminology. The epistolary collection chosen to this purpose is that of Guibert of Gembloux (c 1124/1125 – c 1214)⁽¹⁵⁾. Best known as the secretary and collaborator of the renowned German visionary and prophetess Hildegard of Bingen⁽¹⁶⁾, this Benedictine

Amicitiae und Pacta. Bündnis, Einung, Politik und Gebetsdenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert, Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1992.

(9) Julian HASELDINE, “Friendship and Rivalry: the Role of *Amicitia* in Twelfth-Century Monastic Relations”, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, t. 44, 1993, p. 380-414; HASELDINE, “Friends, Friendship”, *op. cit.*, p. 276-279.

(10) This remark is often made in connection with Bernard of Clairvaux. See for example KNIGHT, *The Correspondence*, *op. cit.*, p. 22-23 and Wim VERBAAL, “Revocare Vitam. Bernard of Clairvaux Writing a Friend’s Life”, in *Revue Mabillon*, t. 14, 2003, p. 157-167.

(11) HASELDINE, “Friends, Friendship”, *op. cit.*, p. 250 and 262.

(12) 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, p. 243-266.

(13) YSEBAERT, “Medieval Letter-Collections”, *op. cit.*, p. 296-300.

(14) A term used by Julian Haseldine in HASELDINE, “Friends, Friendship”, *op. cit.*, p. 246-249.

(15) The only available overview of Guibert of Gembloux’s life is: Hippolyte DELEHAYE, “Guibert, abbé de Florennes et de Gembloux, XII^e et XIII^e siècles”, in *Revue des questions historiques*, t. 46, 1889, p. 5-90 (reprinted in Hippolyte DELEHAYE, *Mélanges d’hagiographie grecque et latine*, Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1966, p. 7-83).

(16) A great deal of research has already been carried out into Guibert’s relation with Hildegard of Bingen. Some important works in this respect are: Joan FERRANTE, “Scribe quae vides et audis. Hildegard, Her Language, and Her Secretaries”, in David TOWNSEND & Andrew TAYLOR, eds., *The Tongue of the Fathers. Gender and Ideology in 12th Century Latin*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998, p. 102-135; John COAKLEY, “A Shared Endeavour? Guibert of Gembloux on Hildegard of Bingen”, in John COAKLEY, *Women, Men and Spiritual Power: Female Saints and Their Male Collaborators*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2006, p. 45-67; Barbara NEWMAN, “Hildegard and Her Hagiographers”, in Catherine MOONEY, ed., *Gendered Voices. Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999, p. 16-34.

monk nevertheless merits the attention of present-day researchers for other reasons as well. For instance, his considerable correspondence attests to his hagiographic interest in St. Martin of Tours, the manner in which he tried to wriggle his way into higher religious circles, and – particularly important for the present investigation – the way he entered into and maintained friendships by using the language of friendship. Despite his two abbacies (at the abbey of Florennes during 1188/1189-1194 and at the abbey of Gembloux during 1194-1204) Guibert never played a major role in the politics of his age. Therefore, this rather ordinary monk's ideas on friendship might offer us a different point of view than those of the luminaries of the twelfth-century Renaissance that have received most of the attention so far. Furthermore, Guibert lived in the later period of this presumed friendship cult. The letters in his *epistolarium* all date from 1175 onwards⁽¹⁷⁾. That is, they all more or less stem from the earlier part of the period 1180-1250, which was characterized by McGuire as a phase of “continuity and change” in monastic friendships. During this period, friendship became more apparent and widespread, both geographically and socially. At the same time, the literary manifestations of friendship became less prominent and doubts about friendship were being voiced⁽¹⁸⁾. In short, the letter collection offers us an excellent test case for the problems encountered in the study of friendship and the language used to express it in the later twelfth-century.

The first part of this inquiry into the use of friendship language in the letters of Guibert of Gembloux employs the usual quantitative method. A prosopographic division of the recipients of the correspondence will serve as a point of departure. I will then identify a number of *amicitia* indicators for which the entire correspondence can be screened. This lexicographical analysis will then be compared to the prosopographic divisions. Finally, I will turn the tables and examine the tone used by those who wrote letters to Guibert of Gembloux.

The second part of the research focuses on a qualitative approach to several specific cases found in the correspondence. On the one hand, a number of examples will be presented in which we can find signs of honest concern, interest and even friendship. On the other hand, several letters will be discussed in which the language of friendship is used as a discourse characteristic of the monastic milieu, a discourse which could also be manipulated in order to express enmity rather than friendship.

I. The Language of Friendship in Guibert's Letters

There are several manuscripts containing letters written by Guibert of Gembloux, an overview of which is thoughtfully provided by Albert Derolez

(17) With the possible exception of letter 53 which is dated by Derolez between 1165 and 1183 and of the (fragmentary) letters 55 and 56 which remain undated.

(18) In fact, one of the chapters of his book is titled “Continuity and Change: The Persistence of Friendship 1180-1250”. See MCGUIRE, *Friendship and Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 339-406, in particular, p. 340-341 and p. 406.

in the introduction to his excellent edition of Guibert's *epistolarium*⁽¹⁹⁾. Letter collections in the Middle Ages are never a neutral gathering of letters, but were often the product of careful selection and extensive revision⁽²⁰⁾. No doubt this also holds true in Guibert's case, something we have to bear in mind while assessing the language of friendship in his letters. In this essay, only those letters included in Derolez's edition will be considered – in total, 59 letters⁽²¹⁾ constituting the majority of his surviving correspondence⁽²²⁾. Of these 59 letters, 42 were written by Guibert⁽²³⁾; 12 were addressed to him and the remaining 5 come from letter exchanges between other individuals that are indirectly related to Guibert of Gembloux.

Letter collections have proven to be a very rich source for the study of friendships and their expression. As several medieval authors, and letter writers in particular, seem to have developed a very specific terminology for elaborating theories about friendship, modern scholars tend to focus on this literary vocabulary while studying friendship in the twelfth century. In this way they attempt to demonstrate the existence of a friendship cult or close ties of friendship between individuals. This linguistic approach will also serve as the initial point of departure for the present study.

By analyzing Guibert's vocabulary in his letters I will determine which group of people he addressed most frequently with the language of friendship. To this end I will adopt the method developed by John McLoughlin in his study of John of Salisbury⁽²⁴⁾. This will enable us to compare the results obtained for Guibert of Gembloux with the numerical data that have already been gathered for other twelfth-century authors. A first step consists of a prosopographic classification of Guibert's correspondents.

(19) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae quae in codice B. R. Brux. 5527-5534 inveniuntur*, ed. Albert DEROLEZ, Turnhout, Brepols, 1988-1989 (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 66-66A).

(20) See GILES CONSTABLE, *Letter and Letter Collections*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1976, p. 56-62. See also JULIAN HASELDINE, "The Creation of a Literary Memorial: The Letter Collection of Peter of Celle", in *Sacris Erudiri*, t. 37, 1997, p. 333-379; WALTER YSEBAERT, "Literaire collecties, registers of *dictamina*? Middeleeuwse brievencollecties als organische en meervoudig gelaagde constructies", in *Millennium*, t. 21, 2007, p. 3-17.

(21) In effect this edition only includes 56 of the letters since three letters had already been included in the earlier edition of Hildegard of Bingen's *epistolarium*. See HILDEGARDIS BINGENSIS, *Epistolarium*, eds. Lieven VAN ACKER & Monika KLAES-HACHMOLLER, Turnhout, Brepols, 1991-2001 (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 91, 91A, 91B) (namely letters CIIIR, CVIR and CIXR). These letters are included in this study and are referred to in the tables as resp. HoB1, HoB2 and HoB3.

(22) A collection of fourteen letters by Guibert of Gembloux remain unedited. They can be found in ms. 5535-37 of the Royal Library of Belgium. Furthermore, three single letters, and one fragment of a letter, have been edited elsewhere, see André SALMON, *Recueil de chroniques de Touraine*, Tours, Ladevèze, 1845, p. 343-373; *Gallia Christiana*, t. III, *Instrumenta* 129-130, Paris, 1725; Hippolyte DELEHAYE, "Guiberti Gemblacensis epistula de Sancto Martino et alterius Guiberti item Gemblacensis carmina de eodem", in *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. 7, 1888, p. 68-70; Jean MABILLON, *Vetera Analecta*, 1675, p. 482.

(23) In line with Derolez's recommendations the three anonymous letters (namely Ep. 53, 55 and 56) are attributed to Guibert himself. There could be some discussion about letter 53, expressed by Delehay, but Derolez's argumentation seems persuasive. See GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, p. 532.

(24) MCLOUGHLIN, "Amicitia in Practice", *op. cit.*, p. 170-174.

1.1. A Prosopographic Analysis of Guibert's Correspondents

The 42 letters written by Guibert can be divided among 22 addressees. McLoughlin proposes two different types of classification, which have been adopted by most authors. The first is a division according to "social order", which focuses on the nature of the religious life led by the recipient (regular clergy, secular clergy, layperson, etc.). The second type of classification, according to "special status", classifies recipients according to function (popes, kings, cardinals, archbishops, abbots, etc.)⁽²⁵⁾. In order to keep the tables concise, only the male terms have been used, though in fact sometimes both sexes are implied (thus, for example, 'abbots and priors' stands for abbots, abbesses, priors and prioresses). At the end of my first analysis, I will devote more attention to these questions of gender. The results of these divisions are presented in Appendix 1. Since similar investigations have already been conducted for John of Salisbury, Arnulf of Lisieux, Gilbert Foliot⁽²⁶⁾, Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable, Peter of Celle⁽²⁷⁾ and Stephen of Tournai⁽²⁸⁾, the data for Guibert of Gembloux are presented alongside the results of these studies.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that Guibert left the smallest number of letters behind when compared to his illustrious contemporaries. Even if we leave stellar correspondent Bernard of Clairvaux out of the picture, the average number of letters hovers around 87 per collection. With only 42 letters, Guibert is far below average. This low number results in a single letter from his correspondence carrying more weight than it would with other authors. Consequently, the numerical results in terms of percentage for Guibert's correspondence are less nuanced.

The data in the table representing social order (Appendix 1, Table 1) show a fair amount of internal variation. For Guibert, two groups immediately stand out: "monks" and "very high ecclesiastical rank". The percentage of the first group (55 percent) in particular is high when compared to the other authors. Only Peter of Celle can boast of a higher figure (60 percent). For the category "very high ecclesiastical rank", the monk of Gembloux is closer to average. Rather striking is the fact that the prosopography of Guibert's correspondents shows remarkable parallels with that of three other abbots, namely Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable and Peter of Celle (the latter also served as bishop, but only for a very short period at the end of his life). Among the remaining four figures, only one has a monastic background – Gilbert Foliot – but he was nevertheless appointed bishop of Hereford and London for the better part of his life. John of Salisbury, Arnulf of Lisieux and Stephen of Tournai were all educated at cathedral schools. This may indicate a notable difference between writing partners with a monastic and those with a secular religious background.

(25) Addressees whose status changed over the course of the correspondence are counted under the status-group in which they received most of their letters.

(26) McLoughlin, "Amicitia in Practice", *op. cit.*, p. 165-181.

(27) HASELDINE, "Understanding the Language", *op. cit.*, p. 237-260.

(28) YSEBAERT, "Ami, client et intermédiaire", *op. cit.*, p. 415-46.

As for the figures classified under special status (Appendix 1, Table 2), we need to conclude that they yield few concrete observations. Guibert's correspondents only comprise three of the nine categories, which makes him difficult to compare to the other authors. Nevertheless, his total percentage of "special status" correspondents is approximately the same as for nearly all authors, with an average of 74 percent. As a general trend, it can be observed that the higher percentages usually occur with categories like "archbishops", "bishops" and "abbots and priors". The number of archbishops in Guibert's correspondence is fairly high in comparison with the other collections of letters examined, but in fact comprises only four individuals.

What most studies of this kind fail to take into account is the classification of correspondents as male or female, for the most part because the letter collections studied so far contain few or no letters to women. Guibert of Gembloux, by contrast, wrote frequently to nuns: approximately one third of his letters are addressed to female correspondents. The female addressees are all members of the religious community of Rupertsberg⁽²⁹⁾.

1.2. Guibert's Use of the Language of Friendship

Are there differences in the way Guibert interacts with these different groups? Which group is addressed with the most indicators of friendship, and which with the least? In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to establish a number of criteria for which the letter collection can be screened. The secondary literature provides several possible "*amicitia* indicators"⁽³⁰⁾. Haseldine, for example, examines his material for the occurrence of the following aspects: (1) long descriptions or definitions of friendship; (2) appeals for help made in the name of friendship; (3) requests for, or responses to requests for, friendship; (4) so-called "letters of friendship" in which friendship is the main theme; (5) the use of the vocative *amice* as a form of address, either in the *salutatio* or in the body of the letter; and finally, (6) the use of either term in passing, in any other context⁽³¹⁾. Ysebaert bases his analysis on the following characteristics: (1) references to the existence of personal ties; (2) the use of *tu*; (3) the use of *amicus* in the *salutations*; (4) reflections on *amicitia*; and (5) references to mutual

(29) Namely, the abbesses of Rupertsberg Hildegard of Bingen and Ida, the nun Gertrude of Rupertsberg, the community of Rupertsberg, and a female community that Derolez has also identified as Rupertsberg.

(30) It must be noted that these *amicitia* indicators are not confined to expressions of friendship alone, but often comprise terminology that refers to love (like *dilectio*, *amor* or *caritas*). This entwining of love and friendship dates back to classical times. For example, Cicero already pointed out that *amor* and *amicitia* both stem from the verb *amare*. During the middle ages, writers appear to have sometimes preferred the vocabulary of love to that of *amicitia*, perhaps because of *amicitia*'s worldly connotations, as Hyatte suggests. See HYATTE, *The Arts of Friendship*, *op. cit.*, p. 48. The relation between terminology of love and that of friendship has been studied for the classical and late antiquity. See for example Hélène PÉTRÉ, *Caritas. Étude sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne*, Louvain, University of Louvain Press, 1948, p. 30-42; KNIGHT, *The Correspondence*, *op. cit.*, p. 13-14; MCEVOY, "The Theory of Friendship", *op. cit.*, p. 32-34.

(31) HASELDINE, "Understanding the Language", *op. cit.*, p. 255.

assistance⁽³²⁾. As this selection shows, there are a great many aspects that can be used as parameters. Every collection of letters being different, it is advisable to choose criteria that are best suited to the source. For example, there is no single instance in Guibert's correspondence at which he refers to mutual assistance or seeks out friendship. Hence, I have opted for the following criteria : (1) friendship as the principal theme of the letter; (2) the use of *amicus/amice* as a form of address, either in the *salutatio* or in the body of the letter; (3) the use of superlatives that refer to ties of friendship to address the correspondent (*amantissimus*, etc.)⁽³³⁾; (4) extensive reflections on friendship (of an abstract, theoretical nature); (5) concrete references to friendship or affection (from *ex affectu suus* in the *salutatio* to mentioning *dilectio* for the recipient); (6) requesting help in the name of friendship; and (7) the mention of mutual friends (literally as *amici communes* or *amici nostri*). The use of *tu/vos* is also analyzed. In order to avoid distorting our image of Guibert's correspondence as a whole, I took into account that some of the letters were addressed to more than one person, and thus necessarily written using the *vos* form. The results are presented in Appendix 2.

The most frequently occurring criteria are the use of superlatives and concrete references to affection. The latter is primarily due to the frequent use of the phrase *ex affectu suus* in the *salutatio*, by which Guibert refers to himself. As such it is more a standard form of expression than an effective reference to friendship. Nine of the 42 letters score positively on three or more criteria (21 percent). The recipients of these letters are Hildegard of Bingen, a priest named Jonas, novice G., Abbess Ida of Rupertsberg, the nun Gertrude of Rupertsberg, Abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius (twice), Joseph of Exeter and Archbishop Conrad of Mainz. Guibert addresses three correspondents as friends: the priest named Jonas, the monks of Marmoutier, and Abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius (twice). The mention of mutual friends occurs primarily in the exchange of letters with Rupertsberg, in which case it usually concerns mutual acquaintances within the cloister community of Rupertsberg itself, and quite frequently monks from Villers or Guibert's own fellow monks from Gembloux. Reflections on friendship are the most personal. Generally Guibert states that he considers himself fortunate to enjoy the friendship of the person in question⁽³⁴⁾. The classical tradition is never referred to explicitly.

Through his contacts with Rupertsberg, Guibert of Gembloux succeeded in working himself into favour with Philippe of Heinsberg, the archbishop of Cologne. This figure regularly acted as the monk's protector in the years that followed. After Philippe of Heinsberg's death, Guibert sought the patronage

(32) Walter YSEBAERT, *De Parijse brievencollecties van Stefaan van Doornik (1167-1192). Vergelijkende studie van de manuscripten en netwerkanalyse op basis van de brieven* (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, unpublished dissertation, 1999), p. 106-119.

(33) Nevertheless we have to keep in mind that Elaine Dickey's observation about the weakening of the superlatives of affectionate adjectives from classical times onwards might also apply to medieval usage in general, as was suggested by Haseldine. See HASELDINE, "Friends, Friendship", *op. cit.*, p. 251-252.

(34) The following passage is exemplary: GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 32, p. 334, l. 4-17.

of the archbishop of Mainz, Siegfried of Eppstein⁽³⁵⁾. In spite of his many efforts, this last alliance never really seems to have gotten off the ground. Striking in this respect is that the correspondence with both prelates contains surprisingly few references to friendship (on average, less than 1 *amicitia* criterion per letter). Evidently, Guibert found the use of explicit terms of friendship inappropriate for these secular clerics. Rather, he chose to address his high-ranking correspondents in terms of deference and modesty. The same can also be observed in his letters to Hildegard of Bingen written before his stay at Rupertsberg in the years 1177-1180 (an average of slightly less than 1 criterion per letter). Since all of these recipients rank clearly above Guibert in terms of status and reputation, it seems that the language of friendship was less frequently used within a vertical network. The remaining letters in Guibert's *epistolarium*, largely written to people from his horizontal network, employ friendship terminology far more frequently. This is remarkable because the language of friendship was often employed to obtain favours from high-ranking persons⁽³⁶⁾ or, as in the case of Byzantine friendship networks, to express a patron-client relationship⁽³⁷⁾.

Finally, a few observations on the use of personal pronouns are in order. The use of the *tu* form is often seen as an indication of an informal relationship between sender and recipient. Guibert uses this form in 38 percent of his letters. However, it appears that the *tu* form is not a good indicator of friendship⁽³⁸⁾. Only four of the nine letters that score positively on three or more criteria are written in the *tu* form. The *tu* form seems rather to indicate a form of subordination or inferiority, or a manner of correcting someone. For example, all of the archbishops are addressed with *vos*, except for Christian of Buch. Christian was able to take over the chair of the archbishop of Mainz in 1160, but was dismissed a year later in favor of Conrad of Wittelsbach. In 1165, however, Conrad was removed from office as well and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa reinstated Christian, who served as archbishop of Mainz until his death in 1183⁽³⁹⁾. Due to this highly debated succession,

(35) More information about these individuals can be found in Stefan BURKHARDT, *Mit Stab und Schwert. Bilder, Träger und Funktionen erzbischöflicher Herrschaft zur Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas. Die Erzbistümer Köln und Mainz im Vergleich*, Ostfildern, Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2008, *passim*. See also Severin CORSTEN & Leo GILLESSEN, eds., *Philipp von Heinsberg: Erzbischof und Reichskanzler (1167-1191). Studien und Quellen*, Heinsberg, Selbstverlag des Kreises Heinsberg, 1991 (Museumsschriften des Kreises Heinsberg, 12) and Paul PIXTON, *The German Episcopacy and the Implementation of the Decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1216-1245. Watchmen on the Tower*, Leiden, Brill, 1995.

(36) ROBINSON, "The Friendship Network", *op. cit.*, p. 7-10; MCLOUGHLIN, "Amicitia in Practice", *op. cit.*, p. 173-174; HASELDINE, "Understanding the Language", *op. cit.*, p. 254-260.

(37) Margaret MULLETT, "Byzantium: A Friendly Society ?", in *Past and Present*, t. 118, 1988, p. 3-24.

(38) In the case of Stephen of Tournai Ysebaert also had to conclude that the author did not use the informal form *tu* consistently. See YSEBAERT, "Medieval Letter-Collections", *op. cit.*, p. 294-295.

(39) BURKHARDT, *Mit Stab und Schwert*, *op. cit.*, p. 73-79 ff. See also Friedhelm JÜRGENSMEIER, *Das Bistum Mainz. Von der Römerzeit bis zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Frankfurt, Knecht Verlag, 1988.

Christian's tenure as archbishop was by no means without opposition⁽⁴⁰⁾. The letter in question is therefore something of an exception: it concerns a complaint against Christian's many misdemeanours and the *tu* form seems to be a means of putting the archbishop in his proper place. Moreover, this is one of the few letters in which the normal order of the *salutatio* is not respected: Guibert emphatically puts himself first⁽⁴¹⁾. In the letter to the poet and academic Joseph of Exeter, whom Guibert considers as his son, he also opts for the *tu* form. Finally, women are always addressed using the *tu* form, even when they are clearly higher up on the hierarchical ladder in terms of function. There is only one exception to this rule: the nun Gertrude from the cloister community at Rupertsberg, and this is quite an unusual occurrence for which there is no immediate explanation.

Examined from the point of view of gender, the letters addressed to women do not seem to differ significantly from those written to men in terms of their vocabulary, with the exception of the habit outlined above in which women are consistently addressed with *tu*.

1.3. Different Language for Different Correspondents ?

The next important question is whether Guibert adjusts his vocabulary to suit his correspondents. Appendix 3 presents the results of comparing the linguistic indicators with the prosopographic classifications. Given the limited extent of Guibert of Gembloux's letter collection, not all prosopographic categories are relevant to the present analysis; therefore, only those categories that generated results are included in the table.

For the category covering "social order", we have results for five groups. For the group "monks", no clear trend can be discerned: sometimes Guibert uses a great deal of *amicitia* terminology, whereas in other letters he hardly employs any friendship language at all. Sixty percent of the letters contain one or two indicators. Notably, these letters also show the highest score of four *amicitia* criteria the most frequent. The results for the group "very high ecclesiastical rank" are more straightforward. Most letters contain very few *amicitia* criteria. 50 percent of these letters do not even contain a single criterion. For the category "schoolmen", there is only one letter, but it scores positively on no less than four counts. One letter belongs to the group

(40) Guibert clearly sides with Conrad in this matter. See GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, op. cit., Ep. 52, p. 519-531. After the death of Christian of Buch in 1183, Conrad was reinstated as archbishop of Mainz until his own death in 1200.

(41) According to the theory expounded by the handbooks of the *ars dictaminis*, the order in which sender and addressee had to be named in the *salutatio* was determined by the nature of their interrelation. This system gave rise to a very sophisticated social stratification in which public merit played a pivotal role. We would expect Guibert to name himself after the archbishop. In spite of the theoretics this is not the case. However, Giles Constable pointed out that the normal rules of the *ars dictaminis* do not seem to apply in the case of enemies and excommunicated persons. See GILES CONSTABLE, "The Structure of Medieval Society According to the Dictators of the 12th Century", in Kenneth PENNINGTON & Robert SOMERVILLE, eds., *Law, Church and Society. Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977, p. 260-261.

“secular clergy”. Here too we observe four indicators as well. Of course, these last two examples are too isolated to draw far-reaching conclusions.

As noted above, the category “special status” yields far more limited results. Only three groups turn out to be relevant. Among the letters written to archbishops (which actually overlap with the letters of “very high ecclesiastical rank”) we find many letters with a low score versus a small number of letters with a slightly higher score. Under the category “bishops” there is only one letter, which scores positively for three criteria. The results for the category “abbots and priors” are less pronounced, paralleling the findings for the group “monks”. On balance, the results reinforce the impression that the language of friendship is more a monastic phenomenon than a widespread habit.

I.4. Guibert through the Eyes of His Correspondents

Guibert of Gembloux’s letter collection also provides us with an excellent opportunity to observe the manner in which his correspondents addressed him. His *epistolarium* is one of the few that contains the letters addressed to the author himself by others. Including these letters in our analysis as well helps reveal whether Guibert was also a “good friend” to his correspondents. Nevertheless, a word of caution is in order: in the Middle Ages, letters were kept for the express intent of publishing them in a collection for posterity. Not surprisingly, this type of source was often revised for the sake of style – and this sometimes entailed changes to content as well⁽⁴²⁾. We must therefore keep in mind that Guibert may have attempted to show himself in a more positive light, and changed the wording of these letters accordingly. Nevertheless, including letters addressed to the central figure under investigation proves to be an interesting exercise.

No less than five of the twelve letters score positively for three or more criteria. The authors of these letters are the nun Gertrude, the abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius, and Joseph of Exeter – the same names we encountered above. Once again, the categories “superlatives” and “concrete references to friendship” score highest, as does the use of *amicus* as a form of address. Guibert is addressed as a friend five times, namely by Gertrude, Joseph of Exeter, Godfrey of St. Eucharius, the monk Radulfus of Villers, and the monks of Gembloux. The first and last categories also score higher than in the letters written by Guibert himself. We get an image of Guibert as a beloved and sought-after friend (something for which the monk may have been at least partly responsible in the process of collecting his *epistolarium*). Of all his correspondents, only Hildegard of Bingen uses the familiar form *tu* in addressing him – as a prophetess and mouthpiece of God, perhaps she found it permissible to do so.

Do these indicators really point to personal ties, or should we consider them from a pragmatic point of view, as McLoughlin does in his study of John of Salisbury⁽⁴³⁾? Is Guibert’s specific vocabulary more than rhetoric and imitation of the *artes dictandi*? Unfortunately, the quantitative approach can

(42) See *supra*, n. 20.

(43) McLoughlin, “*Amicitia* in Practice”, *op. cit.*, p. 165-179.

offer us little in the way of answers to these questions. In what follows, I will explore at close range several of the figures who appeared regularly in the quantitative study. A close reading of several particular cases can help clarify the actual nature of the relationship between Guibert and his correspondents apart from the vocabulary in their exchange of letters.

II. True Friends or Literary Constructions? A Few Cases at Close Range

All four sets of correspondence that I will examine here can be considered unusual in several respects. The first is that between Guibert and Gertrude, a Benedictine nun under the care of Hildegard of Bingen. Presumably their friendship dated from Guibert's stay in Rupertsberg as secretary of Hildegard of Bingen (1177-1180). When Guibert was obliged by his abbot to return to his mother abbey in 1180 after the death of Hildegard, the two remained in contact by exchanging letters and gifts. Their surviving correspondence consists of two letters addressed to Gertrude and one to Guibert⁽⁴⁴⁾, but these probably represent a selection from a more extensive exchange: other letters are referred to with regularity. The letters probably date from the middle of the 1180s, after Guibert had returned to the abbey at Gembloux and when the tense political situation generated a great deal of instability in the region. The succession to the county of Namur was disputed by the duke of Brabant, and this conflict expressed itself in a number of destructive sieges that also affected the abbey of Gembloux⁽⁴⁵⁾.

The second case study deals with the letters exchanged with Joseph of Exeter (born sometime around the middle of the twelfth century). This poet and academic probably met Guibert in Jodoigne, Brabant. As *magister* he taught for several years in Reims and he wrote his most significant literary work on the Trojan War. He is said to have followed his friend and cousin Baldwin, the archbishop of Canterbury, on the Third Crusade to Jerusalem. He later incorporated his experiences into a poem entitled *Antiocheis*, of

(44) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 34, 35 and 37, respectively p. 346-348, 349-351 and 357-365.

(45) The count of Namur, Henry the Blind, had, for lack of heirs, entrusted the succession in his county to his nephew, Baldwin, at the time count of Hainault. The then duke of Brabant, Godfrey III, was not pleased at all with the prospect of this new personal union. Furthermore, he had hoped to lay his hands on the county himself. As a result he found himself involved in a battle with both the count of Namur and the count of Hainault. Gembloux probably got mixed up in their conflict in 1185, when the city, that served as the operating base for the dukes of Brabant, was besieged and destroyed in a punitive expedition by the counts of Namur and Hainault. For that matter, the coalition formed by the dukes collapsed when, against all expectations, Henry the Blind produced an heir (a daughter) and tried to break his commitment to Baldwin. Nevertheless, Baldwin proved to be too strong an opponent for Henry and so in 1190 the count of Hainault was made count of Namur as well. See G. HUYDENS, *Histoire du marquisat d'Anvers et du Saint-Empire*, Brussels, Wahlen & co., 1848, p. 50-66. There is a contemporary source that recounts the destruction of Gembloux. In his *Chronicon Hanoniense* Gilbert of Mons, a contemporary of Guibert, describes how Gembloux and the cloister fell victim to this strife for the succession in Namur. See GISLEBERTUS MONTENSIS, *Chronicle of Hainault*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2005, p. 102 (translated into English by Laura NAPRAN).

which only fragments survive⁽⁴⁶⁾. Guibert's correspondence contains three letters from Joseph of Exeter and one addressed to the *magister*⁽⁴⁷⁾. It is quite possible, however, that the two exchanged other letters. The surviving correspondence of Joseph of Exeter dates to around 1188-1190, when Guibert had just been appointed abbot in Florennes. The one letter Guibert sent to Joseph dates from slightly later – at any rate, from after Guibert's appointment as abbot of Gembloux in 1194. This letter exchange has already attracted the attention of Brian Patrick McGuire due to Guibert's unconventional treatment of friendship⁽⁴⁸⁾.

The exchange of letters between Guibert and Godfrey, abbot of St. Eucharius in Trier, serves as a third illustration. The reason for their correspondence was the *Vita* that Guibert was preparing on Hildegard of Bingen. At the end of his life, Guibert withdrew to the abbey of Florennes, where he dedicated himself to completing his literary oeuvre. One of the projects he returned to was the *Vita* of Hildegard of Bingen, which he had begun around 1177-1180. He hoped to obtain additional information from the abbot in order to fill in the lacunae in his hagiographic account. The correspondence comprises three letters that probably date to the beginning of the thirteenth century (between 1204 and 1209): two addressed to Godfrey and one from Godfrey to Guibert⁽⁴⁹⁾.

The correspondence between Guibert and his fellow monks from Gembloux is also highly interesting. In 1177, Hildegard of Bingen personally asked Guibert to become her secretary. His abbot was not initially in favour of the enterprise, but thanks to the mediation of Philippe of Park, a Norbertine abbot and long-time admirer of the visionary abbess, Guibert was nevertheless granted permission. However, the abbot of Gembloux had not counted on such a long absence: Guibert only returned in 1180, one year after Hildegard's death. The abbot had written him several times, urging him to return to Gembloux. On several occasions, he sought out Guibert in person in order to escort him back to the abbey, but in vain. After Hildegard's death, opposition from Gembloux only increased, and Guibert's fellow monks began to question his intentions. Two letters are directly related to the conflict of interests between Guibert and the community at Gembloux⁽⁵⁰⁾. But many other letters contain references to Guibert's difficult relation with his abbey, all of which can be dated to the time of his stay in Rupertsberg – in other words, between 1177 and 1180.

(46) More information concerning Joseph of Exeter and editions/translations of his work can be found in Ludwig GOMPF, *Joseph Iscanus. Werke und Briefe*, Leiden & Cologne, Brill, 1970 (edition of his works); Alan Keith BATE, *Joseph of Exeter. Trojan War I-III*, Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1986 (English translation) or Jean-Yves TILLIETTE & Francine MORA, *L'Iliade. Épopée du XI^e siècle sur la guerre de Troie*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2003 (French translation).

(47) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 43, 44, 45 and 46, respectively p. 421-423, 424-426, 427-430 and 431-435.

(48) MCGUIRE, *Friendship and Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 374-379.

(49) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 40, 41 and 42, respectively p. 384-386, 387-389 and 390-420.

(50) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 29 and 30, respectively p. 321-325 and 326-328.

II.1. Gertrude

Our first case study concerns the correspondence between Guibert and Gertrude, a nun from Rupertsberg. The earliest surviving letter was written in 1185, but it was certainly not the first of their correspondence. There are references to the many *munuscula*⁽⁵¹⁾ that Gertrude sent Guibert after his departure, and one would expect these little gifts to be accompanied by a letter. Guibert begins the letter in question by dwelling eloquently on his friendship with Gertrude, and lamenting the fact that he cannot come to visit her: “I suffer because I cannot be with you, cannot see you and cannot enjoy your good will and pious solicitude, such pain that if the opportunity were to present itself and the duties of my vows permitted, I would visit Bingen frequently for the sake of your grace and that of your fellow sisters, who, during my stay, would refine me by their great devotion. But seeing as how it is neither permitted nor appropriate or beneficial, I do what is permitted and appropriate and beneficial, and cherish you with pious inclination whenever I can and entrust you to God in my prayers”⁽⁵²⁾. As a monk, Guibert did not have the freedom to simply travel to Rupertsberg to visit Gertrude. His wishes were probably never fulfilled because as far as we know, he never visited the community at Rupertsberg again after his stay in 1177-1180. Guibert subsequently writes that a report had reached his ears of Gertrude’s death. But as the messenger was not entirely certain of the news, Guibert postponed his grief and his prayers until he could be sure⁽⁵³⁾. Within the year he received Gertrude’s reply: it was not she, but another nun, Gertrude of Mainz, who had long been gravely ill and had not long to live. She then describes her friendship for him: “I have so much admiration for you, and on account of such desire my spirit never leaves your side”⁽⁵⁴⁾. However, she is saddened by the fact that she cannot enjoy his “desirable presence and conversation”⁽⁵⁵⁾. Nevertheless, she rejoices to be remembered in his prayers and feels that they often help her. The most sorrowful day in her life was “that day, on which with much weeping we were physically separated from one another”⁽⁵⁶⁾, but she is convinced that they will see one another

(51) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 34, p. 347-348, lines 32-34.

(52) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 34, p. 347, l. 5-13 : *doleo quod uobis caream, uos non uideam uestraque beniuolentia et religiosi non fruar officiis, adeo ut, si facultas daretur et obligatio professionis permetteret, ob gratiam uestri et aliarum sodalium uestrarum, que me cum presens essem tanta deuotione excoluerunt, Binguam sepius inuiserem. Sed quoniam id nec licet nec decet et forte non expedit, id quod licet, decet et expedit factito, quando possum pietatis affectu uos complector Deoque in orationibus commendo.*

(53) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 34, p. 347, l. 16-17 : *Sed interim dolor mediocris erat et oratio suspensa, pro eo quod incertus esset nuntius.* Hence the fact that the letter is directed to Gertrude herself: Guibert refuses to just simply accept the news until it is irrefutably confirmed.

(54) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 35, p. 350, l. 3-4 : *Quantum dilectionis erga uos habeam, quanto desiderio anima mea uobis adhereat.*

(55) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 35, p. 350, l. 5-6 : *desiderata... presentia uel colloquio.*

(56) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 35, p. 350, l. 12-13 : *ea die, qua cum multis lacrimis ab inuicem corporaliter disiuncti sumus.*

again, “if not in this world, in the hereafter”⁽⁵⁷⁾. She then commends several people to his prayers, including her only sister and her aunt. She closes by promising to send Guibert a small reliquary that he had asked for in an earlier letter (which has not survived). She is moreover immensely glad that he so cherishes her gifts. We recover the thread of their relationship in another letter dating from 1185. If we return to the table in Appendix 2, we see that this letter does not score high in terms of *amicitia* indicators. Guibert is writing to tell her of a fire that burned his abbey to the ground⁽⁵⁸⁾. Actually, this letter to Gertrude (Ep. 37) is an expanded version of another letter describing the destruction of the abbey (Ep. 36), addressed to the abbess of Rupertsberg, Ida. The latter letter is filled with pathos but offers few personal details. The letter to Gertrude, by contrast, is far more personal and tells of Guibert’s own experiences. We learn among other things that he and four others took refuge in the church, where they almost suffocated from the smoke. Guibert survived, but two other members of his *socii martyrii* did not⁽⁵⁹⁾. We also learn more about the cause of the fire. The count of Namur had laid siege to Gembloux, and heavy winds caused the resulting fire to engulf the entire city⁽⁶⁰⁾. But this was not to be the last of their trials – nine days later, the count of Hainault plundered the city, sparing no one and nothing. Animals were stolen, altars desecrated and women raped⁽⁶¹⁾. Guibert too suffered personal losses: he lost not only Gertrude’s gifts, of which he was so proud, but also several relics and a manuscript that he himself had written about St. Martin⁽⁶²⁾. From a very young age, Guibert had cherished great admiration for the saint, whom he looked to as a model throughout his life⁽⁶³⁾. The loss of the manuscript was therefore a considerable blow⁽⁶⁴⁾. The letter is primarily focused on

(57) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 35, p. 350, l. 19-20 : *si non in presenti, tamen in futuro seculo*.

(58) See *supra*, n. 45 for the context of this incident. The *Gallia Christiana* contains a (fragmentary) open letter written by John, the abbot of Gembloux at the time of the destruction of the abbey, in an effort to raise sufficient means to rebuild the monastery. His account of the event is in keeping with the portrayal in the letter of Guibert. See *Gallia Christiana*, III, *Instrumenta* 127-128, Parijs, 1725.

(59) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 37, p. 362, l. 33-45.

(60) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 37, p. 361, l. 20-32.

(61) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 37, p. 362-363, l. 45-87.

(62) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 37, p. 363-364, l. 92-102.

(63) More than one letter in the letter collection attests Guibert’s fascination for St. Martin of Tours. Some of the letters bear witness to Guibert’s pilgrimage to Tours, where he briefly considered entering the monastery of Marmoutier, leaving behind Gembloux for good. From other letters we can infer how Guibert tried to gather like-minded figures, among them bishops and archbishops, around him to promote and disperse the cult and fame of St. Martin through this network of high-ranking officials. See for example Guibert’s letters to Philippe of Heinsberg, Siegfried of Eppstein or Philippe of Ratzburg.

(64) The chances are that the manuscript did survive the fire after all seeing that two *Vitae* of St. Martin written by Guibert of Gembloux have been handed down to us. Both can be found in the Royal Library of Belgium: the *Vita* in verse in ms. 1510-1519 and ms. 5527-5534, the *Vita* in prose in ms. 5387-5396, ms. 1510-1519 and ms. 1382-1391. The *Vita* Guibert is referring to in this particular instance is in all probability the one in verse. Other letters contain references to Guibert’s hagiographical work as well: see for example GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 3, Ep. 47 and Ep. 54, respectively p. 59-63, p. 436-461 and p. 540-556.

the destruction of the abbey and the circumstances under which it took place, so it is hardly surprising that it contains little in the way of *amicitia* indicators. We encounter Gertrude once more in Guibert's correspondence in a letter addressed to Godfrey, the abbot of St. Eucharius. Guibert writes to Godfrey concerning Hildegard of Bingen, but seizes the opportunity to inquire about the current wellbeing of the community at Rupertsberg. He adds, "moreover, I would like to ask in particular and in all diligence ... whether lady Gertrude, who is particularly dear to me in Christ, is still alive, and how she fares"⁽⁶⁵⁾. The letter was written after 1204, probably sometime around 1208/09. Apparently, the contact between Guibert and Gertrude had slackened in the meantime. This can be attributed in part to Guibert's own hectic life: after the fire at Gembloux, he left to spend a year at Tours and not long after his return he was elected abbot. Godfrey answers him as follows: "Through living righteously and piously, lady Gertrude of Ockenheim awaits the blessing of hope and the arrival of the Lord"⁽⁶⁶⁾. Evidently she too had reached an advanced age.

The relationship between Gertrude and Guibert comes across as an extremely close, personal bond. Guibert shows a great deal of interest in the course of Gertrude's life. Even when they cannot be together, they remain involved with each other's life by remembering one another in their prayers. Both use the language of *amicitia* in their letters, but it is above all the other remarks made in passing that reinforce our image of the two as friends: exchanging gifts, sharing personal experiences, caring about the state of the other's soul, praying for each other, and experiencing unrest concerning the other's fate. The fact that Guibert still thinks of her and is concerned about her wellbeing years after their last encounter in person is significant in this respect. The letter relating the destruction of the abbey appears to be one of the most important qualitative indications of friendship. It forms an exception among the collected correspondence because it recounts the events at hand without apologetic motives in the background. As Delehayé has already remarked, the letter seems to have been written immediately after the fire, when Guibert was still deeply shaken by the destructive power of the storm that had passed over the abbey⁽⁶⁷⁾. It is a highly personal account that seems to bear witness to a real degree of intimacy between Gertrude and Guibert. Guibert seems to have considered Gertrude as a companion in religious life: they shared a common purpose in life and tried to support each other in achieving this goal, as we can see in their frequent requests for prayers. This brings to mind the idea of Gregory the Great – that friends are each other's *custos animi* – and points to the importance of prayers in

(65) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 40, p. 385-386, l. 31-37 : *Enixius autem et specialis id quoque deprecor; ..., si adhuc uiuat et quomodo se gerat domna Gertrudis, illa specialis in Christo michi dilecta.*

(66) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 41, p. 388, l. 29-30 : *Domna enim Gertrudis de Ocenehem iuste et pie uiuendo expectat beatam spem et aduentum Domini.*

(67) DELEHAYE, *Mélanges*, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

close relationships⁽⁶⁸⁾. According to Rosemary Rader, one of the greatest contributions of early medieval writers to the concept of friendship is their openness towards heterosexual friendships. Aspiring to a shared goal⁽⁶⁹⁾ and competing for perfection in asceticism bound men and women together in friendship in these early Christian communities and helped to eliminate gender differences⁽⁷⁰⁾. Despite Rader's positive view of cross-gender relations, women were generally excluded from (accounts of) friendships in the twelfth century. In his openness towards women, Guibert can be seen as a herald of the new mentality originating around the beginning of the thirteenth century in which women were "accepted as necessary companions on the journey to God"⁽⁷¹⁾.

II.2. *Joseph of Exeter*

The surviving correspondence between Guibert of Gembloux and Joseph of Exeter falls in two chronological clusters: the three letters from Joseph to Guibert, sent during the latter's tenure as abbot of Florennes, and Guibert's letter to Joseph, written when he was abbot of Gembloux. Joseph's first letter is the most moderate in tone. It opens by praising the art of letter-writing: Joseph would like to come and visit Guibert but is prevented by his affairs. Fortunately, there are letters, so that "although [friends] cannot be together in body, they can nevertheless be present in each other's heart"⁽⁷²⁾. He then thanks Guibert for his last letter but immediately expresses embarrassment concerning some of Guibert's expressions: "In this [letter], which quite affected me, you call me 'teacher' and 'lord' and scandalously claim that I do not deserve to be called the slave of your holiness, so that I would not speak as a pupil"⁽⁷³⁾. We should probably read this as a formulaic expression of humility. He then asks to be brought up to date concerning the events that have taken place since Guibert's election as abbot of Florennes. He

(68) This of course begs the question whether historians should not focus more on words like *consors*, *compos*, etc. in their search to detect close intimate bonds instead of concentrating on friendship terminology. Haseldine already suggested as much: "If *amicitia* and *amicus* were applied to formal, cultivated or distant ties, ... different vocabulary was used for close personal ties of long-standing". See HASELDINE, "Friends, Friendship", *op. cit.*, p. 247.

(69) Friendship as a shared endeavour towards a higher goal is in fact an essential feature of most classical theories on friendship (see Aristotle in particular): friends are attracted to each other precisely because they can aid one another in the search for Truth or Wisdom. James McEvoy points to "the mental and spiritual unity which that pilgrimage [i.e. the search for truth] creates between and among friends". HYATTE, *The Arts of Friendship*, *op. cit.*, p. 8-38, especially p. 16-21; MCEVOY, "The Theory of Friendship", *op. cit.*, p. 20.

(70) Rosemary RADER, *Breaking Boundaries. Male/Female Friendship in Early Christian Communities*, New York, Paulist Press, 1983.

(71) Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, "The Cistercians and the Transformation of Monastic Friendships", in *Analecta Cisterciensia*, t. 37, 1981, p. 1-65, quotation taken from p. 65.

(72) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 43, p. 422, l. 10 : *ubi corpore absens, corde semper presens*.

(73) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 43, p. 422, l. 15-18 : *In quibus, quod molestissimum fero, uos uocatis me 'magister' et 'domine', et male dicitis, quod nec uestre sanctitatis seruius, ne dicam discipulus, merear appellari*.

concludes by relating that he has been teaching in Reims, but would rather devote himself entirely to the study of theology. Unfortunately, it is his fate to put his own desires aside – as it has been the fate of many others – and by way of illustration he cites a passage from Juvenal⁽⁷⁴⁾. He ends his letter with a rather enigmatic exhortation: “Write back to me as soon as you can, but do not forget to seal the letter so that our secrets remain secret!”⁽⁷⁵⁾. Joseph’s second letter begins with a testimony of friendship. Its tone and logic are in line with those of his previous letter: given that they cannot be physically present, he will try to pursue Guibert’s society by letter. In this way, they shall never vanish from one another’s presence⁽⁷⁶⁾. In what follows he asks Guibert for his support: he is after all a sinner who needs his prayers, and he compares Guibert to a physician charged with healing him. He closes his letter with a renewed request for news. The last letter is filled with pathos: it was written just before Joseph’s departure on the Third Crusade in the summer of 1190. The underlying theme of the letter seems to be “What shall become of our friendship now?”. Although he knows he has the benefit of Guibert’s prayers, Joseph fears that he will never see his friend again. With an implicit sigh, he writes: “I hope, my lord, my beloved lord, that I shall see you one more time before I die!”⁽⁷⁷⁾. Together with the letter, Joseph also sent two works in verse, one on St. Martin and another on the virtues of chastity. Their common interest in St. Martin is also clear in the way he addresses Guibert as “Guibertus Martinus”⁽⁷⁸⁾. These works were also meant as a keepsake, “given that I do not know whether the next time I see you will be on this side or the next”⁽⁷⁹⁾. He continually refers to himself as (*dilecti*) *Ioseph uestri* and dedicates himself to Guibert completely: *semper suus, ubique suus, totus suus*⁽⁸⁰⁾. He then offers some good Christian advice before concluding emotionally: “I beg you now to accept the last ‘farewell’ from your beloved Joseph”⁽⁸¹⁾. The entire letter is characterized by exaggeration and artificiality and even brings to mind a stylistic exercise. Brian Patrick McGuire finds that Joseph’s letters are typical for letters from a devoted pupil to his spiritual father. He sees nothing extraordinary in Joseph’s use of the

(74) From *Satyræ* III : *Haut facile emergunt, quorum uirtutibus obstat res angusta domi* (GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 43, p. 423, l. 39-40). For an edition of this work see IUVENALIS, *Satyræ III-V*, ed. René MARACHE, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.

(75) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 43, p. 423, l. 41-43 : *Rescribite quam citius poteritis, numquam tamen sine sigillo, ut secretum nostrum secretum sit !*

(76) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 44, p. 425, l. 4-12.

(77) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 428, l. 15-16 : *Utinam uos, dominum meum, dominum dilectissimum meum, semel uideam antequam moriar !*

(78) On the use of the name “Guibertus Martinus” see Jeroen DEPLOIGE, “Anonymat et paternité littéraire dans l’hagiographie des Pays-Bas méridionaux”, in Étienne RENARD et al., eds., *Scribere sanctorum gesta. Recueil d’études d’hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005, p. 91-92.

(79) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 428, l. 124 : *quoniam nescio ultrum uos ulterius in corpore uisurus sim.*

(80) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 428, l. 3.

(81) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 430, l. 87-88 : *Obsecro iam, quod sine lacrimis non profero, extremum, ut puto, dilecti uestri Ioseph ‘uale’ accipiter.*

language of friendship, and refers to the phrase *unum uelle, unum nolle*⁽⁸²⁾, which Joseph could have taken over from Seneca's definition of *amicitia* "as any schoolboy of the time could have done"⁽⁸³⁾. His phrasing is strongest when he speaks of his desire to see Guibert once more⁽⁸⁴⁾. In the published corpus of correspondence, Derolez includes a laudatory poem in honor of Guibert's election as abbot of Gembloux, which he believes may have been written by Joseph of Exeter. In terms of timing this was certainly possible, and the way Derolez describes the author of the poem certainly brings Joseph to mind⁽⁸⁵⁾.

The style of Guibert's letter to Joseph does not really follow the tone of Joseph's letters to him. The powerful, explicit phrases used give McGuire the occasion to speak of "fireworks"⁽⁸⁶⁾. The letter is not particularly structured and exhibits a great deal of "ecstatic and free-flowing expressiveness"⁽⁸⁷⁾. It is entirely devoted to the subject of their friendship, but, still according to McGuire, displays a particular interest in expressing these bonds in non-spiritual language⁽⁸⁸⁾. Guibert addresses Joseph as a son, and uses the informal form of address. He says that he has heard that Joseph would be visiting the nearby region, which gave rise to reflections on the young man's beauty and goodness⁽⁸⁹⁾. After all, who would not fall for such a beautiful, attractive youth⁽⁹⁰⁾? The more he gets to know Joseph, the more he cherishes him. Guibert refers to Gregory the Great's idea that friends are the custodians of each other's soul⁽⁹¹⁾. Beginning at line 68, however, the tone shifts significantly: McGuire speaks of the turning point of the letter. Guibert expresses his dissatisfaction with the fact that Joseph has not yet come to visit him. He longs for his company, but Joseph apparently does not grant it: "I run but do not close the distance; I follow but do not catch up; I long but do not receive; I am exhausted but not refreshed; I am devoured by fire but not cooled"⁽⁹²⁾. And so he is buffeted about by doubt, tossed between "faith and feeling, hope and fear, intellect and desire"⁽⁹³⁾. This desire, which cannot be sated soon enough, torments him⁽⁹⁴⁾. For Guibert, living together with Joseph, or at the very least seeing him in person, is an absolute prerequisite

(82) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 430, l. 75.

(83) Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, "A Letter of Passionate Friendship by Guibert of Gembloux", in *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin*, t. 53, 1986, p. 4.

(84) MCGUIRE, "A Letter", *op. cit.*, p. 4. See for example the following excerpt : *iam reuertatur oculus meus ad intuenda et participanda dulcissime cohabitationis uestre bona* (GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 45, p. 429, l. 45-46).

(85) *Elogium Guiberti abbatis*, in GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, p. 3-5.

(86) MCGUIRE, "A Letter", *op. cit.*, p. 4.

(87) MCGUIRE, "A Letter", *op. cit.*, p. 6.

(88) MCGUIRE, *Friendship and Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

(89) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 432, l. 5-21.

(90) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 432, l. 25-26 : *non totum in se raperet, non totus in eum iret ?*

(91) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 432, l. 27-29.

(92) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 433-434, l. 68-70 : *curro nec comprehendo, sequor nec assequor, desidero nec capio, afficior nec reficior, uror nec refrigeror.*

(93) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 434, l. 71-72 : *inter fidem et affectum, inter spem et metum, inter rationem et desiderium.*

(94) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 434, l. 80-83.

for their friendship⁽⁹⁵⁾. We can therefore understand why McGuire – in keeping with John Boswell's theory – frequently refers to the letter's sexual undertones. The letter ends with a question for Joseph: how does he view their friendship? It seems as if the letter lacks a conclusion and is prematurely broken off. For McGuire, this letter demonstrates how the friendship ideal of the earlier twelfth century has become both more widespread and less sophisticated. He states: "In Guibert of Gembloux spiritual friendship seems to be on the way to losing its integrity and to becoming a frustrated or even disappointed attachment"⁽⁹⁶⁾. In any case, Guibert certainly does combine a more traditional view of friendship with a highly radical interpretation of it, stretching biblical imagery to the breaking point in a manner that is seldom encountered in friendship literature⁽⁹⁷⁾. To say the least, the letter presents an exceptional, and exceptionally intense articulation of *amicitia*.

Guibert's relationship to Joseph is not so straightforward: we can interpret their ties as those of a father and son, teacher and pupil⁽⁹⁸⁾, or lovers (at least from Guibert's perspective). Joseph clearly belongs to the academic world: his language is rather pedantic, formalistic, and theatrical, and he makes use of antique concepts and citations. These letters also come to the foreground in our previous analysis: Joseph's formalistic language can be registered using quantitative methods. Guibert's use of the language of friendship, by contrast, is far more personal and original. Although he limits himself to biblical metaphors and comparisons, he combines and interprets them in a highly unusual way⁽⁹⁹⁾. His vocabulary in the letter points to a deeper relationship, though perhaps one-sided. At any rate, the words he uses are no mere formalistic or learned conventions. Guibert also lays a great deal of blame at his friend's doorstep. Did their relationship decrease in intensity after Guibert's election as abbot? It is also possible that Joseph deliberately broke ties with his former teacher and mentor. He certainly made little effort to visit his friend while he was in the region. Perhaps Guibert's feelings of friendship were too intense for him.

(95) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 46, p. 435, l. 118-125 (with reference to Ecclesiastes, 4: 9-12) : *Ingerit quoque uerba Ecclesiastes, in quibus et solitudinem omnino noxiam et cohabitationem diligentium se pernecessariam testari uidetur, ubi ait: Melius est duos esse simul quam unum. Habebunt enim emolumentum societatis suae. Si unus ceciderit, ab altero fulciatur. Ve soli, quia, cum ceciderit, non habet sublaudentem se. Et si dormierint duo, fouebuntur mutuo. Unus quomodo calefiet ? Et si quispiam preualuerit, contra unum, duo resistent ei.*

(96) MCGUIRE, *Friendship and Community, op. cit.*, p. 379.

(97) MCGUIRE, "A Letter", *op. cit.*, p. 6-7.

(98) Although the classical friendship ideal generally assigns great importance to the equality of friends, the Christianized version of friendship is more open to friendships between persons of unequal rank, especially when framed as a master-disciple friendship bond. In Hyatte's opinion, this is due to the enormous influence of Cicero's *Laelius de amicitia* – which is set in a master-disciple relationship between Laelius and his sons-in-law – on medieval thinking, for example on the writings of Aelred of Rievaulx. HYATTE, *The Arts of Friendship, op. cit.*, p. 32.

(99) These findings are in agreement with the knowledge profile Jeroen Deploige formulated for Guibert of Gembloux. Deploige classified Guibert among the "traditionalists", for whom the Old Testament is the primary source of inspiration. See Jeroen DEPLOIGE, *In nomine femineo. Kennisprofiel en ideologie van Hildegard van Bingen (1098-1179)*, Hilversum, Verloren, 1998, p. 69-71 and 75.

The letters of both Guibert and Joseph contain many *amicitia* indicators. Nevertheless, the way in which each makes use of the language of friendship is completely different. In particular, the contrast between Joseph's safe formulations drawn from the *artes dicandi* of the period, and Guibert's intense, highly original manner of expression is rather striking.

II.3. Godfrey, Abbot of St. Eucharius

The history of Hildegard of Bingen's *Vita* is rather complicated. It was originally intended that Guibert would write the prophetess's life story entirely on his own, but his obligatory return to Gembloux did not leave him sufficient time to complete his task. The nuns of Rupertsberg then appointed Theoderic of Echternach as the hagiographer of their abbess. This monk was also asked to do so by his abbot Ludwig, at that moment the abbot of St. Eucharius but formerly abbot of Echternach and a fervent admirer of the prophetess⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. At the end of his life, Guibert resumed his hagiographic work, but as far as we know he never completed it. The unfinished version of the *Vita* can be found in his correspondence as part of a letter to one of his fellow monks at Gembloux, a certain Bovo⁽¹⁰¹⁾. In all probability, however, this hagiographical part is more recent than the rest of the letter, which has led historians to assume that it was added later⁽¹⁰²⁾. Moreover, the letter itself is unfinished. The text of the hagiography contains numerous lacunae: Guibert leaves blank Hildegard's place of birth and the names of her parents. When he retired to the relative peace of Florennes after serving as abbot of Gembloux, Guibert wrote to the abbot of St. Eucharius for information so that he could fill in the blanks. He probably knew of Theoderic's *Vita* and his ties to the cloister of St. Eucharius, and for this reason may have believed that the abbot of the cloister would be able to lend a helping hand. The first preserved letter of their correspondence never alludes to an intimate bond between Guibert and Godfrey and suggests that they were not well acquainted with one another. At the beginning of his letter, Guibert asks whether Godfrey would grant him the same honour as his predecessor Ludwig had done: "And you, too, as grace befits, consider extending me the friendship that your lord and father, Abbot Ludwig, who sincerely loved you and named you his successor, showed me so generously when I once visited Trier"⁽¹⁰³⁾.

(100) A survey of the genesis of this *Vita* can be found in Monika Klaes's introduction to *Vita Sanctae Hildegardis*, ed. Monika KLAES, Turnhout, Brepols, 1993, p. 86*-145* or p. 59* (diagram) (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievals*, 126) or in NEWMAN, "Hildegard and Her Hagiographers", *op. cit.*, p. 16-34.

(101) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 38, p. 366-379. An English translation of this letter can be found in Anna SILVAS, *Jutta and Hildegard: The Biographical Sources*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1998, p. 89-117.

(102) See Derolez's comment about this in GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

(103) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 40, p. 385, l. 12-15 : *et societatem, quam michi dominus et pater uester abbas L[judouicus], qui uos uere dilexit et prouexit, olim, cum semel Treuerim uenissem, michi benigne concessit, uos quoque clementer recognoscere dignemini.*

The bearer of the letter was instructed to tell the abbot of Guibert's life since his departure from Rupertsberg. This indicates that Guibert probably visited the monastery at Trier during his stay in Rupertsberg and that he might have met Godfrey, then perhaps a monk at the abbey of Trier, but the letters bear no evidence of a close bond between them. Nevertheless, Guibert addresses Godfrey as *domino et patri dilectissimo* and ends his *salutatio* with "as sweet and salubrious as a true friend can wish to be to a friend"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. In addition to asking for more information about Hildegard of Bingen, Guibert adds another request – namely, that Godfrey use the influence he has on the archbishop of Cologne through his brother, an archdeacon, in order to help the abbot of Florennes. The abbot was evidently being blamed for something, and Guibert found this to be unjust⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Nowhere in the body of this letter is the language of friendship used. Therefore, the *salutatio* rather resembles a *captatio benevolentiae*, a friendly and hopeful request in the name of friendship. The high score received by this letter in terms of *amicitia* indicators therefore gives a distorted image of the letter's overall tone. Remarkably, this is the only letter in which Guibert explicitly asks for assistance in the name of friendship, even though this is a very common theme in other letter collections of the twelfth century⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. That same year, Godfrey complied with the requests of Guibert's letter. In his short reply, he immediately assures Guibert of his complete cooperation and explains that the community of St. Eucharius still has the fondest recollections of him. Godfrey certainly wishes to show him all of the honor that is his due, as if Guibert were "one of ours"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. The abbot also sends him Theoderic's *Vita* in answer to his questions about Hildegard of Bingen and asks him to correct it and fill in missing information where necessary. The letter contains few real references to friendship apart from the *salutatio*, where Godfrey addresses Guibert as *carissimo in Christo amico*⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. While this letter also contains a considerable number of *amicitia* indicators, its formulation comes across as more pragmatic and formal. Guibert did not neglect to reply to the abbot's letter and to thank him for his willingness to help. The letter opens with a very elaborate expression of gratitude. Even before opening the letter, Guibert was filled with joy, and when he read it, his joy was no less great: "I was not disappointed in my expectations"⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. His heart is warmed by the "arrows of your words" and filled "with the fire of love"⁽¹¹⁰⁾. The passion of this love

(104) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 40, p. 385, l. 1-3 : *quicquid fidelis amicus amico optare potest dulcius et salubrius*.

(105) His choice of words makes this abundantly clear: for example, he refers to the *assultus* of several *persecutores*. GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 40, p. 386, l. 43-48.

(106) See HASELDINE, "Understanding the Language", *op. cit.*, p. 256; MCLOUGHLIN, "Amicitia in Practice", *op. cit.*, p. 1173-1174; YSEBAERT, *De Parijse brievencollecties*, *op. cit.*, p. 244-245.

(107) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 41, p. 388, l. 11 : *sicut uni fratrum nostrorum*.

(108) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 41, p. 388, l. 1-3.

(109) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 391, l. 22 : *nec deceptus sum ab spe mea*.

(110) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 391, respectively l. 26 and l. 31.

makes his soul weak. He hopefully adds: "May your spirit resemble mine in this matter, so that you are moved by me as I have been moved by us"⁽¹¹¹⁾. He also refers to a number of biblical passages in which many become one through their common love for Christ⁽¹¹²⁾. Moreover, he considers himself very lucky to be the beneficiary of the prayers of the monks of St. Eucharius and Echternach. He proceeds by supplying Godfrey with some practical information: as he found the *Vita* by Theoderic faultless, he will refrain from completing his own attempt⁽¹¹³⁾. His remarks confirm that he has in fact met Godfrey many years ago during Godfrey's visit to Rupertsberg⁽¹¹⁴⁾. He also informs Godfrey of his intention to come and visit him: "I wish to be with you very often, if this is feasible."⁽¹¹⁵⁾ The next part of the letter is dedicated to benevolent advice to Godfrey: "In order to show my affection for you I as a friend admonish a friend in a friendly manner"⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Guibert, a former abbot, seems to have identified with Godfrey⁽¹¹⁷⁾ and exhorts him to better deeds by sharing reflections on his own imminent death. Though highly rhetorical, Guibert's admonitions reveal his inner anxiety about his approaching end and he insistently begs Godfrey to pray on his behalf⁽¹¹⁸⁾. The essence of the letter is primarily to supply the abbot with practical information and to thank him for his cooperation. However, Guibert embellishes his letter with an extensive reflection on how their friendship can evolve, and also adds some words of advice to his counterpart in Trier. In doing so he seems to rely on general ideas about friendship, drawn from the existing discourse of *amicitia*, and hence on what is known as the cult of friendship. Godfrey makes his last appearance in the collection in letter 50. In this letter to Siegfried, the archbishop of Mainz, Guibert mentions his journey home from Mainz in the

(111) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 392, l. 37-38 : *Et utinam anima uestra in hoc similis esset anime mee, ut id in uobis sentiretis de me, quod ego de nobis in me sentio !*

(112) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 391-392, l. 14-47.

(113) Despite Guibert's assertion that Theoderic's *Vita* was perfect and that he did not make any changes to it, Monika Klaes points to two manuscripts from the abbey of Gembloux which contain a slightly altered version of this *Vita*. She suggests that it was Guibert who was responsible for these (mostly stylistic) changes. See *Vita Sanctae Hildegardis, op. cit.*, p. 93-106. For a translation of this revised *Vita*, see SILVAS, *Jutta and Hildegard, op. cit.*, p. 223-237.

(114) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 392, l. 63-67 : *Addebant quoque his mei uos firmam tenere memoriam, referendo eis quomodo, cum interdum ueniretis Binguam adhuc iunior, in illa Dei sancta domo, inter sacras uirgines sponsas Christi, ambulantes in consensus pie societatis et multe dulcedinis*. Further on we read that this encounter had taken place some 30 years ago; GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 403, l. 419 : *cum ab annis fere XXX pro remotione uos nec uiderim nec audierim*.

(115) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 393, l. 102 : *cuperem, si fieri posset, sepius coesse*.

(116) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 395, l. 163-164 : *pro ostendo tamen ergo uos affectu meo amicus amicum amicabiliter moneo*.

(117) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 410, l. 641-644 : *Et quia uos et ex mandato Dei et ex merito uestro sicut me diligo, equum et pium duco in hoc dumtaxat articulo uos quoque mei similem, si possim, facere*.

(118) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 417, l. 894-897 : *quanta possum deuotione precor et obsecro quatenus et ad mala euitanda et ad bona promerenda sanctarum orationum uestrarum causa Dei michi non negetis suffragia*.

company of three friends, one of which is Godfrey⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Apparently, he was able to fulfil his wish of seeing Godfrey in person.

How should we interpret this manifestation of the language of friendship? In the first place, there are clear indications that the language is used functionally: references to friendship serve to put Godfrey in a conciliatory mood so that he will agree to Guibert's requests. Strikingly, Guibert appeals to his former ties of friendship with the deceased Ludwig, not to his connection with Godfrey himself. Godfrey's use of *amicitia* terminology seems to be a form of politeness: by adopting the term *amicus* in his *salutatio*, he echoes Guibert's address from the previous letter. In this way he shows himself receptive to Guibert's requests and perhaps even his friendship without going into the matter too deeply. He remains fairly neutral and sends the ball back into Guibert's court. The latter takes full advantage of the opportunity thus presented. Guibert clearly borrows concepts from the broader tradition of the language of friendship, terms that Godfrey would also understand. He relies on biblical foundations and his discourse contains echoes of classical notions, such as the idea of becoming one through common desire. This appears to be for the most part a literary exercise: the two do not know one another any better than they did at the writing of the first letter, but Guibert's choice of words has become a lot more powerful. Guibert does seem genuine in his desire to become better acquainted with Godfrey, with whom he identifies. His concern for Godfrey's salvation echoes the *custos animi*-idea. Guibert regards Godfrey as a companion on his spiritual pilgrimage in this world, a fellowship to the benefit of both⁽¹²⁰⁾. Guibert draws on the language of friendship even before that friendship is established, to indicate their common background and shared purpose in life. *Amicitia* terminology thus functions here as a kind of communication strategy that is understandable for both partners, a language game with which both are familiar and which both can play according to the rules. The language of friendship serves as a common idiom and distinguishing mechanism for a specific elite⁽¹²¹⁾. This elite may very well have been largely monastic: the quantitative analysis of the letters shows that the language of friendship appears more frequently in letters to the regular rather than the secular clergy. Moreover, the corpus of Guibert's correspondence contains an additional exchange of letters between people who did not know one another: the sender of the first letter even has to excuse himself for not knowing the names of the addressees. This correspondence took place between Archbishop Philippe of Heinsberg and the two religious communities at Tours, the chapter of Châteauneuf and the abbey of Marmoutier⁽¹²²⁾. Neither party makes use of the language of

(119) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 50, p. 508, l. 219-223 : *tribus uidelicet spectabilibus et magni nominis uiris, amicis meis*.

(120) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 42, p. 392-393, l. 69-73 : *uos me, si opportunitas preberetur, libenter uelle uidere, quatenus de his, que ad roborandam amicitie fidem et ad animarum salutem spectant, inuicem conferendo aliquid edificationis et gratie spiritualis alter ab altero possit percipere*.

(121) Julian Haseldine speaks of "markers of inclusion in elite groups". See HASELDINE, "Friends, Friendship", *op. cit.*, p. 244.

(122) This exchange of letters comprising four letters was initiated by Philippe of Heinsberg, the archbishop of Cologne and patron of Guibert. To facilitate Guibert's stay at

friendship, and the most intense expressions used are *amantissimo patri et domino*⁽¹²³⁾ once and two mentions of *dilectis in Christi*⁽¹²⁴⁾. Evidently using such language was considered inappropriate for an archbishop who did not employ it himself either. Philippe was never a member of the monastic milieu: before his appointment as archbishop, he had been a canon in Liège. Our hypothesis that the language of friendship functioned as an identifying characteristic within the monastic community thus gains in credibility. This is not to say that such language had to be used deliberately: if two correspondents felt they had a common background, they could fall back on a discourse that symbolized this shared background – namely, the one in which they had been educated. Hence, the use of *amicitia* terminology does not necessarily indicate the presence of real friendship, and should therefore be subjected to analysis within its historical context.

II.4. *The Monks of Gembloux*

As mentioned earlier, the monks at Gembloux were not exactly enthusiastic about Guibert's long sojourn in Rupertsberg. On several occasions they sent him disappointed letters in which they accuse him of abandoning them in their hour of need. His absence gave them much cause for worry, and they demanded that he would return as soon as possible in order to live up to his vow of *stabilitas loci*. Several of his pronouncements angered them, such as his reference to Gembloux as the slavery of the blind Leah and to Rupertsberg as the loving embrace of Rachel (cf. Genesis 29-31)⁽¹²⁵⁾. Striking below the belt, they even reproached him for not following the good example of St. Martin: "There cannot really be sufficient cause for praise if the struggles of battle are initiated in a safe place; rather, it is when the battle is fought on enemy territory after the example of your good St. Martin that renown and virtue are due to those who fight"⁽¹²⁶⁾. This was undeniably intended as a direct attack on Guibert: the monks were after all very well acquainted with his fascination for and identification with this holy figure. Nevertheless, they address Guibert with *amantissimo*⁽¹²⁷⁾ and *o amicorum desiderantissime*⁽¹²⁸⁾, and even refer to themselves as *amici*⁽¹²⁹⁾. The corpus of letters also contains

Tours, the city of his beloved St. Martin, the archbishop provided Guibert with a letter of recommendation for the cloister community of Marmoutier and the chapter of Châteauneuf. Both religious communities answered the archbishop's request for information. See GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively p. 59-63, p. 64-69, p. 70-82 and p. 83-102.

(123) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 5, p. 71, l. 1.

(124) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 3, p. 60, l. 2; Ep. 6, p. 84, l. 1.

(125) In 1177 Guibert wrote to Bovo, a fellow monk at Gembloux : *De seruitute lippientis Lie...ad delectabilis decore Rachelis amplexus...translatus [sum]*. See GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 38, p. 367, l. 16-18.

(126) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 30, p. 327, l. 26-29 : *Non est adeo sufficientis laudis, si tuto loco conseratur lucta certaminis, sed si exemplo boni uestri Martini ex iniquo loco pugnetur, amplior pugnantibus uirtutis palma debetur.*

(127) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 30, p. 327, l. 1.

(128) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 30, p. 327, l. 4.

(129) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae, op. cit.*, Ep. 30, p. 327, l. 2.

Guibert's reply, and its tone is quite cool. He shows himself to be particularly disappointed in the accusations that have been laid at his doorstep, and says that everyone to whom he has shown the letter shared the same opinion: "The listeners were moved to dismay and would rather have torn the letter to pieces than read it, not because they rejected the idea of calling me back, but because they could not bear the falseness of the words"⁽¹³⁰⁾. Here we are primarily concerned with the way Guibert uses the term *amici* in this context. When he summarizes their accusations, he says the following: "These then are the comforting words my friends offer me; these are the sweet promises with which I am recalled to my mother cloister"⁽¹³¹⁾. He is clearly being ironic when he speaks of his fellow monks as friends, a phenomenon that can be observed in other letter collections as well. In a letter to Radulfus, a monk from the cloister of Villers, not far from Gembloux, he refers to the comments of his *uerbosi amici*⁽¹³²⁾ when he tries to explain why now, after a long silence, he will nevertheless defend himself openly. The language of friendship is used here with a heavy dose of sarcasm, and even powerful phrases such as "most missed of all friends" do not necessarily refer to amicable relations – on the contrary.

Julian Haseldine has suggested that *amicitia* terminology could be interpreted as a conciliatory discourse that was used by the most important figures of the twelfth century⁽¹³³⁾. Perhaps we could interpret the use of the language of friendship in the letters of the monks of Gembloux as an attempt at reconciliation, but this interpretation definitely does not hold true for Guibert's response. More likely, the example of Guibert and his fellow monks demonstrates that the language of friendship in the twelfth century could also be manipulated and transferred to other contexts. This phenomenon has already been observed in other letter collections. In his study of the correspondence of Bernard of Clairvaux, Wim Verbaal has already observed that the less smoothly Bernard's contact with his correspondents flowed, the more the Cistercian abbot fell back on the language of friendship⁽¹³⁴⁾. In fact, historians are constantly becoming more aware of the way medieval writers used word play, joking or irony to convey a deeper, and often quite critical message to their reader(s). *Amicitia iocosa*, though it may at first glance read like a sign of intimacy⁽¹³⁵⁾, is often employed "to facilitate the introduction of serious issues, and even serve to soften or mask potentially painful criticism"⁽¹³⁶⁾. In their letters, the monks of Gembloux and Guibert

(130) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 29, p. 323, l. 65-68 : *ad indignationem pertracti sunt audientes, et maluissent eas sectas quam lectas, non quod improbarent intentionem reuocantium me, sed quod indignitatem uerborum non ferrent.*

(131) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 29, p. 323, l. 61-63 : *Iste sunt lactee consolationes que michi fluunt ab amicis, iste dulces promissiones quibus reuocor ad ubera matris.*

(132) GUIBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Epistolae*, *op. cit.*, Ep. 26, p. 272, l. 41.

(133) HASELDINE, "Friendship and Rivalry", *op. cit.*, p. 390-394.

(134) VERBAAL, "Revocare vitam", *op. cit.*, p. 163-167.

(135) For example, Ronald Pepin considered the jest and playful mocking in the letter exchange between John of Salisbury and Peter of Celle to exemplify their "true friendship". See Ronald PEPIN, "*Amicitia iocosa*: Peter of Celle and John of Salisbury", in *Florilegium*, t. 5, 1983, p. 140-156.

(136) KNIGHT, *The Correspondence*, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

clearly drew on this tradition of manipulating a traditional discourse to convey a diametrically opposed meaning. To uncover this intended meaning, researchers have to consider every text within its historical context.

Conclusion: The Language of Friendship Reconsidered

Though the case of Guibert of Gembloux represents a late twelfth-century view on friendship, seen through the eyes of an “ordinary” person, it is still fairly representative of what we find about the language of friendship in the secondary literature. However, the pragmatic character of the discourse observed by scholars in many comparable letter collections is almost entirely absent here. When Guibert wants to make use of someone’s services, he rarely uses the terminology of *amicitia*. His correspondence contains only one request in the name of friendship, namely, the letter to Godfrey of St. Eucharius. In the letters to his patron, Philippe of Heinsberg, Guibert scarcely refers to friendship at all. Guibert seems to have found the language of friendship less appropriate within a vertical network. In such cases, he chooses to present himself as subordinate and respectful rather than play on a possible friendship. The absence of the *amicitia* terminology in pragmatic contexts may also indicate a dividing line between monastic and secular religious milieus. Godfrey was after all an abbot, while Philippe never led the life of a regular clergyman, not even before his appointment as archbishop. This gives rise to the hypothesis that the discourse of friendship was primarily cultivated in monastic contexts, as Guibert’s letters to members of the regular clergy (among which numerous abbots and abbesses) manifestly contain more *amicitia* indicators than letters to members of the secular clergy.

The discourse of friendship probably served as a repertoire one could fall back on when writing to “fellow initiates”. It was more a stylistic, linguistic exercise by which one could demonstrate mastery in the art of letter writing. The exchange of letters between Guibert and Godfrey of St. Eucharius is a fine illustration of this principle in action. By contrast, his correspondence with the monks of Gembloux illustrates that this discourse could also be manipulated and invested with new meanings, as when the language of *amicitia* was employed sarcastically.

Yet friendship was not limited to discourse alone. The examples of Joseph of Exeter and the nun Gertrude reveal that there was also a place for genuine friendship in the life of Guibert of Gembloux. Interpreting Guibert’s relationship with Joseph of Exeter correctly is no simple matter. It is clear that Guibert filled in the traditional vision of friendship in a highly personal, even extreme manner. In particular, it is the intimate nature of the confessions in the letter – more than the use of specific terms – that offers us a glimpse into the relationship between the people on the parchment. In the case of Gertrude, there is also evidence of a deep, long-lasting friendship. Here too it is not so much the wording of the letters as the details of what is said that give us information about the true nature of their relationship, such as the mention of small gifts and the exchange of practical information concerning mutual friends and acquaintances. In particular, the extremely personal account of the disasters that befell the abbey of Gembloux reveals the strength of

their relationship. Guibert's friendship is above all a spiritual friendship: his friends do not provide him with any material benefits; rather, they are his *consortes* on the journey towards God, joined together by mutual prayer and concern for each other's soul. Because his friendship is conditioned by the sharing of a common goal, it is not surprising that Guibert's friendship ideal is a monastic one. The question posed by Julian Haseldine as to how this "monastic culture of friendship" relates to other concepts of *amicitia* within medieval society at large and its different constituents⁽¹³⁷⁾ is therefore highly pertinent. It should be clear by now that purely terminological research into the language of friendship cannot be used without reservation to declare the existence of friendship between correspondents. Medieval writers were too creative in their handling of discursive conventions to be taken readily at face value. The path recently taken by friendship historians towards the study of 'networks of friends', with its focus on *amicitia* terminology, can certainly enlighten us with regard to the discourse of friendship in the middle ages. But as Guibert's *epistolarium* clearly demonstrates, the degree of intensity and intimacy in the letters offers a better indication of the nature of the relationship between the correspondents than the quantifiable use of specific terms.

(137) See Julian HASELDINE, "The Monastic Culture of Friendship", in James CLARK, ed., *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2007, p. 178-183. Monks were part of the feudal society, in particular in the case of the Cistercians. On the other hand, the sources used to determine the 'secular' view on friendship are charters, often written down by religious institutions. The relationship between religious and secular ideas about, and use of friendship, is therefore very interesting. For example, Ysebaert's summary of Haseldine's view on friendship terminology as "a kind of language which helped to settle monastic conflicts in a peaceful manner" clearly resembles the way Althoff describes the role of *amicitia* between secular lords. See YSEBAERT, "Medieval Letter-Collections", *op. cit.*, p. 290, referring to HASELDINE, "Friendship and Rivalry", *op. cit.*, p. 411-414, and Gerd ALTHOFF, "Friendship and Political Order", in J. HASELDINE, ed., *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, *op. cit.*, p. 91-105.

Appendix 1 : Prosopographic overview of addressees of the letters of Guibert of Gembloux compared to those of other twelfth-century authors

The numerical material for other authors was taken from the synthetic table published by Julian Haseldine⁽¹³⁸⁾, supplemented with data for Stephen of Tournai published by Walter Ysebaert⁽¹³⁹⁾. Addressees whose status changed over the course of the correspondence are counted under the status-group in which they received most of their letters.

Classification according to special status aims at a fairly elite circle, which entails that not every recipient could be classified in these terms. For this reason, the total percentage of Table 2 does not add up to 100 percent, since not all of the recipients could be included.

	Guibert of Gembloux	Peter of Celle	Bernard of Clairvaux	Peter the Venerable	John of Salisbury	Arnulf of Lisieux	Gilbert Foliot	Stephen of Tournai
School-men ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾	2% (1)	1%	1%	1%	7%	2%	0%	2%
Monks	55% (23)	60%	39%	46%	18%	21%	19%	8%
Secular clergy ⁽¹⁴¹⁾	2% (1)	4%	4%	6%	37%	15%	17%	7%
Canons regular ⁽¹⁴²⁾	0%	1%	2%	0%	3%	0%	1%	18%
Lay people	0%	4%	18%	14%	1%	2%	17%	3%
Very high ecclesiastical rank ⁽¹⁴³⁾	38% (16)	24%	31%	32%	22%	58%	40%	63%
Unknown	2% (1)	6%	6%	6%	9%	0%	2%	-
Total number of letters	42	82	252	79	92	62	108	96

Table 1: Classification according to social order

(138) HASELDINE, “Understanding the Language”, *op. cit.*, p. 244-245.

(139) YSEBAERT, “Ami, client et intermédiaire”, *op. cit.*, p. 426-427.

(140) I.e. those still teaching in the schools.

(141) Includes parish clergy, members of secular cathedral chapters and clerks in royal service.

(142) Includes canons and members of regular cathedral chapters.

(143) Includes popes, cardinals, archbishops and bishops.

	Guibert of Gembloux	Peter of Celle	Bernard of Clairvaux	Peter the Venerable	John of Salisbury	Arnulf of Lisieux	Gilbert Foliot	Stephen of Tournai
Popes	0%	4%	2%	5%	2%	6%	5%	19%
Cardinals	0%	2%	9%	5%	8%	15%	6%	12%
Archbishops	38% (16)	10%	7%	9%	2%	10%	5%	9%
Bishops	2% (1)	9%	12%	13%	14%	26%	25%	9%
William of Champagne (144)								14%
Abbots and priors	33% (14)	40%	27%	23%	11%	23%	11%	20%
Archdeacons	0%	0%	<1%	1%	12%	10%	9%	2%
Office holders ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾	0%	4%	2%	3%	10%	3%	6%	4%
Kings	0%	2%	4%	6%	0%	3%	3%	2%
Lay magnates	0%	1%	7%	3%	1%	0%	7%	1%
Percentage of total	73%	72%	71%	68%	60%	96%	77%	91%
Total number of letters	42	82	252	79	92	62	108	96

Table 2: Classification according to special status

(144) William of Champagne was Stephen's most prominent patron. Because of the great number of letters to him, Ysebaert chose to include William of Champagne in the table as a separate category. These letters could just as well been classified under 'archbishops' or 'cardinals'.

(145) Includes office holders in cathedral chapters or other religious houses except abbots and priors, who are counted separately.

Appendix 2 : Use of *amicitia* terminology in the letters of Guibert of Gembloux

No.	Addressee	Vos/Tu	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	No. pos. scores
1.	Philippe of Heinsberg, archbishop of Cologne	Vos			x		x			2
2.	Idem	Vos								0
7.	Idem	Vos			x	x				2
8.	Idem	Vos					x			1
9.	Idem	Vos								0
10.	Idem	Vos					x			1
11.	Idem	Vos								0
12.	Abbot Hervé and the monks of Marmoutier, Tours	Vos (pl), tu			x					1
13.	The abbey of Marmoutier, Tours	Vos		x	x					2
14.	Abbot Geoffrey and the monks of Marmoutier, Tours	Vos (pl)			x		x			2
15.	Philippe of Heinsberg	Vos								0
16.	Hildegard of Bingen	Tu			x		x			2
17.	Idem	Tu							x	1
18.	Idem	Tu				x	x		x	3
19.	Idem	Tu							x	1
20.	Idem	Tu				x				1
21.	Idem	Tu								0
22.	Idem	Tu							x	1
23.	The nuns of Rupertsberg	Vos (pl)			x					1
24.	Hildegard of Bingen	Tu								0
26.	Radulfus, monk of Villers	Vos			x		x			2
27.	Jonas, priest of the church of St. Martin, Perwez	Tu		x	x		x		x	4
28.	Friend G.	Tu			x	x	x		x	4
29.	The monks of Gembloux	Vos (pl)								0
32.	The abbess and nuns of Rupertsberg	Vos (pl)				x	x		x	3
34.	Gertrude, nun of Rupertsberg	Vos	x		x	x	x			4
36.	Abbess Ida and the nuns of Rupertsberg	Vos (pl), tu			x		x			2
37.	Gertrude, nun of Rupertsberg	Vos			x		x			2

No.	Addressee	Vos/Tu	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	No. pos. scores
38.	Bovo, monk of Gembloux	Tu				x	x			2
40.	Abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius, Trier	Vos		x	x		x	x		4
42.	Abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius, Trier	Vos		x		x	x			3
46.	Joseph of Exeter	Tu	x		x	x	x			4
47.	Philippe of Heinsberg, archbishop of Cologne	Vos				x				1
48.	Siegfried, archbishop of Mainz	Vos			x		x			2
49.	Idem	Vos								0
50.	Idem	Vos								0
51.	Idem	Vos								0
52.	Idem	Vos				x				1
53.	The clergy of Mainz and Christian, archbishop of Mainz	Tu								0
54.	Siegfried, archbishop of Mainz, and Philippe, bishop of Ratzburg	Vos (pl), vos			x	x	x			3
55.	A group of nuns (Rupertsberg?)	Vos (pl)			x					1
56.	Unknown	Vos			x					1
Tot.			2	4	19	12	19	1	7	
%			5%	10%	45%	29%	45%	5%	17%	

Category 1: Friendship as principal theme of the letter.

Category 2: The use of *amicus/amice* as a form of address, either in the *salutatio* or in the body of the letter.

Category 3: The use of superlatives that refer to ties of friendship to address the correspondent (*amantissimus*, etc.).

Category 4: Extensive reflections on friendship (of an abstract, theoretical nature).

Category 5: Concrete references to friendship or affection.

Category 6: Requesting help in the name of friendship.

Category 7: The mention of mutual friends.

Appendix 3 : Comparison of the prosopographic classification with *amicitia* indicators

Number of positive scores for linguistic indicators of <i>amicitia</i>	0	1	2	3	4
Classification according to social order of the addressees					
- schoolmen	-	-	-	-	1
- monks	3	7	7	3	3
- secular clergy	-	-	-	-	1
- very high ecclesiastical rank	8	4	3	1	-
- unknown	-	1	-	-	-
Classification according to special status of the addressees					
- archbishops	8	4	3	1	-
- bishops	-	-	-	1	-
- abbots and priors	2	5	3	3	1

Appendix 4 : Use of amicitia terminology in letters addressed to Guibert of Gembloux

No.		Vos/Tu	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	No. pos. scores
25.	Radulfus, monk of Villers	Vos		x						1
30.	The monks of Gembloux	Vos		x	x					2
31.	Jean of Wl., monk of Gembloux	Vos			x					1
33.	Abess Ida and the nuns of Rupertsberg	Vos					x			1
35.	Gertrude, nun of Rupertsberg	Vos	x	x	x	x	x		x	6
41.	Abbot Godfrey of St. Eucharius, Trier	Vos		x	x		x			3
43.	Joseph of Exeter	Vos	x			x	x			3
44.	Idem	Vos	x		x	x	x			4
45.	Idem	Vos	x	x	x	x	x			5
HoB1	Hildegard of Bingen	Tu					x			1
HoB2	Idem	Tu								0
HoB3	Idem	Vos (pl)								0
Total			4	5	6	4	7	0	1	
%			33%	42%	50%	33%	58%	0%	8%	

Category 1: Friendship as principal theme of the letter.

Category 2: The use of *amicus/amice* as a form of address, either in the *salutatio* or in the body of the letter.

Category 3: The use of superlatives that refer to ties of friendship to address the correspondent (*amantissimus*, etc.).

Category 4: Extensive reflections on friendship (of an abstract, theoretical nature).

Category 5: Concrete references to friendship or affection.

Category 6: Requesting help in the name of friendship.

Category 7: The mention of mutual friends.

ABSTRACT

Sara MOENS, *Twelfth-century Epistolary Language of Friendship Reconsidered. The Case of Guibert of Gembloux*

Historians regard the twelfth century as the golden age of friendship. Nevertheless, the correct interpretation of this culture of friendship and its literary manifestations is under debate. Researchers into the *amicitia* debate increasingly rely on the “network approach”, which is centered on the use of the language of friendship. In the present article, this quantitative approach is applied to a late twelfth-century collection of letters by a Benedictine monk, Guibert of Gembloux, and is complemented by a close reading of four case studies. Guibert’s correspondence attests to a spiritual interpretation of friendship that can function as an identifying discourse within a horizontal network among a monastic elite.

Guibert of Gembloux – 12th century – Friendship – Terminology – Correspondence

RÉSUMÉ

Sara MOENS, *Une reconsidération du langage d’amitié. Les lettres de Guibert de Gembloux*

Les historiens considèrent le XII^e siècle comme l’âge d’or de l’amitié. L’interprétation correcte de cette culture d’amitié et de ses expressions littéraires fait néanmoins l’objet d’un débat. Actuellement, les chercheurs de ce débat sur l’*amicitia* sont enclins à utiliser le « network approach » qui met l’accent sur le mode d’emploi du langage d’amitié. Dans cet article, cette méthode quantitative est appliquée à une correspondance datant de la fin du XII^e siècle, émanant d’un moine bénédictin nommé Guibert de Gembloux. Cette approche est complétée par quatre études de cas, examinées de façon qualitative. La correspondance de Guibert atteste d’une conception spirituelle de l’amitié, qui fonctionne comme un discours d’identification dans un réseau horizontal au sein d’une élite monastique.

Guibert de Gembloux – XII^e siècle – amitié – langage – correspondance

SAMENVATTING

Sara MOENS, *Vriendschapstaal in de twaalfde eeuw opnieuw onder de loep. De briefverzameling van Guibertus van Gembloers*

De twaalfde eeuw wordt door historici beschouwd als de bloeiperiode van de vriendschapscultus. De precieze interpretatie van de opbloei van vriendschap en haar literaire manifestaties is echter onderhevig aan discussie. De onderzoekers van dit *amicitia*-debat neigen tegenwoordig naar de “network approach” die focust op het gebruik van vriendschapstaal. Deze kwantitatieve aanpak wordt toegepast op de laat twaalfde-eeuwse briefverzameling van een benedictijner monnik, Guibertus van Gembloers, aangevuld met een kwalitatieve studie van vier casussen. Guibertus’ correspondentie getuigt van een spirituele invulling van vriendschap, die binnen een horizontaal netwerk en onder een monastieke elite als een identificerend discours fungeert.

Guibertus van Gembloers – 12^e eeuw – vriendschap – taalgebruik – briefverzameling