AN ESSAY ON *FRIENDSHIP*

——Tradition of Germanic Love[1]——

By MASAHIKO TAKIZAWA*

Distance, whether in time or in space, makes things look more beautiful than they really are. It may be an illusion and may sometimes lead us to wrong judgements. But the Japanese proverb 'Yomé, tohmé, kasa-no-uchi (at night, at a distance, under an umbrella)' seems to express our unconscious inclination to idealize things distant, and not to notice their minute defects: our wish not to dissect a beautiful thing into pieces. For us, the Japanese students of English Literature, the English language itself can create a distance. This may be one of the reasons which tempt us to approach the English literary world, especially that of old days. Perhaps most Japanese scholars of the English language and literature have once experienced, before they began academic studies, the same fascination as I have mentioned, the feeling caused by the alluring beauty which seemed to lie in a far unknown country. And few have been free from the first impressions, right or wrong.

My hypothesis of *Friendship* may be regarded as one of those wrong conclusions which have been drawn from such an impression. But as amateurs have sometimes made unexpected contributions to professional studies, so this essay, viewing the English literary world at a distance, could bring new facts to light, or it could, at least, do a little more than the so-called positivists, those cynical ultra-realists, have ever done.

It was when I came across the following passage some ten years ago that I first realized that the word *friend* means something slightly different from mere *companion, sympathizer* or *comrade*.

> God is my father; God is my *friend*; I love him; I believe He loves me.
> (Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre*, Ch. 9, my italics)

This is what a young Helen Burns says to her schoolmate, Jane Eyre, on her death-bed. The 'love' between God and Helen may be rightly understood as a sort of *charity* (*caritas* or $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$), which has a long Christian tradition behind it. According to Andres Niygren,[2] *charity* has primarily been the love which God, from above, sends down on the human beings on the earth. It is true that it can be used and has been used to mean other kinds of human love: for example, love of teachers towards their pupils, of parents towards their children, or even between friends.[3] But the love of God has been understood to be something distinct

---

from the love between man and woman, and the distinction has had an important meaning in European intellectual tradition since the fourteenth century. The distinction becomes clearer when it is compared with Japanese 'yuh-joh (friendship)', which is the intimate human relationship between friends, excluding those loves between man and woman, God and man, parents and their children. In a sense, *yuh-joh* has a similarity to Plato's love ($\varepsilon\rho o\varsigma$) in his *Symposion*. But Japanese culture, at least at present, is ignorant of Greek *ideas*, and, therefore, *yuh-joh* does not inspire men to attain virtue. The Japanese language has two words to express mental intimacy among human beings: 'joh (feeling)' and 'ai (love)'. *Yuh-joh* (friend-feeling) is clearly distinct from *ren-ai* (love-loving). The latter is the love between man and woman, who are expected to marry before long. But a husband and his wife are supposed *never* to be in *ren-ai* after their marriage, however strongly they may love each other.

Therefore most Japanese will be puzzled when they read a passage as follows.

> The thirty years I have passed in the company of my best and dearest *friend*.
> (Anne Brontë, *Agnes Grey*, Ch. 19, my italics)

This is what Agnes' mother says looking back on her former days. 'The best and dearest friend' is, of course, her husband. Perhaps to most English-speaking people, this may be so natural a usage of the word that they will pay little attention to this passage. But to call or consider one's husband or wife as one's *friend* is yet completely alien to Japanese culture. I think this kind of surprise or puzzle is of great importance. This may be an example of what anthropologists call cultural shock. But they sometimes overlook the fact that we *can* be shocked only when we keep distance from the objects of our study. 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty'.

At any rate I realized ten years ago that *friendship* is different from *yuh-joh*, or at least it was used in a different context in the first half of the nineteenth century. And since I realized the difference, I have examined various usages of the word, and made a tentative hypothesis on the definition of *friendship*. But if I had been a reader congenial to English culture, such an expression as follows would have escaped my notice and I could not have understood the revolutionary meaning of the word.

> I will venture to predict that woman will be either the *friend* or slave of man.
> (Mary Wollstonecraft [Godwin], *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*,
> Ch. 2, my italics)

I

Theoretically almost all activities of all living creatures, not only animals but plants and micro-organisms also, are conditioned by the two fundamental biological instincts: instincts to preserve individual organisms and to preserve their species: appetite and sex. Human beings, as a species of animals, are, of course, *fundamentally* governed by these instincts, but they realize them in their own way; in other words, they humanize the instincts. In a sense, every human activity is a mode of the humanization of the instincts. Literature especially gives various shades to the instincts. In it, the instinct to preserve oneself becomes

the theme of 'birth', 'death', and 'life', and the instinct to preserve one's species becomes that of 'love', 'strife', and 'loneliness'. Thus 'love' and 'death', two typical themes of literature, are eventually the humanized expressions of the fundamental instincts. This may be the reason why 'l'amour et la mort' and 'womb and tomb' have long been used as riming words since the time of troubadours.

Now *friendship* is a special mode of 'love', a humanized expression of sexual instinct to preserve the human species. Even the love between parents and their children, between teachers and their pupils, or toward a pet or from personified God upon human beings, is *ultimately* the reflection or the existential mode of the instinctive love between man and woman. I am not going to interpret all human activities in terms of sexual instinct, as often done by pseudo-Freudians. In fact, to say that all human activities are ultimately occasioned by natural instincts is to say nothing about *human* activities, which are distinct from those of gorillas or orang-utans.

Karl Marx, in his famous manuscript, says as follows:

> Das unmittelbare, *natürliche* Gattungsverhältnis des Menschen zum Menschen ist das Verhältnis des Mannes zum Weibe. In ihm zeigt sich also, in wie weit das *natürliche* Verhalten des Menschen *menschlich* oder in wie weit das *menschliche* Wesen ihm zum natürlichen Wesen, in wie weit seine *menschliche Natur* ihm zur *Natur* geworden ist.[4]

According to Marx, the modes of love, which are prevalent in a certain society, reflect the modes of the social, human relation of the society, or rather the modes of human relation in a certain district at a certain stage of historical development has certain modes of love. To what degree the social relationship is humanized, or how far it is felt to be 'natural' can be seen in the modes of love, especially in 'the direct and natural relation', between man and woman.

Every language has a term which means 'love' in general (*love, Liebe, amour,* $\phi\iota\lambda o\varsigma$, etc.) and at the same time it has several words which express the specific modes of love (*pity, piety, charity, loyalty, devotion, affection,* etc.). And if the prevailing modes of love in a certain society (for example, $\epsilon\rho o\varsigma$ in Classical Greece or $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$ in the first two centuries of ancient Christian society) reflect the social relation among people who live in the society, every word that expresses a specific mode of love may be supposed to have a corresponding human relation, and, therefore, *friendship,* which is nothing but a specific mode of love, must also have reflected a mode of human relationship of a certain society.

As far as I know, it was Wulfila in the fourth century who, for the first time in European history, translated $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$ as *friapwa* (*friendship*): for example, as follows.

$\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta$ $\mu\alpha\kappa\rho o\theta\upsilon\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota},$ $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota.$
Charity suffereth long, *and* is kind.

friapwa usbeisneiga ist, sels ist.

(1 Cor. xiii 4)

As I mentioned above, $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$ was *originally* the love which God poured down on the Israelites, and the meaning of which St Paul extended to all mankind. And therefore it was essentially the love of superiors towards their inferiors: of God to his people, of teachers to their

---

pupils, of physicians to their patients, etc.

The Gothic language seems to have had the word which corresponds to the 'love in general': *lubon*, as in *broprulubon* for φιλαδελφία.[5] Wulfila, however, did not use the word. Though we cannot know the exact reason for this, I think it was because he considered the word *lubon* to be too general and too weak to express the Christian conception of heavenly love. He chose *friapwa* (*friendship*), perhaps because it was an especially powerful mode of love among them.

Fri-*, the root of *friapwa*, and Sanskrit *priya* (=dear, beloved) are thought to be etymologically cognate. The cognate words of *fri-** in Germanic languages vary as follows.

Mod. G.	*frei* (=*free*)
	freien (=to make free=to marry; as is well known, this word is now a little archaic, and used sometimes with ironic connotation)
	Frau (=lady, woman, wife)
	Friede (=peace)
	Freude (=pleasure)
OHG.	*fridu* (=Mod. G. *freien*)
	frouwa (=Mod. G. *Frau*; cf Mod. Dutch *vrouwe*)
OE.	*freogan, freon* (=to love)
	frea (=husband)
	freond (=friend)
O. Saxon	*fri* (=wife)

Old Norse also has *Freeg* (wife to Odin), which remains in *Friday* (<Freeg-Tag; cf Mod. F. *vendredi*=Venus' day). Old Slavic *prijati* (=to help) is perhaps a cognate word. Modern English *free, friend* (<*freond*; present participle of *freon*=to love), *frank, frolic* are also derivatives of *fri-**. To sum up, *fri-** meant both liberty (*freedom*) and love (*friendship*) which bring us pleasure (*Freude*) and peace (*Friede*).

Thus love and liberty were once thought to be one thing in old Germanic languages. And it is important to note here that, to Germanic nations, *friendship* was originally in the relationship between husband and wife as two equal persons, and that it was, therefore, a horizontal, level love, essentially different from the vertical αγαπη (from God to men) and ερος (from world to *ideas*). What is more, while Japanese are inclined to think that to marry is to lose liberty, Germanic people, contrariwise, found liberty and peace in married life. Before we attempt to find the reason why this was possible, let me add a brief historical survey of various usages of *friend(ship)*.

Though I have not yet read all the manuscripts extant, and I am uncertain whether there may be exceptions at all, αγαπη was translated as *lufan* or *lufo* (love) in most of Anglo-Saxon versions of the Bible since the eighth century. At least by the end of the seventh century, Anglo-Saxons had been able to distinguish clearly the worldly love (*friendship*) from the heavenly love (*charity*). Perhaps the Catholic Church, which had established itself as a firm spiritual authority during the four centuries since Wulfila, had a tremendous influence over the ways of thinking.

However I found an interesting example where 'caritatem dei(God's charity)'is translated into 'lufo-broperscip godes (God's love like brothership)'.[6] I think that the translator sought

---

[5] 1 Thess. iv 9.

[6] Lindisfarne MSS: *Gospels*, ed. by Skeat (EETS).

to express a stronger and more generous mental activity than mere *love*, and added a curious noun in apposition, as he thought *charity* still retained a foreign association. But what impresses me most is the fact that he could not find a more suitable word for the love of God than *brothership*, which means the love that works level-ward among equals: 'horizontal love' according to my terminology. Or might the Germanic languages have lacked, from the beginning, a word that could convey the 'vertical love' among unequal human beings?

Although *friendship* disappeared in Anglo-Saxon Bibles, it was often used in literary works, and expressed the love between husband and wife. For example, we find it in short poems as follows.

> frēondscype fremman.
> (friendship lead *or* make)
>
> *(The Husband's Message, l. 19)*
>
> Frynd sind on eorpan,
> lēofe lifgende, leger weardiað.
> (Friends are on *the* earth,
> dearly living, *one* bed occupy.)
>
> *(The Wife's Lament, ll. 33–4)*

We must not misunderstand that conjugal love was of secondary concern for the people. Though they differentiated it from heavenly love, both loves were equally indispensable for them, and, in a sense, both of them survived with equal strength up to the twelfth century.

It was in the thirteenth century when the English people underwent a change of spiritual climate, and *charity* gradually came to be regarded as a nobler and more valuable love than *friendship*. To Richard Rolle of Hampole, in the fourteenth century, it was a matter of course to evaluate God's *charity* far above the 'horizontal love'.

> They are so heuy in erthely frenchype þat þay may noghte flee intill þe
> lufe of Iesu Christe.
> *(The Nature of the Bee, The Thornton MS, ll. 29–30)*

This was the result of the vulgarization of *friendship*, accompanied by the purification of *charity*. In other words, they learned to conform their behaviours politically to the requirement of authority or to the customs of the community in which they lived, and at the same time, to pretend as if they had no hidden inclinations at all: they developed a sort of dual mentality. This duality, I think, was brought about in the thirteenth century primarily by the change of feudal economic structures: out of 'Villikationsverfassung' into 'Reine Grundherrschaft'. But, for the present, the immediate cause of the changing mental atmosphere is more important for us. In the thirteenth century, every man was confronted with a compulsory choice, whether to become a *perfect* Christian or a mere *nominal* Christian. For example, the Catholic Church taught people to be innocent and chaste, not to indulge in lust, although it did not forbid marriage among laymen. Monks and nuns, being *perfect* Christians, were ordered to avoid marriage, in order to keep themselves purely innocent and clean. But it was impossible to observe the advice *literally*, and if everybody, for example, wanted to be a *perfect* Christian, which the Catholic Church *formally* recommended, European societies should have disappeared hundreds of years ago,

leaving no descendants. Even monks and nuns could not live without food. The truth is that the Catholic churches and monasteries were *officially* sacred places, advocating Christianity, *authentic* and *perfect*, but *in reality* Popes and abbots were not much different from feudal manor lords. This social dualism eventually nourished the peculiar medieval mental dualism. It could purify Christian orthodoxy, as is seen in the Scholastic Theology, without spoiling secular worldly lives of laymen. Otherwise, Christianity might have fallen into the mysticism like the Hynayāna Buddhism which still remains in Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, only this dual mentality could create the Renaissance in Europe, especially in southern Europe where the Catholic influence was dominant. For example, this is the reason why Dante, being almost overwhelmed by his love toward Beatrice Portinari, that is, by ερος in the noblest sense of the word, did not feel any hesitation to marry Gemma Donati. This is also the reason why Chaucer and Boccaccio, both being pious Christians, could write such merry stories as *The Canterbury Tales* and *Decameron*.

Three hundred years later, in the middle of the seventeenth century, John Milton realized that *friendship* had already lost almost all of its former dignity. He thought it had been too vulgarized to be adopted to the intimate relation between Adam and Eve. He chose *fellowship* to express the strongest human 'horizontal love'. *Fellowship* in his Divorce Tracts, *Paradise Lost* and *Samson Agonistes* can be said to be a revolutionary incarnation or restoration of Germanic *friendship*, and it was considered in the eighteenth century as the most powerful love between man and woman.

Once it was realized as the strongest love among mankind, it gradually took on a revolutionary connotation. William Godwin and William Morris, at the end of the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century, called the love among working people, the revolutionary solidity of the proletariate, as *fellowship*. Again the sense of the love between husband and wife dropped from the word. It was in this period of history that the Brontës and Mary Wollstonecraft tried to restore the lost meaning of *friendship*, that is, the love based on mutual assistance between equal man and woman.

II

Our next question is why love was free in Germanic communities:[7] why *friendship* was considered as *freedom*. It is often said that Germanic feudal society was characterized by serfdom, patriarchy, chivalry, Catholicism, and so on. But almost all of these characteristics had developed chiefly out of Latin culture. They functioned as the means of feudal government and exploitation. It was the ruling class, not the peasants, who enjoyed the benefits of them. Even Catholicism itself proved to them to be an effective tool to rule the peasants, and was, in reality, a spiritual support and coverture of tyranny.

The most characteristic feature of Germanic Community is the fact that it consisted, or was considered to consist, of *free* people, in the sense that the inhabitants were not slaves like those of the Graeco-Roman classical community. According to Pr. Ohtsuka, 'Each member of a family, though being governed by a patriarch (Munt), unlike the Roman classical *famulus*, had relatively independent rights (individual relation with others) towards the patriarch,

---

[7] Cf. Marx, *Formen* (op. cit.).

in regard of social status or of private occupation of wealth (including land)' and 'the ancient racial consanguineous relation had no substantial role from the beginning of the community'.[8] In other words, kinship was not such a close bond as *friendship*. This hypothesis is, of course, a little too far-fetched generalization. There were undoubtedly many exceptions. I am not going to neglect the recent historical and archaeological studies on ancient Germanic nations. But it will take too long to survey all the studies and controversies since Marx and Weber,[9] and let it suffice to say that F. Lütge, who was once sceptic of Weber's 'classical' theory, is now of the same opinion as Weber.[10] According to the 'classical' theory, Germanic tribes consisted of equal free people and they were proud of their liberty. As is well known, they had been invading Roman territory since the fourth century. Their invasion is commonly thought to have destroyed Roman civilization. It is true that they plundered Roman cities, though not so much as Romans did in the time of their expansion. But at the same time they broke down Roman slavery and Latifundium, where Catholic influence was relatively weak. The land was re-divided and re-distributed to each member of the communtiy, which eventually brought forth Feudalism over the whole territory of the West Roman Empire. Although their society was not a classless one, Germanic people, especially peasants, took over the conception of *freedom* from their forefathers, and some scholars today even think that the conception of modern individual liberty was formed by the working people during the 'Dark Ages'.[11] After feudalism was firmly established, the ruling class thought it to be both cumbersome and dangerous to regard the peasants[12] as their equals: the ruling class could not live on without the exploitation of the peasants.

The belief in universal human equality and liberty partly transformed itself into various non-economic enforcements (Ausserökonomische Zwänge) and lost its original meaning. For example, what was called 'frank-pledge' must have been 'freeman's pledge' at first, but later, at least by the thirteenth century, it had become nothing but a means through which feudal lords exploited the peasants. The co-operation of a neighbourhood for the sake of their own community as a whole now became the co-operation for the profit of their lords, leaving only the obligations in their hands.

But as the productive power increased, the popular belief in liberty sometimes violently resisted the tyranny of the lords, as in the fourteenth century Kent, and to a degree, liberated themselves from serfdom. Gradually the belief encouraged people to deny rents and corvée, and helped them to cast away the chains of bondage and at last made them claim the ownership of private land and personal freedom; these rights were subsequently to be legally guaranteed in the coming Capitalism.

In a typical village in England in the thirteenth century, there were about sixty houses

---

[8] *Kyodotai no Kiso-riron (Basic Theory of Community)*, 1955: my translation.

[9] Cf. Marx, *Formen* and Weber, *Der Streit um den Charakter der altgermanischen Sozialfassung*: Many criticisms have been made against Marx-Weber theory. Cf. H. Dannenbauer, 'Adel, Burg und Herrschaft', *Historische Jahrbuch*, 1941; A brilliant survey was written by Yozo Horigome: 'Ko-geruman Nosei o meguru Shomondai (Problems concerning the Agrarian Systems of Ancient Germanic People)', *Shigaku Zasshi (Historical Review)*, LIX, 8 (1950).

[10] 'Das Problem der Freiheit in der frühen deutschen Agrarverfassung', *Studien zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1963.

[11] Cf. Sidney Painter, *Feudalism and Liberty*, 1961 & Walter Ullman, *The Individual and Society in the Middle Ages*, 1966.

[12] Peasants here include the serfs, copy-holders, yeomanry and all other productive people in the Middle Ages.

inhabited by about three hundred people: that is, five persons in one house.[13]   The five members were usually a man, his wife and their three children; in other words, a *family* of five members, what anthropologists call 'nuclear family', occupied a house.[14]   Husband and wife worked together in the same field, or it may be more correct to say that they married *because* they worked in the same field.   Some scholars still think that women's tasks were to sew, to cook and serve meals, to keep the house clean, to nurse children, etc.[15]   But those scholars seem to be thinking of the wives of aristocracy or country gentlemen. Doubtlessly women's labour was indispensable for the cultivation of land.   Before the Industrial Revolution, Wordsworth's 'solitary reaper' could be found everywhere in rural England.   They ploughed fields, sowed seeds, manured, weeded, reaped, bundled, thrashed, ground, etc. hand in hand with men.   Of course only women could suckle their children, and only sturdy men could fell huge trees.   But at least in the fields they worked together, and most of their working hours were spent in the fields.   Through their co-operation they found and maintained their intimacy: *friendship* between husband and wife.   Perhaps the love of neighbourhood, *fellowship* among working members of a community, came next in strength.   Other modes of love, those between parents and children, between lords and servants or those of blood-relationship, might be regarded as either secondary to *friendship* or completely different from it, because they were not based on productive labour.

This sensibility is vividly represented in the medieval epics written in Germanic languages, especially in *Old Edda* and *Nibelungenlied*, in which *friendship* between husband and wife and *fellowship* of neighbourhood are stronger than loyalty and blood-relationship. Thus in *Hildebrandslied*, father and son fight to defeat each other for the sake of their respective communities.   In *Nibelungenlied*, Kriemhild kills her brother for the love of her late husband.   In these instances, we can perhaps find the tradition of Germanic love, nourished since the time of the ancient Germanic community: the love which can be born and can grow up only among those who are, at once, free, equal and independent.

To sum up, the *friendship* between a free man and a free woman   (1) excludes both aristocrats and slaves, because it is an intimate relationship between equal personalities and does require neither an inferior nor a superior, and   (2) dispels the metaphysical philosophy of mystic love (ex. Platonic love, Courtly love, Zaubergarten, though it might be 'vor-zauberung' and not '*ent*-zauberung') because it was based on co-operation and mutual assistance, i.e. working together in one house.   They could love each other without the help of magic wine or a string of golden hair carried by a dove, as in *Tristan und Isolde*.

III

To conclude this essay, I want to take up again the wedded love in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. He seems to have depicted in it the *friendship*, begot and nourished through the mutual ·help between Adam and Eve, though he uses the word *fellowship*, as I mentioned above.   For

---

[13] I think the best introductory book on this account is H.S. Bennett's *Life on the English Manor*, 1937, in which the lives of medieval people are vividly represented.   Many elaborate studies have been published since then, including *The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*, (*Cambridge Economic History*, vol. 1) ed. by M.M. Postan, 1966.

[14] Note the difference from *famulus* in Graeco-Roman Classical Community.

[15] For example, see D.P. Kerby, *The Making of Early England*, 1967 (esp. pp. 154-5).

example, Adam calls to Eve, before they take the forbidden fruit, as follows.

> Freely we serve,
> Because we freely love.

<div align="right">(V 538–9)</div>

When I first read these lines, I did not give them any particular consideration. But later I felt uneasy, and tried to interpret them as mechanically as possible: 'we serve each other from our own free will, because we love each other, obeying nothing but our free will, that is, not being forced to make love by someone else's will, whether divine or human.' If my interpretation is correct, as far as the grammatical meaning concerns, this is a unique, and, in a sense, revolutionary sort of love, which the Renaissance literature was completely ignorant of. The Renaissance literature was basically Catholic. It was the literature of aristocracy or that which was patronized by aristocracy; in other words, it was the literature of those who hated labour and wished to spend time leisurely if they could. The Garden of Eden in *Paradise Lost*, where Adam and Eve were situated, is neither what is called 'paradise', where people need not work to get delicious food, splendid clothing and shelter, nor those idyllic places like Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia or Andrew Marvell's Bermudas. Adam and Eve *must* work *incessantly*. At last they realize that there is too much labour for them, and Eve makes a proposal to 'divide (their) labours' (IX 214): in other words, she proposes what is called by sociologists 'industrial rationalization', or 'division of labour', which has a vital significance in Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. Adam and Eve began to work separately in different fields, and this brings them the mortal sin.

If we summarize the process schematically, their fall is due to the changing economic structure in the seventeenth century. In medieval age, in a Germanic agrarian community, man and woman did work together in one field, and this was the womb and nourishment of *friendship*. But during the period of what is called 'original accumulation (Ursprüngliche Akkumulation)' of capital, with the growth of early manufactures, the original agrarian communities began to decline. Industrialization and Enclosure deprived our *friendship* of its basis. Capitalism won over Feudalism: Bourgeois love triumphed over agrarian love.[16]

During the changing world, there sprung up several trends of philosophical minds, nostalgically reminiscent of the lost country life, such as Gerald Winstanley, the leader of the Diggers (or François Emile Baboeuf in France at the end of the eighteenth century or Leo Tolstoi in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century)[17]. But their wish to restore the ideal Germanic community was mercilessly trampled on by modern capitalism

---

[16] Haller calls Milton's love 'amour bourgeois', opposed to Renaissance love, 'amour courtois'. But I would rather call it 'amour paysan' or 'amour germain', because we are to find 'amour bourgeois' in the exact sense of the word at the end of the eighteenth century, in the age of Industrial Revolution and after. Cf. William Haller, 'Hail Wedded Love', *ELH*, 1946; repr. in Alan Rudrum ed., *Milton*, 1968. For the details, see my thesis, 'Milton and the Tradition of Germanic Love', in Masao Hirai ed., *Miluton to sono Jidai* (*Milton and his Age*), 1974.

[17] i.e. when respective countries were undergoing the change from feudalism to capitalism. Cf. 'Winstanley has a place in the transition from the backward-looking agrarian communism of the Middle Ages to modern socialism.' (Christopher Hill, 'Introduction' to *Winstanley, The Law of Freedom and other Writings*, 1973) By the way their philosophy must be distinguished from those of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and William Wordsworth. They loved nature, but not the 'cultivation of nature'. They listened attentively to the songs of birds, but not to the 'groans of peasants'.

in the following centuries. In place of *friendship*, out of a new society came a new sort of love: a mode of love which may be properly called *amour bourgeois*, as de-humanized as the new productive method itself. Woman's love and sex became a commodity, in the sense that manpower (Arbeitkraft) was now a commodity. Not only those poor girls in the streets, but housewives also were in reality not very different from commodities which were sold and bought in markets. Parents wished their daughters to be charming, beautiful, modest, to be able to speak French a little, but not to be academic nor pedantic, not to be obtrusive, because they *consciously* wished their daughters to be happy, but *unconsciously* to sell them at the highest price. Maidens themselves tried to be what was called 'a lady'. In a word, women lost their freedom and dignity.

In fact, in Merovingian Frankish Empire or in Anglo-Saxon England, according to Common Law, it was generally understood that any woman had the right to choose her husband if she wished so, and that no parents were permitted to force their daughter to marry without her consent. But in the middle of the eighteenth century, Lord Hardwicke's Law, on the contrary, forbade women to marry without their parents' consent. Thus, Mary Wollstonecraft and the Brontës were born in an age when Germanic love of *friendship* had completely disappeared. They seem to me to have struggled to recover it in the age of Capitalism, not only to liberate women, but also to enable man and woman to love each other as equal free beings.

Adam's 'we freely love' is the profession of 'free sex' in the profoundest meaning of the word. But freedom of sex under Capitalism is, as is seen everywhere today, like the freedom of managements or the freedom of exploitation, only to make men and women mere commodities. In this sense, the end of *Paradise Lost* is symbolical. As is well known, Adam and Eve are obliged to leave the Garden of Eden (Germanic community), and they wander into wilderness (Capitalism), yet unknown perhaps to Milton himself.

> The world was all before them, where to choose
> Their place of rest, and Providence their guide.
> They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
> Through Eden took their solitary way.[18]
>
> (XII 646–9)

Perhaps they may be unable to find the 'place of rest', as is shown in *Samson Agonistes*. But just compare these lines with the end of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and we shall realize in what stage of history Milton stood.

Milton, when he was thirty-four, declared:

> [The] pure and inbred desire of joining to a fit conversing soul in conjugal *fellowship* (which is properly called *love*) is stronger than death.
>> (*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, Milton's own italics)

Fellowship, here, is what I mean by *friendship* in this essay and, perhaps, nothing else.

---

[18] Few have paid attention to the alliteration in Milton's poems, but I think it is suggestive, especially when we think of his Germanic sensibility, because Anglo-Saxon poems are chiefly alliterative. Note '*w*ith *w*andering *s*teps and *s*low'. Besides, all the four lines begin with *th*-sound, and it appears eight times in all.