The life of Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald of Wales (c.1146 – c.1223) represents many facets of the Middle Ages: he was raised in a frontier society, he was educated in Paris, he worked for the kings of England and he unsuccessfully tried to climb the ecclesiastical ladder. He travelled widely, he met many high-ranking persons, and he wrote books in which he included more than one (amusing) anecdote about many persons. Up to this day, scholars have devoted a different degree of attention to Giraldus’ works: his ethnographical and historiographical works have been studied thoroughly, whereas his hagiographical writing has been left largely unexamined. This observation is quite surprising, because Giraldus’ talent as a hagiographer has been acknowledged long ago.

Scholars have already examined Giraldus’ saints’ lives independently, but an interpretation of his whole hagiographical œuvre is still a desideratum. This thesis proposed to fill this gap by following two major research questions. First of all, this thesis examined the particular way in which Giraldus depicted each saint. Furthermore, it explained why Giraldus chose / preferred a certain depiction of a particular saint.

Overall, an examination of the hagiographical art of writing of Giraldus Cambrensis offered insight into the way hagiography was considered by authors and commissioners and how this art was practiced during the twelfth and thirteenth century.
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Ein Gelehrter und seine Heiligen – Untersuchung des hagiographischen Œuvre des Gerald von Wales


Während sich die Forschung besonders auf die historiographischen und ethnographischen Werke dieses Autors konzentrierte, blieben die hagiographischen Arbeiten dieses Autors lange Zeit vernachlässigt. Die vorliegende Arbeit füllt diese Forschungslücke und bietet eine umfassende Untersuchung des gesamten hagiographischen Œuvre des Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald von Wales.

Insgesamt schrieb Gerald von Wales fünf hagiographische Werke, von denen vier Heiligenviten noch heute erhalten sind. Die Viten lassen sich wiederum den Lebensstationen ihres Autors zuordnen: St Davids (Vita S. Davidis und Vita S. Caradoci), Hereford (Vita S. Ethelberti) und Lincoln (Vita S. Remigii und Vita S. Hugonis). Bis auf die Vita des heiligen Karadoc sind heute alle Texte in mindestens einer Handschrift erhalten. Für die Untersuchung der noch erhaltenen Viten wurden die folgenden Forschungsfragen formuliert:

1. Wie stellt Gerald von Wales die einzelnen Heiligen dar?
2. Warum stellt Gerald von Wales die einzelnen Heiligen in der von ihm gewählten Form dar?
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Durch die Beantwortung dieser Fragen sollen am Beispiel der Werke des Gerald von Wales hagiographische Schreib- und Darstellungstechniken herausgearbeitet werden. Aus verschiedenen Gründen eignen sich dieser Autor und seine Werke besonders gut für diese Untersuchung:


Von den vier erhaltenen Viten des Gerald von Wales handelt es sich um zwei Fälle von Réécriture (*Vita S. Davidis* und *Vita S. Ethelberti*) und um zwei Eigenkompositionen (*Vita S. Remigii* und *Vita S. Hugonis*).

Zunächst wurden die Fälle von Réécriture untersucht (*Vita S. Davidis* in Kapitel 3 und *Vita S. Ethelberti* in Kapitel 4). Da die Vorlagen für Gerald’s Viten noch (zum Großteil) erhalten sind, konnte hier jeweils das Verhältnis von Hypo- zu Hypertext bestimmt werden. So war es in einem zweiten Schritt möglich, Bedeutungsverschiebungen und Darstellungsnuancen herauszuarbeiten, die Gerald’s Texte einzigartig machen. Für die bereits etablierten Heiligen konnte außerdem aufgezeigt werden, auf welche Weise sich Gerald in die (bereits vorhandenen) Darstellungstraditionen des Heiligen einreihen und wie er und seine Werke wiederum diese Darstellungstraditionen für zukünftige Generationen veränderten. Beispielsweise wurden im Fall der Davidsvita dort formulierte Abhängigkeitsansprüche noch Jahrhunderte später kontrovers diskutiert. Auch die *Vita S. Ethelberti* hatte einen nachhaltigen Einfluss auf die Kulttradition, denn viele der liturgischen Texte zu St Ethelbert von
Hereford beziehen sich auch auf die Darstellung des Heiligen nach Gerald von Wales.

Nach der Untersuchung der David- und Ethelbert-Vita widmete sich diese Arbeit den Viten der Bischöfe von Lincoln (Bischof Remigius und Bischof Hugo).


Im Falle der Vita S. Hugonis schrieb Gerald von Wales über seinen Zeitgenossen, Bischof Hugo von Lincoln. Auch hier zeigte der Vergleich mit weiteren Quellen, die Gerald sogar teilweise bekannt waren, dass sich seine Darstellung teilweise stark von der „historischen Wirklichkeit“ unterscheiden kann.

Besonderen Einfluss auf die Viten der Bischöfe von Lincoln hatte der Kult des ermordeten Erzbischofs Thomas Becket. Sein Leben zieht sich nicht nur wie ein roter Faden durch Teile der Remigius-Vita, die Darstellung von Bischof Hugo auf dem Treffen in Oxford ist ebenfalls an das Vorbild des heiligen Erzbischofs angepasst. Während etwa andere Quellen Bischof Hugos Weigerung zur Zahlung von zusätzlichen Geldbeträgen eher auf pragmatische Motive (etwa die finanzielle Situation des Bistums Lincoln) zurückführen, spitzt Gerald die Situation derartig zu, dass Bischof Hugo wie ein zweiter Thomas Becket wirkt, der die Speerspitze des Freiheitskampfes der englischen Kirche repräsentiert.


Die jeweils folgenden Kapitel (Kapitel 3.2, 4.2 und 5.2) beschrieben kurz die noch erhaltenen Handschriften und stellten die Frage nach den Abfassungsdaten der jeweiligen Vita. Während für die David-Vita zwei Fassungen aufgrund der noch erhaltenen Handschriften konkret
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nachgewiesen werden konnten, wurde beispielsweise für die Remigius-Vita herausgearbeitet, dass von mindestens drei Überarbeitungsphasen und damit von bis zu drei sehr unterschiedlichen Viten-Versionen auszugehen ist, von denen leider nur die letzte Version in einem Textzeugen erhalten ist. Außerdem wurde (neben den konkreten Textvorlagen für die Fälle von Réécriture) auf mögliche Quellen für die jeweiligen Viten hingewiesen.

Danach erfolgte die Interpretation der Texte anhand der oben dargelegten Forschungsfragen (Kapitel 3.3, 4.3 und 5.3 bis 5.5). Da die Vita S. Remigii und die Vita S. Hugonis nur noch in einer gemeinsamen Handschrift erhalten sind und davon auszugehen ist, dass diese Überlieferung auf Gerald von Wales zurückgeht, erfolgte auch eine Untersuchung der Makrostruktur. Kapitel 5.6 beleuchtete daher Elemente beider Viten, die eine Verbindung zwischen beiden Texten schaffen.


Ein Vergleich der vier Viten untereinander ergab nicht nur die persönlichen Präferenzen des Gerald von Wales im Hinblick auf Stil und Eigenschaften der betreffenden Heiligen (so legte Gerald in seiner Darstellung der Heiligen etwa besonderen Wert auf ihre Bildung, vgl. Kapitel sechs). Der Vergleich ergab auch, dass Gerald von Wales seine Heiligen – ganz gleich, ob es sich dabei um seit langem verehrte Heilige handelte oder solche, deren Heiligkeit noch in einem
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The life of Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald of Wales (c.1146 – c.1223) represents many facets of the Middle Ages: he was raised in a frontier society, he was educated in Paris, he worked for the kings of England and he unsuccessfully tried to climb the ecclesiastical ladder. He travelled widely, he met many high-ranking persons, and he wrote books in which he included more than one (amusing) anecdote about popes, kings, archbishops and many other persons of his lifetime. Up to this day, scholars have devoted a different degree of attention to Giraldus’ works: his ethnographical and historiographical works have been studied thoroughly, whereas his hagiographical writing has been left largely unexamined. This observation is quite surprising, because Giraldus’ talent as a hagiographer has been acknowledged long ago.

Overall, Giraldus wrote five vitae, of which four have come down to us in at least one manuscript. These vitae include the Vita S. Davidis, the Vita S. Ethelberti, the Vita S. Remigii and the Vita S. Hugonis. All saints have certain connections to important places of Giraldus’ biography: St Davids (Wales), Hereford (England), and Lincoln (England). The vitae of St David and St Ethelbert represent instances of réécriture, whereas the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, Remigius and Hugh, represent Giraldus’ original compositions. While St David and St Ethelbert have long been venerated vox populi, the saints of Lincoln still awaited their canonization.

Scholars have already examined Giraldus’ saints’ lives independently, but an interpretation of his whole hagiographical œuvre is still a desideratum. This thesis proposed to fill this gap by following two major research questions. First of all, this thesis examined the particular way in which Giraldus depicted each saint. Furthermore, it explained why Giraldus chose / preferred a certain depiction of a particular saint (causae scribendi and causae legendi aut audiendi).

Chapter two inquired into Giraldus’ biography. Each saint’s major place of veneration represents an important stage in Giraldus’ life. This chapter proved that Giraldus was integrated in the important ecclesiastical circles of each place and thus knew about plans these circles had for the cult of each saint. Furthermore, this chapter was also dedicated to Giraldus’ habit
of rewriting his own texts, which was also important for the composition of the saints’ lives (chapter 2.3).

Chapters three to five were dedicated to the saints’ lives. First of all, each saint was located in his historical framework (chapter 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1). After a brief description of the existing manuscripts, each life was dated and its possible sources were examined (chapter 3.2, 4.2, and 5.2 – in case of the réécriture, the hypotexts were examined, and in case of the original compositions, independent sources were chosen). Then, the texts themselves are interpreted. As the lives of the bishops of Lincoln have come down to us in one single manuscript which proves that Giraldus intended this special type of composition, the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh were examined both separately and as a complete composition (chapters 5.4 to 5.6). Finally, the causae scribendi and the causae legendi aut audiendi of each saint’s life were established (chapter 3.5, 4.4, and 5.7).

Chapter six was dedicated to the common grounds and the differences between each saint’s life. Furthermore, it inquired into the wider topics which denote Giraldus, the hagiographer. Fortunately, Giraldus was not a ‘genuine British’ author. He was influenced by norms, values, and concepts of saintliness which prevailed in many parts of Western Europe. Overall, an examination of the hagiographical art of writing of Giraldus Cambrensis offered insight into the way hagiography was considered by authors and commissioners and how this art was practiced during the twelfth and thirteenth century.
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1. A scholar and his saints: introduction

*Tanto namque propensiore opus est opera, tantoque singula prius elimanda videntur quam eliminanda, quanto scripto commendata se oculis multorum subicere non formidant, nec solum praesentibus sed futuris, argutorum simul subitura iudicium et offensorum*.

Well, writing is an even more serious business. All the more, it seems that single elements have to be elaborated rather than eliminated, when the content shall not shun the eyes of many readers, neither the present ones nor the future ones, for it will receive the judgement of tattlers as well as the judgement of offenders.

These are the words of Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald of Wales (c. 1146 – c. 1223). Giraldus was a scholar, a man of the court, and a man of the church. Having left Paris, where he lectured on the *Decretum Gratiani*3, he decided to follow the court, like Peter of Blois or Walter Map, his equally famous contemporaries. However, the court did not reward Giraldus’ skills, and so he turned his eye towards an ecclesiastical career. But in his lifetime, he never rose above his rank as archdeacon, although he was a candidate for the bishopric of St Davids (Pembrokeshire, Wales) for three times.

Throughout his life, Giraldus never ceased to be a scholar – a man of books, letters, and writing. In his extensive œuvre, he recorded many incidents from his travels and personal encounters, mixed with anecdotes and gossip. He met many high-ranking figures, and often incorporated more than one amusing anecdote about them in his writings. The pages of his books overflow with personal information about kings, like King Henry II and his sons; or popes, such as Pope Innocent III; or saints, like St Hugh of Lincoln.

---

1 *DK* p. 163–164. The translations in this thesis are mine, if not otherwise indicated. The orthography of Latin quotations has been normalized throughout the thesis without further indication.

2 Although Giraldus might be known today as ‘Gerald of Wales’, he never called himself ‘Cambrensis’. Instead, he seems to have preferred the title ‘archidiaconus Menevensis’ (Thorpe, Gerald of Wales, p. 9). Therefore, he will be called Giraldus throughout this thesis. For the different interpretations of the sobriquet ‘Cambrensis’, and the implications of its usage, cf. Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 16.

3 *RG*, p. 48.
Judging from certain quotations and frequent cases of rewriting, Giraldus took the art of writing very seriously.

So far, it is mainly historians who have studied Giraldus’ works. Although they have uncovered his thoughts and ideas, his œuvre still offers many opportunities for philologists, as Richard Loomis emphasized:

Literary critics have paid Giraldus less attention than have historians, but they could render a useful service by helping readers recognise his literary artistry and judge him in terms of the artistic aims he may address in a particular work. They might even help readers appreciate Giraldus’s obtrusive persona, that vain and garrulous literary man bristling with resentments.

This plea should be taken very seriously, for Giraldus’ texts are not easy to interpret. Although it might be argued that his œuvre is broad enough to offer an internal corrective, his writings also cover periods for which we have surprisingly little information. A famous example is Giraldus’ struggle as the champion of St Davids.

Furthermore, Giraldus had mastered the art of writing, as my examination will prove. He knew how to entertain and influence his intended audiences. Overall, Giraldus “is a thoroughly self-conscious and careful crafter of argument, deliberate in his use of sources and intended impact [...]. Gerald’s narrative style was not disordered, careless or mercurial, as has been previously suggested, but rather meticulous and thorough.” Or, to use a phrase coined by Robert Bartlett: “Gerald was neither a systematic nor an abstract thinker. What he liked best was telling stories.”

---

4 Cf. below, chapter 2.3.
5 Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s Homage to Hugh of Avalon, p. 29. Up to now, only a handful of scholars, including Georgia Henley, have devoted their attention to this task (cf. Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s Itinerarium Kambriae, p. 1–52).
6 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 44.
7 Cf. chapter 2.2.3 and, for a detailed analysis, Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, 1976, Revised Edition.
8 This knowledge is crucial: if the values propagated in a text run contrary to the values of the intended audience, the text loses its importance. At best, it is ignored, at worst, it is challenged (cf. Heffernan, Sacred Biography, p. 18).
9 Henley and McMullen, Gerald of Wales: Interpretation and Innovation in Medieval Britain, p. 6.
1.1 Giraldus Cambrensis: the state of research

Unfortunately, scholars have neglected this talented storyteller for a long time. Already in 1976, Michael Richter lamented that “Giraldus is still undeservedly neglected by British scholarship [...] and is only beginning to be discovered by continental scholars”11. More than four decades later, his claim is still partly valid, although conditions have been improving12.

More than once, Giraldus proves to be a lucky find for medievalists. Through his voluminous œuvre, we may access his thoughts, ideas, and experiences. But these are not only Giraldus’ thoughts and ideas. As Robert Bartlett wrote in a detailed biographical study of Giraldus’ life, an examination of Giraldus’ experiences “throws light on many of the complex processes of twelfth-century society”13.

Thanks to Giraldus’ power of observation, his shrewd humour, and his strong command of Latin, his texts still capture the attention of modern day readers. It is therefore no wonder that extracts from Giraldus’ works are often used as vivid illustrations in secondary literature. But when scholars are asked for their personal opinions on Giraldus, not all would necessarily echo in the praise voiced by John Edward Lloyd:

[… ] it may be said that nothing is so lifelike in the picture as Giraldus himself. The portrait could not be improved; a duller soul would have painted himself in dull, conventional tones of the right clerical hue; a wiser one, less charmingly open and frank in his vanity, would have drawn a stately and impressive figure, clad in robes of dignity and uprightness, and would never have been betrayed into those disclosures of weakness and folly which make Giraldus one of the most amusing and at the same time one of the most lovable men of his age.14

On the contrary, the statements that John Edward Lloyd considered amusing are described as “passages of bombast and self-adulation”15 by

---

11 Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 10–11.
12 Providing scholars with new, accessible editions might help to remedy this problem, because the most recent edition often dates back to the 19th century Rolls Series. In April 2020, a new Leverhulme funded research project was started: its aim is to publish new editions of Giraldus’ texts.
15 Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 75.
other scholars, who argue that these lines were written by “the supreme egotist of mediaeval England”\textsuperscript{16}. Giraldus thus divides the lines of academics.

Giraldus is often heavily criticized for the “bitterness, vanity and self-esteem”\textsuperscript{17} of his works (especially the later ones). Judging by statements Giraldus made in his letter to the chapter of Hereford, Giraldus’ contemporaries must have rebuked him as well. According to Giraldus’ report, they claimed that it would not befit a man of the church to devote his time to literary activities\textsuperscript{18}. Yet Giraldus assures his readers that he deliberately chose to ignore such accusations and to seek eternal favour and fame as an author\textsuperscript{19}.

Scholars have devoted a varying degree of attention to Giraldus’ vast œuvre. While his major historiographical / ethnographical works (\textit{Topographia Hibernica}, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, \textit{Descriptio Cambriae}, \textit{Itinerarium Cambriae}) have been thoroughly studied, the remaining corpus of his works has received only little attention. This is especially true for the saints’ lives.

\section*{1.2 Saints, cults and saints’ lives: a very short introduction}

Despite the heightened general interest in saints, their cults, and ‘hagiography’ / ‘hagiology’ / ‘hagiographischen Diskurs’/ ‘Hagiographik’ in general\textsuperscript{20}, Giraldus, the hagiographer, has long been neglected by scholarship\textsuperscript{21}. Although some lives (mainly the life of St David and the life

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Tupper Jr., A Mediaeval Egotist, p. 420.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Rigg, A History of Anglo-Latin literature 1066–1422, p. 93–94.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Cf. his apologia in \textit{LS}, p. 409–419.
\item \textsuperscript{19} \textit{LS}, p. 412. For an analysis of the letter, cf. Verger, Plus Libris quam Linguis: Giraud de Barri et l’Écriture d’après la "Lettre au Chapitre de Hereford" (vers 1221), p. 499–505.
\item \textsuperscript{20} The establishment of DFG-Forschergruppen (such as the project “Sakralität und Sakralisierung in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit. Interkulturelle Perspektiven in Europa und Asien”, which was based at the FAU Erlangen) or AHRC-funded projects like “Cult of Saints in Wales” (until 2017) and “Vitae Sanctorum Cambriæ: Latin Lives of the Welsh Saints” (until 2019) show the heightened interest in hagiographical studies. For differentiation between the terms, cf. Bührer, Heiligkeiten im Europäischen Früh- und Hochmittelalter, p. 13–14.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Michael Staunton has already examined Giraldus, the historian (cf. especially Staunton, The Historians of Angevin England, p. 95–107). Of course, it is difficult to divide a single author into separate ‘author-personalities’, because the different experiences will influence an author’s writings regardless of the type of genre he writes in. As Michael Staunton concludes, Giraldus could well have used hagiographical models for his historiographical
\end{itemize}
of St Hugh of Lincoln) have been examined before, a comparative study of Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre is still lacking. As Giraldus has been described as the “principal Welsh hagiographer of the later twelfth century”\(^{22}\), this observation is quite surprising.

But before we can turn to our examination of Giraldus, the hagiographer, we have to ask ourselves the following questions: What exactly is denoted by the term ‘saint’? Who was a saint? How could a person become a saint?

These questions are not easy to answer, as the amount of secondary literature proves. Since the foundations of scholarship were laid by Hippolyte Delehaye\(^{23}\), René Aigrain\(^{24}\) or Baudouin de Gaiffier\(^{25}\), a lot of secondary literature has been written. Among today’s standard texts, we may count works by Peter Brown\(^{26}\), Jacques Dubois and Jean-Loup Lemaître\(^{27}\), Réginald Grégoire\(^{28}\), Thomas Heffernan\(^{29}\) or André Vauchez\(^{30}\). These names represent just a tiny fragment of the huge quantity of secondary literature available\(^{31}\). While the secondary literature on hagiography is already vast, the number of hagiographical primary texts which are still unexamined is even greater.

Although the core attributes of saintliness may have been stable, its boundaries (and thus, the answer to the questions of what exactly denotes a saint and distinguishes him/her from those around him/her) have been shifting throughout the centuries, depending on the place / country and timeframe examined\(^{32}\).

---


\(^{23}\) Cf., for example, Delehaye, Die Hagiographischen Legenden, 1907 or Delehaye, Cinq Leçons sur la Méthode Hagiographique, 1934.

\(^{24}\) Aigrain, L’Hagiographie, 1953 (Reprinted 2000).


\(^{27}\) Dubois and Lemaître, Sources et Méthodes de l’Hagiographie Médiévale, 1993.


\(^{29}\) Heffernan, Sacred Biography, 1988.

\(^{30}\) Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, 2005.


\(^{32}\) A good starting point is Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 183–206. Weinstein and Bell tried to answer the question “Who was a saint?” in Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 141–163. The chapter provides first impressions of how complex the phenomenon of sanctity was / is and how many aspects of life it touches.
No one could choose to become a saint like, for example, one could choose to become a medievalist. Saintliness could only be recognized by the people surrounding that person. A saint could not exist separately from a society, for otherwise, there was no one to recognize his/her saintliness. Thus, the veneration of saints – their cult – reflects the norms and values of a particular society. However, societies changed, and so societies’ views on their saints changed, too. This phenomenon could produce even contradictory material: we only have to remind ourselves that Saint James the Apostle may have been a peaceful fisherman from the Sea of Galilee, but centuries later, he was imagined as a knight heading the Spanish army.

A definition of the cult of saints is as impossible as a definition of saintliness, since each cult is marked by a “persistence of a plurality of responses to manifestation of Christian faith”. As many different reasons for involvement in a saint’s cult exist. After all, saints served many purposes through the ages.

First of all, a special interest in a certain saint was primarily rooted in religious motives, devotional feelings, and didactic aims. Saints imitated Christ, and they served as role models for the proper behaviour of each Christian (scientia recte vivendi).

A saint also represented a connection between God and the faithful. It was easier to reach out to a saint, as saints are present in heaven as well as in their shrines. Relics also played a major role; after all, they once were part of the saint/saintly object. As a result, a saint may have been regarded as a type of ‘patron’, on whose intercessory powers the faithful relied. Following the principle of “Do, ut des”, the faithful who had received the

33 Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 185.
34 Goodich, Vita Perfecta, p. 3.
35 Bozóky, Introduction, p. 5.
39 Van’t Spijker, Model Reading, p. 137.
40 Wilson, Introduction, p. 11.
41 For example, the holy cross (Wilson, Introduction, p. 5). In many cases, the shape and material of relics as well as their power determined the way how a saint could (and would) be venerated (Ferrari, Körper und Ding, p. 131). A major medieval source concerned with the veneration of relics was written by Thiofrid of Echternach (cf. for further information on this matter Ferrari, Gold und Asche, p. 61–74 and Ferrari, Körper und Ding, p. 134–141).
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saint’s aid would bring *ex-voto* gifts in order to thank the saint for the support they had received\(^{42}\).

This principle highlights the economic aspect of the cult of saints. An effective saint represented economic advantages for the church and as a consequence, the veneration of saints was also a money-making business. The local church could take advantage of a saint’s fame in different ways. We only have to think of the beautifully adorned shrines, which could become very valuable. For example, in 1540, all the shrines of Lincoln were worth more than 2,600 ounces of gold and 4,200 ounces of silver\(^{43}\).

Furthermore, local churches could become great centres of pilgrimages. The benefits of a prosperous pilgrimage centre were not only felt by the church concerned, on the contrary, the local population and even adjacent churches could benefit from “ancillary pilgrimage services”\(^{44}\). The different pilgrimage centres competed with each other: obviously, a powerful saint attracted more pilgrims than an unknown saint\(^{45}\).

To ensure that the whole system worked properly, the population must have been familiar with the intercessory powers of the saint. With every sick person cured, the power of the saint spread (usually through word of mouth). The greater a saint’s fame, the more believers he would attract. The more believers visited a shrine, the more illnesses could be cured in turn. The more invalids were cured, the more believers would spread the word of the saint’s power. But the circle could also turn in the other direction. “Unless a saint was venerated by the local population, no miracles would follow, hence no publicity or special literature, hence no pilgrims and no income”\(^{46}\).

Some churches knew how to spread their saints’ fame. From the records at Hereford, we can deduce that a marketing campaign was launched for the shrine of the newly canonized St Thomas de Cantilupe († 1282, canonized 1320)\(^{47}\). Many more instances of (un)successful marketing for saints and

---

\(^{43}\) Woolley, St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 187.
\(^{45}\) Birch, Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change, p. 6.
\(^{46}\) Sharp, Æthelbert, King and Martyr: the Development of a Legend, p. 60.
\(^{47}\) Swanson and Lepine, The Later Middle Ages, 1268–1535, p. 73.
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their relics could be enumerated. Overall, cults “did not simply develop: they were developed”\textsuperscript{48}.

The religious elite of a saint’s community often had private interests in the fostering of a saint’s cult. Members of this elite could commission a saint’s vita in order to ensure that the fame of their particular saint was properly spread\textsuperscript{49}. Well written texts could help to promote the cult. Such texts usually comprised a saint’s biography and accounts of miracles that he had wrought post mortem\textsuperscript{50}.

Hagiographical texts could also serve as instruments to establish the power and authority of a church\textsuperscript{51}. For example, the life of St Remy of Reims, written by his successor Hincmar, was used predominantly to establish Hincmar’s position against the king and his fellow-bishops\textsuperscript{52}. Saints and their deeds were used to defend territorial claims of a particular church – a phenomenon often attested for Welsh saints’ lives of the 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{53}. While religious or didactic aims and purposes were usually openly proclaimed, these secondary aims often lie buried within the text\textsuperscript{54}. This is one major reason why saint’s lives must be examined carefully.

In a number of cases, saints’ vitae already existed, but were perceived to be out-dated for a number of reasons. Thus, authors were engaged to rewrite these texts, a phenomenon that is called ‘réécriture / rewriting’\textsuperscript{55}. Vitae had

\textsuperscript{48} Ridyard, The Royal Saints of Anglo-Saxon England, p. 5. And sometimes, even modern scholars can easily be deceived when assessing the role and popularity of a cult. In his examination of the cult of St Dunstan at Canterbury, Alan Thacker noted that the initial impression of a prospering legend of St Dunstan “seems to have resided largely in a few pious embroideries of some rather commonplace anecdotes, by an ‘outside’ author commissioned to write a work which the community at Christ Church was either too indifferent or too ignorant to provide for itself” (Thacker, Cults at Canterbury: Relics and Reform under Dunstan and his Successors, p. 225).

\textsuperscript{49} Michele C. Ferrari emphasized the profound connection between saints and their (written) sources (Ferrari, Inquisitione Diligenti et Fideli. Beglaubigungsstrategien und Hagiologische Recherchen im Mittelalter, p. 226).

\textsuperscript{50} Welsh saints’ lives seem to prefer to record miracles in vita (Smith, Oral and Written, p. 340).

\textsuperscript{51} Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 296.

\textsuperscript{52} Nahmer, Die Lateinische Heiligenvita, p. 106.

\textsuperscript{53} Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{54} Coué, Hagiographie im Kontext, p. 172.

\textsuperscript{55} “Par réécriture on entend la rédaction d’une nouvelle version (hypertexte) d’un texte préexistant (hypotexte), obtenue par des modifications appelées formelles si elles affectent le signifiant (et elles sont alors d’ordre quantitatif, structurel ou linguistique), semantiques ou conceptuelles si elles affectent le signifié” (Goullet, Vers une Typologie des Réécritures Hagiographiques, à Partir de Quelques Examples du Nord-Est de la France. Avec une Édition Synoptique des Deux Vies de Saint Èvre de Toul, p. 110). The examination of réécriture is a
to be rewritten for a number of reasons. Some of these are related to the unstable boundaries of the concept of saintliness: Customs and norms of (saintly) behaviour could have changed, the texts were regarded as outdated and barbaric, or they were translated from one language to another. In extreme cases of réécriture, the new hypertext could represent an almost complete transformation of its hypotext, although elements of the templates would be preserved nevertheless.

Overall, the number of saints’ lives produced during the Middle Ages grew rapidly. The Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina lists more than 8,000 saints’ lives, which means that nearly everyone had encountered these texts in one way or another during the Middle Ages. Some vitae became standard models on which later writers leaned. For the 12th century, these models included the life of St Anthony by Athanasius, the life of St Benedict by Gregory the Great, and Sulpicius Severus’ Vita Martini. But, while the core attributes of saintliness may have been quite stable throughout the centuries, its boundaries were unstable. Thus, behind the term ‘hagiography’, we must not expect to find a clear-cut textual genre.

---

57 Not only in terms of style, but also in cultural terms: Robert Bartlett speaks of a “spirit of smug cultural superiority that seems to have predominated amongst those rewriting Irish, Welsh or Scottish Lives” (Bartlett, Cults of Irish, Scottish and Welsh Saints in Twelfth-Century England, p. 85–86).
59 Deploige, Écriture, Continuation, Réécriture: La Réactualisation des Miracles Posthumes dans l’Hagiographie des Pays-Bas Méridionaux, ca 920 – ca 1320, p. 22.
60 Cf. the caveat voiced in Gray, Saints on the Edge: Reconfiguring Sanctity in the Welsh March, p. 91.
63 Cf. the examination of Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 183–206.
64 Nahmer, Die Lateinische Heiligenvita, p. 3.
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Scholars tend to attribute hagiographical texts either to the categories “historiographical” or “biographical”.

Unfortunately, this broad division is not suitable for my examination of Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre: Overall, Giraldus composed six biographical texts. These are the lives of St David, St Caradoc, St Ethelbert, Remigius of Lincoln, St Hugh of Lincoln, and Geoffrey Plantagenet.

Of these six lives, only five are hagiographical vitae: The life of Geoffrey Plantagenet, archbishop of York and illegitimate son of King Henry II, is not a hagiographical text. This division was not only drawn by secondary literature; even Giraldus excludes Geoffrey’s vita from the corpus of the remaining lives. In Giraldus’ Catalogus Brevior, which is basically a list of his books, the life of Geoffrey Plantagenet is classed under a different heading than the remaining lives:


Item, Liber de promotionibus et persecutionibus Gaufredi Eboracensis Archiepiscopi; quia nec in cunabulis aut celsitudine generis, nec in divitiis aut fortunae blanditiis spes ponenda, exemplum praebens.

Furthermore, [I have written] a book about saints’ lives; namely, the life of St David, archbishop of St Davids; the life of the noble St Caradoc, a confessor of the very same place; the life of St Ethelbert, the famous martyr of Hereford, the life of St Remigius, the first bishop of Lincoln; and the life of St Hugh, who was the fifth bishop after Remigius had been bishop of the very same place.

---

65 Cf., for example, Delehaye, Cinq Leçons sur la Méthode Hagiographique, p. 7.
66 Cf., for example, Berschin, Biographie und Epochenstil im Lateinischen Mittelalter, Band I: Von der Passio Perpetuae zu den Dialogi Gregors des Großen, p. 17.
67 Unfortunately, besides the preface which is preserved in Symbolum Electorum, the life of St Caradoc has not come down to us (cf. Plass and Thompson, (in preparation), The Scholar and His Saints: Gerald of Wales and the Vita S. Karadoci, for further information). Although Remigius of Lincoln is usually styled sanctus in Giraldus’ texts, I will refrain from using this title. In contrast to St David, St Ethelbert or St Hugh, Remigius of Lincoln was never canonized.
68 Cf. exemplarily Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 33–34.
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Then, [I wrote] a book about the promotions and persecutions of Geoffrey, archbishop of York, because it serves as an example that hope should neither be put in descent, nor in the power of one’s family; neither in the riches nor in the flattery of fortune.

A similar impression can be gained from the *Epistola ad Capitulum Herefordense*. In this letter, the life of Geoffrey is not treated immediately after the saints’ lives. On the contrary, it is mentioned at an even later point in the text.\(^7^0\) As Giraldus himself obviously considered his life of Geoffrey Plantagenet to be different from his hagiographical texts, the work is not an object of investigation for my thesis. Furthermore, I will not assign the hagiographical works to the category of ‘biographical’ material. However, this does not mean that Giraldus’ hagiographical output should be assigned to the category of ‘historiographical’ material. In the case of Giraldus, we are dealing with a very inventive author, as Cam Grey observed exemplarily for the life of Remigius:

Gerald effectively combined the ‘secular’ and the ‘sacred’ elements of biographical writing in the project he undertook for the cathedral of Lincoln. [...] Consequently, the text fits with other contemporary historical undertakings, for it marries the historiographical project with the urge towards documentation in a contemporary context. But it is also tempting to interpret this as a piece of exemplary biography in the mode of the Second Sophistic author, Plutarch, for to his list of bishops’ lives Gerald added a further section of six contemporary churchmen, arranged in three sets of pairs. This paired structure is clearly intentional, and speaks to Gerald’s boldness in simultaneously combining and appreciating the generic opportunities provided by a number of complementary biographical forms.\(^7^1\)

Based on these considerations, I do not deem it possible to decide whether Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre should be interpreted as ‘historiographical’ or ‘biographical’ writing.\(^7^2\)

---

\(^7^0\) The life of Geoffrey is mentioned on page 414, while the saints’ lives are grouped on p. 416–417. (Cf. *LS*, p. 414–417). Interestingly, the additional remark on the life of Geoffrey is the same as in the *Catalogus*.

\(^7^1\) Grey, Historiography and Biography from the Period of Gildas to Gerald of Wales, p. 340.

\(^7^2\) Cf. also Marc van Uytfanghe, who concluded for *vitae* of the early Middle Ages that a greater part of them was both historiographical and biographical writing, “aber immer wieder in wechselnden Verhältnissen” (Uytfanghe, Die Vita im Spannungsfeld von Legende, Biographik und Geschichte, p. 206). Consequently, I will refrain from such classifications as, for example, Richard W. Southern designed (for his classification of four main patterns, cf. Southern, Saint Anselm and His Biographer, p. 320–328). This approach had been
1.3 Outline of this work

The twelfth century is a crucial period for the development of the British Isles. We are fortunate that Giraldus lived throughout this century and that he was a loquacious and productive writer, whose œuvre can offer us access to this time. Giraldus’ hagiographical texts represent a chance to assess different processes. For example, his life of St David and his life of St Ethelbert are instances of réécriture of older vitae. But how did people in the 12th century treat these older vitae? How did the obvious changes to religious norms, standards, and practices affect the process of rewriting? And why did the commissioners for new saints’ lives order these new texts at all?

Similar questions may be asked in case of the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh. Giraldus composed both vitae without a pre-existing hypotext he could rely on. How did Giraldus portray both bishops? What events did he focus on, what events in their lives did he omit? If we compare Giraldus’ depiction of events with the narrations of other (contemporary) authors, we may ask how and why Giraldus’ depiction differs from theirs. Furthermore, we may ask ourselves: how did the increasing standardization of the canonization procedure influence the composition of both lives?

These are only some of the questions, which point to the causae scribendi and causae legendi aut audiendi of the saints’ lives with which my thesis is concerned.

For each vita Giraldus composed, he had to have in mind the prerequisites of his specific audience. Because of his biographical background, Giraldus was at home in different cultural areas. His travels and labours had also brought him into contact with different layers of society. Each of our vitae can be assigned to a certain place in the Anglo-Norman realm: The lives of St David and St Caradoc have ties to St Davids (Pembrokeshire, Wales), while St Ethelbert was the patron saint of Hereford (Herefordshire, England). The last remaining vitae deal with the bishops of Lincoln (Lincolnshire, England). Giraldus had personal connections with each of

__________________________


these places and intensive contacts with their local communities\textsuperscript{74}. Some of his acquaintances would play an important role in the development of the saint’s cult, as did, for example, Adam of Eynsham and Dean Roger of Rolleston during the canonization of St Hugh.

To take into account his personal involvement in each saints’ cult, chapter two examines Giraldus’ biography as well as the historical and social environment against which he must be measured. It traces the major influences on his œuvre by taking into consideration the social and the historical background of his time and his general habit of rewriting his texts.

The next chapters are dedicated to the examination of Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre. His œuvre may be divided into two broad groups: the réécritures (\textit{Vita S. Davidis}, \textit{Vita S. Ethelberti}) and Giraldus’ original compositions (\textit{Vita S. Caradoci}, \textit{Vita S. Remigii}, and \textit{Vita S. Hugonis}). While the first two vitæ are discussed in separate chapters, Giraldus’ surviving original compositions – the lives of the bishops of Lincoln – depend so heavily on each other that they will be discussed in the same chapter.

The chapters follow the same pattern: First of all, I will deal with information on the ‘historical’ figure of the saint and outline major lines of the development of his cult\textsuperscript{75}. Having considered these points, I will assess the possible dates when Giraldus finished the composition of each vita, and the possible sources he drew upon. Afterwards, the content of each life will be interpreted. Finally, I will assess Giraldus’ reasons for composition and his intended audience (\textit{causa scribendi} and \textit{causa legendi aut audiendi}). The conclusions drawn from chapter two (Giraldus’ biography) and from the first part of each saint’s chapter provide the background for the examination of each saint’s life\textsuperscript{76}.

In case of the life of St David and the life of St Ethelbert, my interpretation focuses on the comparison of Giraldus’ particular hypertext with its corresponding hypotext. I will highlight points where Giraldus diverged from his templates and work out why he chose to include or omit certain

\textsuperscript{74} Cf. chapter 2.2 for more information on Giraldus’ connections with St Davids, Hereford, and Lincoln.

\textsuperscript{75} As this thesis is concerned with the hagiographical œuvre of Giraldus Cambrensis, any additional information offered on the cult of saints before and after Giraldus will only serve as a rough outline. Much more could be said, but to provide a full examination of each saint’s cult is beyond the scope of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{76} A similar method was used by Stephanie Coué (cf. her explanation: Coué, Hagiographie im Kontext, p. 23–24).
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aspects. By comparing these texts, I will be able to determine the art of Giraldus, the hagiographer, when he was asked to re-write saints’ lives.

In case of the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh, we are dealing with original compositions. Thus, the interpretation will focus on how Giraldus structured each vita in order to create a special image of the saint. If I can determine how a particular saint is represented, I may conclude why and for which audience Giraldus wrote his text (causa scribendi and causa legendi aut audiendi). I propose that Giraldus wrote his texts with a particular audience in mind, and if he wanted the audience to accept and value his text, he had to shape it according to the expectations of this particular group. But we cannot expect that the target-audience of, for example, the life of St David is the same as the target-audience of the life of St Hugh. As Simon Meecham-Jones remarks, Giraldus did not receive constant patronage from either one dynastic or religious faction. As a result, he addressed different kinds of audiences with his works over the course of his life77.

My goal is to detect what image of each saint Giraldus wanted to create and what measures he applied to achieve his goal, either in the process of rewriting or in his original compositions.

The final chapter will bring together the results of each saint’s chapter, so that we may determine the art of Giraldus, the hagiographer.

The cult of saints has a more profound cultural impact than many modern readers might acknowledge: St David is considered the patron saint of Wales, although the Anglican church usually does not venerate saints in the same way as the Roman Catholic church78. Although the relics of St Ethelbert of Hereford were lost in the 11th century, a new shrine was erected at Hereford Cathedral in 2007 to honour the saint79. Bishop Remigius of Lincoln was never officially canonized and consequently, his grave survived the Reformation and was intact when it was opened at the beginning of the 20th century80. Remigius’ successor, Hugh of Lincoln, enjoyed a great reputation as a saint during the Middle Ages. When the body of St Hugh

77 Meecham-Jones, Style, Truth and Irony: Listening to the Voice of Gerald of Wales’s Writings, p. 129. Georgia Henley suggests that this may be also one reason why Giraldus constantly revised his texts – they had to fit the taste of different audiences of possible patrons (Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s Itinerarium Cambriae, p. 50).
78 For more information on his matter, cf. especially Tudor Edwards, Last Man Standing, p. 293–319.
79 Tavinor, Shrines of the Saints: In England and Wales, p. 157.
was (possibly) detected during excavations in Victorian times, it was hidden in an unknown grave, out of fear that “if it were known where his body was it might become a centre of a cult or of pilgrimages” 81.

An examination of Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre may provide insights into his methods, motivations and, of course, into the wider cultural influences that shaped Giraldus’ writings and were finally re-shaped by them. It has yet to be established whether a thread runs through all the saints’ lives or whether Giraldus applied different concepts of sanctity for “Welsh” (St David) and “English” (St Ethelbert, St Remigius, and St Hugh) audiences. Neither do we know if the vitae differ, because some saints had already been venerated for a long time (St David and St Ethelbert), whereas others were awaiting their canonization (Remigius and St Hugh). Finally, we may determine whether Giraldus proceeded differently when he had a hypotext to follow (the lives of St David and St Ethelbert are rewritings of older vitae) or if he applied other measures when no previous vita existed which he could rely on (Remigius and St Hugh).

Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre offers scholars different points from which saints, their cults, and hagiographical writing itself may be studied. Furthermore, we are exceptional lucky that Giraldus himself is no obscure Anonymus. Giraldus was raised in what today is Wales, he (was) taught in modern France and wrote in both modern Wales and England, about saints of the “present” and about saints who came from a distant and, in the case of St David and St Ethelbert, – from an Anglo-Norman viewpoint – also from a foreign past. A comparative study of Giraldus ideas and his working techniques on hagiographical material is not a study of a genuine “British” author. Instead, it may offer us glimpses of Western European norms, values, and concepts of saintliness in the transitional period from the twelfth to the thirteenth century.

---

2. The life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis

Giraldus, archdeacon of St Davids – as he called himself in the preface accompanying the lives of Remigius and St Hugh of Lincoln\(^2\) – lived from c. 1146 to c.1223.

On the one hand, gathering information about his life seems easy. Several of Giraldus works cover periods of his own lifetime, like his autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, or the account of his deeds as champion of the church of St Davids (*De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*). Even the paucity of manuscripts does not necessarily present a problem: Although *De Rebus*, for example, has only come down to us in parts, the missing sections can be supplemented from Giraldus’ remaining works. In general, only a few question marks remain. They mostly refer to very early and very late stages of Giraldus’ life.

Overall, we are able to form a fairly accurate picture of the life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis. Several scholars have undertaken the task of collecting all biographical details that can be deduced from Giraldus’ texts.

Among the best articles about Giraldus’ biography are Frederick Maurice Powicke, “Gerald of Wales”\(^3\), James Conway Davies, “Giraldus Cambrensis”\(^4\), and Michael Richter, “Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death”\(^5\). Three books which all have a slightly different focus must be mentioned as well: Michael Richter, “Giraldus Cambrensis”\(^6\), Harold E. Butler, “The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales”\(^7\), and Robert Bartlett, “Gerald of Wales”\(^8\).

---

\(^2\) *VR*, p. 3.
\(^3\) Powicke, Gerald of Wales, p. 389–410.
\(^6\) Cf. Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, 1976, Revised Edition. This study focuses on Giraldus’ time as champion of St Davids.
\(^7\) Butler, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, 1937 (reprinted 2005). Harold Butler assembled Giraldus’ biography by collecting the different biographical information found throughout Giraldus’ œuvre. The book contains in many cases the only translation of certain texts.
\(^8\) Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, 2006. This is the standard study on Giraldus’ life and thought. Another biography, albeit shorter, was written by Brynley Roberts (Roberts, Gerald of Wales, 1982). It has a slightly different focus than Bartlett’s work, but does not offer any references (that is, it contains no foot- or endnotes).
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Thanks to instances of self-insertion, we even know roughly what Giraldus would have looked like. Apparently, he was a man with an impressive and distinctive appearance. In *Speculum Ecclesiae*, Giraldus mentioned that he was complimented on his good looks by an acquaintance of Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury. Once he had seen Giraldus, the man exclaimed:

*Putasne ulla tenus mori possit tam pulchra iuventus?*

Would you think that such beauty of youth could ever die?

Several years later, as Giraldus reports, he was recognized by his pursuers in a group of people because of his tall stature and shaggy eyebrows.

These anecdotes may leave the impression that reconstructing Giraldus’ life is a straightforward task, because we possess all the necessary information. Unfortunately, quite the opposite is true. When we examine Giraldus’ biography, we are often relying on his own works alone. Giraldus is rarely mentioned by his contemporaries. For example, Gervase of Canterbury († 1228) and Roger of Howden (†1201/1202) dedicate only a few lines to the bustling archdeacon.

Of course, we have to bear in mind that Giraldus’ texts do not provide any impression of an “historical accurate” life. Instead, his works show us how he wanted his life to be remembered by future generations. Besides instances of conscious manipulation, we also have to take into account instances of unconscious manipulation. Furthermore, Giraldus is a surprisingly inaccurate narrator: he may describe events and give the specific dates when they occurred, but such information cannot be completely relied on.

However, as the following subchapters will show, a close biographical examination of the life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis is worth the

---

89 Cf. the description in Williams, An Old Man Remembers: Gerald the Welshman, p. 7.
90 *Spec.*, p. 104.
91 *JS*, p. 293.
93 Cf. Wada, Gerald on Gerald: Self-Presentation by Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 223–246 for further information on the subject.
95 Cf. Kay, Gerald of Wales and the Fourth Lateran Council, p. 88 for the question of why Giraldus’ date specifications cannot be trusted unquestioningly.
effort, because his life offers us remarkable insights into Norman and Welsh, English and French, political and ecclesiastical history during the transitional period from the twelfth to the thirteenth century.

2.1 Contextualizing Giraldus Cambrensis

Well, because the children of Nesta have held seven cantrefs in Wales, besides Cardigan, of which they once possessed a greater part as well, and because they have acquired some thirty or more cantrefs in Ireland, no one can truly say or should be serious when he says that the offspring of Nesta lives in what is only a corner of Pembroke.

The quotation is taken from the second book of Giraldus’ autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*. In this passage, he narrated an event that took place at Hereford. The local bishop, William de Vere († 1198), entertained an assembly of several important Norman and Welsh personalities, and Giraldus was present at this meeting. Also in attendance was the Welsh prince of Deheubarth, Rhys ap Gruffydd, also known as ‘the Lord Rhys’. Lord Rhys was not only one of the most important leaders of South Wales, but also one of Giraldus’ kin. Both men were related via the Welsh princes Nesta, who was Giraldus’ grandmother and Rhys’ aunt.

At some point during the meeting, Giraldus and Rhys started to discuss their common family background. The question arose as to whose family branch possessed more power. Rhys claimed all the glory and Giraldus would not consent on this matter. He underlined the widespread influence of his family branch by pointing out their possessions, which were not only

96 *RG*, p. 59.
97 We are unfamiliar with the concrete nature of this meeting, but it is usually accepted that Giraldus may have acted as an ambassador of the court (the suggestion was made by Lloyd, *A History of Wales*, p. 561).
located in Wales, but also in Ireland\textsuperscript{99}. In the end, Giraldus reports that Rhys acknowledged the superiority of his argument.

As this scene demonstrates, Giraldus’ family belonged to a wider network of kinship, that spread over Wales and Ireland. These countries were the main footholds of the “Geraldines”.

For Giraldus, the heartland of his kin must have lain at Manorbier Castle, where he was born in about 1146. Giraldus’ deep connection with his place of origin is obvious: In his \textit{Itinerarium}, he described Manorbier Castle as the most beautiful spot in Wales:

\textit{Terrarum igitur omnium Kambriae totius, septem cantaredis conserta Demetia tam pulcherrima est quam potissima; Demetiae vero, Pembrochia; Pembrochiae quidem, terra praescripta. Restat igitur, ut Kambriae totius locus sit hic amoenissimus\textsuperscript{100}}.

If we look at the whole of Wales, Dyfed, which consists of seven cantrefs, is the most beautiful and powerful. But out of Dyfed, Pembroke is the most beautiful and powerful one, of course, and out of Pembroke, the land that I have just described. Consequently, this place is the most scenic spot in all Wales.

Besides its tremendous beauty, Manorbier Castle and its surrounding area are of historical importance, too. The castle symbolizes a history of Norman and Welsh people, which may be exemplarily illustrated by Giraldus’ kin and its past. Although Giraldus might not have been aware of it, the history of Wales had a profound impact on his life\textsuperscript{101}. Before examining this, it is necessary to have a look at events that happened long before Giraldus was born.

Throughout its history, Wales was never a homogeneous country. Perhaps it may be best described as a “patchwork quilt”. Although leading figures from different parts of Wales emerged here and there throughout its history, the country stayed divided most of the time. “Political particularism seemed as natural to Wales as did geographical fragmentation and regional loyalties. The three indeed fed upon one

\textsuperscript{99} The family also possessed estates in England, because Giraldus’ uncle William had received land in Devon as compensation for the lordship he had lost to his cousin, Lord Rhys (Roderick, Marriage and Politics in Wales, 1066–1282, p. 6–7).

\textsuperscript{100} \textit{IK}, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{101} Walker, Gerald of Wales, p. 63.
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another“102. Giraldus and his contemporaries were also aware of these problems. In his Descriptio Kambriae, Giraldus claimed that the Welsh would be unconquerable, if they only were inseperable103.

However, this decentralization had another important consequence: Wales resisted the Norman conquerors for about two hundred years longer than its neighbour England104.

During Giraldus’ lifetime, Manorbier Castle and large parts of the surrounding area were completely under neither Welsh nor Norman control. The castle was located in an area called the “March”105. The word itself may be translated as border region, “but in Wales it came to have a particular meaning as a result of the establishment of marcher lordships“106.

When William the Conqueror subdued England in 1066, Wales lay outside his field of vision107. He concentrated on vanquishing England. But Wales began to pose problems, when the Welsh attacked settlements near the border108 and allied with Anglo-Saxon rebels109. The threatening of his border forced William to react. At his Western frontier, William founded three earldoms that were situated at Chester, Shrewsbury, and Hereford, and had castles built in order to secure peace110. These earldoms enjoyed

102 Davies, The Age of Conquest, p. 15.
103 DK, p. 226: Si igitur inseparabiles fieri vellent, et insuperabiles valde fiere possent.
104 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 19.
106 Carr, Medieval Wales, p. 36. In applying this term, I will follow the terminology of modern historians who thereby signify “the congeries of lordships carved out in Wales between 1067 and 1283” (Lieberman, The Medieval March of Wales: The Creation and Perception of a Frontier, 1066–1283, p. 5). Even in Giraldus’ times, it was sometimes uncertain which place belonged to the March and which one did not (Lieberman, The Medieval 'Marches' of Normandy and Wales, p. 1358–1359).
107 According to Robert R. Davies, Wales “was utterly peripheral to their ambitions and concerns” (Davies, The Age of Conquest, p. 27). For the events leading to the Conquest, the Battle of Hastings and William’s coronation, cf. especially Bates, William the Conqueror, p. 191–200 and p. 206–257.
108 The concept of a ‘frontier’ is, of course, a very vague one, for large Welsh communities existed on both sides of this ‘border’ (Daniell, From Norman Conquest to Magna Carta: England 1066–1215, p. 62).
109 Davies, The Age of Conquest, p. 28.
110 Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 69.
greater autonomy than usual, and it was with these earldoms that the “March” began to be established\textsuperscript{111}.

Wales underwent a distinctive change. This becomes obvious when we look at the names with which the country is described in literature: Up to the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, most Welsh authors called their country Britannia, while the term Wallia was mainly applied by non-Welsh writers\textsuperscript{112}. Giraldus and his contemporaries also recognised the existence of two terms for one country. At the beginning of his Descriptio Kambriae, Giraldus explained that the term Wallia was a foreign word and that the original name of Wales had been Kambria\textsuperscript{113}.

Over the course of time, more and more soldiers of fortune made for the border. The Norman arrival was not always regarded as a potential threat. The local Welsh Lords in the the South, for example, welcomed the newcomers as military support against their Welsh Rivals\textsuperscript{114}.

Initially, before the Crown became involved, the Norman invasion of Wales may have started as a type of private baronial campaign\textsuperscript{115}. Men who occupied the lesser ranks could make their fortune in the border areas of England and Wales. One of these men was Gerald of Windsor, Giraldus’ grandfather.

The Church also played a role in the shaping of the March. The Welsh Church before the Norman Conquest is often depicted as “a world of bishops without cathedral, of dioceses based on the units of secular

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{111} According to Max Lieberman, the foundations that would shape the history of the March for more than two centuries were established under William the Conqueror (Lieberman, The March of Wales 1067–1300, p. 22). However, different opinions about the beginnings of the ‘March’ prevail among scholars. A recent summary may be found in Lieberman, The Medieval ‘Marches’ of Normandy and Wales, p. 1359–1360.
\item\textsuperscript{112} Davies, The Age of Conquest, p. 4.
\item\textsuperscript{113} \textit{DK}, p. 165: \textit{Kambria, quae adulterino vocabulo, usitatoque magis sed proprio minus, modernis diebus Wallia dicitur}. Huw Pryce examined the different use of words for Wales and its people. He remarks that the term Cambria was maybe “largely restricted to Southwest Wales, particularly St Davids” (Pryce, British or Welsh? National Identity in Twelfth–Century Wales, p. 798). Cf. also Davies, The Identity of ‘Wales’ in the Thirteenth Century, p. 45–63 and Rhys Roberts, A Surfeit of Identity? Regional Solidarities, Welsh Identity and the Idea of Britain, p. 247–278.
\item\textsuperscript{114} Maund, The Welsh Kings, p. 73.
\item\textsuperscript{115} Davies, A History of Wales, p. 108–109. The history of the March was partially determined by lesser Normans who did not occupy the first ranks of power, because the leading Norman lords had to spend a greater part of their time outside the March near their king (Davies, A History of Wales, p. 113).
\end{itemize}
authority and waying and wayning with them, and of hereditary abbots”\textsuperscript{116}. The structure of this church was different than the monastic structures the Normans knew from the continent\textsuperscript{117}.

By and by, the pre-existing church-structures were overthrown and the Church of Wales was turned into a “diocesan church on Roman lines”\textsuperscript{118}. The more land the Normans conquered, the more powerful became the influence of the Church. Already in 1092, an Anglo-Norman nominee was promoted to the bishopric of Bangor\textsuperscript{119}.

As the English king claimed supremacy over Welsh kingdoms, so did the Archbishop of Canterbury claim primacy over the Welsh bishoprics\textsuperscript{120}. By 1120, the dioceses of Bangor, Llandaff and St Davids were incorporated in the archdiocese of Canterbury, and St Asaph, which would be created some decades later, would eventually suffer the same fate\textsuperscript{121}.

Gradually, the (political) boundaries between Norman England and Wales were pushed further and further into the West and the newcomers managed to establish themselves in the area\textsuperscript{122}. In 1135, Normans already controlled the west of Dyfed – thanks to castles like Carew, Haverford and Manorbier\textsuperscript{123}.

It would lead be too great a deviation to explain all the seesaw changes during the years from 1066 until the time of Giraldus’ death\textsuperscript{124}. Sometimes the Normans retained the upper hand, sometimes the Welsh rulers managed to recapture areas they had lost. The outcome of changes in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Carr, Medieval Wales, p. 49.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 67.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 13. For an overview of Church Reform in Wales, cf. Davies, Aspects of Church Reform in Wales, c. 1093-c.1223, p. 85–99. Madeleine Gray pointed out that the traditional interpretation of a clash not only between societies, but also between churches, and the claim of rapid assimilation and incorporation of these reformed ideas is now modified: while some of these new ideas may already have reached Wales before the Norman arrival, other concepts were never adopted at all (Gray, Saints on the Edge: Reconfiguring Sanctity in the Welsh March, p. 89). In his examination of Welsh saints’ cults, John Reuben Davies cautions against a too nationalistic and religiously predisposed view of the clashes and changes that took place in Wales after the Conquest (cf. for further information Davies, The Cult of Saints in the Early Welsh March: Aspects of Cultural Transmission in a Time of Political Conflict, p. 37–55).
  \item \textsuperscript{119} It was not a successful promotion – in the end, the bishop was driven into exile (Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 93).
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 37.
  \item \textsuperscript{121} Davies, A History of Wales, p. 122.
  \item \textsuperscript{122} Daniell, From Norman Conquest to Magna Carta: England 1066–1215, p. 63.
  \item \textsuperscript{123} Davies, The Age of Conquest, p. 37.
\end{itemize}
power and politics also depended on the English king: Henry I had managed to retain the power of the Marcher Lords, whereas their influence grew under his successor, King Stephen.\(^{125}\)

Giraldus’ kin and family witnessed many of the developments outlined above. Two of Giraldus’ uncles fought in the battle of Crug Mawr in 1136 and were defeated by their Welsh relative, Gruffydd ap Rhys.\(^{126}\) When Gruffydd’s son, Lord Rhys, invaded Cardigan in 1166, he captured the keeper of Cardigan Castle, Robert FitzStephen, who was one of Giraldus’ uncles. The Welsh *Brut y Tywysogion* illustrates the family network:

> And in that summer the Lord Rhys [...] removed Robert, son of Stephen by Nest, the daughter of Rhys, son of Tewdwr. That Nesta was aunt to Rhys, and Robert was his cousin; and the brothers of Robert were David, bishop of Menevia, and William the Bastard; and those were sons to Gerald the steward.\(^{127}\)

Our summary might suggest that the history of Wales was nothing but bloodshed and war. Actually, almost the contrary is true, since another option for the newcomers was to marry.\(^{128}\) A marriage between Norman and Welsh families could form an alliance between neighbours and bring different family trees together. In fact, it was a marriage that laid the basis for the rise of Giraldus’ own kin, known today as the “Geraldines.”\(^{129}\)

The term “Geraldines” denotes a kin-group whose power lay not only in Wales, but also in Ireland. A single Geraldine identity does not exist, and even Giraldus offered various depictions of his kin, depending on the purpose of his texts.\(^{130}\) Today, the Geraldines are mainly remembered for their participation in the Conquest of Ireland. This is partly a result of the

---

\(^{125}\) Davies, *Kings, Lords and Liberties in the March of Wales, 1066–1272*, p. 54. Cf. also Plassmann, *Die englischen Könige im Krieg mit den keltischen Nachbarn (1066–1216)*, p. 100–107, which focuses on the personal involvement of the kings.

\(^{126}\) Thorpe, *Gerald of Wales*, p. 177.

\(^{127}\) Translation taken from *Brut*, p. 213.

\(^{128}\) Norman and Welsh soon realized that their troubles could be solved by war as well as through intermarriage (cf. for example Lieberman, *The March of Wales 1067–1300*, p. 57–58).


\(^{130}\) Duffy, Preface, p. 18 and Pryce, *Giral... Geraldines*, p. 57. Giraldus cultivated the *memoria* of his family, because no institutions (for example, monasteries that had been founded by members of the family) had undergone this task (Pryce, *Giral... Geraldines*, p. 68).
influence of Giraldus, who recorded the deeds of his kin in his *Expugnatio Hibernica*\(^{131}\).

The beginnings of the Geraldines may be dated back to the year 1100, when Gerald of Windsor, castellan of Pembroke castle, married the Welsh Princess Nesta\(^{132}\). From this marriage, a close-knit Cambro-Norman network would arise. Its members would soon occupy powerful secular and ecclesiastical positions in Southwest Wales. While Gerald of Windsor belonged to the Norman newcomers, Nesta’s father was Rhys ap Tewdwr (†1093), King of Deheubarth in Southwest Wales. His importance is stressed by the fact that all “the later native princes and lords in Deheubarth would trace their descent”\(^{133}\) from him.

Like other Welsh kingdoms, Deheubarth was troubled by invading Normans. Rhys ap Tewdwr surrendered and intended to come to terms with the invaders. An agreement between the Welsh king and William the Conqueror saved Rhys ap Tewdwr from further harassment by the Marcher Barons and allowed him to concentrate on the inner stability of his kingdom\(^{134}\).

The death of King William changed the situation dramatically. Under his successor, William Rufus, the assaults on Deheubarth revived\(^{135}\). Rhys ap Tewdwr was forced to react. When he fell in battle in 1093, contemporaries knew that Wales had lost its prominent leading figure. The Welsh *Brut y Tywysogion* lamented:

> [...] when Rhys, son of Tewdwr, king of South Wales, was killed by the French, who inhabited Brecheiniog; [...] then fell the kingdom of the Britons\(^{136}\).

Rhys’ sons barely escaped to Ireland, while his daughter Nesta married Gerald of Windsor, one of the Norman invaders\(^{137}\).

---

\(^{131}\) Pryce, Giraldus and the Geraldines, p. 53.

\(^{132}\) For a short overview over her life, cf. Johns, Gender, Nation and Conquest in the High Middle Ages, p. 20–22.

\(^{133}\) Maund, The Welsh Kings, p. 81.

\(^{134}\) Babcock, Rhys ap Tewdwr, King of Deheubarth, p. 27.

\(^{135}\) Babcock, Rhys ap Tewdwr, King of Deheubarth, p. 27.

\(^{136}\) Translation taken from *Brut*, p. 55.

\(^{137}\) A. J. Roderick stresses that, after the death of her father, Nesta had no choice but to ally herself with the Norman invaders (Roderick, Marriage and Politics in Wales, 1066–1282, p. 10).
Gerald of Windsor had a stroke of luck when he married the Welsh princess. The newly established alliance granted him both political and social influence in Deheubarth\textsuperscript{138}. Nesta had widespread connections throughout Wales and Ireland. Her family is not only associated with the foundation and history of St Davids\textsuperscript{139}, it also had strong Irish ties\textsuperscript{140}. However, Nesta’s story did not end with being married off to a Norman conqueror. Rumour claims that she was mistress to King Henry I\textsuperscript{141}. After Gerald of Windsor had died, she married the constable of Cardigan. Overall, Nesta was mother of eight sons and two daughters\textsuperscript{142}.

Thanks to his grandmother, Giraldus had manifold connections within the Welsh March. Nesta’s oldest son, William, was lord of Carew (Pembrokeshire). Maurice FitzGerald, who was also an uncle of Giraldus, would play a major role in the Conquest of Ireland. Nesta’s third son, David, became bishop of St Davids. Angharad, Giraldus’ mother, married William de Barri, lord of Manorbier Castle, whose family took its name from the Isle of Barry\textsuperscript{143}.

Some of Giraldus’ family members play more or less prominent roles in his writings. In his \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}, Giraldus described the shrewdness of his grandfather during a Welsh siege\textsuperscript{144}, and mentioned how his uncle, Bishop David, who had been harassed by a hostile Norman lord, was saved

\textsuperscript{138} Carr, Medieval Wales, p. 40–41. As his grandson Giraldus explains in his \textit{Itinerarium}: Gerald of Windsor married the princess to obtain a more secure stronghold within the country (\textit{IK}, p. 91).

\textsuperscript{139} Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{140} Duffy, Gerald of Windsor and the Origins of the Geraldines, p. 48.

\textsuperscript{141} Giraldus writes: \textit{Fuerant autem duo nobiles viri, et eius qui scripsit haec avunculi, cum alius huc a rege transmissi; Henricus scilicet regis Henrici primi filius, et secundi avunculus, ex nobili Nesta, Resi filii Theodori filia, in australi Kambria Demetiae finibus oriundus (IK}, p. 130: There were two noble men, uncles to the man writing these lines, who were sent there with others by the king. One of them was, of course, Henry, son of Henry I, and uncle of the second, son of the noble Nesta, daughter of Rhys ap Tewdwr, who was born in the southern parts of Dyfed in Wales).

\textsuperscript{142} Johns, Gender, Nation and Conquest in the High Middle Ages, p. 22. Giraldus mentioned other relatives throughout his writings. For example, he calls William FitzHay his \textit{consanguinus} in his autobiography (cf. \textit{RG}, p. 28, and Butler, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, p. 44).

\textsuperscript{143} Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 86. Although the family probably originated in Devon, Giraldus chose to highlight the Welsh links of this name in his \textit{Itinerarium} (Cf. \textit{IK}, p. 66 and Pryce, Giraldus and the Geraldines, p. 56).

\textsuperscript{144} \textit{IK}, p. 89–90.
by the vengeance of St David\textsuperscript{145}. Within the \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, Giraldus gave prominent roles to his uncles, Maurice and Robert\textsuperscript{146}.

Giraldus had three older brothers: Philip (who would later inherit Manorbier Castle), Robert, and Walter. The latter was Giraldus half-brother, as Giraldus explains in his \textit{Expugnatio}\textsuperscript{147}. Both Walter and Robert took part in the Conquest of Ireland, too. Philip de Barri was a very important person in Giraldus’ life – we may suppose that their relationship was a very close one. He is frequently mentioned throughout Giraldus’ works. In \textit{De Jure}, for example, Giraldus calls him “\textit{frater optimus}”\textsuperscript{148}. The praise is continued throughout \textit{Speculum Duorum}\textsuperscript{149}.

\subsection*{2.2 The biography of Giraldus Cambrensis}

\subsubsection*{2.2.1 Giraldus’ early years}

In his autobiography, Giraldus creates the impression that, from an early age, he was destined to pursue an ecclesiastical career\textsuperscript{150}. He tells us, for example, that his father used to call him “his bishop”\textsuperscript{151}. Although we cannot be sure that this is true, we know that some members of his family-network had already pursued an ecclesiastical career. One of these persons was Giraldus’ uncle, David FitzGerald, who was bishop of St Davids from 1148 to 1176\textsuperscript{152}. This position was quite powerful, although Giraldus would later point out the economic poverty of the bishopric\textsuperscript{153}.

\textsuperscript{145} \textit{IK}, p. 30–31.
\textsuperscript{146} \textit{EH}, p. 28 and passim. Robert Bartlett called the \textit{Expugnatio} a “family epic” with good reason (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 24).
\textsuperscript{147} Giraldus refers to his half-brother in his \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, when Angharad appeared in a dream of Walter (\textit{EH}, p. 116).
\textsuperscript{148} Cf. \textit{JS}, p. 326.
\textsuperscript{149} Cf. \textit{SD}, p. 30 and p. 52.
\textsuperscript{150} Wada, Gerald on Gerald: Self-Presentation by Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{151} \textit{RG}, p. 22: \textit{eum [...] suum episcopum vocare consuevit}.
We can only guess how close the relationship between nephew and uncle was. From what Giraldus tells in his De Rebus, we may deduce that Bishop David had a lasting effect on Giraldus’ life.

Giral当地 reports how his uncle took care of his early education, which took place in St. Peter’s (Gloucester). Giraldus, the future student of Paris and champion of St Davids, was a rather slow learner, distracted by his brothers, who became knights.

The situation changed because of Bishop David (and the teasing of two of his clerks), who steadily corrected Giraldus and thus quickened his pace of learning:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ceterum tandem a Menevensi episco po piae memoriae Davide tunc praesidente, qui et avunculus eius ex titerat, correptus quidem et statim correctus, clericorumque duorum eiusdem episcopi, quorum unus in suggillationem ipsius declinabat durus, durior, durissimus, et \textit{alter}, stultus, stultior, stultissimus, insultatione plurimum adiutus, plus verecundia deinde quam virga, plusque pudore quam praecentore sive timore quovis, proficere coepit}^{156}.
\end{quote}

Well, Giraldus had been scolded and corrected by blessed David, bishop of St Davids, who had been his uncle, and by two clerks of this bishop. One of them mocked him by declining \textit{durus, durior, durissimus}, while the other said \textit{stultus, stultior, stultissimus}. Giraldus was greatly aided by this insult, more out of conscience than out of fear of the rod, and more out of shame than because of the teacher or out of fear. At length, he began to make progress.

During his later years, Giraldus took care of his eponymous nephew. The situation turned upside down when Giraldus later found himself in the position of his uncle. He obviously applied the same methods of education that had formed his early years, but this time, they had a different effect. Giraldus lamented in \textit{Speculum Duorum}:  

\begin{quote}
\textit{O quotiens nepos noster, et vera a nepa dictus, et huic in nequitia valde propinquus, dicere quasi comminando consuevit quod antea monacus fieret quam correctionis nostrae doctrinaeque iugum et disciplinae frenum diutius}
\end{quote}

---

\textsuperscript{154} Cf. Spec., p. 107.

\textsuperscript{155} RG, p. 22: \textit{longe segnius in proposita disciplina profecit}.

\textsuperscript{156} RG, p. 22–23.
sustineret, quatinus inopiam ei sic generaret qui copiam ipsi et opulentiam tanto studio procurarat\textsuperscript{157}.

O, how often has our nephew – and truly, this word derives from *nepa*, scorpion, and he resembles it so closely in his uselessness – used to say, or better to say, used to thread, that he would rather become a monk than endure the bay of our corrections, our teaching, and our disciplining styles any longer, so that he might render this man impoverish who had fought so hard for his wealth and riches.

Whereas the situation between Giraldus and his nephew deteriorated over the years, Bishop David and Giraldus were on good terms. Throughout his writings, Giraldus narrated several anecdotes about his uncle. For example, Bishop David told his nephew the story of fairies who were talking in a language that resembled Greek\textsuperscript{158}.

After his time in Gloucester, Giraldus went to Paris, already a thriving city for scholars\textsuperscript{159}. This period of study lasted for sixteen years overall and was marked by several interruptions which led Giraldus back to England.

The years in France were crucial for Giraldus’ future, especially as an author\textsuperscript{160}. Giraldus’ impressive knowledge of classical authors is well-

\textsuperscript{157} *SD*, p. 12. For an analysis of the strained relationship between Giraldus and his nephew and the effects of *Speculum Duorum*, cf. Sprouse, In Sickness and in Health: the Boethian Narrative of the Two Gerals of Brecon, p. 56–77.

\textsuperscript{158} Cf. *IK*, p. 75–77.

\textsuperscript{159} Scholars agree that Wales could never have offered Giraldus the cultural resources that he needed to reach the amount of learning he displays in his books (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 11 and Pryce, A Cross-Border Career, p. 47–48). For a first impression of the educational situation in England after the Conquest until the middle of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, cf. Knappe, Manuscript Evidence of the Teaching of the Language Arts in Late Anglo-Saxon and Early Norman England, with Particular Regard to the Role of the Classics, p. 23–60.

\textsuperscript{160} For Peter the Chanter, who had a tremendous influence on Giraldus, cf. Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, 1970. The university of Paris began to emerge during Giraldus’ lifetime, and many of his former fellow students played a part in this development. Cf. for further information Young, Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris, 2014 and, for a students point of view, Williams, Aristotle in the Medieval Classroom: Students, Teaching, and Educational Change in the Schools of Paris in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, p. 222–243.
known\textsuperscript{161} and the learning of the Parisian schools sparkles in his writings\textsuperscript{162}. Despite his earlier learning-problems, Giraldus claimed to have been a very good student. He studied the liberal arts with great success and even taught the *Trivium* (he achieved his greatest successes in rhetoric\textsuperscript{163}). Later, he proceeded to study civil law and canon law in Paris. He even lectured on the *Decretum Gratiani*:

\begin{quote}
[T]antus ad vocem eius iocundam doctorum omnium fere cum scholaribus suis concursus extiterat, quod vix domus amplissima capere poterat auditores\textsuperscript{164}.
\end{quote}

So great was the gathering of nearly all the teachers and scholars who came to listen to his pleasing voice, that the biggest house could barely house the listeners.

During his years in Paris, Giraldus became acquainted with men he would meet and write about at a later point of his life. Among them are Adam de Ponte Parvo\textsuperscript{165} (future bishop of St. Asaph), Stephen Langton\textsuperscript{166} (future archbishop of Canterbury), and Lothar of Segni (future Pope Innocent III\textsuperscript{167}), to name only a few.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{161} Edward Best has researched the Classical Latin Prose writers Giraldus quoted in his texts (Best, Classical Latin Prose Writers Quoted by Giraldus Gambrensis, 1957), while Georgia Henley investigated Giraldus’ use of quotations in his *Itinerary* (Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s *Itinerarium Kambriae*, p. 1–52). For more information on Giraldus’ knowledge of biblical or classical texts, cf. exemplarily Guy, Gerald and Welsh Genealogical Learning, p. 47, with literature references. For Giraldus’ use of *florilegia*, cf. Goddu and Rouse, Gerald of Wales and the Florilegium Angelicum, p. 488–521.

\textsuperscript{162} We may think about his letters, for example, to Adam of Eynsham (letter no. 10 in Symb., p. 234 – 237), to Walter Map (letter no. 24 in Symb., p. 271 – 289), or of a *carmen* which was written for Giraldus by his fellow-canon at Hereford, Simon de Freine (Symb., p. 382–384 and Hunt, English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century, p. 23).

\textsuperscript{163} Cf. *RG*, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{164} *RG*, p. 45.

\textsuperscript{165} Giraldus used his powers as Archdeacon of St Davids to prevent him from consecrating a church that belonged to the diocese of St Davids (cf. *RG*, p. 32–39).

\textsuperscript{166} Cf. chapter 2.2.3 for further information.

\textsuperscript{167} Giraldus would meet him again during his time as champion of St Davids (cf. exemplarily *RG*, p. 119, when Giraldus boasts how the Pope liked the *Gemma Ecclesiastica*).
\end{footnotes}
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2.2.2 Political and ecclesiastical affairs until 1198

Around 1174, Giraldus, having abandoned his plans to study in Bologna, returned to St Davids\(^{168}\). After his return, he became archdeacon of Brecon, the highest ecclesiastical position he would hold until the end of his life\(^{69}\). Giraldus’ promotion may be eyed critically, because he had been personally involved in the eviction of his predecessor\(^{70}\).

Although not all acta of the bishopric have come down to us, the surviving material suggests that Giraldus did not witness too many acta at all: with the exception of a grant, his name appears in two inspeximus (and in one case, the witness may well have been Giraldus’ nephew and namesake)\(^{71}\). The first document of the bishopric’s acta, where we encounter Giraldus, can be dated within the period from 1174 to the beginning of May 1176\(^{72}\). It was a grant which was issued for Giraldus’ uncle, Maurice FitzGerald, who received the stewardship of the land of St Davids\(^{73}\).

After almost 28 years of being loyal to the archbishopric of Canterbury, Bishop David FitzGerald died in May 1176\(^{74}\). The chapter of St Davids had to agree on possible successors, wherefore it compiled a list of candidates. This list contained Giraldus’ name. Giraldus seemed to have been the first choice of the chapter, yet when the canons presented their candidates to the archbishop of Canterbury and the king, the latter refused Giraldus’ promotion. In his autobiography, Giraldus, who was told by the bishop of Worcester about this incident, claimed that the king considered him too

\(^{168}\) RG, p. 49. Bartlett gives the year 1173 (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 34) and Richter the year 1174 (Richter, Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death, p. 380).


\(^{70}\) The former archdeacon of Brecon was named Jordan. He lived together with a concubine (a reason for his eviction). But the matter is not as clear as it seems at first glance, because Jordan had already been in trouble with ecclesiastical authorities quite a few times before (cf. Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 91, and, for a detailed account St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 6 and p. 59–60).


\(^{72}\) St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 28 and p. 59–60.

\(^{73}\) St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 59–60.

\(^{74}\) His loyalty towards Canterbury had angered his Welsh clerics (Richter, Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death, p. 380).
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virtuous to become bishop of St Davids. He puts the following words in the mouth of the king:

\[ \text{Nec regi nec archiepiscopo opus est aut expediens nimis probum aut strenuum, ne vel Angliae corona vel Cantiae cathedra detrimentum sentiat, in ecclesia Sancti David episcopum esse}\]

To ensure that neither the crown of England nor the see of Canterbury should suffer any harm, there is no need for the king nor the archbishop (nor would it be suitable for them) that someone too virtuous or too vigorous should become bishop of the church of St Davids.

Another reason for his refusal, revealed only secretly, were Giraldus’ family-connections with Lord Rhys and other Welsh magnates. This is, of course, how Giraldus saw the situation (or would have liked future generations to judge the situation). But even if we take this statement with the necessary grain of salt, his claims do not come from nowhere.

During Giraldus’ lifetime, Wales had not yet been fully conquered, and the rebellious Welsh princes demanded the king’s attention. In fact, the Welsh had never lost a single, decisive battle and there was always the possibility that they could unite themselves under a prominent leading figure. Henry II had tried to conquer Wales trice and had failed. From Giraldus’ point of view, this failure had one main reason behind it: The king did not trust his Marcher Lords.

But because of his family-connections, Giraldus is far from being impartial. Over the course of decades, the Marcher Lords had managed to gain a certain degree of autonomy within Wales. A Marcher Lord could behave as “governor and universal landlord”, and consequently, “the king’s writ did

---

175 RG, p. 43. This bishop was Roger of Worcester († 1179), who will make an appearance in the copula tergemin of the life of Remigius of Lincoln.
176 RG, p. 43.
178 Cf. IK, p. 138.
179 Davies, Kings, Lords and Liberties in the March of Wales, 1066–1272, p. 41.
not run in the march180. No wonder that the king did not fully trust these men.

In 1169, Welsh Marcher Lords supported an exiled Irish king. Among these Lords were, for example, Giraldus’ uncle Robert FitzStephen and his older brother Robert181. Of course, the Welsh aid for the Irish king was not offered without any ulterior motives. During the second half of the 1150s, Henry II had tightened his grip on castles and estates in the March – the local lords were alarmed and seized their opportunity to escape the king’s grip as soon as they saw their chance182. In the end, the Welsh Marcher Lords set over to Ireland, where they began to establish a power base. Soon, the Irish had to realize that the supposed aid from Wales was determined to stay. At the same time, the growing autonomy of the Norman lords once again represented a threat for power of the Angevin kings. Keeping this information in mind, we may say that Giraldus’ explanations for his failed promotions are not completely improbable, because, under the given circumstances, Giraldus’ election could have had dangerous consequences for the king.

Giraldus was rejected as a candidate. In the end, the prior of Wenlock, Peter de Leia († 1198), became bishop of St Davids183.

After his election had been spoiled, Giraldus went back to Paris to finish his studies. He stayed another three years in France, before he returning to England184.

Once again, Giraldus went to St Davids. Soon, he became the bishop’s representative. However, the situation turned out to be difficult, because Giraldus and Peter de Leia did not get along with each other. “The dictatorial archdeacon was personally and physically allergic to the political bishop; the absentee bishop was equally allergic to the meticulous archdeacon”185, as James C. Davies described the situation. A single incident

---

180 Carr, Medieval Wales, p. 39. Robert R. Davies doubts that the kings of England had no power in Wales or Ireland (Davies, Domination and Conquest, p. 72).
181 A short overview over Giraldus’ relatives who had followed the call for aid to Ireland may be found in Flanagan, Irish Society, Anglo-Norman Settlers, Angevin Kingship, p. 145–155. Cf. for further information also Veach, The Geraldines and the Conquest of Ireland, p. 72–84.
183 RG, p. 44.
184 Apparently because he had run out of money (RG, p. 49). Michael Richter suggested that the chapter of St Davids had called him back due to problems with the ever-absent Bishop Peter de Leia (Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 6).
185 Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 99.
speaks volumes about the relationship between the two men: Giraldus
never credited Bishop Peter for building the cathedral church of St
Davids\(^\text{186}\). In the end, Giraldus decided to quit his position as Bishop Peter’s
representative.

After a visit to relatives in Ireland in 1183\(^\text{187}\), Giraldus followed the calling of
the court. He started working as a royal clerk for the kings of England. This
period of his life, described with the words \textit{pluribus annis} in his
autobiography, lasted for about ten years\(^\text{188}\). Unfortunately, independent
sources offering clues about his whereabouts have not come down to us.
Giraldu s’ name does not appear in any witness lists of charters\(^\text{189}\). However,
Giraldus is in good company, for the same could basically be said about
men like Roger of Howden, Peter of Blois, or Walter Map\(^\text{190}\).

During his years in royal service, Giraldus was sent on different missions to
Ireland and Wales. He travelled with Prince John to Ireland\(^\text{191}\), accompanied
Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury on a preaching tour\(^\text{192}\), and was sent to
Wales by Richard Lionheart to pacify the country after King Henry II had
died\(^\text{193}\). Giraldus’ connections and kin relationships with the mighty men of
the March were obviously of good use to him. Edward Lloyd suggested that
Giraldus came into royal service because he could serve as an intermediator
between the king and the Welsh princes\(^\text{194}\). Giraldus never explained why
he had been summoned to the court by the king, attributing the king’s
attention only to his own ever growing \textit{fama}. His remarks on his time as a
royal clerk are surprisingly short:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Crescente igitur fama Giraldi et de die in diem amplius innotescente, ab
Anglorum rege Henrico II., in Marchiae finibus ad Walliam pacificandam
tunc agente consilio magnatum suorum est vocatus; et per regis instantiam
magnam, promissiones etiam et praecessiones, quamquam invitus plurimum}
\end{quote}

\(^{186}\) Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 24. J. Wyn Evans suggests that Peter de Leia, who was often
absent from his diocese, may not have been responsible for the construction. Instead, the
chapter may have taken over the responsibility (Wyn Evans, The Bishops of St Davids from
Bernard to Bec, p. 284).

\(^{187}\) Cf. \textit{EH}, p. 188.

\(^{188}\) \textit{RG}, p. 57.


\(^{191}\) Cf. \textit{RG}, p. 61 passim and his \textit{EH}.

\(^{192}\) Cf. \textit{IK} for an account of the events.

\(^{193}\) Cf. \textit{RG}, p. 80–81 and Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 21 for more missions in which Giraldus
took part.

\(^{194}\) Lloyd, A History of Wales, p. 561.
et renitens, quia sicut scholarium vitam prae aliis appreciari sic curialium quoque detestari solet, demum curiae sequela et clericus regis est effectus.\footnote{RG, p. 57.}

As the fame of Giraldus grew and from day to day, more and more people knew his name, he was then called in the March to pacify Wales by the English King Henry II, who acted because of the council of his magnates, and, because of king’s great urgency, the promises and the admonitions (although he very much did not want and it was against his will, because he used to place the life of a scholar above other things and he used to detest the life of a follower of the court), he finally followed the court and became the king’s clerk.

Overall, Giraldus seems to have enjoyed some sort of patronage from the royal family. Prince John offered him bishoprics in Ireland and Wales, which Giraldus declined.\footnote{RG, p. 87.}

Working as a royal clerk meant working together with different parties, among whom were his own kin. On the one hand, some of these encounters ended on friendly terms and in good humour. The argument between Giraldus and Lord Rhys, whose family branch was the mightier, has already been quoted above.\footnote{RG, p. 59.}

On the other hand, Giraldus was eyed suspiciously because of his family-connections. Two of his enemies – Peter de Leia, the incumbent bishop of St Davids, and the Cistercian monk William Wibert – gave Giraldus a hard time in royal service. Both men not only managed to stir up the distrust of Giraldus’ Welsh relatives against him, they also alienated Giraldus from the king.

\textit{Castellum itaque quod Walenses obsederant, mea obsessum asseruit machinatione; et quidquid mali in Marchia acciderat, me fuisse instigante protractum.}\footnote{Symb., p. 205. Cf. as well Giraldus’ complaints about Peter de Leia in Symb., p. 332 and Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 24.}

He [= William Wibert] asserted that a castle, which the Welsh besieged, was besieged because of my trickery, and whatever had gone wrong in the March had been aroused by me.
Peter de Leia and William Wibert were not the only ones who used Giraldus’ mixed decent against him. In his *De Principis Instructione*, Giraldus lamented that he was often regarded as a Welshman, although his blood was more Norman than Welsh.\(^{199}\)

In about 1194, Giraldus quit royal service. His reasons for doing so are unclear. Whereas Robert Bartlett argues that Giraldus, who belonged to the circle of Prince John, had provoked some of King Richard’s men and thus had to take his leave,\(^{200}\) James C. Davies supposes that Giraldus quit service because of “routine duties [...] and apparent inactivity.”\(^{201}\) This, at least, is what Giraldus told us in his autobiography: The scholar’s desk called him from the court.

> Considerans autem Giraldus vanam ex toto curiae sequelam, vanas omnino promissiones, vanas et indignas nec iuxta merita promotiones; quod olim mente conceperat ac paulatim iam inceperat, a curiae strepitu tamquam tempestuoso pelago penitus se retraxit; et ad scholas ac studium tamquam portum quietum et tranquillum salubriori consilio se transferre curavit.\(^{202}\)

But Giraldus, considering his utterly vain following of the court, all the vain promises, and the vain promotions that were unworthy and not offered because of merits, withdrew himself completely from the noise of the court as from a stormy sea. This he had once conceived in his mind and had already gradually started. Because of a rather wholesome advice, he took measures to transfer himself to the schools and the study, as if they were a quiet and tranquil harbour.

Giraldus intended to return to Paris. However, war between France and England compelled him to remain. Instead of crossing the Channel, Giraldus stayed at Oxford and Hereford.\(^{203}\)

It was in Hereford that the next important stage in Giraldus’ life begun. Several scholars assume that Giraldus left the court in 1194 at the latest.\(^{204}\)

\(^{199}\) PI, p. 5.  
\(^{200}\) Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 59.  
\(^{201}\) Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 105.  
\(^{202}\) RG, p. 89.  
\(^{203}\) RG, p. 93.  
\(^{204}\) Cf. for example, Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 7, Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 31–32, and Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 59.
We also know that he was at Lincoln in about 1196\textsuperscript{205}, so his sojourn in Hereford lasted for around two years.

Surprisingly, the years spent at Hereford did not find their way into Giraldus’ autobiography. Nevertheless, we may catch glimpses of them when we examine passages taken from his remaining œuvre.

Thinking about Hereford and Giraldus, three names come to mind. These are the names of the local bishop of Hereford, William de Vere († 1198), and of two canons: Simon de Freine († c.1210) and Walter Map († 1209 or 1210). Of course, Giraldus’ personal network consisted of many more acquaintances. Among them were, for example, members of the Foliot-Family\textsuperscript{206}.

William de Vere was bishop of Hereford from 1186 to 1198\textsuperscript{207}. Unfortunately, we do not know when Giraldus and Bishop William first met. Julia Barrow suggests that their first encounter may have taken place in 1186, when Bishop William hosted a meeting between Norman and Welsh parties\textsuperscript{208}. Neither can we determine the concrete quality of their relationship. Two letters, preserved in \textit{Symbolum Electorum}, suggest a certain amount of personal contact. The first letter (no. 18), recommends Robert Grosseteste, future bishop of Lincoln († 1253) to William de Vere\textsuperscript{209}. The second letter (no. 29) contains Giraldus’ lamentations about the mistreatment he received from Bishop Peter de Leia\textsuperscript{210}. In his relationship with William de Vere, Giraldus’ literary talent may have been his major advantage\textsuperscript{211}.

But Giraldus was not only on good terms with the bishop of Hereford. Another friend of him, Simon de Freine, was canon at Hereford and a

\textsuperscript{205} This interval can be detected from references in \textit{RG}, p. 97 and \textit{Symb.}, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{206} The condolences to William, \textit{praecentor} of Hereford, on the death of Ralph Foliot are preserved in \textit{Symb.}, p. 268–271.
\textsuperscript{207} For further information on William de Vere, cf. Barrow, A Twelfth-Century Bishop and Literary Patron: William de Vere, p. 175–189.
\textsuperscript{208} Barrow, A Twelfth-Century Bishop and Literary Patron: William de Vere, p. 182–183.
\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Symb.}, p. 307–308. Further examples of William de Vere occurring in Giraldus’ works can be found in Barrow, A Twelfth-Century Bishop and Literary Patron: William de Vere, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{211} Julia Barrow proposes that Bishop William may have regarded Giraldus as a “decorative addition” to Hereford, because of his literary qualities (Barrow, A Twelfth-Century Bishop and Literary Patron: William de Vere, p. 186). William de Vere seems to have been a patron of literature: when he had visited the Holy Land, he took Byzantine manuscripts with him (French, Foretelling the Future: Arabic Astrology and English Medicine in the Late Twelfth Century, p. 464).
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writer, like Giraldus\(^{212}\). Simon wrote in French and Latin. A poem, addressed to Giraldus, has come down to us\(^{213}\). In this poem, Simon invited Giraldus to come to Hereford, for “it pains England, the rich, that poor Wales calls the *speculum mundi* its own”\(^{214}\).

Giraldus’ most prominent companion at Hereford was Walter Map, who seems to have been a “Marcher”, too\(^{215}\). Lewis Thorpe supposes that Walter Map was born around 1140 in Herefordshire\(^{216}\). We know of several occasions when Giraldus and Walter might have met: If such a meeting had not taken place at St. Peter’s (Gloucester), Lewis Thorpe argues they probably met in Paris, where Map studied somewhere between 1160 and 1177\(^{217}\).

Walter Map and Giraldus are usually regarded as friends\(^{218}\). Unfortunately, assessing the exact quality of this ‘friendship’ is outside the scope of this work, for it would require a meticulous analysis of the whole *opera* of both authors. Yet some points deserve a brief examination: First of all, the careers of Walter Map and Giraldus show some interesting parallels. Both

\(^{212}\) According to Arthur Rigg, Giraldus was Simon de Freine’s master (Rigg, A History of Anglo-Latin literature 1066–1422, p. 96).

\(^{213}\) It was partly edited by John Brewer: *Symb.*, p. 382–384. A missing part is provided by Hunt, English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century, p. 23. Giraldus’ answer and a further poem of Simon de Freine are printed in *Symb.*, p. 384–387. For further information on Simon de Freine, cf. Agrigoroaei, Qu’y a-t-il dans un Auteur? Simund de Freine en Dialogue avec Giraud de Barri, p. 145–153 and, for the poems, especially p. 147–150.

\(^{214}\) *Symb.*, p. 383: *Dolet Anglia dives, quod speculum mundi Wallia pauper habet*. The poem contains many hyperbolic praises. It is dated 1195 to 1197 by Nicholas Orme (Orme, The Cathedral School before the Reformation, p. 566).

\(^{215}\) Cf. the reference in *NC*, p. 194.

\(^{216}\) Thorpe, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, p. 13. According to Arthur Rigg, Map was born in 1135 (Rigg, A History of Anglo-Latin literature 1066–1422, p. 88–91), whereas the latest editors of Map’s *De nugis curialium* favour 1130 X 5 (*NC*, p. XIII).

\(^{217}\) Thorpe, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, p. 13.

\(^{218}\) This view is largely supported by C.N.L. Brooke and R.A.B. Mynors (*NC*, p. XV) and Lewis Thorpe (Thorpe, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, p. 13). John Hagen (Gerald of Wales and Hagen, The Jewel of the Church, p. XIII), and, to some extent, Joshua Byron Smith (Smith, Walter Map and the Matter of Britain, p. 2), accept this argument, whereas A.K. Bate thinks Giraldus and Walter Map were (not too friendly) “acquaintances” (Bate, Walter Map and Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 875). Bate’s arguments are followed by Tony Davenport (Davenport, Sex, Ghosts and Dreams: Walter Map (1135?–1210?) and Gerald of Wales (1146–1223), p. 134) and Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt and William Kynan-Wilson (Fonnesberg-Schmidt and Kynan-Wilson, Smiling, Laughing and Joking in Papal Rome: Thomas of Marlborough and Gerald of Wales at the Court of Innocent III (1198–1216), p. 160).
men were employed for some time at the royal court\textsuperscript{219}. They also sought to climb the ecclesiastical career ladder, because they intended to become bishop in different dioceses (while Giraldus sought his fortune at St Davids, Walter Map tried his luck at Hereford\textsuperscript{220}). In the end, both men saw their attempts spoiled by political circumstances\textsuperscript{221}. They also share some personal experiences. In their texts, Giraldus and Walter Map complained about their nephews who gave them a hard time\textsuperscript{222}.

Admittingly, Walter Map and Giraldus probably did not see each other very often – when Giraldus stayed in Oxford around 1194, Map was in Lincoln, and when Giraldus resided in Lincoln around 1196, Walter Map soon moved to Oxford\textsuperscript{223}. On the other hand, they must have stayed in contact, probably through letters. One letter which Giraldus wrote to Walter Map has come down to us as well as two \textit{carmina}\textsuperscript{224}. Giraldus mentioned that Walter Map, “a very literate man”, praised his \textit{Topographia Hibernica}\textsuperscript{225}. Because of the insistence of Walter Map (among others), Giraldus decided to compose \textit{Symbolum Electorum}\textsuperscript{226}. Based on these observations, Walter Map will be treated as a friend of Giraldus throughout this thesis.

Giraldus did not stay at Hereford, but finally chose Lincoln as his new residence. Lincoln was a thriving city for scholars in England. Since 1186, the Carthusian monk Hugh of Avalon († 1200) had been bishop of the diocese\textsuperscript{227}. Bishop Hugh cared about the education of his clergy: he summoned the teacher William de Monte († 1213) to the city\textsuperscript{228}, whom Giraldus knew from his time as a student in Paris. Thanks to this “group of

\textsuperscript{219} Unfortunately, we know surprisingly little about the connections between the many authors of the court (Vincent, The Strange Case of the Missing Biographies: The Lives of the Plantagenet Kings of England 1154–1272, p. 251).

\textsuperscript{220} \textit{MV}2, p. 131.

\textsuperscript{221} English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XLV.

\textsuperscript{222} \textit{NC}, p. 22 and \textit{SD}, p. 2–76.

\textsuperscript{223} Thorpe, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{224} \textit{Symb.}, p. 271–289 (The letter contains mainly philosophical topics). Giraldus’ \textit{carmen} (\textit{Symb.}, p. 362) revolves around the gift of a stick.


\textsuperscript{226} Cf. \textit{JS}, p. 336.

\textsuperscript{227} Cf. chapter 5.1 for further information on Hugh of Avalon.

2. The life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis

scholars distinguished for learning and virtue"\textsuperscript{229}, the city had the reputation of “the best school of theology in England”\textsuperscript{230}.

It was Lincoln’s fame that attracted Giraldus:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ubi sanius atque salubrius in Anglia theologicam scientiam vigere cognovit, sub doctore peroptimo magistro Willelmo de Monte dicto, quoniam in monte S. Genovefae Parisiis legerat, quem etiam ibi archidiaconus tunc noverat, studii causa Lincolniam adivit}\textsuperscript{231}.
\end{quote}

He [= Giraldus] went to Lincoln to pursue his studies, because he knew that there flourished the science of theology most soundly in England under the most excellent magister William, who was called de Monte, because he had lectured on Montagne Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, where the archdeacon [= Giraldus] had then met him.

Giraldus stayed at Lincoln almost until the end of his life. He was a canon of Lincoln cathedral and he received benefits from the church of Chesterton\textsuperscript{232}.

Besides Walter Map, Giraldus made other friends among the canons of Lincoln\textsuperscript{233}. The chancellor of Lincoln, William de Monte has already been mentioned. Two further names should be added: Adam of Eynsham († c.1233), personal chaplain of Bishop Hugh, and Roger of Rolleston († 1223), dean of the cathedral.

Like Giraldus, Adam of Eynsham wrote a life of Bishop Hugh of Lincoln\textsuperscript{234}. Two letters that Giraldus wrote to Adam have come down to us. They are preserved in \textit{Symbolum Electorum}. The letters are directly related to each other and their main topic is friendship. While the first letter (no. 9)

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{229} Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s Homage to Hugh of Avalon, p. 32.
\item \textsuperscript{230} Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 106. Before theology thrived in Lincoln, a law school seems to have existed for a short time (Edwards, The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages, p. 185–186).
\item \textsuperscript{231} RG, p. 93.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Chesterton was one of the benefits Giraldus had received because of his work as royal clerk (Richter, Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death, p. 381). We only know about Giraldus’ connection with Chesterton through his own works, as no charter has come down to us (English Episcopal Acta IV, p. 205).
\item \textsuperscript{233} Cf. JS, p. 109–110: The canons of Lincoln, who valued Giraldus (\textit{a quibus dilectus erat}), offer him council.
\item \textsuperscript{234} Cf. also chapter 5.5.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
revolves around the topic of friendship in general, the second letter (no. 10) contains Giraldus’ apologies for not having responded earlier\textsuperscript{235}.

Roger of Rolleston is mentioned frequently throughout Giraldus’ œuvre. He was archdeacon of Leicester from 1189 to 1195 and dean of Lincoln from 1195 until his death in 1223\textsuperscript{236}. At the beginning, he had been clerk of Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury. When Hugh of Avalon became bishop of Lincoln, he asked the archbishop for able persons to help him administrate the diocese. Archbishop Baldwin sent two men. One of them was Roger of Rolleston, as Adam of Eynsham narrated\textsuperscript{237}.

Giraldus praised Roger, especially in \textit{Speculum Duorum}, as “a man who possesses a true man’s mind”\textsuperscript{238}. He also admired the words of this “trustworthy and good man, so discreet and learned”\textsuperscript{239}. As \textit{Speculum Duorum} is centred around the dispute between Giraldus and his eponymous nephew, Giraldus narrated how Roger of Rolleston heavily criticised the nephew’s ungrateful behaviour\textsuperscript{240}. Even if we take into account that Giraldus, hurt by the betrayal of his nephew, implicitly compared himself to Roger, who had cast out his own, ungrateful brother, the whole picture is still dominated by Giraldus’ admiration\textsuperscript{241}. Given Giraldus’ involvement in the canonization of St Hugh and the participation of Adam of Eynsham and Roger of Rolleston in it, we may suppose that the contact between the three men intensified during the last years of Giraldus’ life\textsuperscript{242}.

During his first years at Lincoln, Giraldus’ life was a period of scholarly learning. He reported that he was content with the life of a scholar and had no ambitions for any office, especially not for the bishopric of St Davids\textsuperscript{243}. Every statement of his autobiography has to be taken with a grain of salt, but Giraldus’ first years in Lincoln were indeed years of productivity: He wrote several books and bestowed them on the church library, as can still

\textsuperscript{237} \textit{MV1}, p. 111–113.
\textsuperscript{238} \textit{SD}, p. 10: vir revera virilis animi.
\textsuperscript{239} Cf. \textit{SD}, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{240} Cf. \textit{SD}, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{241} The whole story is narrated in \textit{SD}, p. 8–11.
\textsuperscript{242} Cf. for further information chapter 5.7.
\textsuperscript{243} \textit{RG}, p. 93–94.
be seen on a page of a great medieval bible. However, the scholarly life ended suddenly in 1199, when Giraldus received letters from St Davids.

2.2.3 Political and ecclesiastical affairs after 1198

In autumn 1198, Peter de Leia, bishop of St Davids, died. The situation of 1176 repeated itself: Once again, the chapter of St Davids drew up a list of nominees for the vacant see. And once more, Giraldus’ name appeared on that list. Similar to 1176, Giraldus was the most unsuitable candidate who could be elected.

However, there was one major difference to the situation of 1176: Giraldus was not only aiming to become the next bishop of St Davids, he also wanted to turn the bishopric into an archbishopric. If he achieved his goal, Giraldus would secure independence for St Davids from the archbishopric of Canterbury. Of course, Hubert Walter († 1205), who was at that time archbishop of Canterbury, firmly objected to Giraldus’ election and the threatening loss of a suffragan diocese. But this time, Giraldus would not give up so easily.

The whole affair was deferred to the Pope. In his complaint to Innocent III, Giraldus lamented it was

\[
[...\text{ si aperte dicat: ‘Quia de Wallia oriundus in Wallia non debet esse praelatus;’ ergo a simili nec Anglici in Anglia, nec Franci in Francia, nec Italici in Italia, praefici debent nec promoveri}]^{246}
\]

as if he [= the archbishop of Canterbury] openly said: “Because he [= Giraldus] was born in Wales, he must not be made prelate in Wales”. So let neither English in England, nor French in France, nor Italians in Italy be made prelates or achieve any other career level!

As in 1176, Giraldus’ Welsh blood made a difference. This time, however, Giraldus decided to use his Welsh ancestors to his advantage. As can be

\[\text{244 VR, p. XII.}\]
\[\text{245 For details of the election, cf. Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 76–77. For possible reasons why Giraldus consented to be elected a second time, cf. Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 40.}\]
\[\text{246 Invectiones, p. 17. When a similar law in 1217 was issued against Irish bishops in Ireland, their appeal to the Pope bore fruits: the law was crushed only three years later (cf. Smith, The Frontiers of Church Reform in the British Isles, 1170–1230, p. 252–253).}\]
clearly seen from the quotation, Giraldus did not hide his ancestry from the Pope. On the contrary, he explicitly alluded to his Welsh blood. Only a few decades ago, Ireland had received four archbishops. From Giraldus’ point of view, it seemed only logical for Wales to receive the same treatment. And who was better suited as archbishop of Wales, than Giraldus, with his illustrious Welsh ancestry?

Yet the situation was not as simple as it might seem. As Frank Barlow put it: “Metropolitan and primatial claims fared best when they accorded with the political situation or were supported by secular imperialism”. Although the Welsh princes may have supported Giraldus’ case, the political situation in 1199 was nevertheless quite unfavourable for his plans.

The first problem for the chapter of St Davids was to find King Richard, who had left England for France. A delegation of canons was sent after him, so that the king would appoint Giraldus as a new bishop. But when the canons reached the court, the king had already died from the mortal wound he had received at the siege of Châlus-Chabrol, Prince John, with whom Giraldus had travelled to Ireland about fifteen years before, succeeded his brother. The succession was far from self-evident, because his position was challenged by the existence of Richard’s nephew, Arthur of Brittany. Prince John could bear no further disturbance, especially not from Wales. Furthermore, he had private interests in the country. He was married to the heiress of Glamorgan, which was the largest Marcher Lordship.

Besides the political turbulences, the ecclesiastical situation was complicated, too. Canterbury wanted to impose its primacy over the British Isles, but had troubles achieving this aim. Only recently, Scotland had broken away from the English Church. The same process could not be permitted to happen in Wales. Here, in contrast to Scotland, Canterbury as yet had no rival to her primacy. Giraldus’ plan that St Davids should receive the dignities of an archbishopric would have turned the current situation upside down.

---

247 The synods of Ráith Bressail (1111) and Kells (1152) are important for the construction of an archiepiscopal hierarchy in Ireland (Flanagan, The Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, p. 34–35). Cf. for further information on that point, Flanagan, The Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, p. 1–91.

248 Barlow, The English Church, p. 31.

249 Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 77.

250 Davies, A History of Wales, p. 134.


252 Richter, Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death, p. 385.
Giraldus was not the first to aim for a Welsh archbishopric at St Davids. The state of affairs has to be judged against the background of the Norman Conquest of Wales. As already mentioned above, the Normans had conquered Wales not only by force and marriage alliances, but also by introducing a hierarchical concept of church structure. However, the introduction of this concept could also be used to their disadvantage.

The first bishop who had addressed the question of an archbishopric at St Davids was Bishop Bernard († 1148), predecessor of Giraldus’ uncle David. Bishop Bernard introduced, among many other things, a chapter into the old clas church of St Davids\textsuperscript{253}. He also fought two important conflicts for his see: When more and more Normans arrived in Wales, the bishoprics realized their potential of support. As a result, the dioceses of St Davids and Llandaff competed for contributions from the new arrivals: the greater the fame and power of the see’s saint, the more assistance could be expected from the Norman newcomers\textsuperscript{254}.

The second conflict involved the possible creation of an archbishopric. When Giraldus addressed the problem, he referred to the previous claims of Bishop Bernard several decades prior\textsuperscript{255}. As Giraldus had to struggle with Hubert Walter, Bishop Bernard quarrelled with Archbishop Theobald († 1161)\textsuperscript{256}. In both cases, the opposing parties appealed to the Pope. In 1147, Pope Eugenius decided temporarily against Bernard’s claim but granted an inquiry for the following year\textsuperscript{257}. However, Bishop Bernard died in 1148. The case was closed and Archbishop Theobald demanded an oath from Bernard’s successor, David FitzGerald\textsuperscript{258}. The situation was solved – provisionally.

\textsuperscript{253} Cf. for his episcopacy Wyn Evans, The Bishops of St Davids from Bernard to Bec, p. 272–277 and chapter 3.1.
\textsuperscript{254} Tudor Edwards, Last Man Standing, p. 301. In fact, Geoffrey of Monmouth turned both St Davids and Llandaff into an archbishopric in his \textit{Historia regum Britanniae} (cf. for an analysis Brooke, The Archbishops of St David’s, Llandaff and Caerleon-on-Usk, p. 201–242). Michael Faletra pointed out that Giraldus viewed the Welsh past through the lens of Geoffrey’s history (Faletra, Wales and the Medieval Colonial Imagination, p. 135).
\textsuperscript{255} Bernard’s efforts must have been mentioned in \textit{De Rebus a Se Gestis} (Harold Butler, Autobiography, p. 182). References to Bernard are furthermore included in \textit{De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae} (JS, p. 167–168 and passim) and in \textit{De Invectionibus} (Invectiones, p. 49–50).
\textsuperscript{256} Cf. the detailed analysis of the case in Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 40–55.
\textsuperscript{257} Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{258} Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 55.
After Giraldus had raised his claim, he fought for four years to achieve his goal. During this time, the whole situation got more and more out of his hands. Though Giraldus travelled to Rome several times to defend his case before the Pope, he finally had to realize that he could not rely on papal support. Furthermore, his foes had managed to estrange him from his supporters and the chapter of St Davids. In the end, Giraldus’ election was cancelled by Pope Innocent III. Giraldus failed, for he neither became bishop nor archbishop. Furthermore, he had to forswear his metropolitan ambitions for St Davids. The successor to Peter de Leia was Geoffrey de Henlaw († 1214), a former physician of Archbishop Hubert Walter.

Unfortunately, Giraldus’ last years are shrouded in darkness and we can catch only glimpses highlighting some periods. Undoubtedly, Giraldus’ life was still intertwined with political upheavals. Though he might not have found himself at the heart of the storm, he was still troubled by it.

After Archbishop Hubert Walter had died in 1205, a dispute over his successor arose. Pope Innocent III intervened and presented Stephen Langton to the rival parties. The soon-to-be archbishop of Canterbury was no stranger to Giraldus.

Stephen Langton, whose family was not of high birth, was probably from Wragby in Lincolnshire. It has been suggested that his early education might have taken place in the school of Lincoln cathedral. From 1170 on, Stephen Langton studied in Paris, where he and Giraldus probably became fellow students. The Church of Wales would depend from Canterbury until 1920.

---

260 Patet itaque, quam ambigua sunt valde fata causarum (There it was obvious, how very dubious are the outcomes of suits: JS, p. 269).
262 Richter, Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death, p. 388. The Church of Wales would depend from Canterbury until 1920 (Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 97).
263 Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 94.
264 Baumann, Stephen Langton, p. 33.
266 John Baldwin considers Stephen Langton as part of the inner circle of Peter the Chanter (Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, p. 18). Furthermore, he draws attention to the obvious debt to Peter the Chanter that Giraldus displays in the composition of the Gemma ecclesiastica (Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, p. 42–43). Thus, Stephen Langton and Giraldus may be considered fellow students (Baumann, Stephen Langton, p. 43–44). For a short overview on the biography of Stephen Langton (with special focus on his time as a master at Paris), cf. Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, p. 25–29.
Whereas Giraldus left Paris, Stephen Langton stayed until Pope Innocent’s decision drew him into English politics. His promotion to the archbishopric was not undebated. A furious King John suspected Stephen Langton of being a French spy, but the Pope adhered to his decision. In June 1207, Stephen Langton was consecrated.

Meanwhile, after his defeat in 1204, Giraldus had gone on pilgrimage to Rome. The journey would take time. It cannot be safely stated when Giraldus returned to Lincoln: maybe it was in 1207, or perhaps it was in 1208. Therefore, it is possible that Giraldus was present at Stephen Langton’s consecration in Italy. Having returned from his pilgrimage, Giraldus took up residence in Lincoln, where he owned a small house (and had a small familia).

Giraldus’ claims and his persistence in the case of St Davids had obviously not been forgotten. Giraldus reports in his *Invectiones* that, after his return from Rome, he was called to the court. In a private discussion, King John offered his support, if Giraldus intended to raise the matter of St Davids again:

> [...] *si denuo causam illam moveret et controversiam suscitaret, ipsum non solum non impediret verum etiam totis nisibus adiuvaret*.

If he would again bring that case forth and stir up this controversy again, he himself would not only not interfere, but assist him with all his might.

The king’s goal was to use Giraldus to hold Stephen Langton at bay. But Giraldus declined this offer. He had his own problems to deal with.

---


268 Cf. *Invectiones*, p. 137.

269 Cf. Butler, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, p. 357 and Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 270. If Michael Richter is correct, Giraldus returned to Lincoln in 1208 (Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 9). This would make Giraldus’ presence at the consecration ceremony even more likely.

270 Cf. SD, p. 62–63.

271 *Invectiones*, p. 151.
After he had forsworn his metropolitan ambitions, Giraldus took care of his nephew Gerald (son of Giraldus’ beloved brother Philip)\(^{272}\). He conferred his archdeaconry of Brecon and a prebend onto his nephew, but he also assured that he would keep the administration in his hands\(^{273}\). The relationship between uncle and nephew deteriorated continuously. Much of this personal quarrel can be read in *Speculum Duorum*.

Besides these family problems, St Davids would not let Giraldus go so easily. In 1214, bishop Geoffrey de Henlaw died and the bishopric fell vacant again. Some of the canons put forth Giraldus’ name. It was the third time Giraldus was regarded as a possible successor to a deceased bishop of St Davids, but this time, he refused the offer. As he explained himself in *De Jure*:

\[Si\ vocatus\ ab\ omnibus\ unanimer\ fuisset,\ et\ a\ nullo\ recusatus,\ nec\ rege\ quoque\ nec\ archiepiscopo\ dissentiente\ [...]\ tunc\ onerosam\ paupertatem\ illam\ non\ recusasset\] \(^{274}\).

If he [= Giraldus] had been called by all of them unanimously, and if no one had voted against him, and if neither the king nor the archbishop had had a different opinion [...] then he would not have refused the burdensome poverty.

In the end, the Welshman Iorwerth, former prior of Talley, was consecrated by Archbishop Stephen Langton in June 1215\(^{275}\).

At first glance, it may seem strange that Giraldus called the bishopric a burdensome poverty. But many Welsh dioceses were so poorly endowed that their bishops left them and relied on the hospitality of richer English religious houses\(^{276}\). The same accounts for St Davids. Although it may have been the largest and richest diocese in Wales, even a hundred years after Giraldus’ death, its bishops would have possessed only a tenth of the income of the bishops of Winchester\(^{277}\).


\(^{273}\) *JS*, p. 325.

\(^{274}\) *JS*, p. 133–134.

\(^{275}\) St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 10. Iorwerth was bishop until he died in 1229.

\(^{276}\) Cf. the examples mentioned by Pryce, A Cross-Border Career, p. 48–49.

\(^{277}\) Turner, The Medieval Palaces of the Bishops of St Davids, Wales, p. 217.
Giraldus himself was no poor man, for he had not been idle with collecting benefices in England and Wales\(^{278}\). Overall, he received 100 marks from them every year, and as a bishop of St Davids, he would have possessed only a fifth of this sum\(^{279}\).

Although Giraldus had declined King John's offer of support, the paths of Giraldus and Stephen Langton crossed nevertheless. As 1199 had been an important year for Giraldus, 1215 – the year of the Magna Carta – proved to be an equally turbulent year for Archbishop Stephen Langton. After his consecration in 1207, Stephen Langton had to remain in exile until 1213, because King John prohibited him from crossing the Channel\(^{280}\). When the king finally gave in and was reconciled with the pope, Stephen Langton was urged to assist “the pope's favoured vassal”\(^{281}\) in every possible way.

The difficult situation between the archbishop of Canterbury and King John worsened, as Stephen Langton did not firmly side with his king during the protests of the barons and the events around the issuing of the Magna Carta\(^{282}\). Surrounded by problems and isolated (indeed, a situation very similar to Giraldus’ situation more than ten years earlier), Stephen Langton considered resigning his archbishopric and becoming a monk. We know that Giraldus did not support such a decision and vehemently tried to dissuade Stephen Langton from his plan\(^{283}\).

But this is not the only indication of personal contact between the scholar and the archbishop. As the letter proves, both men obviously shared an admiration for Saint Thomas Becket, Stephen Langton’s predecessor at Canterbury\(^{284}\).

\(^{278}\) *EH*, p. XIII.

\(^{279}\) *JS*, p. 133 and *Invectiones*, p. 19. James C. Davies compiled a list of benefices and revenues Giraldus had been collecting throughout his life (Davies, *Giraldus Cambrensis*, p. 89).


\(^{281}\) Church, *King John*, p. 201.


\(^{284}\) The cult of Thomas Becket did not prosper in Wales (Williams-Jones, *Thomas Becket and Wales*, p. 359). In the case of Giraldus, the veneration of Thomas Becket may have largely been due to his time in Paris, where the martyred archbishop was strongly venerated (Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools*, p. 192). Furthermore, Giraldus had also visited Becket’s shrine in 1180 (*RG*, p. 49–50).
Furthermore, both men must have been in contact throughout the previous years, as several dedications to Stephen Langton prove: Besides the lives of Remigius and St Hugh, Giraldus dedicated *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, Speculum Ecclesiae*, the third version of his *Itinerarium Kambriae* and the second version of the *Descriptio Kambriae* to the archbishop.

The ongoing civil war made the situation in England difficult. King John’s opponents, secular and ecclesiastical men alike, were forced into exile in France. Among them was Stephen Langton. Because of his associations with the rebel barons, the archbishop had been suspended by the pope and was only reinstalled to his office on the condition that he did not return to England, as long as the situation had not changed\textsuperscript{285}. It was Stephen Langton’s second exile as archbishop of Canterbury and it would last until May 1218. Then, he returned to England.

Meanwhile, England was turned into a battle field by the opposing parties\textsuperscript{286}. The rebels sought help from the continent and invited the French Prince Louis, who landed with an army in England. His arrival was welcomed by Giraldus, as we see in a laudatory poem he wrote\textsuperscript{287}. If Giraldus was still living in Lincoln, he must have witnessed the siege of Lincoln castle, which was a bastion of King John’s supporters\textsuperscript{288}.

When King John died in October 1216, his son Henry, a child of nine years old, succeeded him\textsuperscript{289}. War raged on until the decisive battle at Lincoln, which took place on 20 May 1217\textsuperscript{290}. What became of Giraldus? When did he die, and where?

Things became quiet around the “garrulous”\textsuperscript{291} archdeacon. Maybe he witnessed the canonization of Bishop Hugh and the *translatio* of Thomas

\textsuperscript{285} Church, King John, p. 241–242. A few weeks later, the Lateran Council of 1215 took place at Rome. For information on Pope Innocent III, the Council, and its impact on art and literature, cf. Ferrari, Herbers, and Witthöft, Einleitung, p. 7–25 and the remaining articles of this essay collection.


\textsuperscript{287} This poem is printed in Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 181–183. The text was supposedly written in the second half of 1216 (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 83).

\textsuperscript{288} Both Lincolnshire and Lincoln fell to the French, but Lincoln Castle would not (McGlynn, Blood Cries Afar, p. 173).


\textsuperscript{290} A detailed description can be found in McGlynn, Blood Cries Afar, p. 208–215. The main battleground can be located between the castle and Lincoln Cathedral (McGlynn, Blood Cries Afar, p. 212).

\textsuperscript{291} Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s Homage to Hugh of Avalon, p. 20.
2. The life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis

Becket in 1220. Robert Bartlett convincingly argued that Giraldus spent his last days at Llanthony priory (near Hereford), where he probably worked on the *History of Llanthony Prima*. In the end, our talkative writer would have silently disappeared from our sight, if it had not been for an entry in the register of Bishop Hugh of Wells.

There, we learn that a new clerk was admitted to the church of Chesterton, which had been in the possession of Giraldus:

*Willelmus de Paris, clericus, [...] ad ecclesiam de Cestretone, facta prius inquisitione per Archidiaconum Oxon’ etc., et domino Episcopo certiorato per litteras patentes Decani Herefordensis de morte magistri G. de Barri, proximo rectoris eiusdem ecclesiae, admissus est.*

William of Paris, clerk, [...] is admitted to the Church of Chesterton, after an inquiry had earlier been made by the archdeacon of Oxford, etc., and after the Lord bishop had been ensured by letters of the Dean of Hereford that magister G. de Barri, former rector of the aforesaid church, had died.

Due to this entry, Giraldus’ death is placed in the years 1222 / 1223. Tradition claims that he was buried in St Davids, but the supposed grave is not contemporary.

2.3 Giraldus and his saints’ lives

Giraldus loved to write about himself, his family, and his writings, wherefore we can deduce a lot of information from his texts. Moreover, we may gain an impression of how he thought about his works from the references scattered throughout his œuvre. This is also possible for the saints’ lives.

Our first hint can be found in the seventh book of *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae* (probably composed around 1218). In a short

---

292 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales and the *History of Llanthony Priory*, p. 92.
293 Rotuli Hugonis de Welles, Episcopi Lincolniensis, A.D. MCCIX – MCCXXXV, p. 9–10.
294 The supposed grave of Giraldus dates from the 14th or 15th century (Bloxam, A Concise Description of the Principal Sepulchral Monuments in St. David’s Cathedral, South Wales, p. 296 and Lloyd, A History of Wales, p. 631).
295 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 178.
catalogue of his writings, Giraldus mentioned his saints’ lives after a reference to Symbolum Electorum and before the entry for his Invectiones.

Necnon et Legendas Sanctorum multas; inter quas Vitam Sancti Davidis, et Vitam Sancti Karadoci egregie tractavit. Et ad sanctum Karadocum canonizandum, sanctorumque catalogo connumerandum, apud curiam Romanam laudabili devotione laboravit296.

And [there are] many saints’ lives, among them the life of St David and the life of St Caradoc, which he [= Giraldus] excellently wrote. And he went to the curia at Rome and there devotedly laboured that Saint Caradoc should be canonized and listed among the saints in the catalogue.

In this passage, Giraldus did not refer to every life he had composed. Instead, he chose to highlight the lives of David and Caradoc separately. There is an obvious reason for his choice: the whole text of De Jure revolves around Giraldus’ championship of the church of St Davids, where St David and St Caradoc are venerated. By referring to his devoted labour for both saints, Giraldus presents himself as an ideal bishop for the church of St Davids.

The second passage in which Giraldus commented on his saints’ lives can be found in his Catalogus brevior (composed about 1217)297. The text contains a list of books that Giraldus had written. Unfortunately, in this catalogue, the book entries do not appear in chronological order. If it were, the entry for the Descriptio Kambriae, for example, would suggest a later composition298. The text, however, is one of Giraldus’ earliest works.

In the Catalogus, Giraldus mentioned his complete hagiographical œuvre after a reference to the Expugnatio Hibernica and before a reference to the life of Geoffrey Plantagenet:


2. The life and times of Giraldus Cambrensis

Furthermore, [I have written] a book about saints’ lives; namely, the life of St David, archbishop of St Davids; the life of the noble St Caradoc, a confessor of the very same place; the life of St Ethelbert, the famous martyr of Hereford, the life of St Remigius, the first bishop of Lincoln; and the life of St Hugh, who was the fifth bishop after Remigius had been bishop of the very same place.

The passage assigns each saint to his main place of veneration: St Davids (David and Caradoc), Hereford (Ethelbert), and Lincoln (Remigius and Hugh). Furthermore, the sequence in which the lives appear seems to hint at the order of composition. Thus, Giraldus would have written the life of St David first, and the life of St Hugh last. Unfortunately, no year is assigned to the entries and the order of appearance might as well be random.

A third source can be consulted: It is a letter, addressed to the chapter of Hereford. In an overview of his œuvre, Giraldus distinguished not only between works of his youth and those of his riper age\textsuperscript{300}, but also between \textit{opuscula minora} and \textit{maiora}\textsuperscript{301}. We may argue that Giraldus did not prefer the \textit{maiora} over the \textit{minora}, because he hastened to add that a mind that applies himself to minor and major works alike deserves to be praised\textsuperscript{302}. In fact, Giraldus specifically emphasized the importance of his saints’ lives, when he referred to famous predecessors who had also written saints’ lives, like St Ambrose or St Bernard of Clairvaux\textsuperscript{303}. Especially St Ambrose may have served as an example for Giraldus, because he had dedicated his time both to the Holy Scripture and the life of St Agnes.

The passage in which Giraldus remarked on his saints’ lives runs as follows:

\begin{quote}
Ad magnorum quoque virorum et auctenticorum instantiam plurimam, legendas sanctorum vitas emisi; Vitam videlicet Sancti Ædelberti, martyris Herefordensis egregii; Vitam Sancti David, Menevensis archiepiscopi; Vitam quoque Sancti Karadoci, loci eiusdem heremitaie nobilis et presbyteri. Item
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{300} LS, p. 411 and p. 414. 

\textsuperscript{301} LS, p. 416. 

\textsuperscript{302} LS, p. 416. 

\textsuperscript{303} Cf. LS, p. 416: \textit{Beatus Ambrosius eodem stilo studioque, quo sacras Scripturas tam arduas exposuit et explanavit, vitam quoque Sanctae Agnetis Virginis et Martiris explicare dignum.} Contrary to the suggestion of Matthew Mesley, Giraldus does not claim that the lives of St Agnes (written by St Ambrose) and St Malachy (written by St Bernard of Clairvaux) served as models for his own hagiographical writing (cf. Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 201 and, for the Latin text, \textit{LS}, p. 416). Giraldus continues his list of possible role models with other authors, who had also dedicated their time to letters and letter-books, when they did not write \textit{opera maiora}, in order to justify his own writing career (cf. \textit{LS}, p. 416–417).
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Vitam Sancti Remigii, Lincolniensis episcopi primi. Vitamque similiter Sancti Hugonis, sedis eiusdem episcopi, de Cartusiensis Ordinis carcere feliciter assumpti.304

Because I have been urged by great and powerful men, I have written saints’ lives that should be read; namely, the life of St Ethelbert, the famous martyr of Hereford; the life of St David, archbishop of St Davids and the life of St Caradoc, a noble hermit and presbyter of the very same place. I have also written the life of St Remigius, first bishop of Lincoln. And I have written a life of St Hugh as well. He was bishop of the same see and had gladly accepted the austere life of the Carthusian order.

Though the remarks on the lives are as short as in the Catalogus, this passage allows for some interesting observations:

First of all, if we compare the passage from the Epistola ad Capitulum Herefordense with the corresponding part of the Catalogus, we can see that the sequence of appearance of the vitae has changed: The life of St Ethelbert is mentioned at the beginning and thus raised from number three of the order of appearance in the Catalogus to number one in the letter to the chapter of Hereford. At first glance, this might indicate that Ethelbert’s life is older than, for example, the lives of the Welsh saints David and Caradoc. We should keep in mind, however, that the letter was addressed to the chapter of Hereford, which means, it was directed to canons at the place of principal veneration of St Ethelbert. Consequently, Giraldus may have changed the sequence of appearance out of courtesy towards the addresses of the letter. We should therefore not attribute too much weight on this observation, but treat it as a captatio benevolentiae towards the readers at Hereford.

The initial phrase Ad magnorum quoque virorum et auctenticorum instantiam plurimam refers to the commissioners of the saints’ lives. With these words, Giraldus summarized possible advocates, benefactors and friends who might have commissioned a life of a particular saint. On the one hand, this may be a topos, on the other hand, Giraldus may have spoken the truth: after all, the previous chapter showed that Giraldus had strong connections with the religious elite of the respective places of veneration of his saints.

Overall, the three passages taken from Giraldus’ non-hagiographical œuvre suggest the following: first, Giraldus did not give the impression that he “did not care much about his subject.”305 Unfortunately, the three passages do not allow us to define the order in which Giraldus wrote his lives. In De Jure and the Epistola ad Capitulum Herefordense, Giraldus probably adapted the order of appearance to the addresses of each text. The entries in the Catalogus do not bear any dates, so their order may well be accidental.

There is, however, one rough line that is usually drawn: In contrast to the life of St Hugh, the lives of St David, St Ethelbert, St Karadoc and St Remigius must have been written before 1199, because they are included in Giraldus’ Symbolum Electorum. Symbolum Electorum is an election of Giraldus’ favourite prefaces, which Robert Bartlett dates to 1199306.

Symbolum Electorum has come down to us in several manuscripts, although not all of them contain every single part of the compilation. Overall, at least parts of the text are contained in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.7.11, Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 0.10.16 (a 17th century-copy of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.7.11307), and London, British Library, Cotton MS Cleopatra D V308.

The saints’ life are only included in Cambridge, Trinity College, R.7.11. Their order of appearance is as follows: from f.93v-94r (Ethelbert-preface), f.94r (David-preface), and f.94r-95r (Karadoc-preface) to f.95r (Remigius-preface). Unfortunately, this order of appearance does not necessarily give a hint on the dates of compilation: The manuscript once came from Hereford, which may explain the appearance of Ethelbert’s praefatio at the beginning. Furthermore, this version of Symbolum Electorum was probably updated at a time unknown to us. Of course, glosses in the text may be a sign of a later update, but they might also have come into existence because of scribal errors. Nevertheless, internal reference points to a later update.

305 Cf. Antonia Gransden’s comment on how Giraldus wrote the life of Remigius (Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 311). Indeed, the contrary is true. Giraldus never failed to mention his saint’s lives when appropriate. The life of Remigius, for example, is referred to in a letter to William de Monte (SD, p. 172–173).
306 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 178. Giraldus composed this compilation because of the requests of his friends, and one of these friends was Walter Map (LS, p. 413).
308 Planta, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library Deposited in the British Museum, p. 583 (Symbolum electorum, sive eiusdem ad varios epistolae). Symbolum Electorum was partly edited in the Rolls Series and the prefaces of the saints’ lives were not included in the edition (cf. Symb., p. 395).
One of the most obvious cases is the form of address reserved for Adam of Eynsham. He is styled *venerabili viro abbati de Evesham Adam*\(^{309}\), but he was elected abbot of Eynsham in 1213\(^{310}\). The title is neither glossed nor does the passage show any trace of being a later addition, wherefore it seems to be clear that at least this folio must have been written at a time later than 1199, which is usually accepted as the text’s date of composition\(^{311}\).

The case of *Symbolum Electorum* leads us to another habit of Giraldus that should be briefly examined before we can start with the interpretation of the saints’ lives: his habit of continuous revision and amending. This habit may be best described by the following quotation, taken from a letter which he wrote to the chapter of Hereford:

> Rogo itaque quatinus librum nostrum, sc. Ecclesiae Speculum, beato Æthelberto anno iam fere praeterito datum, mihi per hunc clericum praesentium latorem, ad corrigendum adhuc plenius et utilia quaedam locis competentibus adiciendum, remittere velitis\(^{312}\).

Therefore I ask you to send my book back to me, namely, Speculum Ecclesiae, which I had given to the community of St Ethelbert almost a year ago. Send it back to me through this clerk, who has given you this letter, and I may correct the text in greater detail and add some useful remarks to fitting passages.

Rewriting, adding, shaping and polishing – although Giraldus probably regarded his works as masterpieces in their own right, he could almost never leave them in peace. In case of his famous *Topographia Hibernia*, four recensions + \(X\) later versions of this work have survived\(^{313}\). However, if Giraldus’ interest in a text waned, he would even publish it in a rougher shape than we might expect. For the second *distinctio* of the *Expugnatio*, A. B. Scott and F. X. Martin noted:

> In fact the most remarkable feature of all this is that Giraldus, who was normally so fond of tinkering with his text, adding, altering, even cutting in some places, has here left in passages which even he must have felt were

---

\(^{309}\) CTC 7.11, f. 11r and *Symb.*, p. 229.

\(^{310}\) MV1, p. XII.

\(^{311}\) Unfortunately, establishing a date of composition for *Symbolum Electorum* is out of the scope of this thesis. The arguments of Robert Bartlett for dating the (original) composition of *Symbolum Electorum* are valid, wherefore 1199 will still be accepted.

\(^{312}\) LS, p. 409.

\(^{313}\) Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 174.
irrelevant, and yet has never gone back over these narrative sections and filled them out\textsuperscript{314}.

Throughout Giraldus’ œuvre, we have different types of revision: on the level of words, on the level of sentences – he usually adds quotations of authorities to bolster his argument – and, finally, rewrites of even larger parts of a text. He usually uses techniques of substitution\textsuperscript{315} or augmentation\textsuperscript{316}, and, especially in the cases of réécriture, techniques of concision and, partly, of condensation\textsuperscript{317}. Usually, instances of any of these types can only be addressed if at least two manuscripts containing different versions of the same text have come down to us. In cases of texts that circulated widely, like Topographia Hibernica, the different manuscripts can be compared easily. Unfortunately, the manuscript tradition in Giraldus’ œuvre is not always as good. Several works of Giraldus have come down to us only in one manuscript. This is also true for the saints’ lives\textsuperscript{318}.

Thankfully, Giraldus was proud of what he had accomplished throughout his life as an author. Indeed, he might have been his own greatest admirer, for if self-plagiarism had been a crime in the Middle Ages, he would have been severely punished for the multiple cases in which he committed it\textsuperscript{319}. His self-love (or, his love of his own writings) is to our advantage, because in some cases, missing parts of one text can be reconstructed from another text that has come down to us. In case of the saints’ lives, we may look at Symbolum Electorum.

His time in Paris should have equipped Giraldus with systematic, abstract thinking. Scholastic theology and Peter the Chanter come immediately to

\textsuperscript{314} EH, p. XXXIII.
\textsuperscript{318} The exception is Giraldus’ life of St David, for which we can prove he wrote two different versions (cf. chapter 3.2.1).
\textsuperscript{319} For an analysis of incidents of self-quotation in his Itinerarium, cf. Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s Itinerarium Cambriae, p. 46–50.
mind\textsuperscript{320}. Another academic tendency would have included the rise of rhetoric and the increasing use of classical authors, which have definitively left their marks on hagiographical writing\textsuperscript{321}.

If we think of Giraldus’ time in Paris, we may conclude that his process of revision may have followed a specific system. However, the contrary is the case. Giraldus “was not a slave to consistency”\textsuperscript{322}.

Of course, this statement has to be taken with the necessary grain of salt: over the course of his long career, Giraldus’ opinions on certain subjects must have necessarily changed\textsuperscript{323}. Furthermore, this statement strictly refers to the fact that Giraldus’ probably had no theoretical framework in mind when he started writing a theoretical piece. A good example would be Giraldus’ \textit{Gemma Ecclesiastica}, which may be described as a “digressive and unsystematic book”\textsuperscript{324}. Finally, this statement may also be applied to Giraldus’ habit of revision. Although he must have come into contact with questions of rhetoric and style, his works shows that he had no system in mind when he ‘polished’ his texts.

Yet the lack of a theoretical framework did not diminish the stylistic quality of his works. On the contrary, Giraldus was gifted with a “talent for

\textsuperscript{320} Cf. above, chapter 2.2.1. Although Peter the Chanter had a great influence on Giraldus, Robert Bartlett concludes that scholastic theology as such influenced Giraldus’ only slightly (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 14).

\textsuperscript{321} Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 599. Traces of the rhetorical developments and standards during Giraldus’ lifetime have come down to us in the form of rhetorical handbooks. One of the most famous handbooks was written by a contemporary of Giraldus, Geoffrey of Vinsauf (for the text and its sources, cf. The Poetria Nova and Its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine, by Ernest A. Gallo, 1971). More authors concerned with rhetoric during the 11th to the 13th century are listed in Cizek, Imitatio et Tractatio, p. 15. Cf. for further information on rhetoric in the Middle Ages Murphy, Rhetoric in the Middle Ages, 1974, Cizek, Imitatio et Tractatio, 1994, Kennedy, Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times, p. 212–225, and, with extensive literature references, Ward, Classical Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: The Medieval Rhetors and Their Art 400–1300, with Manuscript Survey to 1500 CE, p. 399–453.

\textsuperscript{322} Meecham-Jones, Style, Truth and Irony: Listening to the Voice of Gerald of Wales’s Writings, p. 128. Or, as Robert Bartlett put it: “Gerald was neither a systematic nor an abstract thinker” (\textit{PI}, p. XXIII).

\textsuperscript{323} Giraldus’ changes of mind are preserved in his \textit{Retractationes} (Retr., p.425–427). We should, however, doubt Giraldus’ contrition, for Yoko Wada cautions that Giraldus may have written them as a reference to Augustine and Bede (Wada, Gerald on Gerald: Self-Presentation by Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 233).

\textsuperscript{324} Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 33.
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descriptive writing”\textsuperscript{325}, he wrote in “vivid and personal prose”\textsuperscript{326}, and he displayed “literary artistry”\textsuperscript{327}.

When Giraldus polished his text on the level of words, he had two possibilities: he could either add or replace words. Although Giraldus could also have omitted words, Georgia Henley has shown in her examination of \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} that Giraldus’ “revision process was one of accretion”\textsuperscript{328}. In order to examine this type of polishing on the level of words, we would need several manuscripts containing several versions of a text, so that we could also exclude the possibility of scribal errors. Unfortunately, given the paucity of manuscripts, such an enterprise is almost impossible in case of the saints’ lives.

Much easier is the examination of revision on the level of sentences. Sentences and quotations usually consist of a larger amount of words, which reduces the probability of scribal errors (although a scribe could nevertheless omit whole sentences because of carelessness). Scholars have especially hunted for quotations that Giraldus had taken from literary authorities. In case of \textit{Gemma Ecclesiastica}, for example, Giraldus relied heavily on Peter the Chanter’s \textit{verbum abbreviatum}\textsuperscript{329}. Other scholars have tracked down Giraldus’ quotations from classical authors. Goddu and Rouse have shown that many of these quotations were taken from \textit{florilegia}\textsuperscript{330}. A useful analysis for \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} was undertaken by Georgia Henley. She found out that Giraldus used a wide range of classical, biblical, and patristic sources\textsuperscript{331}.

But Giraldus also rewrote larger parts of his works and thus changed the narrative structure of the texts. An example would be the treatment of William de Braose in his \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}: while Giraldus treats him very critically in version one of the \textit{Itinerarium}, this critique is considerably

\textsuperscript{325} Gransden, Review, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{326} Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{327} Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s Homage to Hugh of Avalon, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{328} Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}, p. 11. This is not necessarily always true for the saints’ lives, cf. especially the life of St David, chapter 3.2.1 and 3.4.
\textsuperscript{329} Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, p. 42–43.
\textsuperscript{330} Goddu and Rouse, Gerald of Wales and the Florilegium Angelicum, p. 488–521. Giraldus’ time at the University of Paris probably equipped him with many a quotation (or even \textit{florilegia}) that he later used throughout his writings. He may have lost some of these quotation collections to the monks of \textit{Strata Florida} (\textit{Spec.}, p. 154–155).
\textsuperscript{331} Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}, p. 1–52. Cf. as well Guy, Gerald and Welsh Genealogical Learning, p. 47 for literature references.
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Weakened in version two\(^{332}\). This adjustment of larger parts could include a reworking of words, sentences, and the addition of completely new information, as Michael Faletra analysed for a scene in which Giraldus describes beavers\(^{333}\).

In the case of the saints’ lives, we have to bear in mind that Giraldus’ habit of rewriting possibly created different versions of his texts. These versions might differ considerably, depending on the *causae legendi* and *causae scribendi* of each text. Thus, we may not equate a later version of a text with an earlier one, as it is often done, for example, in the case of the life of Remigius\(^{334}\). Unfortunately, in the case of the saints’ lives, usually only one of the (possibly several) versions has come down to us, so that we can not examine the differences between the different versions. Consequently, we are often unable to decide whether differences between the texts were purposefully created by Giraldus or whether they owe their existence to scribal errors\(^{335}\).

To account for the possibly very large differences that Giraldus created, I will use the term ‘version’ throughout this thesis and thereby include the possibility that Giraldus undertook major changes between two versions of the same text.

\(^{332}\) Thorpe, Gerald of Wales, p. 42.
\(^{333}\) Faletra, Giralidan Beavers: Revision and the Making of Meaning in Gerald’s Early Works, p. 113–118. For further examples of Giraldus’ habit of revising his works, cf. also the latest edition and translation of *De Principis Instructione*, written by Robert Bartlett (*PI*, p. XVIII–XIX).

\(^{334}\) Cf. chapter 5 for further information on that point.

\(^{335}\) Georgia Henley drew attention to the problem of changes caused by scribal transmission (Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giraldus Cambrensis’s *Itinerarium Kambriae*, p. 40). An example of a doublet possibly created by Giraldus’ habit of rewriting would be the case of Lindsey in the life of Remigius, cf. Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitsprozessen.
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The first saint’s life to be examined is the *Vita S. Davidis*. It was written in honour of St David, who is venerated today as the patron saint of Wales\(^{336}\).

3.1 The historical figure of St David

St David is commemorated on 1 March. Although evidence of the historical David is scarce, he probably existed. Within Wales, hints of David’s existence can be found in the inscription of the Idnerth stone of Llanddewi Brefi, which is dated to the 7th century or 9th century\(^{337}\). Outside Wales, the evidence comes mainly from Irish sources. For example, David is mentioned in the *Catalogus sanctorum Hiberniae*, which was written in the 8th or 10th century\(^{338}\). He is also commemorated in early Irish martyrologies (written around 800)\(^{339}\). Finally, evidence from the continent can also be found. David is also associated with a habit of drinking cold water and his surname, *Aquaticus*, is attested in the life of St Paul of Léon (Brittany), which was written in 884\(^{340}\).

Other primary sources which were written at a later date also contain references to St David. Unfortunately, these references form a rather confusing picture: For example, the *Annales Cambriae* place the birth of St David, who is called *archiepiscopus*\(^{341}\), in the year 458 and his death in the

---

\(^{336}\) For explanations why St David survived as a patron saint throughout the Reformation until the present day, cf. Bowen, Dewi Sant, p. 93–111, Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 12–18, and Tudor Edwards, Last Man Standing, p. 311–312.

\(^{337}\) Dumville, Saint David of Wales, p. 31–32.

\(^{338}\) Tudor Edwards, Last Man Standing, p. 298 attributes the text to the 9th or 10th century, while David Farmer says it was written around 730 (Farmer, The Oxford Dictionary of Saints, p. 130).

\(^{339}\) Farmer, The Oxford Dictionary of Saints, p. 130. David’s mother, Non, was probably more popular in Brittany than in Wales (Cartwright, Introduction, p. 2).

\(^{340}\) Vie de St Paul de Léon en Bretagne, p. 421 (*Sanctumque Devium qui pro eo quod propter artissimam vitae eius in Christo conversationem et sui a Deo iudice laboris firmissimam retributionis spem in pane et aqua vixerit cognomento dicebatur Aquaticus*).

\(^{341}\) Ann. Cambr., p. 6.
year 601\textsuperscript{342}. The Annales of Waverley claim that David died in 544\textsuperscript{343}. According to the Dunstaple Annales, St David was consecrated bishop in 534\textsuperscript{344}.

Despite the conflicting entries in the primary sources, it may be taken for granted that a man called ‘David’ once lived. It is generally accepted that this man lived during the sixth century and that he led a monastic community\textsuperscript{345}. Some facts about St David stated in his \textit{vitae} – for example, his noble birth or his education by Paulinus – may also be true\textsuperscript{346}. The day of his death, the first of March, seems to be true, whereas the year of his death is uncertain – it may be placed around 600, but the sources differ\textsuperscript{347}.

This short overview demonstrates that information about the life of the ‘historical’ David has been confusing since the Middle Ages. Consequently, quite a lot of (sometimes contradictory) traditions evolved around the figure of St David. While hagiographers like Rhygyfarch ap Sulien proclaimed David was consecrated archbishop by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and again elected as archbishop of Wales on the Synod of Brefi\textsuperscript{348}, Geoffrey of Monmouth narrated how David became the archiepiscopal successor of St Dubricius (Dyfrig)\textsuperscript{349}. Some of these traditions surround David with a ‘miraculous’ air, so to speak. He is, for example, said to have been King Arthur’s uncle\textsuperscript{350}.

Whereas David’s fame was limited to his native country during his lifetime\textsuperscript{351}, it grew over the centuries. Similar to Saint James the Apostle, St David was evoked as a military leader. Even before the Norman Conquest,

\textsuperscript{342} \textit{Ann. Cambr.}, p. 3 and p. 6.
\textsuperscript{345} Tudor Edwards, Last Man Standing, p. 296.
\textsuperscript{346} Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{347} Wooding, The Figure of David, p. 1. Some historians claim David died in 589 (cf. Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 2), but the date has varied frequently, even throughout the Middle Ages (Dumville, Saint David of Wales, p. 26).
\textsuperscript{348} Cf. chapter 3.3.5.
\textsuperscript{349} Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{350} An information which is provided by Geoffrey of Monmouth (Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 215) and is also mentioned in \textit{IK}, p. 101. There is, however, also the tradition that David was Arthur’s great-nephew (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 32).
\textsuperscript{351} Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 2. Pádraig ó Riain suggests that the spread of David’s cult could have been connected with Irish settlement in Wales (Ó Riain, The Church in Ceredigion in the Early Middle Ages b. The Saints of Cardiganshire, p. 390).
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a prophetic poem – *Armes Prydein* – calls on David as leader of a host of saints and men that would drive out the Saxons. The chronicle *La Geste des Engleis en Yrlande* (also known as *The Song of Dermot and the Earl*) contains scenes in which either single military leaders or the whole host invokes the help of St David as their battle cry. Over the centuries, many more facets were added to the figure of Saint David. During the 15th and 16th century, he appears in poems that foretold the fate of the nation.

Similar to the figure of St David, several traditions have evolved for his most famous workplace, St Davids. Its Latin name is *Menevia*, which derives from Welsh *Mynyw* (‘thorny bush’ or ‘brake’). Curiously, the connection between St David and his main place of veneration did necessarily exist from the beginning. Some scholars argue that David’s cult might have originated in Cardiganshire, and that it was taken to St Davids later. It has also been suggested that Bishop Sulien ((†1099) brought the cult to St Davids. Unfortunately, our evidence on these points is very scarce. In any case, St Davids and St David have been closely connected since the 9th century.

Among the frequently quoted sources connected with David is *Asser’s Life of King Alfred*, where Asser refers to Nobis, bishop of St Davids, as *archiepiscopus*.

---

353 Cf. The Deeds of the Normans in Ireland (*La Geste des Engleis en Yrlande*), p. 72, verse 753 and p. 78, verse 987 (battle cry of the host) and p. 102, verse 1936 (Raymond le Gros invokes St David) and p. 141, verses 3441, 3445 and 3450. The vernacular chronicle was probably written around the time when Giraldus wrote his *Expugnatio* (*The Deeds of the Normans in Ireland* (*La Geste des Engleis en Yrlande*), p. 37).
354 Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 38.
355 James, The Cult of St. David in the Middle Ages, p. 105. The Irish cognate *muine* also means ‘thicket’ or ‘brake’ (Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids and the Coming of the Normans, p. 10).
356 James, The Cult of St. David in the Middle Ages, p. 105.
357 Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids: Some Observations on the Cult, Site and Buildings, p. 15, Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 39, and James, The Geography of the Cult of St David, p. 81.
358 Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 39.
360 Asser’s Life of King Alfred: Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser, p. 66. David is also celebrated in Sherborne, where Asser was bishop, and in Leominster, where some relics are said to have been venerated (Hillaby, The Early Church in Herefordshire: Columban and Roman, p. 48. cf. also a grant of indulgence ushered by Bishop Iorwerth which mentions an arm of St David: St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 103–104). David’s name is also attested in Anglo-Saxon liturgical books (Davies, The Saints of South Wales and the Welsh Church, p. 377–378).
Due to its geographical position, St Davids was often plundered by different groups of raiders, often referred to as ‘pagans’\textsuperscript{361}. The Brut enumerates the lootings: they happened in 904, 981, 987, 991, 1011, 1020, 1071, 1078 and 1089\textsuperscript{362}. The list could be continued by the Annales Cambriae, which lament more than once that “Menevia was devastated”\textsuperscript{363}. The frequent raids even compelled the community to abandon the site for a short time\textsuperscript{364}.

In 1090, raiders stole the shrine of St David\textsuperscript{365}. We do not know whether the relics were recovered or not. However, that did not stop St Davids from becoming a major cult site. A rhyme, written down by William of Malmesbury, connects it with one of the greatest pilgrimage centres in Europe, Rome\textsuperscript{366}. The rhyme goes as follows:

\begin{quote}
Meneviam pete bis, Romam adire si vis  
Merces aequa tibi, redditur hic et ibi,  
Roma semel quantum, dat bis Menevia tantum\textsuperscript{367}.
\end{quote}

Go twice to St Davids, if you want to go to Rome,  
Equal reward is given to you here and there,  
What you receive on a single pilgrimage to Rome,  
St Davids will give it to you for two pilgrimages.

\textsuperscript{361} For the dispute as to whether the location of Menevia had ever been changed, cf. Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids and the Coming of the Normans, p. 12–15.  
\textsuperscript{363} For example, in 1016, 1071, 1078, 1089, and 1097, when Gerald, Giraldus’ grandfather, devastated the lands of St Davids (cf. Ann. Cambr., p. 23–30). As already sketched out in chapter two, the approach of the Normans left its imprint on Wales. St Davids was not exempted from this process, for it lost land to the new arrivals on various occasions (Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 67).  
\textsuperscript{364} Wyn Evans, The Bishops of St Davids from Bernard to Bec, p. 271.  
\textsuperscript{365} St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 2. The Annales Cambriae lament for the year 1088 (Ann. Cambr., p. 28–29): Archa Sancti David ab ecclesia sua furata est, et auro argentoque quibus tegebatur spoliata est. (The Shrine of St David was stolen from its church and stripped of its gold and silver). The theft of the relics before the vitae had been written by Rhiggyfarch and Giraldus would explain why both authors only mention secondary relics (Cowley, The Relics of St David: The Historical Evidence, p. 275).  
\textsuperscript{366} William of Malmesbury refers to Pope Calixt II (GR, p. 778–780). Three visits to St Davids seem to have been regarded as equal to one pilgrimage to Jerusalem (cf. Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 10, Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 65–66, and Tudor Edwards, Political Implications in Medieval Services Celebrating St David of Wales, p. 4, with further references).  
\textsuperscript{367} The quotation is said to come from Archbishop Beckham, who had visited St Davids in 1284 (Harris, “Was St. David ever canonized”?, p. 31–32). Cf. the general doubts of J. Wyn Evans on the privilege (Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids: Some Observations on the Cult, Site and Buildings, p. 24).
Three names come to mind when we think of the promotion of David’s cult during the 11th and 12th century: Rhygyfarch ap Sulien (†1099), Bishop Bernard of St Davids (†1148), and Giraldus. Both Rhygyfarch ap Sulien and Giraldus worked as hagiographers.

Rhygyfarch was the son of Bishop Sulien, who was bishop of St Davids from 1073–1078 and 1080–1085. He was celebrated for his learning and his command of Latin. He wrote a life of St David. Besides its obvious religious intent, the text documents the influence and power of St Davids decades after the Norman Conquest.

An important period for St David’s main place of veneration began with the episcopate of Bishop Bernard. Bernard, a former royal clerk and chaplain of Queen Mathilda, was consecrated bishop of St Davids in 1115. His episcopate is celebrated as one of great success, for he built a cathedral, reorganized the chapter, and, moreover, secured extensive territorial rights for his diocese. Furthermore, under his episcopate, St Davids was associated with powerful saints, among them St Andrew or St Caradoc. Bishop Bernard fostered the cult of St David, too. During his episcopate, short pamphlets containing a life of St David had probably circulated throughout important places in England. Furthermore, Bishop Bernard is said to have searched for the body of St David (in vain, as William of Malmesbury noted).

---

368 For the spelling of Ricemarus’ Welsh name, cf. Wooding, The Figure of David, p. 3. For Bishop Sulien and his sons, cf. Lapidge, The Welsh–Latin Poetry of Sulien’s Family, p. 68–74, esp. p. 73–74 for Rhygyfarch. Rhygyfarch’s brothers later entered the service of Bishop Bernard (Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 34–35).
369 For the hagiographical material on St David, cf. BHL, no. 2107–2112 and BHL_Suppl., no. 2160. Giraldus’ vita may be found under BHL, no. 211.
370 The Brut laments for the year 1097: “In that year died Rythmarch the Wise, son of bishop Sulien, the wisest of the wise among the Britons, in the forty-third year of his age; the man whose like had not appeared before the ages” (translation taken from Brut, p. 63).
371 Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 34. As T.M. Charles-Edwards remarks, Rhygyfarch probably built his arguments on the work of predecessors, as can be proven by works like Armes Prydein or The Seven Bishop-Houses of Dyfed (Charles-Edwards, The Seven Bishop-Houses of Dyfed, p. 260).
372 Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 35.
374 Cf. for further information Davies, Cathedrals and the Cult of Saints in Eleventh- and Twelfth–Century Wales, p. 102–105.
376 Sharpe, Which Text is Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David?, p. 104–105.
377 Scott, The Early History of Glastonbury, p. 64.
Although David had acquired his saintly status *vox populi*, it is still discussed whether he was canonized in about 1123 under Pope Calixt II and Bishop Bernard378.

Bishop Bernard’s episcopate is marked by two major conflicts, one with the diocese of Llandaff, and the other one with the archbishopric of Canterbury379. The conflict with Llandaff was about diocesan boundaries and supremacy. Llandaff, with its patron saint Dyfrig (*Dubricius*) never accepted St Davids’ claim of supremacy, and the *Liber Landavensis* speaks volumes about the resistance380. With the *vitae* included in the *Liber Landavensis*, Llandaff also claimed archiepiscopal dignity in Wales381.

The second conflict during Bishop Bernard’s episcopate was fought with the archbishop of Canterbury. Indeed, Giraldus was not the only canon / bishop from St Davids to fight for the metropolitan claims of the see, for in the person of Bishop Bernard, he had his predecessor382. With Bishop Bernard’s past as chancellor of the queen, his involvement in the fight for ecclesiastical independency seems astonishing. Yet “allegiance to and identification with one’s own diocese was often a stronger impulse than any supposedly national loyalty”383. Ecclesiastical practice elsewhere had each nation assigned its own metropolitan, so Bernard concluded that Wales had to be independent from the church of Canterbury384. From the 1120s to the 1140s, Bishop Bernard frequently addressed the pope to solve the matter. It was argued whether St Davids had always been an archbishopric


380 The *vitae* in the *Liber Landavensis* were clearly written with political intentions (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 5).

381 Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 30. The so-called *graphium* of St Davids seemed to have been equal to the *Liber Landavensis* “in purpose if not in form” (Pryce, The Dynasty of Deheubarth and the Church of St Davids, p. 313–314).

382 The death of Bishop Bernard and his struggle for the establishment of an archbishopric is commemorated in the *Brut* (*Brut*, p. 177), but not in the *Annales Cambriae* (*Ann. Cambr.*, p. 44).


384 Carr, Medieval Wales, p. 51.
and whether Bernard had inherited this archiepiscopal status\textsuperscript{385}. From the position of the native Welsh rulers, the claim for ecclesiastical independency corresponded well with their own intentions, as Wales was in upheaval during the reign of King Stephen\textsuperscript{386}. Similar to Giraldus’ situation decades later in 1199, the native secular rulers supported the bishop’s claim.

Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury reacted swiftly to the threat from Wales: surrounded with supportive suffragans, he encountered the claims of Bishop Bernard\textsuperscript{387}. The situation was deferred to the pope. In 1147, Pope Eugenius decided – temporarily – in favour of his archbishop: Bishop Bernard and St Davids remained suffragans to Canterbury, but the question of the metropolitan claims was delayed for a year\textsuperscript{388}. In 1148, however, the death of Bishop Bernard brought a natural solution to the discussion. Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury reacted quickly and assured himself of the loyalty of Bernard’s successor, who was David FitzGerald, Giraldus’ uncle\textsuperscript{389}. About five decades later, Giraldus resumed Bishop Bernard’s struggle, but to no good end. Both men lost their cases, and St Davids was to remain dependent on Canterbury until 1920\textsuperscript{390}.

The cult of St David, however, kept on flourishing. Throughout Giraldus’ lifetime, the cathedral church was often repaired and rebuilt\textsuperscript{391}. When the saint’s relics were found in 1275, a new shrine was constructed\textsuperscript{392}. Soon, St David’s relics were distributed: to the king, Salisbury Cathedral, or Reading Abbey\textsuperscript{393}. The complete ensemble of St Davids was finished in the 1520s\textsuperscript{394}.

During that time, St David’s fame grew immensely. Finally, it outgrew the boundaries of its diocese. In the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, Wales was divided: while

\textsuperscript{385} Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{386} Richter, Giraldu Cambrensis, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{387} Richter, Giraldu Cambrensis, p. 45–46.
\textsuperscript{388} Richter, Giraldu Cambrensis, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{389} Richter, Giraldu Cambrensis, p. 48. Interestingly, the successors of Bishop Bernard had – with the exception of Peter de Leia – strong connections to the March, wherefore “the bishopric was recognised as a marcher lordship” (Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 73).
\textsuperscript{390} Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 97. Later on, Bernard’s and Giraldus’ attempts were imitated by Bishop Thomas Bek (cf. for further information Greenway, Archbishop Pecham, Thomas Bek and St. David’s, p. 152–163).
\textsuperscript{391} Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{392} Cf. Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 245. How this invention can be reconciled with the theft of the shrine 200 years earlier is unclear.
\textsuperscript{393} Cowley, The Relics of St David: The Historical Evidence, p. 278–279.
\textsuperscript{394} For the shrine and the interior equipment of the church, cf. Wyn Evans, The Reformation and St Davids Cathedral, p. 5 and Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 245–246.
Beuno was the major saint of the North, David was considered the major saint of the South\textsuperscript{395}. In 1398, the feast of St David became part of the influential Sarum calendar, wherefore the memory of St David was widely celebrated\textsuperscript{396}.

The Reformation dealt several heavy blows to St David and his community, although veneration of the saint continued even after the liturgical reform of 1543\textsuperscript{397}. The sources for St Davids itself are scarce, partly because many texts were destroyed during the Reformation. Especially the first protestant bishop of the diocese, Bishop William Barlow († 1547), had a lasting impact on the saint’s main place of veneration. Not only did he consider moving his church from St Davids to Carmarthen in order to escape the old traditions\textsuperscript{398}, he also ordered the shrine of St David and its relics to be destroyed\textsuperscript{399}. As Bishop Barlow wrote to Oliver Cromwell, among these relics were

\begin{quote}
  two heedes of sylver plate enclosinge two rotten skulles stuffed with putrified clowtes; Item, two arme bones, and a worme eaten boke covered with sylver plate\textsuperscript{400}.
\end{quote}

These relics may have been the heads of David and of Justinian\textsuperscript{401}, whereas the \textit{worme eaten boke} may have been the (un-)finished gospel mentioned in Giraldus’ life of St David\textsuperscript{402}.

But the destruction wrought during the Reformation could not make St David disappear. In 1866, bones were found in a niche. For several decades, these bones were attributed to St David, until radiocarbon analysis proved that they belonged to a person who lived in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{403}.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[395] Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 37.
\item[396] Tudor Edwards, Political Implications in Medieval Services Celebrating St David of Wales, p. 2.
\item[397] Tudor Edwards, Political Implications in Medieval Services Celebrating St David of Wales, p. 2.
\item[398] Williams, The Tradition of St. David in Wales, p. 12.
\item[399] For more information on William Barlow and St Davids, cf. Wyn Evans, The Reformation and St Davids Cathedral, p. 1–16.
\item[400] Wright, Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of Monasteries, p. 184.
\item[401] Wright, Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of Monasteries, p. 5.
\item[402] Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 30–31. Cf. also chapter 3.3.4.1.
\item[403] Cowley, The Relics of St David: The Historical Evidence, p. 281.
\end{footnotes}
The cult of David has prevailed until today. However, especially during the last centuries, the political implications of the cult have gained weight.\(^{404}\)

### 3.2 Background information on the life of St David

#### 3.2.1 A short description of the manuscripts

We can prove that Giraldus wrote at least two different versions of his life of St David.\(^{405}\) These two versions were written down in at least two different manuscripts.

A (slightly) earlier version of the vita is preserved in London, British Library, Royal MS 13 C.i.\(^{406}\) Michael Curley suggests that the manuscript itself was compiled around 1458–1459.\(^{407}\) The life of St David, as preserved in this manuscript, has recently been edited by Paul Russell for the “Vitae Sanctorum Cambriae: Latin lives of the Welsh Saints” project.\(^{408}\)

Royal MS 13 C.i seems to have been a text long in use. An unknown author / scribe followed the invitation offered by Giraldus at the end of his vita,  

---

\(^{404}\) For further information, cf. Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 39–42.

\(^{405}\) Although it has been suggested otherwise, no other versions of the life of St David have come down to us. For example, the description in the British Library Catalogue of Harley MS 624 still suggests that it contains a life of St David written by Giraldus (cf., https://manuscrits-france-angleterre.org/services/engine/search/sru?operation=searchRetrieve&version=1.2&query=%28gallica%20all%20%22Harley%20MS%20624%22%29&dc.type%20all%20%22manuscrit%22&lang=en&suggest=0#resultat-id-1, accessed 8 April 2019). It has already been pointed out by John Sherren Brewer that this assumption is false (Gerald of Wales, I. De Invectionibus, Lib. IV; II. De Menevensi Ecclesia Dialogus; III. Vita S. David, p. XLII).

\(^{406}\) Paul Russell kindly allowed me to view his yet unpublished material on this manuscript and pointed this out to me. His material will be published on http://welshsaints.ac.uk/. The main difference between the two versions lies in an additional chapter that had been omitted in the Cotton Manuscript (a more detailed description will be provided by Paul Russell’s forthcoming publication). Overall, the text has only three lectiones, of which only one lectio corresponds to the system established in Cott. Vit. (\(VD^C\), p. 138). The responsio / antiphon “Glorioso praesul” does not appear in Royal. (\(VD^C\), p. 138).

\(^{407}\) \(VD^C\), p. 181. For further references to the description of the manuscript and its different datings, cf. \(VD^C\), p. 137.

\(^{408}\) The publication was due in 2019.
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namely, that his successors would add further miracles to his text which were wrought by St David. Consequently, Royal MS 13 C.1 contains eleven additional miracles, which the saint wrought from the time of Bishop Iorwerth († 1229) until August 1405. The composition of the miracles probably took place “sometime after August 1405”.

The later version of the VD was written down in Cott. Vit. Unfortunately, the Cotton-manuscript was badly damaged in the Ashburnham House fire in 1731. Only about six folios survived, which Arthur Wade-Evans and, later, Richard Sharpe dated to the early 13th century. Although the major part of this manuscript was lost to the fire, its content survived, because an edition had previously been made by Henry Wharton for the Anglia Sacra. The edition of the Rolls Series is mainly based on Wharton’s text.

The vita Davidis, as preserved in Cotton-Vitellius, seems to have been divided in different lectiones, which are sometimes subdivided into different paragraphs. The responsio / antiphon “Gloriose praesul”, which asks for St David’s intercession and support, closes the manuscript.

3.2.2 Dating the life of St David

A precise dating of the life of St David would be very welcome, because it could give scholars a point of reference for when Giraldus’ involvement in Welsh ecclesiastical affairs started. After all, St David’s main place of veneration is the very same place where Giraldus intended to become

---

409 VD, p. 404. The vita and the additional miracles were written by the same hand (VDC, p. 136).
411 VDC, p. 155. Terminus ante quem of the composition is 1413 (VDC, p. 149).
412 This manuscript also contained Giraldus’ life of St Ethelbert (Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae Cui Praemittuntur Illustris Vīri, D. Roberti Cottoni, Equitis Aurati & Baronetti, Vita: et Bibliothecae Cottonianae Historia & Synopsis, p. 97).
413 Wade-Evans, Life of St. David, p. XII and Sharpe, Which Text is Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David?, p. 94.
415 The edition in the Rolls Series is mainly based on Wharton’s text (Gerald of Wales, I. De Invectionibus, Lib. IV; II. De Menevensi Ecclesia Dialogus; III. Vita S. David, p. XLIII).
416 Cf. above, chapter 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.
bishop and archbishop. Furthermore, in the *Vita S. Davidis*, St David is portrayed as archbishop of Wales. Overall, the content of the life suggests a connection with Giraldus’ time as champion of St Davids.

Unfortunately, dating the *VD* is difficult, because neither the text itself nor the manuscripts offer us hints. Besides standard-phrases like *hodie*417 or *usque in hodiernum*418, the *vita* do not contain any explicit references to Giraldus’ own lifetime. Nor did Giraldus record any post-mortem miracles, which may have helped us find a *terminus post quem* for the composition of the text. The manuscripts cannot help us date the life of St David. *Royal* dates from the 15th century419. *Cott. Vit.* dates from the 13th century420, but the manuscript was badly burned in the 18th century.

Usually, hints to the composition of certain manuscripts can be found throughout Giraldus’ remaining œuvre. However, we find no explicit reference to the composition of the life of St David in Giraldus’ other texts. Our only evidence that the life of St David must have been written before 1199 is *Symbolum Electorum*, which contains the preface to life of St David421.

Nevertheless, the question of dating has been raised by several scholars. Several possible dates have been suggested. These dates include the years 1176422, 1180423, the period of the early 1190s / 1192–1194424, and the years 1194425.

---

417 *VD*, p. 381.
418 *VD*, p. 383.
419 *VDC*, p. 181.
421 Cf. also above, chapter 2.3.
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and c.1200. In many cases, these dates are based on Giraldus’ biography, which has already been sketched out in chapter two.

The year 1176 marks the death of Giraldus’ uncle, Bishop David, and Giraldus’ first nomination as a bishop for the see of St Davids. Indeed, Giraldus may have decided to write the life of the saint during this time. The archiepiscopal theme would have certainly touched a raw nerve for the chapter of St Davids, which had raised the metropolitan claim on the synod of Westminster and, shortly afterwards, on the Lateran Council in 1179. There is, however, no concrete evidence for how much Giraldus actually knew about the metropolitan claims of St Davids at that point.

Furthermore, such a connection is purely speculative: we may as well argue that David’s archiepiscopal rank, as it is proclaimed in the life, would be more fitting for Giraldus’ second attempt to become (arch)bishop of St Davids. Then, the composition would fall into the period of 1199 to 1204. But composition during this period is not possible, because the preface of the VD is preserved in Symbolum Electorum. Thus, a dating of the life, which is solely based on Giraldus’ (archi)episcopal attempts, should be rejected.

The widely-accepted date for the composition of the VD is 1192 to 1194. This period of composition was suggested by Michael Richter. He based his suggestion on similarities between the life of St David and Giraldus’ topographical works, especially the Itinerarium Kambriae. Michael Richter is supported by the majority of scholars, and his dating is also accepted for this thesis.

---

426 Like Silas M. Harris (Harris, Saint David in the Liturgy, p. 16) Nora Chadwick advocates for a composition “probably about 1200” (Chadwick, Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church, p. 135).
427 Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 6.
428 Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 19 and Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 6.
429 Cf. for further information Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 8.
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3.2.3 Possible sources for the life of St David

The tradition of St David was already rich when Giraldus was asked to rewrite Rhygyfarch’s life. Therefore, we have to take into account that possible oral stories, local traditions, and pre-existing liturgical material may have influenced Giraldus’ composition. Giraldus and his family had a long and strong connection with St Davids, and he was immersed in the cult of the saint. His grandmother, Nesta, had a close association with St Davids. Her son, David, was consecrated bishop of St Davids, and the Welsh royal members of Giraldus’ family, for example, Lord Rhys, had close relations with St Davids, too. It is also possible that Giraldus encountered parts of his sources during his travels in Ireland.

The vernacular material on St David must be mentioned as well. Yet despite Giraldus’ Welsh family-bonds through Nesta, we cannot be sure whether he understood or spoke Welsh at all. In his Itinerarium, for example, Giraldus remarked that he preached in Latin and French at Haverford, but he did not mention any sermons delivered in the Welsh language. Ad Putter concludes that Giraldus knew some words, but “his command of the language was rudimentary”. In his examination of Giraldus’ Welsh quotations and explanations in the Descriptio and the Itinerarium Kambriae, Stefan Zimmer concluded that Giraldus probably spoke Welsh but was far from mastering the language. As we have no explicit prove

---

433 Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 86.
434 Pryce, The Dynasty of Deheubarth and the Church of St Davids, p. 305. However, he adds that Lord Rhys was more dedicated to Saint David than to the bishopric and its bishops (Pryce, The Dynasty of Deheubarth and the Church of St Davids, p. 306–307).
435 Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 30 and chapter 3.3.4.2.
436 IK, p. 82–83. In his Expugnatio, Giraldus narrated how he had translated a book containing the (vernacular) prophecies of Merlin with the help of translators (EH, p. 256).
437 Putter, Multilingualism in England and Wales, c. 1200: The Testimony of Gerald of Wales, p. 85 and p. 99–100. Cf. also Roberts, Gerald of Wales and Welsh Tradition, p. 129–147. Robert Bartlett also concludes that Giraldus was not a fluent speaker of Welsh (Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 20).
that Giraldus spoke Welsh, vernacular material about St David will not be taken into consideration for the comparison in chapter 3.3.

St David and St Davids appear also in Giraldus’ remaining works. As we can read in De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, when Giraldus found himself in captivity, he prayed to St David for help\textsuperscript{439}. In his Itinerarium Kambriae, Giraldus gathered material about St David. This material includes also information and anecdotes which are not present in the vita. An example would be David’s bell in Elfael, which Giraldus only briefly mentions in the VD\textsuperscript{440}. Giraldus also knew about post-mortem miracles (for example vengeance-miracles\textsuperscript{441}) or David’s saintly intercession, for example, on behalf of Bishop David\textsuperscript{442}. However, he included none of these stories in the VD.

Giraldus was not the first to write down the life of St David. In the preface, he announced that he had rewritten an older template\textsuperscript{443}. His authorial predecessor was Rhygyfarch ap Sulien († 1099). Rhygyfarch composed a life of St David, which scholars have been trying to reconstruct\textsuperscript{444}. The text was probably preserved in the so-called Vespasian-recension of the life of David\textsuperscript{445}. Giraldus, however, used a different recension as his source, namely, the so-called ‘Nero-Digby’-recension, which is much shorter than the Vespasian-recension\textsuperscript{446}. We do not know the reasons for Giraldus’ choice. Maybe he did not know the Vespasian-recension, maybe he knew about its existence but had no access to the text, or maybe he deliberately chose to ignore it in favour of the Nero-Digby-recension\textsuperscript{447}.

\textsuperscript{439} JS, p. 294.
\textsuperscript{440} Cf. VD, p. 398 and IK, p. 18. The bell and other miracles, however, have only been included in version two of the Itinerarium (Thorpe, Gerald of Wales, p. 275). The omission of the bells is odd, for in his Itinerarium Kambriae, Giraldus proceeds to narrate how greatly these types of secondary relics were venerated (IK, p. 27).
\textsuperscript{441} Cf. IK, p. 23–24: a boy who wanted to steal birds from a church dedicated to St David was frozen to the spot as a punishment.
\textsuperscript{442} IK, p. 30–31.
\textsuperscript{443} VD, p. 377.
\textsuperscript{444} Cf. Wade-Evans, Rhygyfarch’s Life of Saint David, p. 1–73, James, Rhigyfarch’s Life of St. David, 1967, and Sharpe, Which Text is Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David?, p. 90–105. David Dumville cautions that none of these editions necessarily represents the ‘original’ composition of Rhigyfarch (Dumville, Saint David of Wales, p. 9).
\textsuperscript{446} Sharpe, Which Text is Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David?, p. 93.
\textsuperscript{447} Sharpe, Which Text is Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David?, p. 96.
Based on these considerations, chapter 3.3 will make use of both recensions in the comparison. Thus, we can see how the cult of St David, as preserved in the different vitae, changed during the roughly 100 years which lie between Rhygyfarch and Giraldus.

### 3.3 Interpreting the content of Cott. Vit. 448

As J. Wyn Evans remarked, “any discussion of transition and survival relating to St David and St Davids, has perforce to take account of the life, career, literary works and views of Giraldus de Barri” 449. Consequently, scholars have dedicated their time to Giraldus, his life of St David, and the St Davids-case 450.

The life of St David is an instance of réécriture. As both the hypertext (Giraldus’ *Vita S. Davidis*) and its template / hypotext, the Nero-Digby-recension of Rhygyfarch’s life (*David*) have come down to us, a comparison is possible 451. This comparison will be enlarged by including the Vespasian-recension (*VES*). By including both recensions, I can highlight the difference between the various representations of St David. As Robert Bartlett concluded, any added or adapted parts in the *VD* are due to “a conscious process of omission or addition” 452 on the part of Giraldus. It is important to point out these parts, so that we may assess Giraldus’ *causa scribendi* more precisely.

---

448 So far, the edition of *Cott. Vit.* is the only edition of Giraldus’ life of St David. An edition of the life of St David as preserved in *Royal* was due to be published in 2019. As the text was not available when this thesis was submitted, a detailed comparison of the different versions of Giraldus’ text was not possible.

449 Wyn Evans, *Transition and Survival*, p. 27.


3. The saint of St Davids: The life of St David

3.3.1 The preface

With the first words of the vita, Giraldus sets the tone for the narrative that follows, calls St David archiepiscopus. The struggle for the establishment of an archbishopric at St Davids had not only occupied Giraldus, but also Bishop Bernard of St Davids. With the first words of the Vita S. Davidis, Giraldus states clearly that their claims were rooted in ancient tradition.

Giraldus’ preface also clearly connects with its audience: the phrase “whom the common people call ‘Dewi’” (quem vulgares Dewi dicunt) is preserved in similar words in both the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recension. Giraldus obviously intended to keep the essence of this statement. After all, he did not copy it word for word, but rewrote it slightly. Consequently, the phrase is not a simple transfer from the template. This leads us to a conclusion about Giraldus’ intended audience: it must have been different from the vulgares, because if both groups were the same, we may expect a phrase like quem dicimus Dewi. This observation allows for two further conclusions: First of all, Giraldus’ audience probably belonged to the upper secular / ecclesiastical circles, because Giraldus explicitly mentioned that the vulgares, the common people, usually refer to St David as Dewi. This distinction is even more likely when we keep in mind that the life was written in the Latin language, and not in the vernacular. Furthermore, it would fit well with the statement that the chapter of St Davids, with its mixture of Norman and Welsh canons, was the driving force behind the commissioning of the life.

Finally, the phrase suggests that Giraldus’ audience was probably to a certain degree non-native / non-Welsh, for if this had been the case, the explanation would be superfluous. This does not mean that the audience was completely non-Welsh, for otherwise, we might expect a phrase like

---

453 Cf. VD, p. 377–378. The preface of Giraldus’ VD has also been preserved in Symbolum Electorum (cf. CTC 7.11, f. 94r). After the edition of the life as preserved in Royal is published, a comparison of the three different prefaces will offer further possibilities for scholars especially concerned with the representation of St David within these texts. As this thesis focuses on the whole hagiographical œuvre of Giraldus Cambrensis, such a detailed analysis would go beyond the scope of this work and upset the balance between the different saints’ lives Giraldus composed.

454 VD, p. 377.

455 VD, p. 377.

456 The references to the Welsh variant of St David’s name are given in David, p. 1 (quem [...] vulgus autem Dewi clamat) and VES, p. 108 (quem [...] vulgus autem Dewi clamat).

457 Cf. VD, p. 377.
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quem Walenses Dewi dicunt. This result does not exclude the chapter of St Davids completely, but overall, the phrase hints rather at a wider audience located in the upper circles of Wales / the March.

In the preface of the life of St David, Giraldus explains his reasons for rewriting his template: although occupied with many other tasks, he was persuaded by the chapter of St Davids\(^{458}\). The preface also mentions an ‘ancient’ template that Giraldus rewrote in scholastic style (scholastic stilo)\(^ {459}\), fitting a new taste and also a new era of education\(^ {460}\). The announcement that a vita was rewritten because of a perceived lack of stylistic quality may be found in a lot of hagiographical works. According to Michele C. Ferrari, it is one of the principal motifs of hagiographical rewriting\(^ {461}\). Although Giraldus was proud of his educational accomplishments, we may thus conclude that this is a general hagiographical topos rather than a concrete critique on the stylistic elements of the Nero-Digby recension.

Giraldus boldly states that he changed the words, the sequence of events, and the connection of the particular events for his VD\(^ {462}\). He claims to have amended and polished his template, as well on the textual as on the stylistical level. The analysis of lectio I proves that Giraldus kept his word.

\(^{458}\) VD, p. 377.
\(^{459}\) VD, p. 377.
\(^{460}\) In the case of hagiographical rewriting, this type of announcement is called “transtylisation annoncée” (Goullet, Vers une Typologie des Réécritures Hagiographiques, à Partir de Quelques Examples du Nord-Est de la France. Avec une Édition Synoptique des Deux Vies de Saint Èvre de Toul, p. 119). For examples which compare the style of the Nero-Digby recension and Giraldus’ version, cf. Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 605–607.
\(^{462}\) Cf. VD, p. 377.
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3.3.2 Events before David’s birth

3.3.2.1 The first meeting of David’s parents

The first lectio is concerned with David’s parents. His father was Sanctus, prince of Ceredigion, wherefore David was of royal blood. His mother was Nonnita, a girl whom Sanctus met by chance.

The historical accuracy of this information has been doubted. For example, it has been argued that names of David’s parents “are clearly fabricated”: while Sanctus may be a misreading, the name of David’s mother may either derive from nonna or from Llan-non, which means ‘church of the ash tree’. David Dumville emphasizes that the choice of a king of Ceredigion for a saint whose major area was Dyfed is odd. He suggests that it may be either explained with church dedications in Ceredigion or with the association of Rhygyfarch and his family with this area. David’s royal genealogy may have even been invented – as Giraldus himself remarks dryly in the Descriptio Kambriae, the Welsh adore nobility, even if the nobles are as poor as a church mouse.

---

464 VD, p. 378–379.
465 Royal (or, at least, noble) blood signifies a saint’s privileged role from the very beginning (Henken, The Saint as Folk Hero: Biographical Patterning in Welsh Hagiography, p. 60). As Jonathan M. Wooding notes for the life of St Samson of Dol, who was a contemporary of St David: royal parentage for St Samson (and, ultimately, St David) may well have been possible, but nevertheless, it is also known as a hagiographical topos (Wooding, The Representation of Early British Monasticism and Peregrinatio in Vita Prima S. Samsonis, p. 141–142).
467 Dewi Sant (Saint David) may have been misread as Dewi ap Sant (David, son of Sanctus), as Pádraig Ó Ríain explains (Ó Ríain, The Church in Ceredigion in the Early Middle Ages b. The Saints of Cardiganshire, p. 390).
469 Dumville, Saint David of Wales, p. 28.
470 DK, p. 200.
During the night before a hunting trip, Sanctus receives a dreamlike vision\textsuperscript{471}. In this vision, an angelic voice predicts that Sanctus will meet three kinds of animals during the hunting trip: a stag, a fish, and bees\textsuperscript{472}. These animals are described as “heavenly gifts”\textsuperscript{473}, which would foretell the nature of Sanctus’ as yet unborn (and unconceived) son\textsuperscript{474}. The significance of the animals is explained, too. The stag symbolizes triumph over the Devil, the fish hints at David’s habit of drinking only water\textsuperscript{475}, and the honey represents David’s wisdom. This prophecy serves as an outline of how the narrative that follows should be read\textsuperscript{476}.

In VES, the nucleus of this story is the same: Sanctus, from the royal stock of Ceredigion\textsuperscript{477}, is foretold by an angelic voice in a dream that he would encounter three kinds of heavenly gifts, that is, a stag, a fish, and bees on his hunting trip the next day\textsuperscript{478}. Yet the story is enriched with more details: the river, near which Sanctus kills the stag, is called the River Teifi\textsuperscript{479}, and the location of the bees is specified\textsuperscript{480}. The Vespasian-recension also contains the angel’s command that Sanctus should preserve a part of these gifts and bring them to a certain monastery\textsuperscript{481}. The interpretation of the heavenly gifts is the same, although the order in which the gifts are

\textsuperscript{471} The religious importance of the message separates a dream-vision from an ordinary dream (Dinzelbacher, Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter, p. 90). Not all visions are sent from God, and only proper Christians / chosen people can recognize whether or not the dream was sent by God (Bitel, \textit{In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories}, 450–900, p. 46–47). The angelic announcement of David’s birth is only one of several references to Jesus (cf. Tudor Edwards, \textit{Last Man Standing}, p. 302: these details include the prophecy of David’s birth and death, the descendant of a royal line or the virginity of his mother).

\textsuperscript{472} VD, p. 378.

\textsuperscript{473} VD, p. 378.

\textsuperscript{474} Patrick Henriet defines the term ‘prophecy’ in the following way: “La prophétie est donc la proclamation de choses caches aux hommes” (Henriet, \textit{Quod Recte Prophetia Dicitur – Introduction}, p. 6).

\textsuperscript{475} VD, p. 378–379. The Welsh phrase \textit{Dewi Deverur} is immediately translated with \textit{David, vir aquaticus}. Cf. also David’s surname in Vie de St Paul de Léon en Bretagne, p. 421. David was not the only ‘waterman’ in Wales, cf. for more information Wade-Evans, \textit{Life of St. David}, p. 62.


\textsuperscript{477} He is not styled \textit{filius regis}, as in Giraldus’ \textit{vita} (Cf. VES, p. 108).

\textsuperscript{478} VES, p. 108.

\textsuperscript{479} \textit{[...] tria ibi munera reperies iuxta amnem Theibi} (VES, p. 108).

\textsuperscript{480} These bees are hanging on a tree in \textit{Llyn Henllan}, which Richard Sharpe and John Reuben Davies identify as a village on the River Teifi (VES, p. 109).

\textsuperscript{481} VES, p. 108.
explained is different. Here, the honeycomb (‘wisdom’) is identified first, whereas in Giraldus’ life, the stag’s meaning (‘triumph over the devil’) is explained at the beginning.

The Nero-Digby-recension also mentions Sanctus, from the royal stock of Ceredigion, who is foretold of his encounter with three animal gifts on the upcoming hunting trip in a dream482. The order in which the meaning of the gifts is explained is the same as in the Vespasian-recension. Whereas neither the river Teifi nor the tree near Llyn Henllan are specified in the Nero-Digby-recension, Sanctus is also commanded to deposit parts of his gifts at the monastery of Meugan483.

Giraldus’ version of David’s life lacks this command, as well as the reference to the monastery of Meugan. He has, however, the reference to David’s Welsh nickname, which can neither be found in VES nor in the Nero-Digby-recension.

Our comparison has shown that Giraldus kept his promise from the preface: not only did he change words and individual phrases when he rewrote the hypotext484, but he also altered individual parts of the text. This alteration begins with the different sequences in which the heavenly gifts are explained. Finally, Giraldus played with typical Welsh elements: on the one hand, he added David’s Welsh nickname and explained the phrase immediately, on the other hand, he left out several Welsh place names. This last observation may be partly explained by Giraldus’ template, the Nero-Digby-recension, which also lacks the name of the river and the location of the tree. However, this recension does contain the reference to the monastery of Meugan, which Giraldus omitted in his text. A probable explanation is that Giraldus intended to leave out the names of as many ‘superfluous’ side characters and minor locations as possible485. Omitting (obscure) local place names could also make a life more accessible for an international audience486. This observation points to an audience that may be located outside Dyfed.

482 *David*, p. 1.
483 *David*, p. 1.
484 We only have to think of Sanctus – in Giraldus’ version, he is a *filius regis* (*VD*, p. 378), whereas in the different recensions of Rhygyfarch’s text, Sanctus is *gentis regali potentia fretus* (*David*, p. 1 and *VES*, p. 108).
485 It is a habit that he will also display in the lives of Ethelbert, Remigius, and Hugh (cf. the following chapters).
486 McMullen, Rewriting the Ecclesiastical Landscape of Early Medieval Northumbria in the Lives of Cuthbert, p. 60.
Giraldus continues with his narrative: thirty years later, as Sanctus arrives in the region of Peabody, the north-western cantref of Dyfed. Separated from his group, he encounters a beautiful girl named Nonnita. Sanctus rapes the extremely pure and innocent girl who conceives David. Afterwards, Sanctus silently disappears from David’s story. The absent father is known from many different saints’ lives, among them the lives of Rose of Viterbo, Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugh of Cluny or Gilbert of Sempringham.

Because of the illegitimate conception, David is placed on the edge of society. This is, however, not to his disadvantage, because he gains power from his border position.

In the Vespasian-recension, the sequence of events is different: first, the story revolves around St Patrick and how he was commanded to settle in Ireland, and only afterwards does it turn to the meeting of Sanctus and Nonnita. The Nero-Digby-recension follows the storyline of the Vespasian-recension, wherefore it first has the story of St Patrick and afterwards the meeting between Sanctus and Nonnita. The texts differ in terms of the details they either provide or suppress. While Giraldus’ information on the meeting-place of Sanctus and Nonnita was more precise, the Vespasian-recension speaks simply of the “kingdom of the people of Dyfed”. On the other hand, the Vespasian-recension specifies that Nonnita is a nun. This information was suppressed by Giraldus, probably deliberately – after all, Nonnita is raped. In contrast to Giraldus’ *vita*, both the Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension dwell on Nonnita’s modesty, which she preserved even after the rape. Again, this is an information missing in Giraldus’ text.

---

487 This is situated in the same cantref as St Davids, and was later known as Dewisland (Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids and the Coming of the Normans, p. 14).
488 Although she is a victim of rape, Nonnita is nevertheless considered a pure virgin before and afterwards. Her purity, despite the rape, is a very important characteristic for both Nonnita and David (Henken, The Saint as Folk Hero: Biographical Patterning in Welsh Hagiography, p. 63).
489 Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 23.
491 *VES*, p. 110–112.
492 After Sanctus’ Dream (*David*, p. 1–2), the story of St Patrick is inserted (*David*, p. 2–3), before Sanctus and Nonnita meet (*David*, p. 3–4).
493 *VES*, p. 113, also for the explanation, why *gens* may be translated with ‘kingdom’.
494 *VES*, p. 112.
495 *VES*, p. 112 and *David*, p. 4.
496 Cf. *VD*, p. 379 and *VES*, p. 112 and *David*, p. 4.
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3.3.2.2 David’s pre-eminence over St Patrick

The sequence of the event “How St Patrick was sent to Ireland” and the event “How Sanctus and Nonnita met” are exchanged in Giraldus’ vita and the two recensions. In Giraldus’ text, the delegation of St Patrick to Ireland forms the content of lectio II. Around the time when Sanctus had his prophetic dream, St Patrick, who had travelled to Italy, returned to Britannia, his native country. He arrived in the region of Ceredigion, where he came to the province of Dyfed, and afterwards, to the cantref of Pebidiog, to a place called Vallis Rosina. It is remarkable that Giraldus describes the whereabouts of Vallis Rosina so precisely, naming not only the cantref, but also the province and, as an even larger unit, the region in which the place can be found. This habit is neither portrayed in the Vespasian-recension (where David returns first to Ceredigion, then to Dyfed and afterwards to Vallis Rosina), nor in the Nero-Digby-recension. We may conclude that such extensive information would not have been necessary for readers / listeners familiar with the particular Welsh landscape. Thus, the way in which Giraldus describes the whereabouts seems to hint at an audience that was probably not local. Instead, it probably lived even in other, more remote parts of Wales / England.

Perceiving the solitude of the place, Patrick decides to settle down. However, he is suddenly addressed by an angelic voice, who explains to him that this place is reserved for a man who would be born thirty years later. Such a story has a strong political undertone, for the pre-eminence of Wales (represented by David) over Ireland (represented by Patrick) is made obvious through David’s divine election in this scene. Underlying the

---

497 VD, p. 379–381.
498 Identifying the meaning of Britannia is difficult: it may either mean the whole island or simply Wales (cf. for further information Charles-Edwards, Wales and the Britons 350–1064, p. 1). St Patrick’s return to preach in Wales seems to be invention, for it is not found in any Live of St Patrick (VES, p. 111).
499 VD, p. 380. Vallis Rosina may be a misinterpretation of the Welsh name Nant Rhosan, which means ‘valley of the little marsh’ (VES, p. 111). It is Giraldus who identifies Menevia and Vallis Rosina with the site of David’s monastery, and no earlier sources have come down to us which prove whether the location of St David’s community ever changed (Cf. Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids and the Coming of the Normans, p. 12–15).
500 Cf. VES, p. 110 and David, p. 2.
501 VD, p. 380.
whole scene is the association with St John the Baptist, preparing the way for Christ\textsuperscript{503}.

St Patrick takes the news ill and considers all his efforts for God to have been in vain. Giraldus uses direct speech to emphasize Patrick’s desperation. The parallel structure of the sentences and the repetition of \textit{frustra} underline this effect:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Frustra diutinis abstinentiae taediis corpus afflixi, frustra ieiuniis olim, frustra vigiliis et orationibus vexor, ex quo tot meritis nihil adhuc meritus, quia nondum natus antefertur}\textsuperscript{504}.
\end{quote}

In vain I have lived an austere life, in vain I have once vexed myself with fasting, in vain I have observed the vigils and the prayers, for I have gained nothing from it, because someone who has not yet been born is preferred to me.

Interestingly, Patrick’s complaint can only be found in Giraldus’ text. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension go a step further, because in these texts, Patrick even threatens to forsake God\textsuperscript{505}. The narration of Patrick’s despair may serve different purposes: first of all, it contrasts Patrick with the obedient David whom we will encounter later in \textit{lectio VII}\textsuperscript{506}. Moreover, it proves that, despite Patrick’s efforts and the trials he withstood because of his love for God, David is \textit{dilectus}, he is God’s chosen one for Wales. Becoming the patron saint of Wales, a country with many powerful and important saints, was, so to say, David’s manifest destiny. While the Vespasian-recension emphasizes that St Patrick was nevertheless greatly valued by God\textsuperscript{507}, such an emphasis is missing in Giraldus’ text. Thus, Giraldus’ version is focussed on David and St Patrick plays only a minor role in the story. This conclusion can be corroborated by several other hints found in this chapter.

In Giraldus’ narration, the angel continues to explain that Ireland was assigned to Patrick, and that he would become the apostle of the whole

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{503} Tudor Edwards, Symbolism in the Legend of St. David, p. 150.
\textsuperscript{504} VD, p. 380.
\textsuperscript{506} Later, David will receive an angelic command to go on pilgrimage for Jerusalem. In contrast to St Patrick, he readily obeys (cf. VD, p. 380 and VD, p. 397).
\textsuperscript{507} VES, p. 110: \textit{Sed Dominus multum diligebat Patricium}.
\end{flushright}
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island. The angel shows Patrick Ireland from a place that is called sedes Patricii (St Patrick’s seat)\(^{508}\). Patrick accepts the command and hastens to sail to Ireland. Before Patrick can set sails, he revives a dead man\(^{509}\). If we think of Jesus and Lazarus, this is a clear example of Patrick’s power\(^{510}\).

But contrary to VES and the Nero-Digby-recension, Giraldus significantly reduced the information on this incident and omitted details glorifying St Patrick\(^{511}\). All the information on the Irish saint is marked as a digression, when Giraldus delegates those readers who are interested in Patrick’s life and deeds to Irish writings\(^{512}\). Giraldus even justifies his reference to other works with the focus of the narration\(^{513}\).

3.3.2.3 David’s pre-eminence over Gildas\(^{514}\)

The next part of lectio II is a paragraph dealing with Gildas, who became mute in the presence of the as yet unborn David. The scene takes place in Kaermorva, which is, as Giraldus explains, a town or castle on the seaside\(^{515}\). The event is also attested in other sources\(^{516}\). For example, the incident is alluded to in the Prophecies of Merlin, which were ‘translated’ by Geoffrey of Monmouth. In the prophecies, a praedicator Hiberniae (a preacher of Ireland) is said to have fallen silent in the presence of the unborn David\(^{517}\). Although the name of the praedicator is not offered, the text probably refers to St Patrick. The prophecy may also allude to Bishop Ailbe, who is said to have fallen silent in the presence of the unborn David according to another

\(^{508}\) The location of this place is unknown today (Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 29). For attempts to identify it, cf. Wade-Evans, Life of St. David, p. 68–69.

\(^{509}\) VD, p. 381.

\(^{510}\) Cf. Joh. 11,1–45.

\(^{511}\) The dead man has a different name in the Vespasian-recension. Furthermore, more information is offered about him (cf. VES, p. 112 and David, p. 3).

\(^{512}\) VD, p. 381. Both the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby recension have only half of this phrase, they do not justify their restrictions (VES, p. 112 and David, p. 3).

\(^{513}\) VD, p. 381: nos ad coepta redeamus.

\(^{514}\) VD, p. 381–382.

\(^{515}\) VD, p. 381. This is an etymological translation of Giraldus (Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 29). For the identification of the town, cf. Wade-Evans, Life of St. David, p. 72–74.

\(^{516}\) According to Elissa Henken, the event sometimes refers to St Patrick, sometimes to Gildas, and the name of the mute preacher is not always explicitly mentioned (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 34–35).

\(^{517}\) Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 145–147.
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tradition 518. In Giraldus’ version, however, the scene is centred on the meeting between Nonnita, her unborn son David, and Gildas the Wise.

Nonnita, whose pregnancy is already visible, enters the church in which Gildas preaches to the people. As soon as Nonnita has entered the church, Gildas is no longer able to preach. Gildas asks the people to leave the church, but Nonnita remains out of piety, as Giraldus explains519.

Again, Gildas tries to preach, and again, he is unable to do so. Having discovered Nonnita, Gildas asks her to leave the church, so that the other people may re-enter, and as soon as she has left the church, he recovers his ability to preach520. The incident is explained at the end of lectio II: As Gildas and the other churchgoers realize, Gildas could not preach because he was in the presence of someone who would outshine all the other doctores of Britannia in terms of honour, wisdom, and the power of his preaching521. This is another incident which proves David’s power and his sovereignty over other saints / important ecclesiastical persons and essentially repeats the central message from lectio II and the meeting of St Patrick and the angel522.

In the Vespasian-recension, Nonnita also enters a church, in order to give alms and to hear Gildas preaching the gospel. VES contains the information that the scene took place in the time of King Tryffin and his sons523, but the setting of the scene is not concretised. Giraldus omitted the reference to King Tryffin, maybe because the king was of no interest for his audience. If this is the case, we have to take into consideration that the intended audience was a wider one, which we may also have to locate outside Wales.

The sequence of the event is the same as in Giraldus’ narration, although Giraldus follows the Nero-Digby-text more closely, for he has also left out the direct speech of the churchgoers524 and Gildas’ announcement that he would leave Wales because of David’s sovereignty525. As this announcement

---

518 For further information, cf. VES, p. 117.
519 VD, p. 382. Nonnita is depicted as a very religious woman, a portrayal which may echo the biblical depiction of Jesus’ mother Mary (cf. also chapter 3.3.3.1. for another explicit parallel).
520 VD, p. 382.
521 VD, p. 382: qui honoris privilegio, sapientiae fulgore, sermonis facundia cunctos Britanniae doctores incomparabiliter antecelleret.
522 Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 34.
523 VES, p. 112. For information on the king, cf. VES, p. 112.
524 Cf. VES, p. 114 and David, p. 4–5.
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would have proved David’s power and served as a direct link to *lectio II* with St Patrick, we may conclude that Giraldus probably had no access to the Vespasian-recension, whose message would have suited his authorial intentions.

### 3.3.3 Events before the foundation of St Davids

#### 3.3.3.1 David's birth

The depiction of David’s birth is obviously modelled on Jesus’ birth: a nearby tyrant who was informed about the boy’s birth by magicians thirsts for his blood, because the boy threatens the tyrant’s power and superiority. Giraldus even highlights the parallels, because he describes the tyrant as an *Herodes alter*, a second Herod. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension proclaim the decision of the tyrant to murder the baby with direct speech.

Nonnita and her son are protected from the tyrant: heavy rainfalls and thunderstorms shield them from their persecutor. The place where Nonnita gives birth to David is described as a *locus amoenus*, a little paradise on earth, which is graced with divine light. When Nonnita labours in pain, a stone bursts in half out of sympathy for the mother. The stone has been preserved in a church, where it is placed upon the altar. Giraldus narrates that the imprint of Nonnita’s fingers can still be seen.

However, the miracles do not cease to flow after David is finally born: a spring erupts so that he may be baptized. The creation of water supplies is a minor dominant theme in the *VD*, for it occurs later, when David and his brethren settle at St Davids. In *lectio III*, the sacramental association is obvious, because David can now be baptized. As Giraldus assures his

---

528 *VD*, p. 383.
529 *VES*, p. 114 and *David*, p. 5. This was omitted in *VD*.
530 *VD*, p. 383. The Vespasian-recension also mentions that one part of the stone jumped as far as Nonnita’s feet (*VES*, p. 114). According to Owain Edwards, the stones should remind the audience of menhirs (*Edwards, Welsh Saints’ Lives as Legendary Propaganda*, p. 155).
532 Hutton Sharp, Creation and Redemption in Twelfth-Century Welsh Hagiography, p. 221.
audience, the spring, which is situated at Porth Clais (about one mile from St Davids), is still existent.533

David is baptized by Ailbe, bishop of Munster, who had come over from Ireland guided by divine grace.534 With Bishop Ailbe, the most important Irish dignitaries appear in David’s biography, for Patrick, who would become apostle of the Irish, is the only one superior to the bishop of Munster535. The appearance of both Irish saints enhances David’s status significantly.

Ailbe is assisted by a blind man named Mobi, whose blindness is cured thanks to the baptismal water.536 The cure of Mobi is enriched with further information in the Vespasian-recension537, but not in the Nero-Digby-recension.

3.3.3.2 David’s early years538

David is raised in Vetus Menevia, for which Giraldus offers the different names in Welsh, Latin, and Irish.539 This is another clear incident for his philological interest,540 but also an opportunity he used to show off his education.

David is depicted as an old child, full of grace, eager to study, and with a quick mind. God’s grace is made obvious for mankind, because it appears in the shape of a white dove sitting on David’s shoulder.541 David proceeds

---

533 VD, p. 393. This is one of many aetiological references in the VD.
534 VD, p. 383–384. VES, p. 116 and David, p. 6 either call Ailbe bishop of Munster or bishop of Mynyw (depending on the manuscript consulted), which may express a “general confusion concerning the Irish monk whose major area of work was Munster, but who also had a church, Llan Eilw, four miles from St Davids, in Pebeidiog, and for whom there is a site called Fagwr Eilw […] only two miles away” (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 38–39).
535 Ó Riain, Hagiography Without Frontiers: Borrowing of Saints Accross the Irish Sea, p. 43.
536 VD, p. 384. For Mobi, cf. VES, p. 117. Elissa Henken also discusses the name of Mobi: she supposes scribal errors (‘monk’) or a reference to an Irish saint behind the name (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 41).
537 Cf. VES, p. 116.
539 VD, p. 384.
541 VD, p. 384. The dove also appears in VES, p. 116 and David, p. 6. In comparison with other Welsh saints, animals play only a minor role in David’s life (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 66).
in the ecclesiastical ranks and at vecta insula\(^{542}\), he joins Paulinus, who was a disciple of St Germanus, to live a life dedicated to God\(^{543}\).

Paulinus, however, became blind with old age. When he asks his disciples to restore his eyesight, only David, whose reluctance testifies his modesty, has the power to cure Paulinus with the sign of the cross\(^{544}\). In contrast to the Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension, Giraldus’ text leaves no room for a direct speech of Paulinus\(^{545}\). The passage of direct speech is restricted for the speech of the angel, for, not long after the event, an angel appears to Paulinus, commanding him to send away David so that he may spread God’s word and glory\(^{546}\).

David obeys and leaves the community. He travels the country and founds monasteries\(^{547}\). Overall, David is said to have founded twelve communities, among which, Joe Hillaby suggests, may be included “a traditional list of houses of the familia of St David”\(^{548}\). The names Giraldus gives are Glastonbury\(^{549}\), Bath\(^{550}\), Crowland\(^{551}\), Repton\(^{552}\), Colva and Glasscwm\(^{553}\).

---

\(^{542}\) In VES, p. 118, and David, p. 7, the island’s name is given as Wincdilantquendi (cf. for more information VES, p. 119).

\(^{543}\) VD, p. 385. The cult of St David incorporates different traditions on David’s education. For example, he is also said to have been taught by Bishop Ailbe of Munster (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 41–43. Cf. also above, chapter 3.3.3.1 for Bishop Ailbe).

\(^{544}\) VD, p. 385. This healing miracle may be classified as an act of mercy (Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 34).

\(^{545}\) VES, p. 118 and David, p. 7.


\(^{547}\) David’s journey through Wales and England resembles St Patrick’s circuit and may be understood as a symbol of lordship and superiority (Charles-Edwards, The Seven Bishop-Houses of Dyfed, p. 261).


\(^{549}\) Famous for Glastonbury Abbey and the grave of King Arthur. According to Geoffrey of Monmouth, St David was Arthur’s uncle (Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 215 and IK, p. 101). Not only do we have “evidence of a vigorous cult” for St David, Glastonbury claims to have been in possession of some of his relics since the 9th century (Chadwick, Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church, p. 133).

\(^{550}\) The hot springs of Bath were already known to the Romans. David is said to have made them health-giving (VD, p. 386, VES, p. 120, and David, p. 8). He is not the only one associated with these hot springs, cf. Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 45–47.

\(^{551}\) The Mercian abbey is associated with St Guthlac.

\(^{552}\) Another Mercian abbey, associated with St Wigstan.

\(^{553}\) Both places are situated about 100 miles east of St Davids.
Leominster\textsuperscript{554}, Raglan\textsuperscript{555} and Llangyfelach\textsuperscript{556}. The remaining monasteries are not mentioned.

During his travels, David displays his saintly powers when he restores the eyesight of the king of Ergyng\textsuperscript{557}. Finally, David returns to Menevia, where he meets his uncle, Bishop Gwystli\textsuperscript{558}. David tells his uncle about the angelic prophecy that he, David, is meant to settle down in \textit{Vallis Rosina}\textsuperscript{559}. This is not only a later aetiological explanation, it has also a strong political undertone: repeatedly, God has announced through his messengers that the site had been chosen for St David and his community\textsuperscript{560}. This repetition strengthens the connection between the cult site and its major saint.

### 3.3.3.3 Settling down\textsuperscript{561}

David settles down in \textit{Vallis Rosina}, accompanied by three of his most faithful disciples, namely, Aidan (whose Irish Name is Maedóc / Maodhog\textsuperscript{562}), Eliud (who is also called Teilo\textsuperscript{563}), and Ishmael\textsuperscript{564}. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension also contain the names of these three disciples, however, they do not draw a link between Aidan and Maedóc and Eliud and Teilo\textsuperscript{565}.

When David and his disciples arrive, a fire is lit. Its smoke surrounds the whole Island of Britain and also Ireland\textsuperscript{566}. The lightning of fire is a clear sign that David claims supremacy\textsuperscript{567}, and in that case, his supremacy

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[554] The abbey is situated about 15 miles north of Hereford.
  \item[555] Situated less than 30 miles in the South of Hereford.
  \item[556] About four miles north of Swansea, situated in a diocesan territory which Llandaff claimed (James, The Geography of the Cult of St David, p. 70). It is also referred to in chapter 3.3.5.1.
  \item[557] He seems to have been a historical figure (VES, p. 121).
  \item[558] VD, p. 386.
  \item[559] Prophecies are a common hagiographical \textit{topos}.
  \item[560] Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 29.
  \item[561] VD, p. 387–389.
  \item[562] VES, p. 131.
  \item[563] For Teilo, cf. chapter 3.3.5.1.
  \item[564] In the Book of Llandaff, Ishmael’s role is much more expanded, because he is Teilo’s nephew (James, The Geography of the Cult of St David, p. 57).
  \item[565] VES, p. 120 and David, p. 9.
  \item[566] VD, p. 387, VES, p. 120, and David, p. 9.
  \item[567] Henken, Welsh hagiography and the nationalist impulse, p. 32. The scene also shows the ambivalent relationship between Welsh saints and power: on the one hand, David is of royal lineage and therefore born to rule a country, on the other hand, his saintly destiny causes
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
pertains to the whole of Britain and to Ireland. But his claims are challenged in the form of a local magnate (vir praepotens) named Boia, who perceives David’s arrival with fear and indignation. While the Nero-Digby-recension only speaks of a neighbour (propinquus)568, the Vespasian-recension also mentions that Boia / Baia, a warlord and seer, was an Irishman569. The conflict between David and Boia could be interpreted as a conflict between a spiritual authority and a secular authority that attacks the rights of the Church and must nevertheless face defeat570.

Aroused by his wife, Boia battles the holy community both with words and with force. She even proposes that her husband and his men should kill David571. A sudden fever prevents Boia and his men from implementing their plans.

Because Boia insulted David’s community, his livestock dies572. Boia concedes and accepts David’s superiority, wherefore his livestock is revived. Her husband, defeated, Boia’s wife tries a different scheme. Accompanied by beautiful girls, she tries to seduce the holy men573. Overall, Giraldus depicted this scene much more intensely than in VES or the Nero-Digby-recension, thereby intensifying the horror the brethren must have felt faced with the girls574. Whereas David’s disciples lose courage, David himself does not falter and encourages his brethren to stay575.

A short time afterwards, David and his disciples are avenged, for Boia is killed by an enemy and his wife, having gone mad, kills their child576.


568 David, p. 9.

569 VES, p. 120. Elisa Henken mentions that the conflict between David and Boia may be seen as a parallel of the conflict between St Patrick and the druids (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 47–48).


572 This vengeance miracle is an act of power (Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 34).

573 VD, p. 388, VES, p. 122, and David, p. 10.

574 The scene is interpreted by Robert Bartlett as a clear sign of misogynistic phrasing (Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 602).


576 VD, p. 389. The killing of the girl as well as the killing of Boia are explained in greater detail in VES, p. 124, whereas the Nero-Digby recension has this passage abbreviated, too (Cf. David, p. 11). The use of divine anger in text which were written (sometimes as a justification) for monastic communities, is commonly attested in clashes between monks
Having overcome their secular foes, David and his community establish their settlement. They serve as a shining example for others and the obvious holiness of this place attracts even powerful secular lords who desire to be buried in the cemetery. Those buried there are guaranteed not to suffer in hell. David was not the only saint who was granted this privilege, since it is also known from the life of St Bairre. Giraldus summarizes the establishment of the community briefly, whereas the recensions of Rhygyfarch’s version dedicate many paragraphs to a description of the monastic life in St David’s community. By shortening these passages, Giraldus portrays David “much less vivid as a monastic leader” than the other recensions. The passage highlights the different background of both authors: while Rhygyfarch knew St Davids as a monastic community, St Davids was a community of secular canons during Giraldus’ lifetime.

In some sense, St Davids, being located on the remotest corner of Wales, serves as a linking element of different social spheres: on the one hand, St Davids is a community of monks, on the other hand, it is the burial place of secular authorities (kings). Thus, St Davids brings together the ecclesiastical as well as the secular sphere, and both spheres are reunited because of the saintly power of St David, who himself incorporates both ecclesiastical (monastic) and secular (his royal genealogy) powers.

### 3.3.4 Life in the community of St Davids

The following lectiones present certain episodes from the life at the community of St Davids. They depict the saintly powers of St Davids as well as the powers of his disciples.

---


577 VD, p. 389.
578 Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 65. For St Bairre / Finnbarr of Cork, cf. also chapter 3.3.4.2.
581 The great change took place under Bishop Bernard of St Davids (Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids: Some Observations on the Cult, Site and Buildings, p. 12–13).
582 VD, p. 390–397.
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3.3.4.1 The miracles of St David

Although St Davids may have been the most suitable place for the salvation of souls, St David and his disciples soon found out that it was lacking certain necessary resources, even for a community dedicated to an austere life. Giraldus narrated how the brethren complained about a missing fountain – not for themselves to drink, but for the performance of liturgical rites. This addition is missing in the Vespasian-recension and in the Nero-Digby-recension. In contrast to, for example, communities in the desert, the community of St Davids possibly experienced no shortage of water which would have endangered their survival. Consequently, the creation of possible supplies of water usually has a sacramental significance. Giraldus adds that the spring also consisted of wine and milk for some time, which may not only be a biblical reference but also a reference to the version of the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recension, which claim that the water turned into wine so that the brethren could celebrate the sacrament.

Because of David’s prayers, a very clear fountain springs forth at a place where the saint used to converse with angels, another sign known from hagiographical literature to signify St David as God’s chosen. As the reference to Giraldus’ present day (usque in hodiernum) suggests, the myth of the fountain is an aetiological myth. Its origin story is extended to several other fountains which came into existence because of the power

---

584 VD, p. 390.
587 VD, p. 390. The story is also preserved in IK, p. 109.
590 VD, p. 390.
591 The appearance of holy wells or springs usually suggests that the place might have been worshipped in pre-Christian times. If such a landscape feature appears in Christian hagiography, it might be argued that the well or spring was ‘Christianised’ (Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, p. 476). John Blair argues that the provincial religious culture of early medieval England was, once established, extremely persistent (Blair, A Saint for Every Minster? Local Cults in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 462). This may also have been the case for early Welsh provincial religious culture.
of St David (the fountain for Terddi\textsuperscript{592}) or because of the powers of his disciples\textsuperscript{593}.

The story of an important secondary relic, the unfinished gospel, is preserved in \textit{lectio VI}. It has no predecessor in the Vespasian- or the Nero-Digby-recension, wherefore we may suppose that with this miracle, Giraldus added his own contribution to David’s cult. Elissa Henken suggests that Giraldus recorded an oral tradition in this \textit{lectio}\textsuperscript{594}.

Giraldus narrated how David had decided to copy the gospel of St John one day\textsuperscript{595}. When the bells ring, David leaves his work, unfinished. When he returns, he detects that an unfinished column had been finished by another writer – an angel – with golden letters. Astonished by the miracle, David decides to hide the book from mortal eyes. According to John Reuben Davies, this scene bears evidence of the practice of keeping richly ornamented and decorated gospel books permanently sealed. Over the course of time, these books were turned into mystical objects with spiritual power\textsuperscript{596}.

As the aetiological myth (made obvious by the references \textit{usque ad moderna fere temporae} and \textit{usque in hodiernum}\textsuperscript{597}) explains, no one dares to open the book, which is called the “Unfinished Gospel” (\textit{Evangelium Imperfectum}) by the local people. Giraldus adds that this relic was worshipped by everyone\textsuperscript{598}. We may suppose that the unfinished gospel is exactly the “worrne eaten boke covered with a sylver plate”\textsuperscript{599} about which Bishop Barlow wrote to Oliver Cromwell.

Another miracle depicts David’s power over life and death, even the life of his fellow saints. When a working peasant raises a weapon to kill David’s disciple Modomnóc, David stops the assassination by making the sign of the cross. The peasant’s hand withers away; David has saved Modomnóc’s life\textsuperscript{600}.

\textsuperscript{592} Whereas Giraldus summarized the story with a few words, more of the peasant Terddi is preserved in \textit{VES}, p. 130 and \textit{David}, p. 15. However, only Giraldus identifies the location of the newly created spring.

\textsuperscript{593} \textit{VD}, p. 390.

\textsuperscript{594} Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{595} \textit{VD}, p. 393.

\textsuperscript{596} Davies, Cathedrals and the Cult of Saints in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Wales, p. 114.

\textsuperscript{597} \textit{VD}, p. 393.

\textsuperscript{598} \textit{VD}, p. 393: \textit{in maxima non immerito reverentia a cunctis habetur}.

\textsuperscript{599} Wright, Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of Monasteries, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{600} \textit{VD}, p. 396, \textit{VES}, p. 136, and \textit{David}, p. 18.
3. The saint of St Davids: The life of St David

3.3.4.2 The miracles of his disciples and other saints

Saintly command over the forces of nature is shown in lectio V, when a miracle wrought by St Aidan Maedóc is narrated. The effect of this scene is made clear at the beginning: Aidan’s power is meant to glorify the power of St David.

Sed quoniam quidquid gratiae spiritalis discipulis impenditur, in patris ac praecpositoris proculdubio redundant gloriæ, nonnulla discipulorum insignia interdum interserere praeter rem non putandum.

But, as part of the spiritual grace is imprinted on the disciples, without any doubt it makes the glory of their father and teacher overflow, so, it should not be regarded out of topic to insert certain miracles of the disciples meanwhile.

The first disciple whose miracle is narrated is Aidan. While reading, Aidan is commanded to collect firewood with the help of a yoke of oxen. Aidan leaves the book at its place (which is outside, as VES and the Nero-Digby-recension clarify) and hurries to fulfil his task. Giraldus specifies the place where the event happened: the Valley of Solfach, which lies about two miles away from the monastery. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension only speak vaguely of a valley and a nearby wood.

On Aidan’s way back to the monastery, the oxen tumble down a cliff, but with the sign of the cross, they are restored to Aidan. But this is not the only miracle: although it began to rain heavily, the book which Aidan was reading remained dry. While the Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension explain the dry book with St David’s powers, Giraldus is silent on that matter. This may be a consequence of his earlier announcement that he wanted to depict the miracles wrought by David’s disciples, and not David’s miracles.

---

602 Control over the elements is a typical phenomenon in the life of Welsh saints (Gray, Saints on the Edge: Reconfiguring Sanctity in the Welsh March, p. 97).
603 VD, p. 391.
604 VES, p. 130 and David, p. 15.
605 VD, p. 391.
606 VES, p. 130 and David, p. 15.
607 Cf. VD, p. 391, VES, p. 132 and David, p. 15.
Having received the blessing of David and his brethren, Aidan travels to Ireland. Although Giraldus keeps on calling him “Aidan”, he repeats that Aidan’s Irish name is Maedóc, thus connecting the Welsh monk with his future home Ireland\textsuperscript{608}.

Aidan founds the monastery of Ferns, which would be subject to St David and St Davids\textsuperscript{609}. This is a special addition which can only be found in Giraldus’ \textit{VD}\textsuperscript{610}. As it is an original contribution to the cult of St David, Giraldus’ reference to Ferns deserves a closer examination.

First of all, Ferns is situated in County Wexford. As already explained above, several Marcher lords – among them relatives of Giraldus – had travelled to Ireland to fight for an exiled Irish king\textsuperscript{611}. The Marcher Lords fought successfully, and Giraldus’ relatives were rewarded with the city of Wexford\textsuperscript{612}. Giraldus himself must also have known Ferns, for he was offered the bishopric by Prince John\textsuperscript{613}. Thus, Ferns and Giraldus have a close biographical connection. J. Wyn Evans ponders whether Giraldus had found any information on the relationship between Ferns and St Davids when he was in Ireland\textsuperscript{614}. This may have been the case, but it may also have been that Giraldus chose Ferns deliberately, because of his own familiarity with the monastery / bishopric and the presence of his relatives in Wexford and its surroundings. After all, if Giraldus had succeeded and had become archbishop of St Davids, the ‘Geraldines’ would have ruled a territory stretching from Wales to Ireland with both secular and ecclesiastical power\textsuperscript{615}. After all, according to Giraldus’ \textit{VD}, Ferns adopts the rule of St David, thus making itself a dependency of St Davids\textsuperscript{616}. Giraldus’ additional

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{608} \textit{VD}, p. 391. Despite his journey to Ireland, Aidan is still important for the community of St Davids and for Giraldus’ story. This is in stark contrast to St Patrick, who left Wales for Ireland and makes no further appearance in the text.
\textsuperscript{609} Cf. \textit{VD}, p. 391: Aidan founded the monastery of Ferns (County Wexford, Ireland), where he vowed to serve according to the rule established by St David.
\textsuperscript{610} \textit{VES}, p. 132 only speaks of Aidan’s holy life at Ferns, and \textit{David}, p. 16, too.
\textsuperscript{611} Cf. above, chapter 2.2.2.
\textsuperscript{612} Veach, The Geraldines and the Conquest of Ireland, p. 74.
\textsuperscript{613} \textit{RG}, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{614} Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{615} This goal had once been achieved for Wales: while David FitzGerald had been bishop, Maurice FitzGerald had been granted the stewardship of St Davids and even after his death, the office had been kept in the family (St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 59, p. 73–74, and p. 91).
\textsuperscript{616} Cf. \textit{VD}, p. 391.
\end{flushleft}
contribution to the life of St David could be interpreted as a territorial claim on an Irish monastery.\(^{617}\)

Furthermore, Ferns declaring itself dependent of St Davids refers back to the events narrated in *lectio IV*, where Aidan was present, too. As already explained above, the lightning of fire symbolised taking possession of a land,\(^{618}\), and when David lit a fire, its smoke surrounded Ireland, too. Thus, the scene with Aidan and Ferns actually fulfils the prediction of the earlier *lectio*. Furthermore, if Ferns became a suffragan of St Davids, this would also serve as a foreshadowing to David’s superior role as archbishop in *lectio VIII*.

Giraldus’ claims must have persuaded contemporaries and following generations: A list of suspected suffragans of St Davids was incorporated in Royal MS 13 C.i, in the miracle account and Ferns is listed among these suffragans.\(^{619}\) The assumed connection between Ferns and St Davids lasted until the 17th century, for the “improbability of the suffragan relationship […] was first recognized by Bishop Ussher, who categorically rejected the idea.”\(^{620}\)

Giraldus continues to narrate: Some time later, during Easter vigil, Aidan is approached by an angel who warns him that David is in danger, for evil brethren plan to poison him during breakfast.\(^{621}\) Aidan feels helpless, as he has no means to reach David on time. The feeling of helplessness is highlighted through direct speech which reports the conversation between Aidan and the angel.\(^{622}\) The angel commands Aidan to sent his brother Swithun to the sea. All three texts chose to depict the conversation between the angel and Aidan in direct speech in order to intensify the dramatic effect of the scene.\(^{624}\)

---

\(^{617}\) Territorial claims in saints’ lives are no invention of Giraldus. In the anonymous life of St Cuthbert, for example, the author had inserted such claims, but these were later removed in Bede’s life of St Cuthbert (McMullen, Rewriting the Ecclesiastical Landscape of Early Medieval Northumbria in the Lives of Cuthbert, p. 59).

\(^{618}\) Henken, Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse, p. 32.

\(^{619}\) *VD C*, p. 155.

\(^{620}\) *VD C*, p. 161–162.

\(^{621}\) *VD*, p. 392.

\(^{622}\) Cf. *VD*, p. 392.

\(^{623}\) In the Vespasian-recension, he is called St Scuithín, a saint who is known from other texts to ride on sea beasts (*VES*, p. 133). Scuithín is later identified with *Scolanus* / *Ysgolan*, another legendary Welsh figure (*VES*, p. 133), and although Giraldus gives the same reference to *Scolanus*, he mistakenly identifies him as the Anglo-Saxon saint of Winchester († 863) (*VD*, p. 392).

\(^{624}\) *VD*, p. 392, *VES*, p. 132, and *David*, p. 16.
3. The saint of St Davids: The life of St David

The angel’s command is fulfilled and St Swithun travels on the back of a sea monster to Wales, where he reaches St David in time. He insists on serving the brethren at breakfast, but St David proves that he needed no help: having divided the bread and having shared it with a dog and a raven, he eats it. While the animals perish, David is not harmed. The Vespasian-recension provides greater detail of the evil plan: the three poisoners were the cook, the steward and a servant, and it narrates how the brethren scrutinized David for three hours before they were convinced that he was unharmed.

In reality, this miracle does not display the powers of Aidan, but the powers of God and David. When Aidan does not know what to do, his obedience is rewarded with the appearance of a helpful sea monster. The sea monster, however, is not commanded by Aidan’s or Swithun’s power. Instead, it came because of the angel’s interference. David, on the other hand, proves himself superior when he shows that the poisoned bread could do him no harm. The reader is left to guess that he probably knew about the planned assassination all along. Overall, this lectio suggests that David’s disciples, personified through Aidan, all have miraculous powers (they command the forces of nature when they make fountains appear, they restore the life of cattle, and they are able to ride on sea monsters). However, their power does not come close to the saintly powers of David, who shows himself superior to his fellow brethren.

While the story of Aidan, Ferns, and Swithun laid the foundation for the links between Wales and Ireland, the story of St Bairre / Finnbarr of Cork continues this trace of the story. On his way back from a pilgrimage to Rome, the Irish Abbot Bairre visits St Davids, eager to be allowed to talk to St David. On the one hand, this seems to be a reference to the popularity that David must have already enjoyed. On the other hand, visiting and re-visiting monks is a practice attested in other early vitae.

---

625 VD, p. 392. Elissa Henken suggests a possible interpretation for the deeper meaning of the dog and the raven, but she admits at the same time that the appearance of these specific animals may only serve to verify the whole story by enriching it with extensive details (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 52).

626 VES, p. 132–134. The Nero-Digby recension also provides these information (David, p. 16–17), however, only in the Vespasian-recension does David actually explain to his brethren who wanted to poison him (VES, p. 134).

627 VD, p. 394. VES, p. 134, and David, p. 17. The story about St Bairre / Finnbarr of Cork riding on David’s horse also appears in a variant of St Bairre’s life (VES, p. 135).

When St Bairre decides to return to his homeland, he asks David for a horse, which David used to ride when he was away on church business. David gives him a horse, which carries St Bairre not only to the sea, but even above the waves, where St Bairre encounters St Brendan, who is travelling on a whale. Giraldus' depiction of this scene is shorter than the one given by the recensions, because he especially omitted the parts made up of direct speech. This brief scene is meant to glorify the popularity of St David, because St Bairre explains to St Brendan his experiences in Wales and thus leads him to long to visit St David, too.

St Bairre reaches Cork safely. He spreads the fame of St Davids, and the Irish community keeps David’s horse and even builds a statue of it in gold and silver. In contrast to the recensions, Giraldus finishes the passage with scriptural quotations, claiming that

*Nihil enim contra naturae Dominum prævalet natura.*

Nature can do nothing against its Lord.

We may even speculate that the scene was ‘too miraculous’ for Giraldus’ taste, wherefore he felt the need to justify this narration.

The last link to Ireland is cast with the story of Modomnóc. At St Davids, he is keeper of the bees. He was saved one day by St David from being killed

---

629 *VD*, p. 394, *VES*, p. 134, and *David*, p. 17. Interestingly, in his life of St Hugh, Giraldus would highlight that Bishop Hugh never confirmed from horseback (cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.1). Unfortunately, we do not know whether confirmation was part of David’s *ecclesiasticas utilitates*.


634 *VD*, p. 395–397, *VES*, p. 136–138, and *David*, p. 18–19. Modomnóc’s cult was established at Ceredigion (Wooding, The Figure of David, p. 13). The story of Modomnóc and the bees
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by a peasant. Modomnóc intends to travel to Ireland but the bees of St Davids, over which he has kept watch, follow him stubbornly several times. Modomnóc returns, not wanting to deprive St Davids of its bees. St David and the brethren, however, allow Modomnóc to take the bees to Ireland. The Vespasian-recension has a long blessing from St David, which Giraldus' version lacks. According to Giraldus, this aetiological story explains why Ireland has plenty of bees and Wales lacks them.

3.3.5 David, archbishop of Wales

3.3.5.1 Pilgrimage to Jerusalem

The narration starts with a dreamlike vision David receives one night. An angel commands him to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem immediately, accompanied by Eliud (who is identified as Teilo), and Padarn. The identification of Eliud as Teilo can also be found in the Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension. Both recensions also refer to a life of St

---

635 Cf. above, chapter 3.3.4.1.
636 *VES*, p. 138. The Nero-Digby recension has only a shorter version of this blessing (*David*, p. 19).
637 *VD*, p. 396–397. A similar reference can be found in *VES*, p. 138 and *David*, p. 19. See also *VES*, p. 139, for Giraldus’ comment in the *Topographia* on the introduction of bees to Ireland (*TH*, p. 28–29).
638 *VD*, p. 397–404.
639 *VD*, p. 397–399.
641 The pilgrimage is also mentioned in the lives of Teilo and Padarn (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 57) and it has also made its way into liturgical material (Cf. Tudor Edwards, Political Implications in Medieval Services Celebrating St David of Wales, p. 4). In some Welsh and Latin texts, David is also associated with a pilgrimage to Rome (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 59). This element of the *vita* is contrary to the usual pattern that Welsh saints cease moving after having settled down (this pattern was detected by Elissa Henken detected in her study of Welsh saints’ lives: Henken, The Welsh Saints, p. 5).
Padarn, which contains more information about the saint. This information is omitted by Giraldus, because he probably wanted to focus on the main character of the *vita*, St David, and not divert his readers’ attention to other saints, who could possibly be considered David’s rivals.

After all, the identification of Eliud as Teilo and the presence of Padarn, and, more importantly, their submission to St David, refer to great disputes between the churches of Llandaff and St Davids. Teilo and Padarn had several churches dedicated to them, which themselves dominated different areas of Wales. Both St Davids and Llandaff claimed influence on churches dedicated to Teilo. In the end, however, a major part of Teilo’s patrimony and many of St Padarn’s churches in Cardigan were pulled into the sphere of St Davids. The appearance of Eliud / Teilo and Padarn in Giraldus’ *VD* is a literate proof for the claims and self-image of St Davids as being superior to Llandaff (and the other Welsh churches).

Although David is ready to obey, he remarks that Eliud and Padarn are currently away at a distance of three or more days. Giraldus’ use of direct speech emphasizes David’s humility and his readiness to obey the Lord’s commands. He is implicitly contrasted with St Patrick, who had received an angelic command in *lectio II* and nearly despaired over it.

The angel assures David that everything will be in good order and, indeed, David meets his destined companions on the next day. The three go on pilgrimage together. In contrast to *VES* and the Nero-Digby-recension, Giraldus significantly omitted a reference claiming that David, Eliud, and Padarn “were equals as fellow-travellers, no one considered himself to be above the other, each one of them was a servant, each one master.” This statement would have run contrary to his intentions of depicting David as superior to the others.

---

642 *VES*, p. 138, *David*, p. 20. According to John Reuben Davies, St Padarn’s name is not attested in sources pre-dating the late 11th century (Davies, The Saints of South Wales and the Welsh Church, p. 379).
643 Cf. above, chapter 3.3.3.3, where Teilo is identified as David’s disciple.
644 Cf. for a more information Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 13–14.
646 Davies, Wales and West Britain, p. 347.
649 Translation taken from *VES*, p. 139. Cf. the translation with *VD*, p. 397 and *David*, p. 20.
According to Giraldus, the pilgrims traverse the Atlantic\textsuperscript{650} and the Mediterranean sea. On their way, they receive the Gift of Tongues\textsuperscript{651}. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension have a slightly different version of the travel route, for in these versions, David and his companions cross the Channel and travel through France, where they receive the Gift of Tongues\textsuperscript{652}. We may speculate that Giraldus adapted his narrative because of the personal circumstances under which he was writing: he had been a member of the Angevin court and had studied for several years in France, wherefore he probably would have associated alienigenas diversarum gentium linguas\textsuperscript{653}, or, as Giraldus expresses it, diversas nationum linguas\textsuperscript{654} with a different location than France. The impending Crusades and the importance of Jerusalem may have played another major part in this decision.

Before David, Eliud, and Padarn arrive in Jerusalem, their arrival is announced to the Patriarch in a dreamlike vision. The angel’s prophecy, that David (whose name is the only one given in Giraldus’ version of the text, the names of Eliud and Padarn are skipped\textsuperscript{655}) would arrive the next day, is again narrated in direct speech. This, and the omission of Eliud’s and Padarn’s names, highlight the importance of David.

The Patriarch is delighted and honours the three pilgrims highly. After some time, he even consecrates David, who is chosen out of divine grace (\textit{divinitus}), as bishop\textsuperscript{656}. In contrast to Giraldus’ vita, VES narrates that the Patriarch consecrated David as archbishop (\textit{ad archiepiscopatum} [... \textit{provehit}]\textsuperscript{657}). This consecration would have violated papal claims in Rome. Whereas Rhygyfarch and his adaptors might not have flinched from a conflict with the Roman authorities, Giraldus obviously cringed at the prospect\textsuperscript{658}.

\textsuperscript{650} Mare Gallicum (VD, p. 397).
\textsuperscript{651} Cf. Marc. 16,17: \textit{signa autem eos qui crediderint haec sequentus: in nomine meo daemonia eicient, linguis loquentur novis}. Cf. also Act 2,4: \textit{et repletae sunt omnes Spiritu Sancto et coeperunt loqui alis linguis prout Spiritus Sanctus dabat eloqui illis}.
\textsuperscript{652} VES, p. 140 and David, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{653} VES, p. 140 and David, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{654} VD, p. 398.
\textsuperscript{655} Cf. VD, p. 398 with VES, p. 140 and David, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{656} VD, p. 398.
\textsuperscript{657} VES, p. 140 and David, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{658} Nora Chadwick suggests that Rhygyfarch may have either followed variant traditions or he could have introduced the consecration in Jerusalem as an excuse for David’s election at the Synod of Breif. In that sense, the Synod acted in accord with the wishes of the Patriarch of Jerusalem (Chadwick, Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church, p. 144).
The three pilgrims, however, do not at once return to their homeland. They arrived in a time of pagan riots and successfully start to work as missionaries. While the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recensions speak of Jewish uprisings, Giraldus’ calls them *gentiles*. This change of terminology may also reflect Giraldus’ impressions of the Crusades.

Some time later, before David, Eliud, and Padarn return to Wales, they receive four gifts from the Patriarch of Jerusalem: a consecrated portable altar, a bell, a staff and a golden coat. These gifts were not brought back to Wales by the pilgrims, instead, they were carried by angels. David’s gifts, the bell and the altar, were brought to his monastery of Llangyfelach, and Eliud’s and Padarn’s gifts to their respective monasteries. This is an aetiological explanation for the secondary relics of the monastery, which, as Giraldus and the Vespasian-recension assert, “are called heavenly gifts by the common people.” The explicit mention of the monastery of Llangyfelach is important, for the monastery is situated in a territory which was claimed by the bishopric of Llandaff. The positioning of the altar “could hardly be a more potent symbol of St Davids’ metropolitan aspirations and its claim to diocesan territory.”

Having compared Giraldus’ way of narrating the pilgrimage to Jerusalem with the narrations found in the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recension, we may safely state that Giraldus stressed David’s preeminent role stronger than the recensions did. Giraldus did not only omit references to the equality of the pilgrims, he even did not mention the names of David’s companions when they arrive at Jerusalem. At the same time, contrary to the other versions, Giraldus claimed that David was not consecrated archbishop but bishop. Thus, Giraldus avoids a doublet / double consecration / election of David and emphasizes the importance of the events at the Synod of Brefi, for, in Giraldus narration, the driving force is not a foreign power (in this case, the Patriarch of Jerusalem), but the Welsh Church. This shift of power from Jerusalem to the Welsh Church stresses the connection between David / St Davids and Wales.

---

660 Cf. Wyn Evans, *Transition and Survival*, p. 31. Giraldus should have participated in the third crusade, but he was released from his vows (Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales*, p. 68).
662 The monastery is one of the twelve monasteries David founded before he returned to St Davids. Cf. above, chapter 3.3.3.2. According to a (later interpolated) chapter in William of Malmesbury’s *De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie*, David’s altar was later taken to Glastonbury (Scott, *The Early History of Glastonbury*, p. 80–82 and p. 195).
664 James, *The Geography of the Cult of St David*, p. 70.
3. The saint of St Davids: The life of St David

3.3.5.2 David’s election as archbishop of Wales

*Lectio VIII* is occupied with David’s election as archbishop on the Synod of Brefi, which was a universal synod of entire Wales. Brefi had a logistic importance during David’s time. The synod was aimed against the Pelagian heresy, which had spread throughout Britain.

At first, David was not present at the synod. The bishops spoke to the audience, but they could achieve nothing against the heresy. In the end, bishop Paulinus sent for David. Twice David neglected the call of his former teacher, but the third time, Daniel and St Dubricius were sent to fetch David.

Daniel and Dubricius are Deiniol and Dyfrig, the respective saints of Llandaff and Bangor, rivals of St Davids throughout the times of Rhygyfarch and Bishop Bernard. As both saints (and, consequently, their respective churches) can achieve nothing against the Pelagian heresy without the help of St David, this scene is a great triumph for St Davids and its claims against both rivals.

---

665 *VD*, p. 399–402.
666 [...] *universali totius Kambriae synodo* (*VD*, p. 399). This information is also contained in *VES*, p. 142 and *David*, p. 21, though both recensions are more specific and tell us that 118 bishops and many other representatives of both clerical and secular ranks were gathered (even women were present). The Synod is also mentioned in other lives, but different reasons for summoning the Synod are offered (Wade-Evans, *Life of St. David*, p. 108).
669 *VD*, p. 399, *VES*, p. 142 (David is referred to as bishop, not archbishop), and *David*, p. 22 (David is referred to as bishop, not archbishop). Nora Chadwick suggests that these may be references to variant traditions on St David (Chadwick, *Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church*, p. 144).
670 *VES*, p. 142 and *David*, p. 22 speak of Daniel and Dubricius being sent after the other messengers had failed trice.
David foretells his brethren the coming of Daniel and Dubricius, and he is right: the next day, both men arrive, and David humbly accepts the invitation to attend the synod\textsuperscript{673}.

On their way, the three men encounter a mother bewailing her dead son somewhere near the river Teifi\textsuperscript{674}. David pities the mother and her child and, when she asks him for help, he raises the boy from the dead. The reference to Jesus and Lazarus in this scene is obvious\textsuperscript{675}. Elissa Henken suggests that this event serves as a ‘test’ which David had to pass before he can succeed at the Synod of Brefi\textsuperscript{676}.

Having arrived at the synod, David is asked to preach. Although the other bishops had stood on the heap of clothes, David does not follow their example when he begins with his sermon\textsuperscript{677}. David does not need manmade aid to enforce the power of his voice: His preaching is accompanied by miracles, for a dove descends from heaven and rests on his shoulder, while the ground rises beneath his feet so that David may tower above his listeners\textsuperscript{678}. The symbolic power of this heap of clothes is specified in the Vespasian-recension and in the Nero-Digby-recension. There, it is explained at the beginning of the narration that the heap is raised because such a multitude of people had gathered that the bishops feared their voices would not be heard. One person was to be elected to preach while standing on the heap, and if this person could miraculously be heard by the multitude, he would be consecrated archbishop\textsuperscript{679}. These details are omitted in Giraldus’ version, which maybe explained by two different reasons: first of all, that his intended audience was already acquainted with the symbolic meaning of the heap of clothes and its background story. This, however, runs contrary to the methods Giraldus used in the first chapter of

\textsuperscript{673} VD, p. 400, VES, p. 142, and David, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{674} VES, p. 144. Giraldus only speaks of a place \textit{a synodo non remota} (not remote from the synod) (VD, p. 400) and the Nero-Digby narrates that the wailing of the mother was heard \textit{ad proximum synodi} (David, p. 22).
\textsuperscript{675} Cf. Joh. 11,1–45.
\textsuperscript{676} Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 56–57.
\textsuperscript{677} This scene is also part of the liturgical material on St David (Cf. Tudor Edwards, Political Implications in Medieval Services Celebrating St David of Wales, p. 11–12). In the Vespasian-recension, a \textit{sudarium} is placed under David’s feet (VES, p. 144, cf. as well David, p. 23 for further appearance of a \textit{sudarium} in some manuscripts).
\textsuperscript{678} VD, p. 401. A church was built on top of the hill and dedicated in the name of St David (VD, p. 401, VES, p. 146, and David, p. 24). This is another etiological explanation for the dedication of the church. The church is also mentioned in IK, p. 119–120. Elissa Henken suggests that Giraldus incorporated local Welsh tradition when he narrates that David preached on flat ground (Henken, Traditions of the Welsh Saints, p. 53).
\textsuperscript{679} VES, p. 142 and David, p. 21–22.
the VD, which suggested an audience outside of Wales. Bearing this in mind, the second option seems more likely; that Giraldus omitted the background story because he thought it too foreign for his intended (non-Welsh) audience.

Thanks to David’s preaching, the Pelagian heresy disappears from Britain. St Dubricius choses David as his archiepiscopal successor and the people present at the synod agree. Consequently, David is elected as archbishop of Wales680.

Giraldus adds that Dubricius had previously resigned this honour to David, a tradition that he also recorded in his Itinerarium Kambriae681. Nora Chadwick suggested that Giraldus may have followed different traditions in this scene682. Here, Giraldus probably tried to reconcile the different traditions propagated by Geoffrey of Monmouth and Rhggyfarch.

The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension add that the monastery was raised to archiepiscopal status, so that David’s successors would also be archbishops683. The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension of the Vita Davidis are not the only primary source which refers to St Davids as being an archiepiscopal seat. The Vita Griffini Filii Conani, for example, which was probably written during the twelfth century, also speaks of St Davids as an archiepiscopal seat684.

As archbishop, David sets out to reform the Church of Wales on two synods: the Synod of Brebi and the so-called ‘Victoria’-Synod685. The decrees set at these synods could be found, as the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recensions assure, in David’s own handwriting in very old documents that had been kept at St Davids, as the Vespasian-recension explains686.

---

680 [...] in Kambriae totius archiepiscopum est sublimatus (VD, p. 401). The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension use the expression archiepiscopus constituitur (VES, p. 146 and David, p. 24). Whereas the secular acceptance of David as archbishop is made explicit in the recensions (VES, p. 146 and David, p. 24), Giraldus did not explicitly speak of it.


682 Chadwick, Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church, p. 150. According to Geoffrey of Monmouth, Dubricius had been made archbishop of Caerleon, but he resigned his office in favour of St David (Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 215 and IK, p. 56). The ‘Prophecies of Merlin’ also refer to David receiving the pallium of Dubricius, cf. Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, p. 145–147.

683 VES, p. 146 and David, p. 24.

684 Vita Griffini Filii Conani, p. 46 and p. 68.

685 VD, p. 401.

Giraldus, however, laments that these documents were lost because of Viking-raids and the carelessness of previous generations\textsuperscript{687}.

All three texts agree that St David served as an excellent exemplar for his brethren, his fellow-bishops, and every other Christian. Only the Vespasian-recension offers much more detail in the description of the power of St David and his monastery / archiepiscopal seat\textsuperscript{688}. This agrees with Elissa Henken’s conclusion that, both Welsh and Anglo-Norman clerics used \textit{vitae} to “assert their churches’ ecclesiastical rights”\textsuperscript{689} during the changes the Church of Wales faced because of the Norman Conquest of England. Giraldus, writing more than a century after the Conquest, may have felt that these details were superfluous, wherefore he omitted them.

\subsection*{3.3.5.3 David’s death\textsuperscript{690}}

St David died at a very old age on the first of March\textsuperscript{691}. In accordance with hagiographical standards, he foretold his brethren his own death and shows no fear but embraces death willingly\textsuperscript{692}. When David is able to predict his own death, the scene shows two major elements: first of all, it proves David’s saintliness, for David is obviously imbued with prophetic power\textsuperscript{693}. Furthermore, when David foretells his death (and, consequently, rumours of his imminent death spread) his fellow saints from Ireland and Britain come to visit him, and he is able to unite his disciples one more time to ensure his legacy will survive\textsuperscript{694}.

David’s death was also referred to by Geoffrey of Monmouth\textsuperscript{695}. In Geoffrey’s narration, David also died in St Davids, which had been founded by St Patrick, who had predicted David’s birth. Geoffrey adds that St David

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item \textsuperscript{687} \textit{VD}, p. 402.
\item \textsuperscript{688} \textit{VES}, p. 146.
\item \textsuperscript{689} Henken, \textit{Welsh Hagiography and the Nationalist Impulse}, p. 30.
\item \textsuperscript{690} \textit{VD}, p. 402–404.
\item \textsuperscript{691} \textit{VD}, p. 402, \textit{VES}, p. 148, and \textit{David}, p. 25.
\item \textsuperscript{692} For the stylisation of death scenes, cf. Crouch, \textit{The Culture of Death in the Anglo-Norman World}, p. 163.
\item \textsuperscript{693} Isaïa, \textit{La Prophétie dans l’Hagiographie Latine du Haut Moyen Âge (VIe-Xe Siècle). L’histoire comme Destin, Prédestination et Providence}, p. 15–16.
\item \textsuperscript{695} Cf. Geoffrey of Monmouth, \textit{The History of the Kings of Britain}, p. 255.
\end{thebibliography}
preferred St Davids to his other monasteries and that he was buried there. Although this narration contains all the elements we know from Giraldus’ narration – David’s death in St Davids, his predilection for this place, and the connection between St Patrick and St David – it is a slightly different version, for now, Patrick had founded St Davids and foretold David’s birth. In the life(s) of St David, Patrick has a much more passive role, for he is cast out of Wales and sent to Ireland, and David’s birth is explained to Patrick and not proclaimed by him.

The Vespasian-recension and the Nero-Digby-recension also speak of David being buried in his monastery, but there is no mention of any post-mortem miracles\(^{696}\). According to Giraldus, David’s body is buried in St Davids, where it attracts miracles and signs\(^{697}\).

At the end of his \textit{VD}, Giraldus invites his successors to add miracles to his text, so they would expand it\(^{698}\). This might seem contradictory to the silence of the Vespasian-recension, which in turn agrees very well with a habit we know from other Welsh saints’ lives. The absence of such miracles is generally attested in these texts\(^{699}\). We have to remind ourselves, however, that Giraldus and Rhygyfarch did not share the same cultural background. In her examination, Julia Smith argues for the case of St Wenefred that a cult might change its type due to a different cultural background: Whereas the bones of St Wenefred were celebrated for healing powers in Anglo-Norman England, the Welsh hagiographers are silent on that point\(^{700}\). Thus, Giraldus end of the life of St David shows that as a hagiographer, he was heavily influenced by the standards of non-Welsh saints’ lives.

\(^{696}\) VES, p. 150 and \textit{David}, p. 27.  
\(^{697}\) \textit{VD}, p. 404. According to William of Malmesbury, David’s body was taken to Glastonbury during the tenth century (Scott, The Early History of Glastonbury, p. 64–66).  
\(^{698}\) \textit{VD}, p. 404.  
\(^{699}\) Smith, Oral and Written, p. 340.  
\(^{700}\) Smith, Oral and Written, p. 341.
3.4 Royal MS 13 C.i: The additional chapter

The manuscript of Royal MS 13 C.i contains an additional chapter which is not found in the *Vita Davidis* that was preserved in *Cott. Vit.*. The additional chapter deals with St David and Glastonbury. David, who was at that time archbishop, had been asked to come to Glastonbury to dedicate a chapel. The saint agreed and took seven suffragans with him. On their way, however, Jesus appeared to David to tell his saint that the Church had already been consecrated by himself. David declared that no one would believe him, if he told this story, wherefore he received the stigmata on his hands. Jesus also explained to David that his hands could be healed again when he said mass at Glastonbury.

The story claims to be based on a book about the history of the church, which Michael Curley identifies as *De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie*, a text written by William of Malmesbury in 1129. John Scott identifies it as one of the “local legends” incorporated by William of Malmesbury in his work.

Michael Curley has examined how Royal MS 13 C.i enhances the picture of St David that was sketched by William of Malmesbury’s account and creates a very positive image of the saint. The question is: why would the Glastonbury-chapter appear in one version of Giraldus’ *vita Davidis*, and why would it be omitted in the other?

As *Royal* contains a slightly earlier version than *Cott. Vit.*, Giraldus must have chosen to omit the Glastonbury-chapter during the revision-process of the *VD*. His decision may have been based on several factors:

---

701 In the absence of the forthcoming edition of the text as preserved in *Royal*, which will be published by Paul Russell, I examine the text of this additional chapter as found in an article by Michael Curley (*VDC*, p. 138–139).


705 *VDC*, p. 140–141.

706 Cf. above, chapter 3.2.
First of all, Giraldus himself may have never chosen to omit the Glastonbury-chapter. The omission may have been due to a scribal error or it may have happened during the edition-process undertaken by Henry Wharton. On the other hand, Giraldus may have also decided later on that the Glastonbury-chapter did not fit his intentions. One reason for his decision may have been his commissioners. After all, Giraldus claimed that he wrote the *Vita Davidis* because of the *fratres* and *concanonici* of St Davids\(^{707}\). In combination with William of Malmesbury’s account that David held Glastonbury in very high esteem\(^{708}\), the chapter might have created the impression that St Davids was not the favourite monastery of St David. It would be a logical consequence to leave out the said chapter in a revised version of the text.

Other reasons may be found if we examine the narrative elements of the Glastonbury-chapter.

It was added after *lectio VIII*, which means, it was added right after David had been elected archbishop of Wales. The chapter, however, does not portray David as a mighty and widely recognized archbishop of the whole of Wales; instead, David fears that no one would believe the story of his encounter with Jesus. Such an impression would be rather contrary to the purpose of the previous and the following chapters, wherefore the whole Glastonbury-event may have been omitted. Furthermore, the chapter alludes to the seven suffragans of St Davids\(^{709}\). This is contradictory to Giraldus’ statement in *lectio III*, where David founds twelve monasteries before he returns to St Davids\(^{710}\).

Overall, Giraldus probably realized during the revision-process that the Glastonbury-chapter either did not match the remaining information in his *vita* or that its statements ran contrary to what he intended to express. Consequently, this chapter was omitted in the new version of the life of St David.

---

\(^{707}\) *VD*, p. 377.
\(^{708}\) *VDC*, p. 139.


\(^{710}\) *VD*, p. 386.
3.5 Reasons for composition and intended audience

Our comparison of the life of St David with VES and David has shown how much the cult of St Davids changed within approximately one hundred years. This change can be felt on the level of words\(^{711}\) and in terms of the structure of the narration\(^{712}\). Although the difference between Rhysgafarch’s St David and Giraldus’ St David might not be so great as the difference between the portrait of Saint James the Apostle as a peaceful fisherman from the Sea of Galilee and that of him as a knight heading the Spanish army\(^{713}\), we have found different, sometimes contradictory nuances nevertheless\(^{714}\).

But what does the text tell us about its purpose?

It is usually claimed that Giraldus’ life of David was written for the liturgy. For John Brewer, the *vita* may have been read out at David’s feast day\(^{715}\). This is a logical conclusion, given the division into *lectiones* and the *responsio*, which is found in *Cott. Vit.*. Yet no one seems to have been aware of the differences with *Royal*. As shown by Michael Curley, the version preserved in *Royal* not only features an additional chapter, but the number of *lectiones* and their position in the text differ greatly\(^{716}\). In his examination of the liturgical material for St David, Silas M. Harris argued that “most of the lessons in use at various centres in the succeeding centuries drew to a greater or less extent on these long *lectiones* of Giraldus”\(^{717}\). Instead of being used in the liturgy, the text itself served as a source and basis for the liturgical material.

---

\(^{711}\) After all, Giraldus proposed to rewrite the *vita* with *scholastico stilo* (*VD*, p. 377).

\(^{712}\) We only have to think about how Giraldus tried to reconcile the tradition that David was consecrated archbishop in Jerusalem and later on (re-)elected as archbishop. Giraldus even incorporated the narration of Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *vita*.


\(^{714}\) Especially when it comes to the depiction of St David’s monastic lifestyle.


\(^{716}\) *VDC*, p. 138.

\(^{717}\) Harris, *Saint David in the Liturgy*, p. 17.
Furthermore, the number and position of the *lectiones* in Brewer’s edition is problematic: the division into paragraphs is very uneven, wherefore Michael Curley argued that the text was probably not suited to be read out at Matins for the feast of St David.\(^{718}\)

Whether the *vita* was wholly used for liturgical purposes or not, Giraldus definitely had secondary objectives in mind when he composed the life of St David. At the beginning of the preface, he explains:

> *Vitam S. David archiepiscopi, quem vulgares Dewi dicunt, scholastico declarare stilo, quamquam alis occupatus plurimum et detentus litterarum studiis, fratrums tamen et concannonicorum victus instantia, vix tandem et invitus adquievi*\(^{719}\).

Finally, I have unwillingly undertaken the task to write the life of Archbishop St David, whom the common people call Dewi, in scholastic style, although I had been very occupied and distracted by other literary pursuits, because I have been persuaded by my brethrens’ and co-clerics’ frequent requests.

The key-term in this paragraph is *scholastico stilo*. As Robert Bartlett and John Reuben Davies have noted, the stylistic difference between Giraldus’ life of St David and the Nero-Digby-recension (and, ultimately, the Vespasian-recension) is huge.\(^{720}\) Giraldus himself was also aware of these differences, too, and he explicitly alluded to them in the preface.\(^{721}\) The revision of the *vita’s* style is one of the major features of Giraldus’ writing techniques.\(^{722}\) Overall, it may very well have been the case that the canons of St Davids simply wanted to have a life of their principal saint ‘up-dated’, that is, rewritten in a modern style.\(^{723}\)

But there may have been other reasons for Giraldus’ choices, reasons, which may have had nothing to do with the canons of St David. Michael Richter had already suggested that Giraldus’ life of St David may best be seen in

---

\(^{718}\) *VD*\(^C\)*, p. 138.

\(^{719}\) *VD*, p. 377.


\(^{721}\) *VD*, p. 377.


\(^{723}\) As suggested by Bartlett, *Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales*, p. 600.
relation to Giraldus’ (future) interests in Wales / Welsh affairs. This suggestion is difficult to validate, for our most extensive sources on Giraldus and the Welsh Church were written by Giraldus himself. We have no concrete picture of Giraldus’ thoughts and views about Wales. On the one hand, Giraldus celebrates the coming of the Normans and the Marcher Lords, on the other, he assures us that the Welsh would be unbeatable, if they united themselves under one flag. Giraldus laments that he was called ‘Welsh’ by his contemporaries, while also labouring to become bishop of St Davids, a Welsh bishopric.

But maybe we should take a step back to assess the situation properly. Perhaps, Giraldus was not interested in what we call ‘Wales’ today, but in a much smaller unit. Maybe Giraldus’ interest was concentrated on the possessions of his family. As already mentioned above, Giraldus’ family was closely connected with St Davids, especially through the Welsh family branch. Giraldus’ grandfather had ravaged the lands of St David and Giraldus uncles (and their children) were also closely bound to the diocese: For example, David FitzGerald, Bishop of St Davids, had alienated the bishopric’s possessions for his daughters. The stewardship for the lands of St Davids was in the hands of the Geraldines, too. Maurice FitzGerald had received the stewardship under bishop David, and even after his death, the position was kept in the Geraldine-family. Even the evident connection between Wales and Ireland would fit this pattern: The involvement of Giraldus’ family-members in Irish affairs is huge. To name a few more examples: Robert FitzStephen and Maurice FitzGerald received the city of Wexford, Robert and Philip, Giraldus’ brothers, also received Irish territory, and Bishop David ‘the Welshman’ of Waterford who was murdered in 1209 was probably a distant cousin of Giraldus.

724 Richter, The Life of St. David by Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 386. He is followed by Walker, Gerald of Wales, Archdeacon of Brecon, p. 75 and, partly, by Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 44 and Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 28.
725 For example, Giraldus suggests, that, if kings intended to conquer Wales, they should better listen to the Marcher Lords (DK, p. 219).
726 DK, p. 226.
727 PI, p. 5
728 Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 86 and Pryce, The Dynasty of Deheubarth and the Church of St Davids, p. 305.
730 St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085–1280, p. 5.
732 Veach, The Geraldines and the Conquest of Ireland, p. 74.
Overall, seven ‘Irish’ saints (that is, saints which are patrons of Irish churches) appear in the different versions of David’s life. Throughout the *vita*, St Davids, which was founded so that David and his brethren could live and pray in solitude, serves as a link between Ireland and Wales. This happens because of David, who incorporates both Welsh and Irish traces: he may have been born to Welsh parents, but he was baptized by an Irishman. He has many more links with Irish saints, for example, with St Patrick. Thus, David (and, ultimately, St Davids) is a reuniting power for both Wales and Ireland. Although the basis for the association of Ireland and Wales was laid out by Rhygyfarch, Giraldus chose to preserve this feature. Especially Giraldus’ additional material on Ferns (County Wexford) intensifies these Irish connections.

Despite the obvious influence of Giraldus’ relatives, Irish and Welsh alike, the connection between Giraldus and St David and St Davids runs deeper. Giraldus proved his fascination with St Davids also in his *Itinerarium* and his *Descriptio Kambriae*, where he narrated miracles, writes about the cathedral’s (invented and embellished) past, or offers anecdotes about his Welsh relatives.

In the life of St David, Giraldus locates the story of the saint and his disciples in a broader frame of reference. This was done in different ways: First of all, Giraldus connected the characters with each other. Furthermore, Welsh place names connect the events with local spots. This observation is especially true for the immediate surroundings of St

---

735 These saints are: Patrick, Ailbe of Munster, Aidan of Ferns, Bairre of Cork, Brendan of Clonfert, Scolan and Modomnóc.
736 Pádraig ó Riain argues that Rhygyfarch did not necessarily have Irish source material at his disposition, but was inspired by the current situation (Ó Riain, Hagiography Without Frontiers: Borrowing of Saints Across the Irish Sea, p. 41–42).
737 For example, a narration about St David’s bell in Elfael (*IK*, p. 18) or a boy’s theft of a bird nesting in one of St David’s churches and the saint’s vengeance (*IK*, p. 23–24).
739 His uncle, Bishop David, is saved from harassment by the interference of St David (*IK*, p. 30–31) and Rhys ap Gruffydd meets his illegitimate son in the church of St Davids (*DK*, p. 191).
Davids, which Heather James calls a “sacralised topography”\textsuperscript{743}. There is no doubt that in the \textit{Vita S. Davidis}, Giraldus created the impression that St Davids was a place “of antiquity and sanctity”\textsuperscript{744}, situated on a map of ecclesiastical influence. The omission of remote place names like, for example, the monastery of Meugan, which is irrelevant for the remaining story, gives the \textit{vita} an international touch\textsuperscript{745}.

This observation leads us to the next point: Despite the creation of a sacralised local topography, the majority of the intended audience was probably located outside of Dyfed. While the preface suggests that the text was written for the canons themselves, the explanation (and / or omission) of Welsh place names and phrases suggests that the \textit{VD} was not confined to a Welsh audience, which means, the life could have been read outside Wales. We have noted that, especially at the beginning of the \textit{vita}, Giraldus uses certain writing techniques apt for a wider, international audience.

Based on these observations and considerations, I would like to suggest that Giraldus’ life of St David could have been used as advertising material for St Davids. Such a use would have been favoured by the chapter of St Davids as well as by Giraldus himself, who may still have hoped to become bishop of St Davids one day.

At this point, an interesting link obtrudes: When Giraldus arrived in Rome towards the end of 1199, he brought some of his books with him. These books he presented to Pope Innocent III, who is said to have favoured the \textit{Gemma Ecclesiastica} highly\textsuperscript{746}. Now, the question is: what were the remaining books?

James C. Davies suggested that Giraldus had taken with him the \textit{Topographia} and the \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, the \textit{Itinerarium} and the \textit{Descriptio Kambriae}, the \textit{Gemma Ecclesiastica} and the \textit{Vita S. Caradoc}\textsuperscript{747}. As Giraldus obtained the pope’s permission to initiate the canonization procedure, it is likely that Pope Innocent received Karadoc’s life on that occasion. But why should Giraldus not have brought the life of St David with him?

\footnote{James, The Cult of St. David in the Middle Ages, p. 105. See also Wyn Evans, St David and St Davids: Some Observations on the Cult, Site and Buildings, p. 11.}
\footnote{Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 31. The frequent use of phrases like \textit{usque in hodiernum}, which connect past and present, has been mentioned throughout the previous chapters.}
\footnote{McMullen, Rewriting the Ecclesiastical Landscape of Early Medieval Northumbria in the Lives of Cuthbert, p. 60.}
\footnote{RG, p. 119 and JS, p. 336.}
\footnote{Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 261.}
Michael Richter put forward that this would have been an unwise move, because the Roman Church plays only a smaller part in the *vita*\textsuperscript{748}. This is true. On the other hand, the life of St David contains many arguments that Giraldus may have brought forward in his process to become (arch)bishop of St Davids. The *vita Davidis* depicts both the antiquity and sanctity of St Davids\textsuperscript{749}, which is part of the *ecclesia universa*\textsuperscript{750}, it creates the impression of a “unbroken continuity between the saint, the site at St Davids and the passage of time – a story which seemed to say that there had been neither disruption nor transition over the previous centuries”\textsuperscript{751}. Indeed, the unique nature of St Davids may have been a beneficial argument for its independence from Canterbury. This would also explain why Giraldus narrated that David was consecrated bishop in Jerusalem but elected as archbishop of Wales on the Synod of Brefi, whereas the Vespasian- and the Nero-Digby-recension claim that he was made archbishop on both occasions\textsuperscript{752}. It would also explain why Giraldus left out miracles which would have been too unimportant for an audience outside of Wales. An example would have been David’s miraculous bell in Elfael\textsuperscript{753}, the punishment of the boy who wanted to steal a bird from a church dedicated to David\textsuperscript{754}, or how St David saved Bishop David from being harassed by a secular landlord\textsuperscript{755}. While such miracles would have contributed to the (local) cult and veneration of St David, they would have been to no advantage for Giraldus’ (rather international) case.

Finally, the use of the life of St David as advertising material for St David and St Davids as an archbishopric would have explained why Giraldus felt the need to create a sacralised topography of St Davids’ surroundings and at the same time assures that the life could also have been read and studied by an audience outside of Wales.

\textsuperscript{748} Richter, The Life of St. David by Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 385.
\textsuperscript{749} Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{750} Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{751} Wyn Evans, Transition and Survival, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{752} Cf. above, chapter 3.3.5.
\textsuperscript{753} *IK*, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{754} *IK*, p. 23–24.
\textsuperscript{755} *IK*, p. 30–31.
4. The saint of Hereford: The life of St Ethelbert

The next saint’s life to be examined is the *Vita S. Ethelberti*. St Ethelbert, who was an Anglo-Saxon king, lived about two hundred years after St David.

4.1 The historical figure of St Ethelbert

St Ethelbert is commemorated on 20 May. It is difficult to establish a historical framework for the Anglo-Saxon king, because the royal saint remains unaddressed in many primary sources. Another problem is the paucity of sources for the kingdom of East Anglia itself. Today, its boundaries would stretch from Norfolk and Suffolk across parts of the Fens.

The story of Ethelbert took place in the 8th century. About three hundred years earlier, as Bede tells us, Germanic tribes from the continent had received an invitation to come to Britain, and the various tribes decided to stay. Having evicted the native aristocracy, they conquered the isle and divided the land into different kingdoms, which waxed and waned over the following decades.

One of these kingdoms was the kingdom of East Anglia, whose ruler, King Ælfwald, died in 749. A king named Ethelbert is attested as his successor. Unfortunately, we do not know whether Ethelbert was part of a line of single-successors or whether he had to share power at first.

Ethelbert’s *vitae* mention a marriage to a daughter of his powerful rival in the West, King Offa of Mercia († 796). This marriage may have resulted

---

756 However, we can be sure that the saint did indeed walk this earth (Rollason, The Cults of Murdered Royal Saints in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 12). For Ethelbert’s biography, cf. also Tavinor, Ethelbert - King & Martyr, 2018.

757 These parts were more or less a frontier zone, because the kingdom of Mercia had an interest in these areas as well (cf. for further information Jones, The English Saints, p. 5). For the history of East Anglia from its origins up to the time of King Ethelbert, cf. Jones, The English Saints, p. 13–130.

from the increasing political dominance of Mercia over East Anglia, which had probably been exercised since the late 780s759. The connection between Ethelbert and Offa is attested in a vernacular primary source, namely, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The respective entry reads as follows:

AN. .dccxcii. Her Offa Miercna cyning het Êþelbryhte rex þæt heafod ofaslean760.

In the year 792, Offa, king of the Mercians, had king Ethelbert beheaded.

Unfortunately, this is the only entry about our Anglo-Saxon king. The chronicle corroborates that Ethelbert died around the end of the 8th century and that he was of royal lineage. However, it does not refer to a saint’s cult. Yet even before the Conquest, Ethelbert must have acquired the status of a saint. He belongs to the group of saints whose sanctity was never proven in a canonization process but manifested itself through popular belief (vox populi, vox Dei)761.

Dedications suggest that Ethelbert’s cult in East Anglia probably flourished side by side with a revival of East Anglian kingship during the 830s762. But his veneration was not confined to his native kingdom, East Anglia. Ethelbert’s burial place at Hereford, which was part of the Mercian

---


760 The quotation is taken from MS A (The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Volume Three: MS A, p. 40). The entries in the remaining variants of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle differ only slightly in their choice of words. For example, MS B, MS C, and MS D omit that Ethelbert was a king (The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Volume Four: MS B, p. 28, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Volume Five: MS C, p. 50, and The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Volume Six: MS D, p. 17), whereas MS F does not mention that Offa was king of the Mercians (The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Volume Eight: MS F, p. 54).

761 The phenomenon is attested for many more saints (Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 13).

762 Jones, The English Saints, p. 128–129. Given the identical names of St Ethelbert of Kent and St Ethelbert of East Anglia, it is difficult to establish whether a church dedicated to a ‘Saint Ethelbert’ was dedicated to the East Anglian king or not (Sharp, Æthelbert, King and Martyr: the Development of a Legend, p. 59). Marden in Herefordshire and Little Dean in Gloucestershire seemed to have been dedicated to ‘our’ royal saint (Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 41). There existed also a community of St Ethelbert in Suffolk (Blair, A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Saints, p. 505).
kingdom, is mentioned in Anglo-Saxon sources. For example, Secgan, the only list of saints’ resting-places that has come down to us from Anglo-Saxon England, mentions a Saint Ethelbert resting at “Hereforda”.

More information about the royal saint can be deduced from sources that were written after the Conquest. For example, Ethelbert also makes an appearance in the Annals of St Neot. The text touches upon East Anglian matters and was probably composed in Bury St Edmunds about 1120–1140.

According to the Annals, the year 794, Saint Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, was killed by the most treacherous Mercian King Offa, while he innocently negotiated peace.

While this entry omits the beheading of Ethelbert, it hints at the plot displayed in the vitae: during the negotiations for a treaty between the kingdom of the East Angles and the kingdom of the Mercians, Ethelbert was killed by his perfidissmus regal opponent.

The nucleus of the story is enlarged in Gesta Regum Anglorum written by William of Malmesbury († c.1143). The chronicler obviously could not decide whether to praise or to condemn the Mercian King Offa, who had Ethelbert beheaded, after he had lured him with false assertions to come to his home. Offa’s treachery is also mentioned in other sources. In Gesta

---

767 GR, p. 120–122 and p. 142 and GP, p. 20, where William of Malmesbury mentioned that Offa also tried to subjugate some bishops of East Anglia. The Mercian king did indeed invade the East Anglian kingdom, although Mercian influence only lasted until the 820s, for
Regum written by Gervase of Canterbury († 1228), Offa’s false adulation induced Ethelbert to visit the Mercian king768. Florence / John of Worcester’s chronicle (first half of the 12th century) mentioned the involvement of Offa’s queen in the murder, as does the Vitae duorum Offarum (13th century), which was composed at St Albans769.

It is difficult to trace the stages through which Ethelbert, a murdered prince of the royal line of East Anglia, came to be venerated at Hereford. During the Middle Ages, Hereford was “a cultural outpost”770, and, especially in the early Middle Ages, the ecclesiastical landscape in Herefordshire was “a melting-pot of diverse and sometimes fiercely competing influences from British, English, Irish, Frankish (or Irish-Frankish) and Roman sources”771.

Similar to St Davids, the diocese of Hereford has a long tradition, for as early as the 7th century, bishops might have held office in the town772. A possible date of foundation may lie shortly before 680, when archbishop Theodore of Canterbury divided the great diocese of Mercia into smaller units773. During the Middle Ages, a king named Mildfrith was regarded as founder of the cathedral774.

Again, the sources for these times and the coming centuries are unfortunately scarce775. We know that, for a long time, two religious communities dominated Hereford: while the cathedral enjoyed the patronage of St Ethelbert, another cult was dedicated to St Guthlac of afterwards, East Anglian kings, associating themselves with the cult of their martyred royal predecessor, won the upper hand (Jones, The English Saints, p. 127–128).

771 Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 3.
772 Keynes, Diocese and Cathedral before 1056, p. 5–6. References from later sources could also be interpreted to suggest the opposite: in any case, the first primary source for Hereford being an episcopal see refers to the year 801 (Sims-Williams, Religion and Literature in Western England, 600–800, p. 90). For more information on the problematic reconstruction of the early history of this see, cf. Hillaby, The Early Church in Herefordshire: Columban and Roman, p. 41–58.
773 English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XXVI.
774 Hillaby, The Early Church in Herefordshire: Columban and Roman, p. 57. For more information on Mildfrith, cf. also chapter 4.3.3.1.
775 English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XXV.
Crowland\textsuperscript{776}. At the end of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century, the church at Hereford was also dedicated to Ethelbert\textsuperscript{777}.

The tide turns with the 11\textsuperscript{th} century, when Bishop Æthelstan of Hereford commissioned the building of a minster\textsuperscript{778}. The building, however, was not meant to last for a long time.

In 1055, the city of Hereford was destroyed in a combined attack of Anglo-Saxon, Welsh, and Irish forces. The Welsh Brut describes how the defenders were overwhelmed, the fortress depopulated, and the city burned\textsuperscript{779}. In the ensuing chaos, the body of St Ethelbert disappeared, and was probably destroyed during the plundering\textsuperscript{780}. Nevertheless, at least parts of Ethelbert’s relics returned, when Hereford received a tooth from its major saint in 1220\textsuperscript{781}. Probably not before the thirteenth century, Ethelbert’s head travelled to Westminster\textsuperscript{782}.

We do not know how and why the East Anglian king acquired so much fame at Hereford. Maybe his cult at Hereford was the result of opposition

\textsuperscript{776} Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 8. Alan Thacker points out that the cult of St Guthlac connected Mercia and East Anglia, as did the cult of St Ethelbert (Thacker, Kings, Saints and Monasteries in Pre-Viking Mercia, p. 17). John Blair suggests that Guthlac’s cult may have arrived at Hereford in the wake of Ethelbert’s cult, but he also remarks that our evidence is not strong enough to decide on that matter (Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 8). Although Hereford may have been “one of England’s most important medieval pilgrimage centres” (Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 41), a great part of this reputation is based on the popularity of St Thomas de Cantilupe, who was canonized in 1320 (Swanson and Lepine, The Later Middle Ages, 1268–1535, p. 48). For further information, cf. for example Cannon, Cathedral, p. 348–352.

\textsuperscript{777} Keynes, Diocese and Cathedral before 1056, p. 10. Although today, the cathedral is dedicated to both St Mary and St Ethelbert, charters suggest that the original dedication was to St Mary alone (Finberg, The Early Charters of the West Midlands, p. 223).

\textsuperscript{778} Keynes, Diocese and Cathedral before 1056, p. 18. According to Jon Cannon, the powerful local aristocracy restricted the dominance of Hereford’s cathedral (Cannon, Cathedral, p. 348). As Julia Barrow remarks, useful material about Hereford can be found in the so-called History of Llanthony Priory (English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XXVI). Robert Bartlett has shown that this text may be supposed to have links with Giraldus (cf. Bartlett, Gerald of Wales and the History of Llanthony Priory, p. 81–93).

\textsuperscript{779} Brut, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{780} Cf. Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis, Tomus I, p. 213. In his Gesta Pontificum, however, William of Malmesbury affirms that Ethelbert’s relics still lie in Hereford’s cathedral: Ornatum episcopalem sedem reliquis suis rex et martir Eielbrihtus, apud Orientales Anglos natus et principatus (GP, p. 462)

\textsuperscript{781} Sharp, Æthelbert, King and Martyr: the Development of a Legend, p. 60. A Becket-relic, which might have been purchased by Bishop William de Vere, was falsely attributed to Ethelbert (Williams, The Ornaments: The Plate, p. 504–505).

\textsuperscript{782} OC, p. 208.
against King Offa\textsuperscript{783}, maybe Ethelbert’s saintly powers had to combat with those of other royal saints at Hereford or elsewhere in England\textsuperscript{784}, or maybe his cult had its origin in lay piety\textsuperscript{785}. In any case, Ethelbert’s fame must have been widespread enough that the cult of this Anglo-Saxon martyr endured the years of the Conquest and the change from Anglo-Saxon churchmen to Norman bishops.

It is striking that the cult of Ethelbert survived the Conquest, in contrast to many other Anglo-Saxon saints, which are today only represented by obscure names and vague traditions. Maybe episcopal continuity at Hereford – Bishop Walter, who had been consecrated in 1061, remained bishop until his death in 1079 – is one explanation\textsuperscript{786}. After all, a newly appointed Norman bishop might have changed the saintly structure for Hereford. As Susan Ridyard pointed out, if a Norman bishop accepted an Anglo-Saxon saint, of whom the Norman bishop had probably never heard before, this judgement said something about the “rightfulness” of the saint as well as about the different purposes for which the Norman bishop could use the saint’s authority and reputation\textsuperscript{787}.

When it comes to size, the diocese of Hereford holds a position in the middle ranks\textsuperscript{788}. Its boundaries had been unstable for a long time. Although this changed slowly in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, the bishops of Hereford continued to have frequent boundary disputes with their colleagues. In the 1140s, the bishops even had to defend themselves against St Davids’ claims that Hereford should be its suffragan\textsuperscript{789}.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{784} Keynes, Diocese and Cathedral before 1056, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{785} Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{786} English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XXXI–XXXIII.
\textsuperscript{788} Barrow, Clergy in the Diocese of Hereford in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{789} English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XXVIII–XXIX. For more information on the parts of the diocese at the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, cf. Barrow, Clergy in the Diocese of Hereford in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, p. 38–39.
\end{flushright}
In contrast to many other cathedrals after the Conquest, Hereford Cathedral was not rebuilt\textsuperscript{790}. The building activities did not start until the beginning of the twelfth century. After thirty years of labour, the new cathedral of Hereford was finished\textsuperscript{791}. We may presume that Giraldus witnessed further building activities at the cathedral around the year 1200, which might have been part of the effort to promote Ethelbert’s cult by ensuring he had proper space for veneration\textsuperscript{792}. In the 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries, further promotion was also achieved through \textit{vitae}. These were written by different authors: an \textit{anonymous}\textsuperscript{793}, Osbert of Clare (\textdagger1158 or later)\textsuperscript{794}, and Giraldus\textsuperscript{795}. The story of St Ethelbert even found its place in the vernacular tradition, as a glance at the Southern English Legendary proves\textsuperscript{796}.

Ethelbert also left his imprint on Hereford and its church and some traces of his veneration can still be seen today. A defaced statue from the fourteenth century, said to portray Ethelbert, can be found near the high altar, and Ethelbert’s images can be found in various places in the church\textsuperscript{797}. An ancient stone structure, known as “St Ethelbert’s Well”, stands near the church, and a hospital bears his name\textsuperscript{798}.

Overall, however, “St Ethelbert remained an uncharismatic presence: devotion to him has left scant evidence, although his depiction on canons’ tombstones shows that he was not altogether forgotten”\textsuperscript{799}. At Hereford, St Thomas de Cantilupe (canonized 1320), who was venerated at Hereford’s major shrine\textsuperscript{800}, soon outshone the martyred royal saint. The same observation accounts for his cults in East Anglia and at Westminster, where

\textsuperscript{790} Cannon, Cathedral, p. 347.  
\textsuperscript{791} Cannon, Cathedral, p. 348.  
\textsuperscript{792} Morris, The Architectural History of the Medieval Cathedral Church, p. 208–210.  
\textsuperscript{793} CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253, cf. chapter 4.3 for further information.  
\textsuperscript{794} Cf. chapter 4.3 for further information.  
\textsuperscript{795} As a look in the Hereford Breviary shows, Giraldus’ \textit{Vita S. Ethelberti} was partly incorporated in liturgical material. Material for St Ethelbert consists of two antiphons and two sequences (cf. Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 39). For the hagiographical material on St Ethelbert, cf. \textit{BHL}, no. 2626–2630 and \textit{BHL Suppl.}, no. 2626–2629e. Giraldus’ \textit{vita} may be found under \textit{BHL}, no. 2626 and \textit{BHL Suppl.}, no. 2626.  
\textsuperscript{796} Probably neither Giraldus’ nor any other text of the Latin \textit{vitae} served as a template for this vernacular version of Ethelbert’s life (Nagy, Saint Æþelberht of East Anglia in the “South English Legendary”, p. 160).  
\textsuperscript{797} Tavinor, Shrines of the Saints: In England and Wales, p. 157.  
\textsuperscript{798} Tavinor, Shrines of the Saints: In England and Wales, p. 157.  
\textsuperscript{799} Swanson and Lepine, The Later Middle Ages, 1268–1535, p. 76.  
\textsuperscript{800} Coldstream, The Medieval Tombs and the Shrine of Saint Thomas Cantilupe, p. 324.
4. The saint of Hereford: The life of St Ethelbert

Ethelbert was replaced by St Edmund († 869) and, Edward the Confessor († 1066), respectively 801.

But, even though the cult of Ethelbert at Hereford was nothing more than a “modest local following”802, it still persists today: in 2007, a new shrine-like structure was erected at a location in the cathedral, where the original shrine was said to have been803.

4.2 Background information on the life of St Ethelbert

4.2.1 A short description of the manuscript

We know of two manuscripts that contained Giraldus’ Vita S. Ethelberti: Cotton MS Vitellius E. vii and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.11.16. Unfortunately, the Cotton-manuscript was damaged in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731804. Thus, our only source for the life of St Ethelbert is Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.11.16. The text is from the 14th / 15th century805 and was given to the library in the 17th century806. It is possible to access the manuscript online807.

801 Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 41.
804 Cf. for further information on the manuscript and the fire chapter 3.2.1. The Cotton Manuscript also contained a life of St David, which was written by Giraldus (Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae Cui Praemittuntur Illustri Viri, D. Roberti Cottoni, Equitis Aurati & Baronetti, Vita: et Bibliothecae Cottonianae Historia & Synopsis, p. 97). Unfortunately, in contrast to the life of St David, no previous edition of the vita S. Ethelberti exists today. Before the Ashburnham House fire, a copy of the life had been sent to the Bollandists, but they rejected the text in favour of a later version (VE, p. 215).
805 James, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, p. 357. Montague Rhode James supposes the manuscript to come either from Exeter or from Hereford itself (James, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, p. 357). Both assumptions are rejected by Neil Ker (Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, p. 344).
806 CTC 11.16, f. 1r.
The manuscript consists of three different parts: liturgical texts written for the feasts of the Virgin Mary (ff. 1r – 77r), the life of St Ethelbert (ff. 77v – 102r), and further lessons for the Octave of St Thomas de Cantilupe (ff. 104r – 127v). Being written in Northern Textualis Formata, it is a rather unusual manuscript, because “most of the Giraldian manuscripts from the fifteenth century are written in Cursiva”808. The text was written in continuous lines. Each page consists of 22 lines. The section on Ethelbert’s miracles starts on f. 90r, and it is not marked as a special section. The initials are decorated with red and blue lines. The text contains a few marginal glosses, some of them written by a different person than the original scribe809.

4.2.2 Dating the life and inquiring after possible sources

Unfortunately, the VE contains no textual references thanks to which its composition could be dated. Neither do we find a concrete reference within Giraldus’ œuvre810. Consequently, the dating of the VE is insecure. However, there is evidence that the vita must have been written before 1199, because its preface is attested in Symbolum Electorum811. Therefore, the Vita Ethelberti cannot postdate this year.

Robert Bartlett suggested that the life of Ethelbert was written around 1195, probably during Giraldus’ stay at Hereford which must have taken place c. 1194 to c. 1196812. His suggestion is followed by other scholars813.

A connection with Giraldus’ time at Hereford during the 1190s is very likely: First of all, Giraldus explains that the life was written at the request of his fellow-canons at Hereford814. Furthermore, the life is meant to be read on the feast day of Ethelbert, which gives it another specific link with Hereford815.

810 Cf. chapter 2.3.
811 Cf. chapter 2.3 and CTC 7.11., ff. 93v–94r.
812 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 177.
814 VE, p. 236: concanonicorum nostrorum instantia.
815 VE, p. 222: hodie sollemnia votive celebramus.
Now, it might be argued that Giraldus' probably stayed more than once at Hereford, wherefore the *Vita Ethelberti* could have been written during an earlier or later stay. This objection is valid, however, our knowledge about Giraldus’ whereabouts during the 1190s is too unprecise to determine another possible composition date for the life of St Ethelbert.

When Giraldus came to Hereford, he must have encountered a tradition of veneration for the Anglo-Saxon saint. This tradition preserved memory of St Ethelbert’s life both in Latin and in Old English / Early Middle English. It is difficult to assess Giraldus’ possible vernacular sources, because we do not know whether Giraldus had any knowledge of Old English⁸¹⁶. We can only prove that, at least, he was interested in the language⁸¹⁷. As we cannot prove a connection between Giraldus and this type of sources, any texts containing vernacular references to St Ethelbert will be excluded from the examination in chapter 4.3.

There is, however, another trace worth following: Towards the end of the *VE*, Giraldus speaks of a previous life of St Ethelbert that he had rewritten:

*Vitam igitur sancti Æthelberti cum miraculis antiquis, longis autem ambagibus rudique sermone congestam concanonicorum nostrorum instantia brevius admodum et dilucidius explanavimus⁸¹⁸.*

And so, at the urgent request of our fellow canons, we have rewritten the life of St Ethelbert with its venerable miracles, which had been composed with long digressions and in a crude Latin, in a shorter and clearer way.

In this passage, Giraldus hints at a *vita* of St Ethelbert which was written by Osbert of Clare († 1158 or later), who is a renowned hagiographer⁸¹⁹. Osbert’s life of St Ethelbert almost suffered the same fate as Giraldus’ life, because for a long time, it was claimed that the text had been lost. However, one

---

⁸¹⁶ Ad Putter concludes that Giraldus knew “some English” (Putter, Multilingualism in England and Wales, c. 1200: The Testimony of Gerald of Wales, p. 85).


⁸¹⁸ *VE*, p. 236.

⁸¹⁹ “Most of the hagiography of royal saints written in twelfth-century England was either written by Osbert or was a rewriting of his works” (*OC*, p. 154). For Osbert of Clare’s biography, cf. *OC*, p. 3–36. Osbert’s life of St Ethelbert was also re-used by other authors, cf. *OC*, p. 208–210.
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manuscript, containing at least a major part of Osbert’s life of St Ethelbert, has survived.

Osbert of Clare probably based his text on another manuscript: An anonymous passio, which could have been written at Hereford during the 12th century. This text survives as well. Today, it is part of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 308, p. 3–17. This manuscript is usually considered to be the oldest version of Ethelbert’s story that we know, and Montague Rhode James supposes it to have been read on Ethelbert’s feast day. The whole text may have been based on vernacular traditions.

Recently, examinations of a text contained in Harley MS 2253, ff. 53r–54v have shown that it is an abridged version of CCCC 308.

The existence of these manuscripts proves that the cult of St Ethelbert must have flourished at Hereford during and before the life and times of Giraldus.

Besides Hereford, we know of another centre where the legend of Ethelbert’s death was preserved.

Ethelbert also appears in the Vitae duorum Offarum, a compilation (and conflation) of the lives of two kings named Offa. The Vitae duorum Offarum was probably composed by a cleric from St Albans. The two earliest manuscripts of this text may be dated to the 13th century. It has been suggested that Matthew Paris († 1259) may have been the author, yet this suggestion is rejected by Michael Swanton. As he sees no reason to attribute the authorship to Matthew Paris, he proposes that Matthew Paris may have been some sort of “enhancing editor” of the text.

---


821 This is not the life of St Ethelbert written by Osbert of Clare, although a the description suggests it (cf. https://parker.stanford.edu/parker/catalog/bp218ym5464, accessed 1 August 2019).

822 VE, p. 218.


824 The manuscript contains extensive hagiographical material which was composed during the 14th century. Cf. Harley MS 2253, p. 1–12 for more information on the manuscript. The Harley-Manuscript shows also traces of scribes that may be linked with Hereford: the so-called Ludlow scribe is often connected with Hereford (Harley MS 2253, p. 9).

825 V. II Off., p. XXVI.

826 V. II Off., p. XXI–XXVI.

827 V. II Off., p. XXIX–XXXII.
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The *Vitae duorum Offarum* records the sequence of events from a point of view that was favourable for King Offa, who is accounted as the founder of St Alban’s (although St Alban’s had already existed long before the time of the Mercian king) 828. Overall, the text shifts the blame for Ethelbert’s murder from the king to his queen, Cynethryth 829.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence that Giraldus either knew about this Ethelbert-tradition or that he intended to entwine the traditions of Hereford and St Alban’s.

4.3 Interpreting the content of CTC 11.16

Although it has been noted that the story of Ethelbert shares parallels with stories about other saints 830, among them St Kenelm 831, the murdered princes of Kent, Æthelberht and Æthelred 832, St Rumwold and St Freemund 833, or St Edward 834; all in all, Giraldus’ *vita S. Ethelberti* has been largely ignored by scholarship. Valuable exceptions to that rule include the most recent edition of Ethelbert’s life, as prepared by Montague R. James, and an analysis written by Robert Bartlett, who was interested in how Giraldus rewrote the hypotext, the life of St Ethelbert written by Osbert of Clare 835.

In his article, Robert Bartlett contrasts Giraldus’ version with the text of Osbert. The same principle will be applied in the following chapter, and the comparison will be enlarged by taking into consideration the differences between Giraldus’ text and the versions of Ethelbert’s story that are presented in CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253, too. As the basics of the story are also preserved in the *Vitae duorum Offarum*, it will be included in the

---

828 Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 78–79.
829 It may be compared with Einhard attributing some of the wrongdoings of Charlemagne to the influence of Fastrada (*V. II Off.*, p. LXXXVII).
831 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 72.
832 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 76.
834 To be precise, to Æthelred’s *Passio Sancti Edwardi* (*Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints*, p. 76).
835 *VE* and Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 598–613.
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comparison as well\(^{836}\). Thus, we will receive an impression of how the story of the Anglo-Saxon king changed during the 11\(^{th}\) and 12\(^{th}\) centuries and how the different stakeholders groups treated the saint differently.

4.3.1 The preface\(^{837}\)

Both CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253 do not have any preface, wherefore we cannot say anything about their specific purpose. However, the preface of the life of Osbert of Clare has come down to us. It was addressed to Gilbert Foliot, the incumbent bishop of Hereford (translated to London in 1163)\(^{838}\). Unfortunately, we cannot say anything about the relationship between both men\(^{839}\).

As the preface of the \textit{VE} shows, Giraldus had a specific purpose in mind when he composed the life of St Ethelbert. Giraldus clearly states that the text was meant to be read out on Ethelbert’s feast day\(^{840}\). The obvious purpose of the text was to join the crowd of many voices (\textit{ut communi multorum suffragio sublevemur}), wherefore the history of Hereford’s special martyr (\textit{specialem nostri martiris historiam}) was going to be explained to celebrate and to glorify the saint. With its heavy focus on alliteration (\textit{paradisi caelestis plena perpetuaque felicitate perfrui [...] devote debet et diligenter [...] De martirum autem meritis, martiris nostri [...] suffragio sublevemur ad specialem}), the frequent parallelisms (\textit{hii sunt qui [...] hii sunt [...] hii sunt qui and sic [...] ut – constructions}), and the play with stark contrasts (for example, “Martyrs are those who love their souls so much that they lose them”)\(^{841}\), the preface displays the oral qualities of a sermon. Clearly, it was meant to be read out aloud in public.

The preface evokes many images of paradise, to which access is granted to those who gain the victory palm. This palm had been gained by virgins, confessors, and martyrs, whose crowds gather together with a multitude of

\(^{836}\) It has been noted that many motifs of Ethelbert’s story may be traced back to folk literature (cf. exemplarily the article Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 53–83). However, as this thesis is concerned with the art and concepts of Giraldus, the hagiographer, any investigation in this direction will not take place.

\(^{837}\) \textit{VE}, p. 222.

\(^{838}\) \textit{OC}, p. 214.

\(^{839}\) \textit{OC}, p. 33.

\(^{840}\) \textit{VE}, p. 222: \textit{hodie sollemnia votive celebramus}.

\(^{841}\) All examples taken from \textit{VE}, p. 222.
jubilating angels. The confessors and the martyrs are marked by their specific attributes: they are white lilies (confessores) and ruby red roses (martires). The text moves on to discuss the martyrs of faith, describing them as milites Christi, following in the footsteps of Christ. They have proven their faith not only through words and consistency (verbis et fidei constancia), they have also shed their blood for their faith.

These explanatory references are interesting: while the text itself speaks of a Vita S. Ethelberti, secondary literature speaks of a passio S. Ethelberti. Based on the definition that a passio is written about martyred saints, the correct designation of the life is indeed problematic, since Ethelbert clearly was a victim of a murder commanded by secular motifs.

In his examination of the cults of murdered royal saints in England, David Rollason concluded that the blame for the murderer was increased because the victims were depicted like martyrs – a depiction that may have even been fostered by the Church, in order to prevent regicide that would have endangered ecclesiastical interests. Regicide and the killing of members of the royal family were even prohibited by a church council held in 786.

Yet we should not put too much weight on Giraldus’ classification of the VE as a vita. As Robert Bartlett remarked, Giraldus was not a systematic thinker when it came to abstract concepts. In the case of the lives of Remigius and Hugh of Lincoln, for example, he used the terms vita and legenda on different occasions for the same texts.
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4.3.2 Part one: Ethelbert’s biography

4.3.2.1 Ethelbert’s origin, his education, and his rise to the throne

Giraldus did not mention the year in which Ethelbert of East Anglia was born. He dwells, however, on Ethelbert’s royal lineage: According to Giraldus, Ethelbert was the son of the East Anglian ruler Adelredus and his wife Leoverina. His line could be traced back to great kings and dukes of both East Saxon and Mercian lines, whose names appear in Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum. The names, however, are not fruits of Giraldus’ laborious search in the archives of Hereford: he simply summarizes the lengthy passage about Ethelbert’s ancestors that appears in Osbert’s vita. There are several possible explanations for Giraldus’ use of this technique: on the one hand, Giraldus may have had no interest in Anglo-Saxon royal lineages, and on the other hand, he could have thought the reference to the literary authority, Bede, to be sufficient. If we take into account the details that Giraldus later adds to the story, when he provides details about the future of King Offa and his family, the latter reason seems slightly preferable.

The names of Ethelbert’s parents seem to be a tradition from Hereford, because they also appear in CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253. This Hereford tradition becomes obvious when we compare it with the Lives of Two Offas. Here, the scene is depicted very differently. Offa and Ethelbert are blood-

---

851 VE, p. 222–228.
852 VE, p. 222–224.
853 The birth year of Ethelbert of East Anglia can only be found in CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253. According to these texts, Ethelbert was born in 779, that is, 329 years after the arrival of the Germanic tribes in Britain, as Bede tells it (oPE, p. 236 and Harley MS 2253, p. 52).
855 OC, p. 216–217. From our point of view, it is problematic to retrace Ethelbert’s lineage: After king Ælfwald, for whom a life of St Guthlac had been written, died in 749, we do not know whether the next kings split the country or whether they ruled in subsequent order (Jones, The English Saints, p. 125). Whatever the case, the dates suggested in VE do not match.
856 Athelredus and Leofruna in oPE, p. 236. The names appear as Ethelredus and Leofruna in Harley MS 2253, p. 50.
related (iure sanguinis) and Offa is said to have conceded the rulership over the East Angles to Ethelbert.

According to Giraldus, Ethelbert was educated from an early age, as was the wish of his pious parents. It may be supposed that Ethelbert’s royal descent is also seen as a possible source for his saintliness. In any case, Ethelbert’s way to holiness is depicted as a continuous process that started at a very early age, for he experienced no turning point in his life which would have led his way to God.

The important keywords in this passage are mores and honestas, to which Ethelbert clings with the help of God. These traits of character will not be displayed later by his hosts in Mercia. Furthermore, the child (and, later on, the young adult) Ethelbert already shows a remarkable degree of maturity, similar to Jesus. Ethelbert is an old child. This depiction is consistent in every vita. Osbert of Clare describes the situation like this: while other children and youths may strive to earn human praise, Ethelbert had set his mind on God. The whole passage, therefore, is dedicated to proving Ethelbert’s life as a life in imitatio Christi.

The situation changes with the death of Ethelbert’s father. Now, Ethelbert is snatched away from his studies, to become king of the East Angles. In CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253, this happens when Ethelbert is fourteen years old. Both Osbert and Giraldus are silent on the age of Ethelbert. Given the fact that Giraldus mentioned, for example, how old St Hugh was when he had entered the monastery, this missing piece of information seems to suggest that Giraldus did not consult / had no access to / did not know of CCCC 308 or Harley MS 2253.

Up to this point, the description of Ethelbert’s reign evokes references to the seven virtues, as they were elaborated in the thirteenth century by

---

857 V. II Off., p. 89.
858 Pious parents have already been noted in the case of St David, and St Hugh’s parents will also be depicted as a very pious couple (cf. chapter 3.3.2 and chapter 5.5.1.1.1).
860 Cf. Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 17.
861 VE, p. 222.
862 Cf. for the topos of an old child Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 29.
863 VE, p. 223, oPE, p. 236 and Harley MS 2253, p. 52.
864 OC, p. 218.
865 VE, p. 223: ab institutis litterarum subito raptus.
866 oPE, p. 236 and MS Harley 2253, p. 52.
867 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.1.1.
theologians like Thomas Aquinas: faith, hope, charity, prudence, temperance, justice and fortitude\textsuperscript{868}. As a king, Ethelbert is praised for his piouness, his clemency, and his charitable deeds\textsuperscript{869}. At the same time, he still fulfils the monastic ideal of \textit{humilitas}\textsuperscript{870} – for “humbleness shone especially brightly in his heart”\textsuperscript{871}. This trait of character is special for a king, as kings usually had to act like warriors. This unusual behaviour may have foreshadowed Ethelbert’s fate to the audience. After all, it had already been noted by Bede that humble kings had the tendency to live not too long\textsuperscript{872}.

Given the fact that secular canons (and not monks) were attached to Hereford Cathedral, the stress on Ethelbert’s humbleness is a somewhat surprising, since the concrete reference to \textit{humilitas} (a monastic ideal) cannot be found in Osbert of Clare’s version, although the two descriptions of Ethelbert’s behaviour as king do not differ much. It is Giraldus’ own contribution to Ethelbert’s cult.

It is also interesting that Osbert mentioned how devoted Ethelbert was to his mother\textsuperscript{873}, whereas Giraldus did not refer to this devotion.

\textsuperscript{868} Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 141.
\textsuperscript{869} \textit{VE}, p. 223. Cf. also \textit{oPE}, p. 236 and \textit{Harley, MS} 2253, p. 52: both texts also dwell on Ethelbert’s handsome outer appearance, as if he was a true fairytale prince.
\textsuperscript{870} Folz, Trois Saints Rois «Souffre-Passion » en Angleterre: Osvin de Deira, Ethelbert d’Est–Anglie, Édouard le Martyr, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{871} \textit{VE}, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{872} Cf. \textit{HE}, p. 258 and Hill, Holy Kings – the Bane of Seventh-Century Society, p. 39–43. Ælfrics description of the kingship of St Edmund of East Anglia closely resembles this description of St Ethelbert’s kingship: both show humbleness, generosity, and clemency towards their subjects (Phelpstead, \textit{Imitatio Christi} in Ælfrics \textit{Life of St Edmund}, p. 36. Cf. a similar description used by Osbert of Clare: \textit{OC}, p. 218).
\textsuperscript{873} \textit{OC}, p. 218.
4.3.2.2 The role of women in the life of St Ethelbert

4.3.2.2.1 On the need to marry: Ethelbert, the virgin

Some time after Ethelbert ascended the throne, he is pressed by advisors – royal and ecclesiastical alike – to marry, so that his children may continue the royal line and defend the kingdom in the future. According to Catherine Cubitt, the cult of royal martyrs, like Ethelbert, had its beginnings in “spontaneous, lay devotion”. She argues that the element of marriage in saints’ stories may be explained by these origins, for a marriage between two (hostile) kingdoms may not always bring the peace that was desired.

The advisors press Ethelbert first in private, then in public. Ethelbert refuses to marry. In a virgin body, he expects to find more joy in heaven. Furthermore, Ethelbert’s study of ethnical and theological works has shown that marriage only brings trouble. This passage stands in stark contrast to the hypotext written by Osbert of Clare. In Osbert’s version, Ethelbert sees the advantages of marriage and remembers the benediction crescite et multiplicamini. Nothing but the complete opposite of this justification can be found in Giraldus’ text.

The passage on the disadvantages of wives and marriage overflows with rhetorical devices that corroborate our conclusion that the vita was meant to be read out loud: The most obvious sign is the inserted inquam. The anaphora legerat (thrice repeated at the beginning of the sentences) shows a similar emphasis. It focuses on the authority of the written records that Ethelbert had studied. The repeated use of alliteration (quantas habeant

---

875 VE, p. 224–225.
876 VE, p. 224. Dynastic matters have no explicit reference in Harley MS 2253, but in CCCC 308 (oPE, p. 237).
877 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 54.
878 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 79.
879 VE, p. 224.
880 OC, p. 219. In CCCC 308 and the Harley-version, this discussion on the (dis-)advantages of marriage is largely absent.
881 Cf. for the following quotations VE, p. 224. Emphasis set by me.
insitas et insertas illa thori thalamique secreta domesticas amaritudines, molestias multas et anxietates or collegerat pectora quidem in quibus haec regnant parum habere pacis plurimum autem perturbationis) ensure that the content will be remembered. The asyndeton almost imprints the sentences in the listener's memory. Based on the thickness of rhetorical devices, we may suppose that Giraldus wanted the passage to be especially remembered.

What may have been Giraldus’ reasons? Robert Bartlett pointed out that in Giraldus’ text, Ethelbert’s renunciation of marriage has a much stronger undertone than it has in Osbert’s life. He concludes: “Nothing can explain Gerald’s handling of this passage except a personal preoccupation, perhaps even a prurient or fascinated obsession, with the vexatiousness of marriage and woman’s irrationality”882. He adds that the passage is reminiscent of Walter Map’s Dissuasio Valeri883, a reference which would fit well with our supposed friendship between both men.

Of course, it well may have been the case that the strong undertone of this passage is due to Giraldus’ own convictions. They may have been partly antifeminist, and partly caused by his zeal to reform clerical life for priests. We know that he was clearly against clerical concubinage – we only have to think of Jordan, Giraldus’ predecessor as archdeacon of Brecon884.

However, the reminiscence on Walter Map’s Dissuasio suggest that the influence may also have come from outside: the strong moral undertone may have been inserted at the request of Giraldus’ fellow-canons (Walter Map being an obvious example) as well as the incumbent bishop, William de Vere. Although Giraldus tends to portray the problem of married priests as a prototypical Welsh problem, such behaviour was also known in the rest of the Anglo-Norman realm885. Thus, the emphasis on the negative aspects of women and marriage in this passage may also refer to actual problems of married priests in or around the diocese of Hereford.

884 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 33. For Jordan, cf. chapter 2.2.2.
885 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 36–37. Paul Haywards suggests that even CCCC 308 may have been designed to propagate the problems of marriage (for clerics and priests), and suggests that the theme may have been emphasized in Giraldus’ time (Hayward, The Idea of Innocent Martyrdom in Late Tenth-and Eleventh-Century English Hagiology, p. 91).
4.3.2.2.2 On choosing the proper bride

Despite his considerations on women and marriage in general, Ethelbert finally gives in and consents to marriage. He is, as Giraldus explains, pressed by dynastic matters. Similar to Jesus sacrificing his life for others, Ethelbert sacrifices his greatest good – his virginity – for the sake of his people. Ethelbert’s will to renounce his virgin life for the sake of others is another clear sign of his humility.

One of Ethelbert’s advisors, who is called Guerro, approaches Ethelbert. He proposes Seledrida, the daughter of King Egeon, as a possible bride. Although a marriage with her would gain Ethelbert access to the kingdom, because Seledrida’s father had died only recently, Ethelbert refuses the suggestion. The scene actually foreshadows that Ethelbert’s future decision to marry the daughter of King Offa of Mercia was not driven by any political considerations, for if these had been Ethelbert’s main motives, the situation in the kingdom would have been much more accessible to him.

All versions of the story consent that Ethelbert rejects the princess because of her father’s vices, and he clearly states that he will not take advantage of the situation and unite the two kingdoms, because he is repealed by her moral condition. Again, the passage must have been important for Giraldus for several reasons: first of all, he deliberately crafted a tangible difference between Ethelbert’s demurral and the rest of the text. The vita directly quotes Ethelbert’s refusal, which gives the text a very lively appearance. The passage is also full of rhetorical devices (especially the parallel structure of the sentences and the frequent use of repetition), which are meant to underline Ethelbert’s argument. Furthermore, Giraldus diverts from his source: while Osbert’s Ethelbert ponders on the

---

887 Cf. VE, p. 224. Dynastic matters are also one – although not the only – reason for Ethelbert’s consent to marry in the vita of Osbert of Clare (OC, p. 219).
888 He is acting similar to St Edmund (Cf. Phelpstead, Imitatio Christi in Ælfric’s Life of St Edmund, p. 37).
889 OC, p. 167.
890 VE, p. 224. Guerro, Egeon, and Seledria in Osbert of Clare (OC, p. 219), Eglan and Syndrytha in CCC 308 (oPE, p. 237) and Eglan and Sindritha in Harley MS 2253, p. 52. The kingdom cannot be identified.
891 VE, p. 224–225.
importance of trust in God, Giraldus’ Ethelbert speculates on character traits inherited through *natura*. When the situation is solved, Count Oswald, a trusted friend of Ethelbert, proposes a marriage to King Offa’s only legitimate daughter Ælfthryth. While the *vita* of Osbert of Clare contains a passage on the power of King Offa, Giraldus’ text has nothing of this sort. Here, Offa is simply styled *rex Merciorum*. The intention is obvious: any praise of King Offa would have cast shadows on the magnificence of Ethelbert.

Giraldus mentioned that Ælfthryth is Offa’s only *legitimate* daughter. This was Giraldus own invention, for the girl is usually called a virgin. By leaving out that piece of information, Giraldus emphasized Ethelbert’s unique status of being a royal virgin.

The *vita* uses reported speech to quote Ethelbert. It repeats his initial rebuff of the suggestion and his decision to hold a council together with his advisors and his mother. A comparison of Giraldus’ and Osbert of Clare’s *vitae* shows that Giraldus converted many passages in which Osbert uses direct speech into reported speech. While Osbert’s “ariable passages of direct speech” may create an air of drama useful in liturgy, it is especially the use of reported speech that makes Giraldus’ tone more level than Osbert’s tone.

Ethelbert also consults his mother in the other *vitae*, so we may suggest that this is a relic from Giraldus’ template and no special invention of Giraldus himself. On the contrary, Giraldus explicitly cut the lengthy dissuasion we find in the life of Osbert of Clare. He may have considered it...
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one aspect of the longis ambagibus of his hypotext, about which he
complains at the end of the VE902.

While the council agrees to the proposed marriage between Ethelbert and
Offa’s daughter, Ethelbert’s mother vainly tries to dissuade her son. Again,
the scene bears elements of foreshadowing, for the vita speculates that the
mother sensed the looming evil that awaited her son903.

We encounter a very different story in the Lives of Two Offas. Here, the
situation is turned around, and King Offa is depicted as the driving force:
he invites Ethelbert to marry his daughter904.

4.3.2.2.3 Signs, visions, and an evil queen: foreshadowing Ethelbert’s fate905

Being a proper Christian, Ethelbert attends mass, before he starts his
journey to Mercia in the morning. While Osbert of Clare locates the
previous events at Bury St Edmunds906, Giraldus did not mention the name
of the place from which Ethelbert departs, accompanied by a multitude of
companions befitting his status as king. The starting point of Ethelbert’s
travels is not named in either CCCC 308 or Harley MS 2253.

Ethelbert’s fate is foreshadowed by divine signs, such as the ground shaking
as soon as he mounts his horse907. Putting his faith in the Lord, Ethelbert
proceeds with his travels, until the sun vanishes in darkness908. The
vita itself points out that these signs had appeared when Christ himself had died
and it adds that they foreshadowed Ethelbert’s death909. Therefore,
Ethelbert is depicted as walking in the footsteps of Christ himself.

Yet the vanishing sun is also explained as another sign, namely, a sign for
the fate of East Anglia: just as the sun hides her light and leaves the world

902 VE, p. 236.
903 VE, p. 225: matre sola [...] vel potius mente praesaga malorum, illud penitus dissuadente.
904 V. II Off., p. 89.
906 OC, p. 223.
907 VE, p. 225. The same happens in OC, p. 223, oPE, p. 238, and Harley MS 2253, p. 54.
908 VE, p. 225. The same happens in OC, p. 224, oPE, p. 238, and Harley MS 2253, p. 54.
909 VE, p. 225: Nec mirum si signa quae in morte Christi apparuuerunt et ante mortem huius
membrì Christi eiusmodi dilecti eandem praesagientia contigerunt. A similar reference is made
in Osbert of Clare (OC, p. 226). The explicit reference is neither made in CCCC 308 nor in
Harley MS 2253.
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in darkness, the absent Ethelbert leaves his kingdom in darkness, until the tide will turn with the reign of King Edmund\textsuperscript{910}. The reference towards King Edmund of East Anglia, whose cult would finally supersede the cult of Ethelbert, also appears in the life written by Osbert of Clare\textsuperscript{911}.

The first signs of Ethelbert’s saintly powers (that is, his ability to work as an intercessor between God and his people) are made apparent when the sun returns because of his prayers\textsuperscript{912}.

Despite the numerous signs of foreboding evil, Ethelbert continues his journey to Mercia. This journey, as Brian Briggs remarks, has “strong undertones of the Celtic \textit{peregrinatio}”\textsuperscript{913}. Given the position of Hereford as a border town between Wales and the Anglo-Saxon / Anglo-Norman realm, such traces of Celtic influences are not surprising.

Ethelbert arrives at dusk, near \textit{villa australis}. This place is called Sutton in CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253\textsuperscript{914}.

Ethelbert decides to set up camp and announces his arrival and intentions to King Offa through messengers. Throughout the night, while Ethelbert is asleep, he is plagued by visions\textsuperscript{915}. The \textit{vita} explicitly states that Ethelbert did not have dreams, but terrible visions\textsuperscript{916}. The difference between dreams and visions lies in their importance: in contrast to dreams, visions are otherworldly messages that have to be obeyed\textsuperscript{917}.


\textsuperscript{911} OC, p. 227. Towards the end of the narration, CCCC 308 juxtaposes St Edmund and St Ethelbert, who are portrayed as being equal in glory (\textit{oPE}, p. 241). Tom Licence suggests that this juxtaposition was used to limit the realm of influence of St Edmund (Licence, The Cult of St Edmund, p. 114).

\textsuperscript{912} VE, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{913} OC, p. 183. Cf. also the discussion in Wooding, The Representation of Early British Monasticism and \textit{Peregrinatio} in \textit{Vita Prima S. Samsonis}, p. 155–156.

\textsuperscript{914} \textit{oPE}, p. 239 and Harley MS 2253, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{915} For dreams and visions, cf. Dinzelbacher, Vision und Visi onsleiteratur im Mittelalter, p. 90–98.

\textsuperscript{916} VE, p. 226.

\textsuperscript{917} The religious importance of the message separates a dream-vision from an ordinary dream (Dinzelbacher, Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter, p. 90). The fact that Ethelbert receives visions (like the prophets of the Old Testament) marks him as a saint (Henriet, \textit{Quod Recte Prophetia Dicitur} – Introduction, p. 7).
In Ethelbert’s vision, the roof of his bed collapses, among other things. Giraldus abbreviated his narration on Ethelbert’s visions. More details are offered in the accounts of Osbert of Clare, CCCC 308, and the Harley manuscript. For example, Osbert mentioned the growing of a tree, which was not mentioned in Giraldus’ version.

In Ethelbert’s case, the message these visions is not obvious, as Count Oswald – the advisor who had suggested the marriage between Ethelbert and Ælfthryth – is asked to interpret. While Oswald interprets the vision in a positive way, Ethelbert gloomily puts his faith in God. The different reaction show that, in contrast to Oswald Ethelbert belonged to God’s chosen people, because he interprets the threatening message of the dream correctly. He knows that he would suffer martyrdom.

The next day, Ethelbert’s messengers return with guarantees of safe passage. Ethelbert continues his journey and arrives at the court of King Offa. His arrival is witnessed by Offa’s daughter Ælfthryth. When she returns to her mother, the princess is full of praise for the handsome Ethelbert. The girl even claims that Ethelbert is a greater king than her own father.

In Harley MS 2253, the situation is depicted differently: here, both queen and princess witness Ethelbert’s arrival. The queen instantly falls in love with the handsome young king, who rejects her and requests her daughter as a bride. Immediately, Cynethryth begins to plot her revenge on Ethelbert. In CCCC 308, the blame for the treacherous plot against

---

918 Giraldus shortened the visions. More details are offered in the accounts of Osbert of Clare (OC, p. 228), CCCC 308 (oPE, p. 239), and Harley MS 2253, p. 54.
919 OC, p. 228, oPE, p. 239, and Harley MS 2253, p. 54.
921 Harley MS 2253 has a similar depiction: While Oswald interprets the dream in a positive way, Ethelbert has his doubts but puts his faith in God (Harley MS 2253, p. 54). In CCCC 308, Oswald counsels Ethelbert to put his faith in God (oPE, p. 239). The interpretation given in Osbert of Clare’s account is much longer and more elaborated (OC, p. 229–230).
923 In the Lives of Two Offas, King Offa receives Ethelbert at his court and greets him friendly (V. II Off., p. 89).
924 Alfrida in OC, p. 231, Ælfþrytha in oPE, p. 237, and Elphryda in Harley MS 2253, line 52.
925 VE, p. 226. The situation is similar in OC, p. 231–232.
926 Cf. Harley MS 2253, p. 54–56.
Ethelbert is immediately laid on King Offa, who is said to have heard that Ethelbert’s travels to Mercia were carried out with hostile motives927.

Remarkably, Giraldus did not give any name for Offa’s queen, as if he intended to erase her memory. We can deduce from the other vitae that she may have been called Cynethryth928. Little is known about this woman, neither the date of her marriage with Offa, nor her origins929. On the other hand, coins with her portrait have been found, wherefore she is said to have brought about a “whole Mercian tradition of female power”, in which one of her daughters, Eadburh, followed in her footsteps930. In a letter to Cynethryth’s son, Alcuin remarked on the queen’s piety (pietas), mercy (misericordia), and Christian devotion (christianae religionis devotionem)931.

Cynethryth and her daughter, Ælfthryth, represent a stark contrast: although they may both be beautiful women, Cynethryth is wicked and evil932. With “female shrewdness and malice”933, she persuades her husband the following night to have Ethelbert killed. The biblical allusion to the beheading of John the Baptist is obvious934.

Ælfthryth, on the contrary, has already passed the (hagiographer’s) test, for Ethelbert had accepted to marry her in the previous passages. As Ethelbert admonishes his adviser: De viciis itaque mulierum et virtutibus, non diviciis et possessionibus est inquirendum935. The advice is exemplified in the persons of the queen and her daughter, for both share in their husband’s / father’s riches and power but are completely different in character. Interestingly, Giraldus contradicts himself: Ælfthryth has not inherited the wicked nature of her mother and this is contrary to the words Giraldus

927 oPE, p. 239. The queen nevertheless advises Offa to kill Ethelbert.
928 Kynedryda in Harley MS 2253 (Harley MS 2253, p. 52), Kynedrytha in CCCC 308 (oPE, p. 237), and Kinedrida (OC, p. 237).
929 V. II Off., p. LXXXIV.
930 V. II Off., p. LXXXIV–LXXXV.
932 In the Lives of Two Offas, Cynethryth’s motive for plotting against Ethelbert is female vindictiveness: although she had different marriage-plans, her daughters were all given to insular kings. As Cynethryth fails to achieve her goals, she turns her mind against Ethelbert, the king who is about to marry her daughter (cf. V. II Off., p. 89).
933 VE, p. 226: muliebri plena tam astutia quam malitia.
934 Cf. Marc. 6, 21–28.
935 VE, p. 224: We have to ask for a woman’s vices and virtues, not for her riches and possessions.
made Ethelbert say when he refuses Seledrida because of her father’s wicked nature\textsuperscript{936}.

Similar to Osbert of Clare, Giraldus uses direct speech for Cynethryth’s oratio\textsuperscript{937}. However, the role models for both speeches are different. While Osbert’s depiction of the wicked queen’s speech relies on biblical models, Giraldus’ depiction has a more classical undertone to it\textsuperscript{938}. Cynethryth accuses Ethelbert of ambition for the Mercian throne\textsuperscript{939}. Listeners and readers of the vita already know that this is not true, as Ethelbert had rejected a marriage with princess Seledrida, even though as her husband, he would have become ruler of two kingdoms.

We know that the ‘historical’ King Offa also had a son named Ecgfrith. As the succession was not secured, Offa undertook great efforts to ensure that his son would become the next Mercian ruler\textsuperscript{940}. Thus, the accusations of Queen Cynethryth may preserve a grain of historically accurate fear\textsuperscript{941}. On the other hand, the killing of Ethelbert may also have been a treacherous plan to take over the kingdom of East Anglia without any greater resistance\textsuperscript{942}.

\textbf{4.3.2.3 Ethelbert’s death}\textsuperscript{943}

Offa is persuaded by the speech of his queen and consequently, he calls together a council to seek advice\textsuperscript{944}. The difference between King Offa and King Ethelbert is that, while Ethelbert did not listen to female suggestions (that is, the warnings of his mother), Offa obeyed his wife\textsuperscript{945}. The councillors who are all friends of the queen back up the decision to have

\begin{flushend}
\textsuperscript{936} VE, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{937} VE, p. 226–227.

\textsuperscript{938} Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 607–608.

\textsuperscript{939} VE, p. 226. The accusations are the same as in the Lives of Two Offas (V. II Off., p. 91).

\textsuperscript{940} Hillaby, The Early Church in Herefordshire: Columban and Roman, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{941} This element of truth may have been preserved even better in Harley MS 2253, when the queen refers to previous news about the coming of the East Angles as enemies (Harley MS 2253, p. 56: \textit{Rumor quem hausisti olim auribus, nunc extat verus} – The rumour that you once heard with your own ears is now proven to be true).

\textsuperscript{942} Jones, The English Saints, p. 127. As remarked in the Lives of Two Offas, the kingdom of the East Angles was left abandoned, because Ethelbert had no heir. So, it subjected to King Offa sine difficultate (V. II Off., p. 99).

\textsuperscript{943} VE, p. 227–228.

\textsuperscript{944} VE, p. 227.

\textsuperscript{945} Offa did not even need a council in Harley MS 2253 (Harley MS 2253, p. 56).
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Ethelbert killed, as long as the murder can be executed without raising too much attention\textsuperscript{946}.

A particular advisor is especially keen on assisting in the murder: Winbert (\textit{Guinbertus}), who seems to be from East Anglia but lives in exile in Mercia\textsuperscript{947}. He is a former \textit{familiaris} of Ethelbert. Similar to Jude betraying Jesus, Winbert receives money for his deceit\textsuperscript{948}. Giraldus depicts Winbert as a \textit{vir sanguinis ad scelus omne paratus}\textsuperscript{949}. In Osbert of Clare’s \textit{vita}, CCCC 308, and in Harley MS 2253, Winbert had fled to Offa’s court because of a murder he had committed. Thus, he is the perfect candidate for killing Ethelbert\textsuperscript{950}.

Winbert approaches Ethelbert and asks for a meeting in the middle of the night: Ethelbert has to come without the aid of his men, so that Offa would not suspect an act of aggression. In Harley MS 2253, Winbert explains the situation because of a sickness under which Offa is said to suffer\textsuperscript{951}. According to Giraldus, Ethelbert innocently believes Winbert, “for the king had never thought of nor had he ever undertaken anything depraved”\textsuperscript{952}.

In the end, everything works according to plan. Ethelbert walks directly in the trap prepared by his murderers\textsuperscript{953}. He is captured and bound. As Ethelbert does not resist his capture, he is an innocent victim, like Christ\textsuperscript{954}. Having commanded his spirit to the Lord, Ethelbert is decapitated by Winbert, who presents Ethelbert’s head to King Offa and his queen\textsuperscript{955}. The biblical allusion to the beheading of John the Baptist is, again, obvious in

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{946} \textit{VE}, p. 227.
\item \textsuperscript{947} \textit{Gwinbertus} in \textit{OC}, p. 233, \textit{Winbertus} in \textit{oPE}, p. 239, \textit{Gwynbertus} in Harley MS 2253, p. 56.
\item \textsuperscript{948} \textit{VE}, p. 228. Cf. also \textit{Mat} 26,15.
\item \textsuperscript{949} \textit{VE}, p. 228.
\item \textsuperscript{950} \textit{OC}, p. 234, \textit{oPE}, p. 239–240, and Harley MS 2253, p. 56.
\item \textsuperscript{951} Harley MS 2253, p. 56.
\item \textsuperscript{952} \textit{VE}, p. 228.
\item \textsuperscript{953} In CCCC 308, the queen herself closes the door before the traitors rush to kill Ethelbert (\textit{oPE}, p. 240). In Osbert of Clare’s narration, Ethelbert is bound and taken to Offa, who orders him to be killed (\textit{OC}, p. 235).
\item \textsuperscript{954} Folz, Trois Saints Rois «Souffre-Passion » en Angleterre: Osvin de Deira, Ethelbert d’Est–Anglie, Édouard le Martyr, p. 36.
\item \textsuperscript{955} \textit{VE}, p. 228. Winbert kills Ethelbert with his own sword in CCCC 308 (\textit{oPE}, p. 240) and Harley MS 2253, p. 56, but the presentation of Ethelbert’s head to the king and queen is not mentioned.
\end{enumerate}
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this passage\textsuperscript{956}. Overall, Ethelbert’s martyrdom and his death are not depicted as his way to sanctity, but as a prove of his eminent sanctity\textsuperscript{957}.

The biographical part of the \textit{VE} finishes with \textit{Amen}\textsuperscript{958}. This is a feature which also appears in the life of Remigius\textsuperscript{959}, but is not to be found in the life of St David\textsuperscript{960} nor the life of St Hugh\textsuperscript{961}.

In the \textit{Lives of Two Offas}, Ethelbert dies a different death\textsuperscript{962}: in this version of the story, Cynethryth had a chamber prepared for Ethelbert. She feigns that Ethelbert may meet his future bride in this chamber and persuades him to sit down on a groomed seat while he waits for the girl. Ethelbert does as he is asked, but he falls into the trap. He dies in a closet / cesspit that is hidden under the seat, because Cynethryth and an unnamed henchman (probably Winbert) suffocate him with pillows\textsuperscript{963}. Later, the murderers decapitate Ethelbert to make sure that he is truly dead\textsuperscript{964}.

\textbf{4.3.3 Part two: Interpreting the miracles}\textsuperscript{965}

A short transition between the biographical part and the miracle-part declares that Giraldus thought it fitting to narrate not only the \textit{passio} and the burial places (\textit{sepulturae loca}), but also the miracles\textsuperscript{966}.

\textsuperscript{956} \textit{Marc.} 6, 21–28. The text of CCC 308 claims that Ethelbert died when he was fourteen years old (\textit{oPE}, p. 241).
\textsuperscript{957} Hayward, The Idea of Innocent Martyrdom in Late Tenth-and Eleventh-Century English Hagiology, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{958} \textit{VE}, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{959} Cf. \textit{VR}, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{960} \textit{VD}, p. 404.
\textsuperscript{961} \textit{VH}, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{962} Cf. \textit{V. II Off.}, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{963} King Edmund of East Anglia died a similar death (\textit{V. II Off.}, p. LXXXVII).
\textsuperscript{964} \textit{V. II Off.}, p. 95. Decapitated dead were continuously venerated by Anglo-Saxon / Anglo-Norman ordinary laity, before the Conquest and long after (cf. the examples given by Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 66).
\textsuperscript{965} \textit{VE}, p. 228–236.
\textsuperscript{966} \textit{VE}, p. 228–229.
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4.3.3.1 Visions and heavenly signs

After Ethelbert is killed, his men return home to East Anglia. Ælfthryth is possessed by a prophetic spirit and foretells the future of her brother Ecgfrith, who would die within three years and whose death will plunge the kingdom into chaos, and of her mother, who would die a horrible death within three months. The events are not depicted. Instead, Giraldus keeps the focus on Ælfthryth, who is loosely connected with Ethelbert. Similar to Ethelbert, she decides to take the veil and join Crowland Abbey, so that she remains a virgin. Neither Offa’s reaction nor his fate are mentioned at that point.

In the *Live of Two Offas*, the storyline is different: Ælfthryth also takes the veil, but Offa is mourning the death of Ethelbert. The evil Queen Cynethryth is banished from the court and dies, robbed, in her own cesspit.

Giraldus’ proceeds with the narration regarding how Ethelbert’s corpse was mistreated. This element of the story shows how much importance was laid on the appropriate burial of the dead.

Offa orders the corpse to be buried secretly on the shores of the River Lugg, an affluent stream of the River Wye, which flows through Hereford. The body is miraculously light to carry, which is also noted by Offa’s servants. In comparison with the other vitae, Giraldus’ account contains the strongest elements of mistreatment: he puts great effort into the depiction of how King Offa’s evil henchmen mistreat Ethelbert’s remains: they even

---

967 *VE*, p. 229–231.
968 *VE*, p. 229 and *OC*, p. 237. In CCCC 308 (*oPE*, p. 240) and Harley MS 2253 (*Harley MS 2253*, p. 56), Ælfthryth decides to end her life as an anchorite, but she is not possessed by a prophetic spirit. In his *Gesta Pontificum*, William of Malmesbury mentioned that Ecgfrith died unexpectedly, but he did not dwell on the reasons (*GP*, p. 20), whereas he hinted at Offa’s cruelty as a possible reason for the events in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (*GR*, p. 136–138 and p. 390).
970 V. II Off., p. 95.
971 V. II Off., p. 97.
972 V. II Off., p. 97–99.
973 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 78.

---
play soccer with the head\textsuperscript{974}. In the end, head and body are buried together in the same ignoble place\textsuperscript{975}. When the burial site is revealed by a column of light, Offa feels so much humility and contrition that he bestows a tenth of his wealth upon the church and goes on pilgrimage to Rome\textsuperscript{976}.

Again, the events are depicted in a different way in the \textit{Lives of Two Offas}: Here, Ethelbert’s burial place is unknown and his head is lost on the way\textsuperscript{977}. But, similar to Giraldus’ story, a column of light marks the location of the head\textsuperscript{978}.

After three nights, Ethelbert appears to a nobleman named Brehtfried, telling him that his body should be buried in a place called \textit{Statuswaye}\textsuperscript{979}. In Harley MS 2253, the place is called \textit{Statum Wye}, in the version preserved in CCCC 308, it is \textit{Fernlage}, and in Osbert of Clare’s text, it is \textit{Statum Waie}\textsuperscript{980}. Giraldus’ account offers different names for Hereford. Its names are given as \textit{Fernlega} in (Old) English (which is translated in Latin as \textit{saltus filicis}, which is roughly, ‘valley of fern’\textsuperscript{981}). Giraldus continues, “in our days, it is named Hereford by the fellow provincials”\textsuperscript{982}. This phrase suggests that the text was meant to be read within the diocese of Hereford, although the appearance of almost the exact phrase in the text of Osbert of Clare casts some doubt on that point\textsuperscript{983}. After all, Giraldus could have simply borrowed the words from his hypotext.

\textsuperscript{974} \textit{VE}, p. 229: \textit{Quidam tamen eorum sanctum caput separatim gestantes obstinatior nequitia illud in terram proiciendo vice pile volutabant.} In Harley MS 2253, Offa simply orders the corpse to be damped into a swamp (Harley MS 2253, p. 56). Catherine Cubitt mentions that elements that feature the mistreatment of the royal body (like a severed head) are part of the stories of several saints (Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 62–63).

\textsuperscript{975} Possibly at Marden (Smith, The Use of Hereford, p. 610).

\textsuperscript{976} \textit{VE}, p. 229–230.

\textsuperscript{977} \textit{V. II Off.}, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{978} \textit{V. II Off.}, p. 97. The great light also appears in \textit{OC}, p. 239 and \textit{oPE}, p. 242, and \textit{Harley MS} 2253, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{979} \textit{Brithfridus} in \textit{OC}, p. 239, \textit{Berh(t)ferhtus} in \textit{oPE}, p. 242, and \textit{Brithfridus} in \textit{Harley MS} 2253, p. 58. The biblical reference is to the three nights Christ had to spent in his tomb (cf. \textit{Matth.} 12,40 and 28,1, \textit{Marc.} 16,2, \textit{Luc.} 23,54–24,1 and \textit{Joh.} 20,1).

\textsuperscript{980} \textit{Harley MS} 2253, p. 58, \textit{oPE}, p. 242, and \textit{OC}, p. 240.

\textsuperscript{981} The explanation can also be found in \textit{OC}, p. 241, wherefore it does not prove that Giraldus had any knowledge of the English vernacular language.

\textsuperscript{982} \textit{VE}, p. 230: \textit{nostris vero diebus a comprovincialibus Herefordia nuncupatur.} For \textit{Fernlage} and \textit{Hereford}, cf. also \textit{oPE}, p. 244, where the new denomination of the place is explained as a symbol of the local \textit{exercitus Dei} (Hereford could be translated as ‘ford of the army’).

\textsuperscript{983} Cf. \textit{OC}, p. 241.
When Ethelbert appears in a vision to the sleeper, he tells Brihtfried that he desires to be buried honourably next to the monastery of that place. Together with his helper Egmund⁹⁸⁴, Brihtfried does as he is asked. First, they find the body and afterwards, the head. Their preparation of the body recalls of the biblical scene when Jesus’ body is prepared for his burial after the Crucifixion⁹⁸⁵. On their way to the burial place, Brihtfried and Egmund carry Ethelbert’s body and head on a bier, from which the head rolls off⁹⁸⁶. It is found by a blind man who recovers his sight⁹⁸⁷. He returns the head to Brihtfried and Egmund, and they proceed towards Hereford, where Ethelbert’s remains are buried⁹⁸⁸. At this point, Harley MS 2253 ends.

After Ethelbert’s burial at Hereford, a miraculous column of light shines upon his grave. Through this sign and others, Ethelbert’s fame grows. It attracts the notice of the Mercian king Milfrid⁹⁸⁹, who sends one of his bishops to inquire in the case of Ethelbert⁹⁹⁰. Having learned about the martyr, Mildfrith bestows much money upon the place and begins to construct a stone church, which later serves as a bishop’s cathedral. The text of CCCC 308 ends here.

However, this scene is very anachronistic, because a Mercian King Mildfrith had already died decades before Ethelbert⁹⁹¹. It is possible that the cathedral was founded by King Mildfrith, but if this was true, its foundation cannot be connected with the burial of Ethelbert⁹⁹². An earlier foundation of Hereford’s cathedral is corroborated by a charter. It suggests that the original dedication of Hereford Cathedral seems to have been to the Virgin

---

⁹⁸⁴ Also named Ecgmund in oPE, p. 242 and Egmund in OC, p. 240 and Harley MS 2253, p. 58.
⁹⁸⁶ In CCCC 308, this happens in a place called Luda, which is probably Lyde (oPE, p. 243 and Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 9).
⁹⁸⁷ VE, p. 230.
⁹⁸⁸ In CCCC 308, the reunion of head and body takes place in Sceldwica, which is probably Shelwick (oPE, p. 243 and Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 9).
⁹⁸⁹ While the heading identifies Mildfrith as a rex Britonum (possibly a Welsh ruler), the text itself speaks of a Mercian king (Cf. VE, p. 229 and p. 230).
⁹⁹⁰ Milefridus in OC, p. 241 and Milferhtus in oPE, p. 244.
⁹⁹¹ Finberg, The Early Charters of the West Midlands, p. 222. The subregulus Mildfrith appears in an inscription dated to 736–740 (Finberg, The Early Charters of the West Midlands, p. 221). Alan Thacker suggests that this Mildfrith and a later Mildfrith, who may have been involved in the building of the church, were conflated over the course of centuries (Thacker, Kings, Saints and Monasteries in Pre-Viking Mercia, p. 16 and p. 24).
⁹⁹² Finberg, The Early Charters of the West Midlands, p. 223.
Mary, Mildfrith, Ethelbert, and the cathedral are connected by the author of CCCC 308, by Osbert of Clare, and by Giraldus. As Giraldus and Osbert of Clare rely on their particular templates, CCCC 308 may represent the local tradition at Hereford. It may be possible that both key events – Ethelbert’s murder and the building of the church – had been conflated from an early point on.

In the *Live of Two Offas*, the story of Ethelbert ends in a slightly different way. Ethelbert’s head is found by a blind man, who instantly recovers his sight, but the body is not found. At the request of the archbishop of Lichfield, Ethelbert’s head is enclosed in a box made from gold and silver in the church of Hereford. Later on, the archbishop receives the body of Ethelbert, which is buried inappropriately (*minus honeste quam decebat*) at Lichfield. A column of light marks the burial place, when Ethelbert’s remains are recovered later on and taken to Hereford, now an episcopal town.

4.3.3.2 *Asser and the punishment of a depraved royal line*  

Giraldus returns to the fate of Ælfthryth, who died as a virgin like she desired. He proceeds to recount that Ælfthryth’s prophecy came true, proving that God had revenged his martyr on the Mercian royal line.

Osbert (and, ultimately, Giraldus) expand the topic of divine vengeance with a story of the punishment of a depraved royal line throughout the future generations by inserting passages from Asser’s *De Rebus Gestis*.

---

994 *OE*, p. 244, *OC*, p. 242, and *VE*, p. 231.
996 *V. II Off.*, p. 95–97.
997 *V. II Off.*, p. 97.
999 *VE*, p. 231–232.
1000 *VE*, p. 231.
Ælfredi. The insertion mentions Offa’s Dyke as well as the marriage between Eadburh and Beorhtric, king of the West Saxons. The marriage does not proceed well, for Eadburh had inherited the tyrannical ways of her father. She plots against a youth who is a very good friend of her husband. But instead of only poisoning the youth, Eadburh accidently kills both the youth and her husband. She flees across the sea and encounters Charlemagne who proposes that she could either marry him or his son Louis.

Eadburh chooses the young prince over the elder emperor. With this choice, she forfeits all her chances of marrying into the royal family at all. Emperor Charles places her in a monastery and makes her abbess, but he later has to eject her again. Aside from one servant, Eadburh dies alone, impoverished, and miserable in the town of Pavia. A lot of elements of Asser’s story seem to have originated in a Frankish source.

At this point in the text, Ethelbert’s story has some interesting parallels in the story of St Kenelm. St Kenelm’s sister, who was responsible for his death, was also called Eadburh. C.E.Wright suggested that a conflation between the two stories must have taken place, wherefore Queen Cynethryth, Eadburh’s mother, is considered an evil queen.

---

1001 OC, p. 242–244, VE, p. 231–232, and Asser’s Life of King Alfred: Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser, p. 12–14. The marriage is also referred to in GR, p. 132–134. Thus, Giraldus seems to have followed Osbert of Clare’s template instead of being “possibly the only witness to Asser’s circulation in Wales” (Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 71). According to C.E.Wright, the passage about Eadburh is “strangely reminiscent” of a passage of Beowulf (Wright, The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 93).

1002 Offa’s Dyke is said to have stretched from one sea to the other between Mercia and Britannia (VE, p. 231). This cannot be proven, but it is likely that the Dyke was meant to provide shelter against the Welsh kingdom of Powys (Lieberman, The March of Wales 1067–1300, p. 77).

1003 OC, p. 243 and VE, p. 231.

1004 William of Malmesbury also refers to contacts between Charlemagne and Offa (GR, p. 132–134).

1005 OC, p. 243 and VE, p. 231.

1006 Wright, The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 95.

1007 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 72.

4. The saint of Hereford: The life of St Ethelbert

4.3.3.3 An immortal landlord in a holy landscape

After the depiction of divine vengeance, Giraldus returns to recount the miracles that had happened because of Ethelbert’s intervention. Overall, there are six miracles.

The first is probably one of Giraldus’ original additions to Ethelbert’s story. It is a healing miracle that deals with the healing of Edwin Shaky-Head. Besides its religious intentions, the story proclaims that the bishops of Hereford had long been in possession of Lydbury North (among other pieces of land). As Giraldus explains, Edwin’s example provokes Offa, who has just returned from his pilgrimage, to donate land to the church of Hereford.

The story of Lydbury North was also told by Walter Map, but according to Joshua Byron Smith, Giraldus probably did not copy from his fellow-canon. Given the two very different arrangements of the core message, a comparison of both texts shows “a clear lack of coordination among the canons of Hereford.” Consequently, both men had presumably elaborated the local tradition individually. Joshua Byron Smith suggests that Giraldus included King Offa in the story, because he was one of the most famous Anglo-Saxon kings of this region. Although a certain degree of personal interest may have been involved in the composition of the VE, I would like to draw attention to the fact that Giraldus had already limited the number of side characters appearing throughout the vita. We only have

---

1009 VE, p. 232–236.
1010 Cf. OC, p. 211. The story cannot be found in CCCC 308 and Harley MS 2253.
1011 The continuous concussio capitis is identified by Joshua Byron Smith as palsy, although it is, presumably, shaking palsy (Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 67). Note that the heading reads confusio instead of concussio (CTC 11.16, f. 96r for the heading and f. 96v for the text).
1013 VE, p. 233.
1015 Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 68.
1016 Cf. Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70 for reasons why both accounts differ in their particular design.
1017 Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70.
1018 Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70.
to think of Ethelbert’s mother, who plays a much smaller role in Giraldus’ version than in Osbert of Clare’s text. Integrating another, yet unknown character like Eadric Streona would have run counter to Giraldus’ usual working techniques\textsuperscript{1019}.

The story of Lydbury North shows how writers could use the past to make sense of the present: in this case, the dedication of a manor to saint Ethelbert was used to confirm the rights of the bishops of Hereford\textsuperscript{1020}. The use of long-dead local saints to defend the rights and interests of a community was not a new invention: similar examples for the time right after the Conquest are known from Bury St Edmunds or Ely\textsuperscript{1021}. The reasons why Giraldus may have felt the need to confirm these rights are manifold – it might have been a personal choice, or a reaction to the frequent changes in landownership in the March that he was witnessing. In any case, the story of Lydbury North describes Ethelbert not only as a saintly intercessor, but also as an immortal landowner, whose power extends the boundaries of Hereford.

This concept can also be examined in the next healing miracle, when Ethelbert restores the eyesight of a pauper who had lost it accidently\textsuperscript{1022}. This miracle happened outside of Hereford, and even outside the kingdom of Mercia, namely in Ethelbert’s former kingdom, at Stradishall\textsuperscript{1023}. Usually, important medieval shrines did not specialize in healing particular illnesses\textsuperscript{1024}. In Ethelbert’s case, we may say that he shows preferences for curing illnesses linked to the head: blindness (the blind man is healed when he stumbles upon Ethelbert’s head), the shaking palsy which manifested itself with Edwin’s continuously shaking head, and, again, the blindness of the pauper of Stradishall.

The healing of the pauper of Stradishall is not the only miracle to happen outside of Hereford, for another one probably happened at Belchamp-Otton (Essex)\textsuperscript{1025}. Here, a young sapling grows to a giant tree during the

\textsuperscript{1019}Cf. for Eadric Streona Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70–71.
\textsuperscript{1020}Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{1021}Ridyard, Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 184 and p. 188. For further examples, cf. Ridyard, Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 179–206.
\textsuperscript{1022}VE, p. 235.
\textsuperscript{1023}VE, p. 234. According to Montague Rhode James, this place is Stradishall, near Clare, in Suffolk (VE, p. 218). This could be a miracle added by Giraldus (cf. OC, p. 211–212).
\textsuperscript{1024}Wilson, Introduction, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{1025}VE, p. 218.
night when Ethelbert camps on the field\textsuperscript{1026}. A cross was made out of the tree’s wood. The cross was kept in a church for veneration over the next years and decades. After the invasions of the Danes\textsuperscript{1027}, a rich man desires to remove both cross and church from the field. Three times he tries: during the first two attempts, the cross reappears at Belchamp-Otton, but on the third attempt, the rich man is struck with blindness\textsuperscript{1028}. Only when he does penance in front of the cross, his eyesight returns.

Another vengeance miracle involves a thief who had decided to steal a carpet from the very same church. But St Ethelbert protected his property\textsuperscript{1029}. The saint’s vengeance strikes the thief, and he cannot leave the church until he is detected the next day\textsuperscript{1030}.

The last miracle to be mentioned in the \textit{vita} is also a vengeance miracle. It happened at the diocesan border of Hereford\textsuperscript{1031}. A Norman named Vitalis – his appearance is a clear sign that this miracle belongs to the \textit{nova miracula} – does not believe that Ethelbert deserves his veneration\textsuperscript{1032}. In the house of a fellow citizen, Vitalis starts an argument over his contempt for Ethelbert with the landlord’s wife. Vitalis swears that his own wife should rather venerate an ass than Ethelbert, whereupon he is struck down and dies miserably\textsuperscript{1033}.

\textsuperscript{1026} \textit{VE}, p. 233–234. Cf. also \textit{OC}, p. 244–245.
\textsuperscript{1027} \textit{VE}, p. 234: the Danes are alluded to as the “tempest, in which St Edmund had died”, and the wildness of the barbarians that had plundered the Isle. The reference to St Edmund also appears in the hypotext (\textit{OC}, p. 245).
\textsuperscript{1028} \textit{VE}, p. 234 and \textit{OC}, p. 246.
\textsuperscript{1029} This is one of the main tasks of saints, as numerous examples prove (Bartlett, \textit{Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?}, p. 404).
\textsuperscript{1030} \textit{VE}, p. 234. This could be one of the miracles Giraldus added when he reworked his template (cf. \textit{OC}, p. 211–212).
\textsuperscript{1031} \textit{VE}, p. 235: \textit{in confinio loci eiusdem in quo martyris ecclesia constructa fuerat}. This could be one of Giraldus’ original miracles (cf. \textit{OC}, p. 211–212).
\textsuperscript{1032} Edward Brooks considers Vitalis as a prototype of such Normans who were sceptical towards the Anglo-Saxon saints (Brooks, \textit{The Life of Saint Ethelbert, King & Martyr, 779 A.D. – 794 A.D., East Saxon King of East Anglia, Son of Ethelred, 11th Lineal Descendant after Raedwald}, p. 6). This Norman scepticism towards Anglo-Saxon saints is a widely-held view, which is contradicted by Ridyard, \textit{Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons}, p. 179–206. For example, it has been claimed that the Normans ‘purged’ the Anglo-Saxon calendar. This statement is contradicted by Pfaff, \textit{Lanfranc’s Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar}, p. 95–108. For more information on how this thought came into being, cf. Pfaff, \textit{Lanfranc’s Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar}, p. 95–96. Cf. Beaumont, \textit{Monastic Autonomy, Episcopal Authority and the Norman Conquest: The Records of Barking Abbey}, p. 36, for further literature references on this point.
\textsuperscript{1033} \textit{VE}, p. 235–236.
Obviously, the *Vita S. Ethelberti* has strong topographical elements. These appeared already during Ethelbert’s biography (we may think of his voyage to King Offa’s court) and they can be detected in this miracle section as well. Ethelbert’s voyage from East Anglia to Mercia creates a holy landscape. Throughout this landscape, other saints, like the virgin Ælfthryth, move. Crowland abbey, an important foundation of the Mercian royal house, are mentioned throughout the whole *vita*. Obviously, the cult of Ethelbert was not confined to veneration at his shrine (at Hereford or, if we follow the *Lives of Two Offas*, at Lichfield). Instead, it is rooted in the (local) landscape.

The existence of holy landscape features – that is, a holy well or, in Ethelbert’s case, a holy tree – is said to have been a pagan relic that was, at some point, incorporated into Christian belief. The appearance of these remains in hagiographical texts may be interpreted as a sign that the texts were adapted to popular belief: “Such legends had the potential both to christianize existing sites of numinous power and to create new ones, and they suggest that a holy site required supernatural sanction, not simply the Church’s approval and blessing, to be popularly regarded as such.”

In Giraldus’ *Vita S. Ethelberti*, the saint travels twice: at the first time, he leaves his native country and encounters death at the end of his journey. The second time, his corpse is brought to Hereford, where he is aptly venerated. As already mentioned above, the early history of the bishopric of Hereford is quite unclear: it may well have been the case that the religious landscape was already dominated by other churches, such as Leominster or Lidebur. John Blair argues that Ethelbert’s last journey to Hereford inserts “Hereford into an older religious landscape.” In that sense, the life of Ethelbert is also a writing of the history of the church of Hereford itself.

---

1034 Jones, The English Saints, p. 128.
1035 Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 57.
1036 Catherine Cubitt also includes severed heads among the pagan remains (Cubitt, Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints, p. 57).
1037 Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, p. 476.
1038 Our problem is that we have no evidence through which we could properly assess the status of these churches (Blair, The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes, p. 11).
4. The saint of Hereford: The life of St Ethelbert

4.3.4 The problem of *nova miracula*

The end of the *VE*, as it has come down to us, requires further explanation. Giraldus wrote:

*Vitam igitur sancti Æthelberti cum miraculis antiquis, longis autem ambagibus rudique sermone congestam concanonicorum nostrorum instantia brevius admodum et dilucidus explanavimus: nova miracula nostrisque diebus propinquiora sancti eiusdem merita in Herefordensi ecclesia deo auctore patrata, cum a testibus fide dignis notis oblata fuerint domino propitiante tractaturi*\(^{1040}\).

And so, at the urgent request of our fellow canons, we have rewritten the life of St Ethelbert with its venerable miracles, which had been composed with long digressions and in a crude Latin, in a shorter and clearer way: new miracles which were brought to our notion by faithful witnesses – these are the merits of the church of Hereford, which are closer to our days and were fulfilled with God’s guidance – will be depicted with the Lord’s help.

This is the last sentence of the *VE*. What do we make of this statement? Should we think that the previous miracles are the *nova miracula*, as Brian Briggs suggested?\(^{1041}\) Or is Montague Rhode James, who wrote that Giraldus proclaimed his intention, but never fulfilled his promise, right\(^{1042}\)?

Obviously, *tractaturi* pertains to an action taking place in the future, depending on the *explanavimus*. Indeed, the sentence can be interpreted in two ways: one interpretation is that up to this point, Giraldus had written down his version of Ethelbert’s life, and he intended to add new miracles to it (like Montague Rhode James said). The other interpretation is that thus far, Giraldus had written down his version of Ethelbert’s life, and had added newer miracles to the old material he had previously used (as Brian Briggs suggested).

As half of the page and the following three pages remained blank, it is tempting to exclude the loss of folios of this manuscript\(^{1043}\). Of course, the break may also have been caused by the scribe, when, for reasons unknown

---

\(^{1040}\) *VE*, p. 236.

\(^{1041}\) *OC*, p. 211.

\(^{1042}\) *VE*, p. 217.

\(^{1043}\) Cf. CTC ii.16, ff. 102r–103v.
to us, he did not finish copying his ‘template’ of the VE in the 15th century. Although negligence may not be ruled out with absolute certainty, the state of the manuscript, however, implies that such an explanation is rather unlikely: the scribe neither omitted any sentence nor added larger glosses to correct his mistakes. Furthermore, the decorations in red and blue ink are all completed. The only explanation I could think of would have been the death of the scribe, but this cannot be proven.

It is also likely that the scribe may have copied a defective text – ‘defective’, in the sense that whole pages or folios of the original text were missing. However, the break – which is, from a textual point of view, logical – does not suggest that the template was missing folios, because the last sentence is complete. It would be far more likely that a loss of folios is indicated by a break in the middle of a sentence than by a break occurring exactly between two sentences.

Thus, we have to decide whether any of the interpretations above is more likely than the other. Indeed, if the expression *nova miracula* refers to the previous miracles, a commentary written by John Leland would suggest that Giraldus added only one miracle to the *vita*. Then, however, the plural form (*nova miracula*) would not make any sense. It may be, of course, that Leland was mistaken in his attribution of the miracles, but this cannot be proven.

On the other hand, it would come as no surprise if Giraldus made empty promises or announced texts he never wrote. Giraldus always proclaimed his intentions to write a *Britannica Topographia*, but he never fulfilled that promise.

However, a third solution may be true. In that case, the life of St Ethelbert would owe its curious ending to Giraldus’ habit of rewriting his texts.

Usually, Giraldus added quotations and anecdotes to reinforce or repeat his argument. However, we will see in the life of St Hugh that Giraldus also added miracle sections to an already existing corpus of miracles. In case of the VE, it is possible that Giraldus did add *nova miracula* to the text, but at a later date. In that case, Giraldus would have created a second version.

---

1044 *OC*, p. 211–212.
1045 *OC*, p. 211–212.
1046 Cf., for example, the reference in his *DK*, p. 158.
1047 Henley, Quotation, Revision, and Narrative Structure in Giral... Kambriae*, p. 42. Cf. chapter 2.3 and chapter 3.4 for different instances of Giraldus’ habit of rewriting.
1048 For further information, cf. chapter 5.2.2 and chapter 5.5.3.
of the VE, just like he created a second version for the VD. If the additions of the second version were not accessible to the scribe copying the Vita S. Ethelberti into CTC 11.16, the odd break in the manuscript could be explained.

This solution could be proven if a second manuscript containing the vita had come down to us. Although Cotton MS Vitellius E. vii may have been burnt in the 18th century, such a comparison is nevertheless possible – at least for a small part of the text. After all, the preface of the VE was preserved in Giraldus’ Symbolum Electorum, which has come down to us as well. We may compare the preface of the VE, as preserved in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.11.16 folio 77v–78v, with the preface of the VE that we can find in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.7.11, folio 93v–94r.

The differences are illustrated in the following chart:

CTC 11.16, folio 78r (VE)  

| non solum verbis et fidei constantia, verum etiam inter exquisita tormentorum genera sanguinis effusione testantur. |

CTC 7.11, folio 93v (Symbolum Electorum)  

| non solum verbis et fidei constantia, verum etiam inter exquisita tormentorum genera sanguinis effusione testantur. |


| Hii sunt qui tamquam olerum plantae sic eradicantur ut crescant |

Figure 1: Comparing the prefaces of the life of St Ethelbert

The difference between the two texts is marked by an additional gloss. This gloss, preserved in Symbolum Electorum, adds a sentence from Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos. Its appearance in the margin suggests that it was added after CTC 7.11 was written. This happened in around 1199. As

1049 Symbolum Electorum belonged to the Franciscans at Hereford.  
1051 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 178.
already suggested, the life of St Ethelbert was probably written earlier. Thus, the later addition of this gloss suggests that Giraldus rewrote this saint’s life during a later stage of his life.

In case of the VE, we may deduce the following: as the gloss was not incorporated in CTC 11.16 in the 15th century, the scribe had an earlier version of the VE as his template, which Giraldus had not glossed yet (and maybe he had neither added the nova miracula to it).

It might have been possible that the now lost Cotton-Vitellius-Manuscript had contained the nova miracula, and thus had preserved a VE 2.0. In his edition of the VE, Montague Rhode James decided to print the last four miracles according to the text in the Acta Sanctorum. The Bollandists’ text derives from a transcription of the now lost Cotton-Vitellius-Manuscript. But despite minor variants in writing and an occasional additional word, there is no further difference between the two texts. This would suggest that the Cotton-Vitellius-Manuscript probably did not contain any additional miracles. However, we should keep in mind that the Bollandists did not treat Giraldus’ Cotton-Vitellius-version too kindly. Therefore, we should not exclude the possibility that miracles were lost at that point, too.

4.4 Reasons for composition and intended audience

Giraldus claims that he rewrote the template in response to his fellow canons’ requests, because the style and structure of the earlier vita were considered inappropriate. As we have seen, the style of Osbert of Clare and that of Giraldus are very different. Although the library of Hereford supposedly lacked the quality (and number) of books that we would expect, the cultivation of learning had a long tradition in Hereford. In his letter to Giraldus, Simon de Freine praised Hereford as a “place of the trivium and the quadrivium”, a place where the septem artes promised honour. Furthermore, canons of Hereford, like Walter Map, had also

---

1052 Cf. VE, p. 233.
1053 VE, p. 215.
1054 VE, p. 236.
1055 Williams, The Library, p. 512.
1056 French, Foretelling the Future: Arabic Astrology and English Medicine in the Late Twelfth Century, p. 463. For example, Bishop Robert of Losinga († 1095) was known as an astronomer.
1057 Symb., p. 383.
spent time in Paris. It is very likely that these men regarded Osbert of Clare’s text inappropriate in style.

As already mentioned in chapter three, the Nero-Digby-recension of the *Vita S. Davidis* shows distinctive qualities: the elimination of pretentious vocabulary and expressions, the adaption of the Latin syntax, and the elimination of references to other saints than St David. Something similar can be detected in Giraldus’ revision of Osbert of Clare’s *vita*: as already noted by Robert Bartlett, Giraldus had cut the “arialike passages of direct speech” that are so remarkable in Osbert’s text. Furthermore, Giraldus limited the proper names and the appearance of minor characters in his text. The best examples of this practice are the scarce appearance of Ethelbert’s mother, as well as the treatment of Queen Cynethryth. Overall, it may well be that Giraldus’ claims are true: the canons wanted to make good use of his literary talent.

Julia Barrow and, at least partly, Arthur Bannister, have gone one step further: they suggested that Giraldus was commissioned to write the *Vita S. Ethelberti* by the bishop of Hereford, William de Vere. Based on the information we gained from the examination of Giraldus’ personal background, such a conclusion is highly plausible. As already explained in chapter two, the bishop may have appreciated Giraldus’ writing qualities. Letters, preserved in *Symbolum Electorum*, suggest some degree of personal contact between both men. Yet if the driving force behind the writing of the *vita* was indeed Bishop William, why did Giraldus not mention his name somewhere in the text? We can prove that Giraldus had done something similar in the life of St Hugh. At the beginning of the third distinction of the life of St Hugh, we can read that Giraldus added miracles to the *vita*, because he was asked to continue the text by the Dean, Roger of Rolleston. As Bishop William’s name does not appear in the text of the *vita*, I consider it unlikely that he was the commissioner of the life. Instead,
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1058 Cf. chapter 2.2.2.
1061 As accepted by Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 600.
1063 Symb., p. 249 (letter no. 18, in which Giraldus recommends Robert Grosseteste) and p. 307–308 (letter no. 29, in which Giraldus complains about the treatment he received from Peter de Leia).
1064 *VH*, p. 68.
I suggest that we may suspect canons like Simon de Freine or Walter Map to be the driving forces behind the life of St Ethelbert. The cult of St Ethelbert was well established at Hereford, as the different vitae that had been written before Giraldus’ life prove. Consequently, Giraldus creates an image of continuity from the time of Ethelbert, to the foundation of the church by King Mildfrith to the present day (with the story of Lydbury North and the reference to nova miracula). Now, we may ask ourselves: if the canons did commission a new version of Ethelbert’s life, was there some secret motif lying behind this commission?

First of all, the canons of Hereford might have felt that Osbert of Clare’s template was missing some important messages. These messages could, for example, have included the strong undertone of the rejection of women in Giraldus’ vita, which is missing in the life of Osbert of Clare. As already explained above, this undertone may reflect Giraldus’ personal view, as well as historic circumstances. Hereford was a place where different cultures melted, and the influence of the Welsh church, whose married priests Giraldus often attacks, cannot be underestimated. Another example would be the inclusion of Edwin Shaky-Head and Lydbury North. This story granted the bishops of Hereford possession of an estate which might have been an episcopal see hundreds of years ago.

We can only guess whether Giraldus’ reason was similar to the motifs of the Nero-Digby-editor, who may have adapted the Vespasian-recension for a wider audience outside St Davids and Wales. If this was the case and Giraldus (and the canons of Hereford) wanted to attract a greater audience, then Sheila Sharp has made an important point: She suggests that another motif behind the commissioning of Giraldus’ life may have been the secret hope to attract pilgrims and benefactors, which would eventually lead to more money for the church. The comment of Edward Brooks, who notes that Giraldus devoted more time and space to gifts of lands and treasures

---

1065 The references to Walter Map’s Dissuasio Valerii have already been mentioned above. It is thrilling to speculate whether Giraldus rewrote his VE at the prospect of Walter Map becoming bishop of Hereford in 1199 (for the event, cf. MV2, p. 131 and English Episcopal Acta VII, p. XLV).

1066 A similar observation has already been made for the life of St David, cf. chapter 3.5.

1067 Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 603.

1068 Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 33.

1069 Cf. Sims-Williams, Religion and Literature in Western England, 600–800, p. 91.


in order to make the Ethelbert-cult more attractive, points in the same direction. Of course, money was always welcome in churches, and the efforts undertaken in the marketing-campaign for Thomas de Cantilupe prove that the church of Hereford knew how to benefit economically from a saint. However, textual evidence, like the reference to Hereford’s comprovincialibus suggests an audience limited to the diocese of Hereford.

Furthermore, the special restriction to Ethelbert’s feast day, on which the vita was meant to be read, points in another direction, namely, use in the liturgy. What is striking is the large number of passages that hint to an oral use for the Vita S. Ethelberti. It starts in the preface, when Giraldus states that the life of Ethelbert was meant to be read on his feast day, and continues throughout the text, where some parts overflow with rhetorical devices which hint at oral features. These devices continue to appear in the miracle-section of the vita.

---

1073 Swanson and Lepine, The Later Middle Ages, 1268–1535, p. 73.
1074 VE, p. 230.
1075 Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 601. Later on, Giraldus’ life of St Ethelbert would become the basis for further liturgical texts (Smith, The Use of Hereford, p. 612). We know of liturgical sources for the feast of St Ethelbert, for example, antiphons and sequences (Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 39). The Hereford Breviary partly depends on Giraldus’ vita (Caldwell, St Ethelbert, King and Martyr: His Cult and Office in the West of England, p. 42). Cf. Smith, The Use of Hereford, p. 619–637 for an overview over the liturgical elements of St Ethelbert’s cult that have come down to us.
1076 Cf. VE, p. 222.
1077 Cf., for example, VE, p. 232: Ecce dilectissimi quomodo iudicia die abyssus multa, ecce quam gravis et quam districta in sanctorum nece patet vindicta (highlights set by me).
5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

The last saints’ lives to be examined are the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh. Both lives have come down to us in a single manuscript: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 425. This appearance is not accidental. CCCC 425 does not represent a later compilation of texts that had already circulated individually. Giraldus intended to group both lives together.\footnote{This can be deduced from the preface, addressed to Stephen Langton. Cf. chapter 5.3.}

This composition requires a special kind of examination, because we have to distinguish between the micro-level (that is, the particular life of a saint) and the elements influencing the macro-level (that is, the connections between both lives). In order to assess both levels, I will apply a two-part strategy: First of all, the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh will be interpreted separately, so that their specific structures may be highlighted (chapter 5.4 and 5.5). Afterwards, both lives will be interpreted as a unit (chapter 5.6). Thus, my examination will offer a coherent interpretation of both lives for the first time. By using a two-step approach, I can identify aspects on the micro-level of each life and determine what kind of role specific elements play in the macrostructure of both lives.

My method of examination is different to the method applied by Matthew Mesley. He interpreted the two lives separately and argues that regarding them as a single unit “ignores the differing agendas behind each work and even the motives that lay behind the creation of CCCC MS 425”\footnote{Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 189.}. I would argue that the contrary is true: interpreting both lives separately ignores the agenda Giraldus had in mind in around 1214, when he decided to present both lives to the incumbent archbishop of Canterbury.
Furthermore, if we interpreted the lives separately, we would be ignoring Giraldu's habit of rewriting his own texts. We cannot equate the version of the VR preserved in CCCC 425 with the autonomous version Giraldu composed independently from CCCC 425. It is not version one of the VR, but version three, that has come down to us.

5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

The figures of Remigius and Hugh of Lincoln lead us to the time when the Normans had set foot in England. Remigius of Lincoln lived during the second half of the 12th century, and his episcopal successor, Hugh, was a contemporary of Giraldu. The historical framework for the lives of both bishops compasses the time from the beginnings of the episcopal city of Lincoln to the days when Giraldu walked the streets of the city. In contrast to the saints previously examined in chapter three and four, many more information can be collected about the saintly bishops. However, this does not mean that every detail of their lives can be reconstructed without any problems.

This caveat is especially true for Bishop Remigius. While his episcopate (he was bishop of Lincoln from 1067 to 1092) can at least be reconstructed fragmentarily, his whereabouts before 1066 are still uncertain. All we know for sure is that Remigius came from Normandy and that he was a monk from the abbey of Fécamp.

Fécamp abbey was founded by the dukes of Normandy. During Remigius’ lifetime, its abbeys had great influence not only in Normandy, but also across Western Europe. Moreover, the abbey enjoyed a close relationship with William the Conqueror († 1087), who honoured it with a visit at Easter in 1067. The abbey also benefited financially from the

---

1080 Cf. chapter 2.3.
1081 Cf. chapter 5.2.2 and chapter 5.2.3 for more details on the different textual stages of the life of Remigius. James Dimock compiled a list of possible differences between version one and version two (VR, p. XI). Yet this list is speculative, because Giraldu might have added whole chapters to the life (or could have rewritten it completely). I will expand this argument in chapter 5.6.
1082 The acts of his bishopric have partly come down to us: English Episcopal Acta I, p. 1–4.
1083 Bates, William the Conqueror, p. 19.
Conqueror’s engagement in England\textsuperscript{1085}. Remigius was not the only monk to accompany Duke William on his trip to England. In his \textit{Gesta Guillelmi}, William of Poitiers mentions a monk of Fécamp who had travelled to England with Duke William, too\textsuperscript{1086}.

David Bates supposes that Remigius might have been born around the mid-1030s into a noble family, because he had received the first vacant English bishopric after the Conquest\textsuperscript{1087}. If a lead tablet which was found in a grave in Lincoln cathedral speaks truth, he may have been related to the d’Aincourt-Family, who had received a barony from the Conqueror\textsuperscript{1088}.

The beginnings of Remigius’ career on English soil are as obscure as his time on the continent. Our primary sources agree that he came to England in the wake of William the Conqueror and that he received the first vacant bishopric in England. Some sources even argue for a connection between these two events: they say that Remigius had supported the Conquest and was rewarded with a bishopric\textsuperscript{1089}.

Remigius’ diocese was a conglomerate formed out of previously independent dioceses during the tenth century\textsuperscript{1090}. This circumstance had already begun to pose problems shortly before the Conquest, and Remigius

\textsuperscript{1085} Fécamp’s holdings in Domesday book amount to more than £200. The nunnery of St Trinité, Caen, is second place (income: £107). Thus, Fécamp tops the list for the income of foreign houses in the Domesday records (cf. for the chart Knowles, The Monastic Order in England, p. 703).

\textsuperscript{1086} William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi}, p. 118–120. Remigius was not the only monk from Fécamp who would become a bishop in England: The future bishop of Norwich, Herbert Losinga († 1119), also came from the abbey (Green, Fécamp et les Rois Anglo-Normands, p. 10).

\textsuperscript{1087} Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 2. David Bates suggests that Remigius was named after St Remi and that he was given to the abbey of Fécamp when he was still a child (Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 4). He also suggests that Remigius may have been related to William the Conqueror (Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 3).

\textsuperscript{1088} For more information on the d’Aincourt-family and Remigius, cf. Sharpe, King Harold’s Daughter, p. 2–3. The plate was found in a grave near the Norman west door of the cathedral (Sharpe, King Harold’s Daughter, p. 1). Its inscription speaks of the son of Walter d’Aincourt, who was “blood-related to Remigius, bishop of Lincoln, who built this church” (\textit{consanguinei Remigii Episcopi Lincolniensis qui hanc ecclesiam fecit}). For the text of the plate, cf. Sharpe, King Harold’s Daughter, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{1089} Cf. for further information chapter 5.4.1.1.2.

\textsuperscript{1090} Owen, Introduction: the English Church in Eastern England, 1066–1100, p. 5. The diocese incorporated the former diocese of Lindsey (cf. also Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen). Besides that, the bishopric included great abbeys, such as Ely or Peterborough. Ely was later excepted from the diocese. Together with two other abbeys, it would form a new diocese (Barlow, The English Church, p. 46).
had inherited these problems from his predecessors. He was involved into several conflicts with secular and ecclesiastical men alike1091.

During the first years of William’s reign, Remigius’ diocese was of huge importance. Danish armies, which were still a potential threat to the recently established king, could have used the province as their operation base1092. But it was not only the Danes who were a serious threat to William’s reign. The years 1069 to 1070 especially showed that the situation after the Conquest was volatile and uprisings could erupt easily1093. Thus, it was necessary for the Conqueror to have not only an excellent prelate, but also a very loyal supporter as bishop of this diocese. He obviously esteemed Remigius to be such a person1094.

As Frank Barlow and H. R. Loyn demonstrated, the Conqueror did not mind if his bishops showed some military talent (we should think of William’s half-brother Odo of Bayeux) and had experience in administration1095. Remigius may have possessed both qualities. If the so-called *Ship List* is correct, then Remigius had been almoner at Fécamp1096. The experience he had gained in this position could have provided him with the necessary expertise to administrate the movement of the episcopal city from Dorchester to Lincoln1097.

1092 Bates, William the Conqueror, p. 285. The Danes were not only a potential threat: a Danish army arrived in 1068 and conquered York (Bates, William the Conqueror, p. 310). Angelo Silvestri proposes that the move from Dorchester to Lincoln has to be judged under military aspects (Silvestri, Power, Politics and Episcopal Authority: The Bishops of Cremona and Lincoln in the Middle Ages (1066-1340), p. 37–40). His argument for the defensive nature of Remigius’ cathedral can be encountered with Jon Cannon, who thinks “the military details were more symbolic than practical” (Cannon, Cathedral, p. 58).
1096 Cf. for further discussion of the *Ship list* and Remigius’ possible military experiences chapter 5.4.1.1.2.
1097 Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 2. A glimpse into Remigius’ administrative expertise may be found in an estate memoranda, probably written by one of his clerks in Dorchester (Cf. for further information Blair, Estate Memoranda of c. 1070 from the See of Dorchester-on-Thames, p. 114–123 and, for administrative records in general, Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 149–154). Administrational experience probably also helped Remigius when he had to act as a Domesday commissioner (Harvey, Domesday, p. 91).
Remigius was not the only bishop who had undertaken such a transfer. Already under Anglo-Saxon kings, bishops had begun to relocate their seats to wealthier churches. During the reign of William the Conqueror, at least four other bishops either considered moving their seats or undertook translocation. According to William of Malmesbury, Remigius tried to settle down in Dorchester during his first years there. However, he did not stay in the city. Maybe the small town was considered unsuitable for the episcopal diocese, as Henry of Huntingdon suggests.

Although the transfer may have been discussed as early as 1070, the first royal charter for the cathedral in Lincoln dates from the year 1072. The movement of the see was completed in 1086.

During his episcopate, Remigius had to face and overcome several obstacles. One of the major problems he encountered was the final incorporation of the former diocese of Lindsey. Remigius had claimed the diocese for his bishopric, and so had the archbishops of York. Hugh the Chanter describes how Archbishop Thomas I of York claimed that the town of Lincoln and a great part of the province of Lindsey belonged to the jurisdiction of York. As already mentioned above, the origins of this

---

1098 Barlow, The English Church, p. 48.
1099 Cf. Barlow, The English Church, p. 47–48. C.P. Lewis considers the events of the following years to represent “three overlapping processes: the burst of activity in 1071–5; the longer rationalisation of 1050–1109; and the incremental monasticisation of the English cathedral from the 960s onwards” (Lewis, Communities, Conflict and Episcopal Policy in the Diocese of Lichfield, 1050–1150, p. 65).
1100 GP, p. 472.
1101 HA, p. 408.
1102 Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, Part II, p. 609.
1105 The problem is also addressed in Giraldu’s life of Remigius. For a discussion of the case of Lindsey, cf. also Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen.
1106 Hugh the Chanter, The History of the Church of York 1066–1127, Translated from the Latin and with Introduction by Charles Johnson, p. 8. Cf. Barlow, The English Church, p. 38, Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 8, and Barrow, Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, p. 160. Remigius’ dispute over Lindsey was not the first dispute he had had with Archbishop Thomas of York. William of Malmesbury reports that Thomas of York had tried to secure that the Remigius’ bishopric would be suffragan of York (GP, p. 54 and GR, p. 528–530 and p. 536). A letter from Archbishop Thomas to Archbishop Lanfranc proves that Remigius was afraid of falling
dispute had come into existence long before Remigius was consecrated bishop of Lincoln. In 1061, Remigius’ predecessor Wulfwig had to defend himself against claims made by York. He appealed to Pope Nicholas, who sent a letter confirming Wulfwig’s possession of Lindsey\textsuperscript{1107}. In 1072, an English council decided that York’s claims ended at the Humber\textsuperscript{1108}. But York did not give up its claims entirely. Shortly before Remigius wanted to consecrate his newly built church in Lincoln in 1092, York must have renewed its claims\textsuperscript{1109}.

The Lindsey-question had probably hovered over Remigius since the beginning of his episcopate. It is therefore no wonder that he sought aid from York’s old rival, Canterbury\textsuperscript{1110}. Unfortunately for Remigius, the incumbent archbishop was no other than Stigand of Canterbury († 1072).

Archbishop Stigand of Canterbury was one of the Anglo-Saxon bishops who survived the events of 1066. His rise had already begun during the reign of King Cnut († 1035). When Stigand’s predecessor fled to Rome, Stigand was uncanonically appointed as his successor\textsuperscript{1111}. Due to this uncanonical election, no Pope would send Stigand his pallium, except anti-Pope Benedict X in 1058\textsuperscript{1112}. Pope Benedict was quickly disposed, but Stigand remained in office. He acquired great wealth and became the richest ecclesiastic when it came to personal landholdings\textsuperscript{1113}.

Initially, William the Conqueror seemingly did not care too much about his uncanonically elected archbishop, because Stigand consecrated Remigius, the first Bishop William had appointed after he became king of England\textsuperscript{1114}.

---

\textsuperscript{1107} The letter in concern is dated to 3 May 1061 (The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, p. 186–188). Cf. also Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, Part I, p. 550–552.

\textsuperscript{1108} Barlow, The English Church, p. 38.


\textsuperscript{1112} Smith, Archbishop Stigand and the Eye of the Needle, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{1113} Smith, Archbishop Stigand and the Eye of the Needle, p. 204.

\textsuperscript{1114} Bates, William the Conqueror, p. 285.
But Archbishop Stigand would not maintain his power forever. In April 1070, he was deposed from his office\textsuperscript{1115}.

The deposition of Stigand is supposed to have cast its shadow on Remigius\textsuperscript{1116}. When Stigand’s successor, Lanfranc, went to Rome to receive his \textit{pallium}, he was accompanied by Thomas, archbishop of York, and Remigius. According to Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, Pope Alexander II intended to dismiss Lanfranc’s companions from their offices. In the end, they were only allowed to keep their posts, because Lanfranc advocated for them\textsuperscript{1117}.

A new cathedral was built in Lincoln. Although Remigius seemed to have had plans for a monastic chapter at first, he finally established a secular chapter, based on the model of Rouen\textsuperscript{1118}. To meet the increasing administrational need, bishops needed to have trained personnel, who were usually found among the secular clerks\textsuperscript{1119}. The establishment of a secular chapter at Lincoln was an idea that was quite ahead of its own time. At the time of Remigius’ death, only York was equally endowed\textsuperscript{1120}. Henry of Huntingdon praised Remigius’ deeds in his \textit{De Contemptu Mundi}: As Henry saw many of the clerics who were first appointed to the church with his own eyes, he is a rich source for us. He also writes about the seven archdeacons, among whose ranks his father and, Henry himself, belonged\textsuperscript{1121}.

Overall, Remigius’ episcopate was not always as troublesome as his dispute with York and his uncanonical election would suggest. He was a wealthy bishop. He received many gifts from William the Conqueror as well as from local magnates\textsuperscript{1122}. These gifts and William’s consent to the move from Dorchester to Lincoln show that Remigius had the king’s favour.

\textsuperscript{1115} For the council, cf. Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, Part II, p. 565–576. The story is also told in William of Malmesbury’s \textit{Gesta Pontificum} (\textit{GP}, p. 48).

\textsuperscript{1116} William of Malmesbury narrated that Remigius was present at the consecration of Lanfranc in August 1070 (\textit{GP}, p. 50).

\textsuperscript{1117} \textit{HN}, p. 11 and \textit{GP}, p. 88–90.


\textsuperscript{1119} Any attempt to replace monks in favour of secular clerks often led to long disputes, like the quarrel between Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury and the monks of Christ Church (Young, Hubert Walter, Lord of Canterbury and Lord of England, p. 65).

\textsuperscript{1120} Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{1121} \textit{HA}, p. XXVI and p. 588–592.

\textsuperscript{1122} Cf. the list of gifts mentioned by Owen, Introduction: the English Church in Eastern England, 1066–1100, p. 8. Remigius’ income in 1086 was only surpassed by the amount of
On the other hand, Henry of Huntingdon mentioned a trial by ordeal because Remigius had been accused of treason against the king. After one of Remigius’ servants had passed the trial of hot iron, the bishop’s reputation was restored\(^\text{1123}\). Unfortunately, we do not know when the incident took place. It may belong to the revolt of the three earls (summer 1075) or to the revolt of 1088 against King William Rufus\(^\text{1124}\). A short letter, written by Archbishop Lanfranc and sent to Remigius, has come down to us. In this letter, Lanfranc assures Remigius that the king does not listen to Remigius’ critics (Lanfranc calls them \textit{maledicos})\(^\text{1125}\). The dating of the short letter is uncertain. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson connect the allusions in this letter with the accusation of treason as described by Henry of Huntingdon and think that it refers to the revolt of 1075\(^\text{1126}\). In the end, Remigius must have regained the king’s favour again (if he had lost it at all), because his name is found in the witness-list of Dover and Hastings from 27 January 1091\(^\text{1127}\).

When Remigius’ death was close at hand, his new cathedral was not finished. He died in 1092, shortly before the cathedral was consecrated. Like Giraldus, the Lincoln obituary gives his day of death as 6 May\(^\text{1128}\).

The first and only attempt at Remigius’ canonization that we know of must have been during Giraldus’ lifetime\(^\text{1129}\). It has been suggested that Lincoln was so sure of achieving the canonization of its founder that they had a chapel built for his cult during the rebuilding of the cathedral under Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (1186–1200)\(^\text{1130}\). But Remigius was never officially


\(^{1125}\) The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 128–129.

\(^{1126}\) The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 128–129.

\(^{1127}\) English Episcopal Acta IV, p. 204.


\(^{1129}\) For the hagiographical material on Remigius, cf. BHL, no. 7146–7149. Giraldus’ vita may be found under BHL, no. 7146–7147, the prologue to the first version of the VR is subsumed under BHL, no. 7148.

\(^{1130}\) Kidson, St Hugh’s Choir, p. 34. He is followed by Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 222. John Baily argues against this assumption (Baily, St Hugh’s Church at Lincoln, p. 31).
5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

canonized, although he might have been venerated nevertheless\textsuperscript{1131}. Probably because of his restricted fame, his grave escaped the destruction wrought during the Reformation. When it was opened in 1927, a chalice, a paten, and half of his pastoral staff were found besides his remains\textsuperscript{1132}.

In contrast to Bishop Remigius, much more information about his successor, Hugh of Lincoln, is known for certain, because contemporary accounts, written by people around him, have come down to us\textsuperscript{1133}. Already during his lifetime, Hugh was widely recognized for his saintliness. He is commemorated on 17 November and 6 October\textsuperscript{1134}. His canonization in 1220, the year of Thomas Becket’s translation, aroused further interest in his person.

About 1140, Hugh was born into an aristocratic family in Avalon / Burgundy\textsuperscript{1135}. He quickly came into contact with the monastic lifestyle. After his mother died, the boy accompanied his father to the Augustinian canons of Villarbenoit, near Grenoble\textsuperscript{1136}. Quickly, Hugh rose in the ecclesiastic ranks. When he visited the Grand Chartreuse in about 1160, he was determined to leave Grenoble behind and become a Carthusian monk\textsuperscript{1137}.

The Carthusian order was founded in 1084. About forty years later, the order’s rule was set. Carthusian monks sought solitude, \textit{vita solitaria}\textsuperscript{1138}. One of their key elements was asceticism. But Hugh was also shaped by the


\textsuperscript{1133} Hugh of Lincoln is known under multiple names: he is also called Hugh of Avalon or Hugh of Burgundy. Although the term ‘Hugh of Lincoln’ may possibly arouse confusion with ‘Little Hugh of Lincoln’ (a martyred boy who died about half a century after Bishop Hugh), the term will nevertheless be applied throughout this thesis. For an overview of both Hughs, cf. Farmer, The Oxford Dictionary of Saints, p. 244–245. David Hugh Farmer composed a biography of St Hugh based on information drawn from medieval primary sources (cf. Farmer, Saint Hugh of Lincoln, 1985).

\textsuperscript{1134} Hugh died after vespers (Farmer, The Cult and Canonization of St Hugh, p. 83). The celebration on 6 October was mainly restricted to Lincoln, where his \textit{translatio} had taken place in 1280 (Farmer, Hugh of Lincoln, Carthusian Saint, p. 14).

\textsuperscript{1135} Cowdrey, Hugh of Avalon, Carthusian and Bishop, p. 41. His status as a ‘foreigner’ is also mentioned by Roger of Wendover (\textit{Wend.}, p. 302).

\textsuperscript{1136} Leyser, Hugh the Carthusian, p. 2.


Carthusian attitude towards learning: “Knowledge, instruction and reading were necessary integral elements. So too was the writing of books”\textsuperscript{1139}. With these key elements in mind, it is no wonder that by 1200, more than 30 Carthusian monks had become bishops\textsuperscript{1140}.

The most important year for the relationship between the Carthusians and England was 1178, the year of the foundation of Witham. Carthusian tradition claims that Witham was meant to represent King Henry II’s penance for the murder of St Thomas Becket\textsuperscript{1141}. Yet the first priors failed to firmly establish the monastery. It was not until 1180, when Hugh came to England and became prior of Witham, that the foundation began to flourish\textsuperscript{1142}. For about six years, he served as prior of Witham. He developed a special connection with the monastery, because even as a bishop, he returned to Witham every year and maintained control of it\textsuperscript{1143}.

In May 1186, Hugh was elected bishop of Lincoln. It is argued that he was a true Carthusian bishop, for his “manner of life and his public attitudes and activities as bishop of Lincoln were well grounded in the Carthusian tradition and ran true to it”\textsuperscript{1144}.

Despite his previous administrational experiences at the Grand Chartreuse and at Witham, Hugh’s first months as bishop must have been challenging. When he became bishop, the see had been vacant for about two years. His predecessor, Walter de Coutances, had taken canons of Lincoln with him to Rouen\textsuperscript{1145}. Hugh needed assistance for the administration of his see, which was one of the largest bishoprics in England. In this situation, he turned to his superior, Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury.

\textsuperscript{1139} Farmer, Hugh of Lincoln, Carthusian Saint, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{1140} Leyser, Hugh the Carthusian, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{1142} Wend., p. 302–303.
\textsuperscript{1143} \textit{MV}I, p. XXVI.
\textsuperscript{1144} Cowdrey, Hugh of Avalon, Carthusian and Bishop, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{1145} Spear, Power, Patronage, and Personality in the Norman Cathedral Chapters, 911–1204, p. 219. Almost no \textit{magister} or \textit{clericus} who had served under Walter of Coutances can be found attesting charters under Bishop Hugh (English Episcopal Acta IV, p. XXIV).
Our source for the meeting is Hugh’s chaplain, Adam of Eynsham, who wrote a life of St Hugh shortly after the bishop’s death. Adam of Eynsham narrated that Archbishop Baldwin sent Hugh two clerks. One of them was Roger of Rolleston, who would become archdeacon of Leicester and Dean of Lincoln. He remained in office until his death in 1223.

During the time of Hugh’s bishopric, the church of Lincoln prospered. The city attracted scholars, because Hugh cared for the education of his canons. Teachers like William de Monte drew equally bright minds to Lincoln, as we have already read in Giraldus’ autobiography.

A good relationship between a bishop and his chapter was not necessarily common in Lincoln, as the power struggle between one of Hugh’s successors, Robert Grosseteste († 1253), and the chapter of Lincoln shows. The relationship between Hugh and his canons was good. For example, Adam of Eynsham tells us that Hugh used to call his canons his .

The chapter did not only benefit from Hugh’s educational zeal, as Hugh enlarged its prestige in other ways. For example, during his episcopate, the Dean enjoyed much greater authority and power. Furthermore, the rights of the chapter were secured.

In 1185, the vault of the cathedral had collapsed because of an earthquake. The rebuilding of the church was mainly undertaken by Bishop Hugh and his successor, Hugh of Wells († 1235). About 1192, Hugh started to rebuild the Norman cathedral whose cornerstone his predecessor Remigius had laid. It was partly completed when Hugh died in 1200.

---

1146 MV1, p. XII.
1147 MV1, p. 110–113.
1148 Giraldus speaks highly of Roger of Rolleston (cf. chapter 2.2.2).
1149 Farmer, Hugh of Lincoln, Carthusian Saint, p. 12.
1150 RG, p. 93.
1152 MV1, p. 124.
1155 Marrit, Secular Cathedrals and the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy, p. 154. The earthquake is attested by Roger of Howden, who explicitly mentioned the damage done to the cathedral of Lincoln (R. Howd. 2, p. 303).
1157 Baily, St Hugh’s Church at Lincoln, p. 1.
Hugh lived under the reign of three kings, King Henry II († 1189) and his sons, Richard Lionheart († 1199) and John Lackland († 1216). The relationship between Henry and Hugh must have been exceptional. According to Adam of Eynsham, contemporary rumour spread that both men were related. However, the situation was different under King Richard.

Judgements about King Richard’s style of ruling England have changed over the course of centuries: during the Middle Ages, his name was mentioned in the same breath with Alexander the Great and Charlemagne, whereas in modern times, some historians have tended to regard him as one of the worst kings England could have ever had. Much of the criticism is based on the fact that Richard spent a considerable period of his reign outside England. Nevertheless, as Ralph Turner points out, Richard’s reign marks “a high point in royal control over episcopal elections in England”. Richard’s “key figure” was no other than Hubert Walter, who later acted both as chief justiciary and archbishop of Canterbury.

The quarrels between Hubert Walter and Hugh of Lincoln were noted in various contemporary sources. The main argument of both bishops seemed to have been the mixture of secular and ecclesiastical office that Hubert Walter enjoyed. Roger of Howden, for example, dwells on Hugh’s opposition to Hubert Walter on the council of Oxford in 1197. Adam of Eynsham famously reports that even on his deathbed, Hugh did not feel any guilt for having provoked his archbishop – on the contrary, he only repented not having done so more often. Indeed, Hugh could be fierce, if he wanted, and he seemingly did not care whether the other person belonged to the common folk or was of noble blood. This character trait...
probably earned him the sobriquet 'hammer of kings', which was attributed to him at his funeral by John of Leicester. Bishop Hugh of Lincoln died on 16 November at London. His body was taken back to Lincoln and buried in the cathedral. The shape of Hugh’s burial place may be deduced from both Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita* and Giraldus’ account: the coffin lay below the pavement level and a superstructure of *foramina* type, consisting of marble panels, was built above it.

However, the exact location of Hugh’s tomb is difficult to detect. As Giraldus’ *vita* attests, Hugh was buried north of the alter of St John the Baptist. Unfortunately, the body was relocated throughout the thirteenth century. Hugh’s final resting place was the so-called Angel’s Choir, whose architecture draws on Ely, Westminster, and Old St Paul’s (London). By adopting the architectural style of these churches with their major shrines, the clergy of Lincoln is said to have strengthened the position of St Hugh – after all, Lincoln lay on the roads to the pilgrimage centres, where the saints of Durham (St Cuthbert) and Lichfield (St Chad) attracted crowds of faithful.

According to Dorothy Owen, Hugh’s most important contribution for the church of Lincoln was his holiness. The cult of St Hugh started shortly after his funeral, which was later depicted in the northern rose window of the great transept of the cathedral (the so-called ‘Dean’s Eye’). Interestingly, the Carthusian order seems never to have intended a canonization for St Hugh. The impetus for canonization came mainly from Hugh’s former diocese, Lincoln.

---

1167 Pontificum baculus, monachorum norma, scholarum consultor, regum malleus, Hugo fuit (MV1, p. 56 and MV2, p. 232).
1168 Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 221. It should be noted that the tomb-shrine of Thomas Becket at Canterbury was also a *foramina* monument, which is described by Benedict of Peterborough (Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 195–196).
1170 Alexander, The Angel Choir of Lincoln Cathedral and the Shrines of St Hugh, p. 137.
1171 Alexander, The Angel Choir of Lincoln Cathedral and the Shrines of St Hugh, p. 137 and p. 139.
1173 MV1, p. XXVII. Maybe the order had refrained from any attempts because it may have disturbed the monastic routine (cf. Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 123–127).
In 1220, Hugh was officially canonized\textsuperscript{1174}. The canonization report has come down to us\textsuperscript{1175}. It contains, among others, a letter from Pope Honorius III to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, William of Cornhill, bishop of Coventry, and John, abbot of Fountains. These men were asked to form a commission in order to inquire after the sanctity of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1176}. Among the witnesses who were asked to account for Hugh’s sanctity were his chaplain, Adam of Eynsham, and Dean Roger of Rolleston\textsuperscript{1177}. The canonization report later became part of the literary tradition concerned with St Hugh: it formed the basis of the *Legenda* of St Hugh and was added to other books, like Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita*\textsuperscript{1178}. Whereas Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita* was not incorporated into the canonization report, parts of Giraldus’ *vita* were. The report draws on the depiction of Hugh’s birthplace, a dialogue between Hugh and William de Monte, and seven miracles\textsuperscript{1179}.

Some years later, Matthew Paris included the following remark about the saints of Lincoln in his *Chronica maiora*:

\begin{quote}
Miracula miraculis in ecclesia Lincolniensi diatim cumulantur. Et operante Domino pro episcopo Roberto, alii Sancti qui in eadem ecclesia requiescent videlicet sancti Remigius et Hugo, ad beneficia fidelibus impendenda suscitantur, tamquam provocati et precibus postulantium inclinati\textsuperscript{1180}.
\end{quote}

And daily the miracles in the church of Lincoln become more frequent. And, with God working through his Bishop Robert [Grosseteste], the other saints resting in this church, namely, Saint Remigius and Saint Hugh, are moved to bestow benefactions upon the believers, for they are provoked and inclined to do so because of the requests of the faithful.

\textsuperscript{1175} It has been edited by Dom Hugh Farmer (Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 86–117). The editing principles are explained on p. 86–89.
\textsuperscript{1176} Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 61. Furthermore, the report contains a letter from the bishop and the chapter of Lincoln to the Pope (Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 111–112) and to the Roman Cardinals (Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 113–114).
\textsuperscript{1177} Farmer, St. Hugh of Lincoln, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{1178} Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 87–89.
\textsuperscript{1179} Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 88.
In 1280, the head and body of Saint Hugh had been separated and were thus housed in separate shrines\textsuperscript{1181}. In 1364, the head was stolen because of its adornments with gold and silver. The thieves were caught, and the head was returned\textsuperscript{1182}.

Overall, in 1520, the list of possessions of the head shrine mentions gold and jewels and a life of St Hugh (a chained book)\textsuperscript{1183}. However, the number of gifts donated to the shrine diminished rapidly over the course of the centuries. This phenomenon is widely attested, for many churches suffered a similar decline in gifts\textsuperscript{1184}. Then, the Reformation swept through England. A note dating to 1548 suggests that the church of Lincoln lost more than 6,900 ounces of gold and silver\textsuperscript{1185}. During this time, Hugh’s shrines suffered the fate of many others. The commission for the spoliation was signed by Cromwell himself\textsuperscript{1186}. The partial destruction of the head shrine took place on 11 June 1540 and the outer form of the shrine seemed to have survived until 1644\textsuperscript{1187}. Its base is still visible today, but traces of the main shrine that housed Hugh’s body have vanished.

However, Hugh’s story does not end in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. Whereas his head (or rather, its precious adornments) went to the king’s treasure-house\textsuperscript{1188}, the fate of his body is uncertain. It was thought to have disappeared as well until 1889, when a headless body, clad in episcopal robes, was found beneath the chapter house\textsuperscript{1189}. In 1955, excavations were undertaken to examine whether the body and the grave belonged to St Hugh. Several graves in the chapter house were opened, but no remains were identified as those of the saint\textsuperscript{1190}. The excavation team concluded that Hugh’s body might already have been removed some decades ago to an unknown place,
probably out of fear that “if it were known where his body was it might become a centre of a cult or of pilgrimages”\textsuperscript{1191}.

5.2 Background information on the lives

5.2.1 A short description of the manuscript

The lives of Remigius and St Hugh of Lincoln have come down to us in one manuscript: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 425\textsuperscript{1192}. Overall, the manuscript consists of two volumes. While volume one comprises the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, volume two (ff. 81v – 191r) consists of letters written by Giraldus’ contemporary, Peter of Blois († 1203)\textsuperscript{1193}.

CCCC 425 was later included in the collection of archbishop Matthew Parker († 1575). Richard Loomis suggested that the archbishop may have obtained the manuscript from the archives of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1194}. If this was true, the manuscript originated from the saints’ main place of veneration.

Giraldus’ lives were written in two columns, consisting of about 25 lines. Initials and headings were highlighted in red and blue ink. The gold decorations could be considered a potential sign for CCCC 425 being a presentation copy “which would in principle originate with the author”\textsuperscript{1195}. It has been argued that the manuscript belongs to a group of texts that “were produced close to Gerald, perhaps by a group of scribes who he employed or to whom he had access”\textsuperscript{1196}.

\textsuperscript{1191} Bruce-Mitford, The Chapter House Vestibule Graves at Lincoln and the Body of St. Hugh, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{1192} They can be found on ff. 6r–44v and ff. 46r–79r. An additional leaf was inserted at the very beginning of the VH, that is, on f. 46av.
\textsuperscript{1194} VH, p. L–LI. For a general description of medieval archives and libraries, cf. Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 154–162.
\textsuperscript{1196} Rooney, The Manuscripts of the Works of Gerald of Wales, p. 114–115. James Dimock, who edited the manuscript for the Rolls Series, even suggests that CCCC 425 could be regarded, “if not as his own autograph copy, yet as written and revised and added to under” Giraldus himself (VR, p. IX–X). This view is shared by Richard Loomis (Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s
Different hands can be found throughout the manuscript. Besides some later additions by archbishop Matthew Parker (for example, his account of content on f. 5v that lists all three parts of the manuscript), we have Giraldus’ vitae which were written in an early 13th century hand, while the letter collection of Peter of Blois is an addition from the 15th century. The text of Giraldus’ vitae contains several (marginal) glosses and two inserted leaves (f. 24a and f. 46a).

The preface, which contains the dedication to Archbishop Stephen Langton, starts on f. 6v and ends on f. 8v. A few blank lines can be seen. The list of chapters starts on the next folio and ends on f. 9v. The prooemium for the life of Remigius starts on the same folio. No blank space is left between these sections. The same observation can be made on f. 11v, when the biographical-section of the VR starts immediately after the prooemium is finished. The biographical section finishes on f. 19v. Almost a whole column is left blank before the successores-section starts on f. 20r. A few blank lines of the left column of f. 24r are visible, before the copula tergmina starts at the beginning of the right column of the same folio. On f. 40v, about six lines of the left column are left blank. Besides nine lines, f. 44r is left blank, as is f. 45.

The last part of the list of chapters of the life of St Hugh (that is, distinctio III) should appear on f. 47r, but was written on f. 46av (an added leaf). There is no space between the chapter list (ending with distinctio II) and the prooemium on f. 47r. On the right column of f. 64v, space was left for a miniature. The life ends on f. 79r, and an explicit fills a few blank spaces in the right column. Folios 79v and 80r are left blank.
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5.2.2 Dating the lives

As we have already noted for the life of St David, Giraldus created several versions of his saints’ lives. Giraldus also rewrote the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, but until now, this has only rarely been taken into consideration. In this chapter, I will argue that we have to account for at least three versions of Remigius’ life and two versions of Hugh’s life. Dating the different versions of the lives does admittingly involve threading on thin ice, as CCCC 425 is the only textual witness that has come down to us. Fortunately, we can also rely on references and remarks found in other sources.

5.2.2.1 The first version of the life of Remigius

In his edition of Remigius’ life in the Rolls Series, James Dimock concluded that Giraldus had written two versions of the VR. His evidence for the existence of a first version is a record of a gift offered by Giraldus to the cathedral library of Lincoln. The corresponding entry is preserved in the library’s catalogue, which was compiled about 1200.

The relevant passage reads as follows:


A gift from the archdeacon of Wales, Master Gerald; the Topographia Hibernica, the Vita S. Remigii and the Gemma Sacerdotalis

---

1198 This chapter expands thoughts previously expressed in Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen.
1199 An example of such a consideration would be found in Hugh, p. 3.
1200 Usually, version one is thought to have been written about 1199, and version two about 1214/15 (cf. below).
1201 VR, p. XII.
1202 Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library, p. V.
1203 VR, p. 168 and Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library, p. VII. A facsimile of the page is printed in VH, p. 108.
As the catalogue was compiled about 1200, the life of Remigius must have been composed earlier, probably during Giraldus’ time at Lincoln. Based on the entry in the catalogue, both James Dimock and Reginald Wooley conclude that a first version of Remigius’ life was probably donated to the cathedral in the summer of 1199. This suggestion is very probable: Peter de Leia, bishop of St Davids, had died in July 1198. Giraldus was considered as a possible successor to the recently deceased bishop. He stayed in Lincoln until April 1199 and must have left Lincoln shortly afterwards, for he was elected bishop on 29 June.

Of course, it is possible that Giraldus had started to write the first version of Remigius’ life during his stay at Lincoln and finally finished it on his way to Rome. If this was the case, the VR had been offered to the cathedral library on Giraldus’ return from Rome. We know that Giraldus had taken books with him on his first journey to the pope. Yet I agree with Matthew Mesley, who considers a previous completion of the life more probable than completion in Rome. To obtain information about Remigius and his successors, Giraldus probably needed access to the town’s archives.

Obviously, the first version of the life of Remigius was an independent composition. It probably circulated independently from the later version grouped together with the life of St Hugh, because Giraldus mentioned only the life of Remigius in a letter to William de Monte, which must have been written before William de Monte died in 1213.

Unfortunately, the first version of the VR has not come down to us. The text had already disappeared by the 15th century, when a new catalogue of the cathedral library at Lincoln was drawn up.

---

1204 VR, p. XII and Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library, p. IX. John Hagen gives the year 1198 for the composition of the life of Remigius (Gerald of Wales and Hagen, The Jewel of the Church, p. XII). Matthew Mesley considers splitting up version one in two earlier versions, but has no version dating from about 1219 (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 189).
1206 This would have been somewhere between December 1199 and March 1201 (Davies, Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 261 and p. 264). Unfortunately, Giraldus’ whereabouts during this time cannot be traced precisely, wherefore we cannot determine whether he was at Lincoln or elsewhere.
1207 Cf. RG, p. 119.
1209 SD, p. 172. This independent circulation is not extraordinary. In case of the De Principis Instructione, for example, Book one circulated independently from the complete three-book edition (PI, p. XIII).
1210 Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library, p. IX.
5.2.2.2 The second version of the life of Remigius and the first version of the life of St Hugh

It is usually claimed that the second version of the life of Remigius and the first version of the life of St Hugh were issued around 1213 or 1214. These claims can be supported by several references.

A first terminus post quem for the composition of the lives can be found in the preface of the text, which dedicates the manuscript to Archbishop Stephen Langton of Canterbury. As Stephen Langton was consecrated on 17 June 1207, both lives must have been written afterwards.

But the possible time frame can be narrowed once more. First of all, Giraldus recommended his life of Remigius (that is, version one of the life) in a letter to William de Monte. As William died in 1213, we may narrow down our timeframe for the composition of the bishop’s lives. If Giraldus had already written them down, he probably would have referred to the VR and the VH in his letter. As he only referred to the VR, we may suppose that the VH had not been written before Giraldus wrote his letter.

Further textual references corroborate a date of composition around 1213 / 1214: Although Giraldus emphasizes that he had composed the manuscript for Stephen Langton, he has further plans for his work. He asks the archbishop to lend the lives of Remigius and Hugh to the second Hugh of Lincoln, namely Bishop Hugh of Wells (1209–1235) who is described as “your firstborn and, until now, your only son.” These words allude to the consecration of Hugh of Wells, which had taken place in December 1209. Based on this phrase, we may suppose that while Giraldus wrote the

1212 In De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, Giraldus mentioned the year in which he finished the composition of the saints’ lives. He writes that he wrote the lives of the bishops of Lincoln “in the 70th year of my life, so to say” (JS, p. 373). It is tempting to add seventy years to 1146, which is usually given as the date of Giraldus’ birth. There are, however, two problems: First of all, Giraldus’ precise year of birth is unknown. Furthermore, Giraldus is notoriously imprecise when it comes to years and dates, wherefore we cannot rely on this information (EH, p. XII and Kay, Gerald of Wales and the Fourth Lateran Council, p. 88).
1213 SD, p. 172.
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preface, Hugh of Wells had been the first and only bishop consecrated by Archbishop Stephen Langton. The next consecrations took place in October 1214, when Stephen Langton consecrated the bishops of Worcester and Exeter. Thus, Giraldus must have written the preface before October 1214 (terminus ante quem).

James Dimock thought it unlikely that Giraldus had dedicated anything to Stephen Langton before the archbishop was allowed to return to England and to exercise his episcopal power in July 1213. This argument is valid, as Giraldus could not have known that Stephen Langton would return to England at all. We may consequently suppose that the lives of the bishops of Lincoln were finished between July 1213 and October 1214.

For their dating of the life of St Hugh, James Dimock, Richard Loomis and Matthew Mesley take into account certain miracles from Distinction III. As I will argue in the following, these miracles were probably added much later than 1214.

5.2.2.3 The third version of the life of Remigius and the second version of life of St Hugh

In my opinion, CCCC 425, as it has come down to us, was probably not composed in 1214. Instead, I argue that the present manuscript dates from c.1219. This implies two conclusions: We have to assume that Giraldus possibly rewrote an unknown percentage of text of the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh, so we are dealing with a third version of the VR and a second version of the VH.

Unquestionably, Giraldus added distinctio III to the VH. This is suggested by an additional leaf and the text itself: Distinction two contained miracles that had taken place before the Interdict (March 1208 – July 1214), which is described as “as unexpected as longlasting.”

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1215}} \text{VR, p. L and p. 5.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1216}} \text{VR, p. XII–XIII.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1217}} \text{VR, p. LII, VH, p. 124–125, and Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 245–246.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1218}} \text{CCCC 425, f. 46av.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1219}} \text{VH, p. 64: interdicto tam inopinato et tam diuturno.} \]
At the beginning of distinctio III, Giraldus writes:

> Quamquam autem huic operi et delicioso labori finem hic ponere promiserimus, cum tamen nihil honestum vere valeat aut debeat amicitiae denegari, ad instantiam viri venerabilis Rogeri decani Lincolniensis et ea miracula quibus nubiloso nihilominus interdicti tempore divina bonitas, tamquam luculentam in tenebris lucernam accendens, sanctum suum clarificari in terris voluit et magnificari, scholastico quoque digerere stilo ceterisque non incompetenter adicere, dignum duximus.

But although we have promised to end our work and delicious labour here, we have considered it worthy because of the request of the venerable Dean of Lincoln, Roger, – for nothing honourable can indeed by denied or should be rejected in friendship – to add in a scholastic style to the other miracles these with which God’s goodness nevertheless decided to glorify and magnify his saint among the lands during the clouded times of the Interdict, as if he would ignite a shining light in the darkness.

Here, we find a clear gap between distinction two and distinction three, which makes distinction three a supplement. This gap proves that Giraldus had originally intended to finish the life of St Hugh after the second distinction. Thus, distinction three must represent a later addition and the miracles of distinction three cannot help dating the earlier version of the lives, as James Dimock, Richard Loomis and Matthew Mesley suggested.

But how much later was distinctio III added to the text? Giraldus’ choice of words seems to suggest that the Interdict had already been lifted when Giraldus wrote these lines. In my opinion, the text was probably written after July 1214, when the Interdict was lifted from England. Therefore terminus post quem is July 1214.

---

1220 VH, p. 68.
1222 VR, p. LII, VH, p. 124–125, and Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 245–246. In my opinion, the marginal addition primo on f. 73v of CCCC 425 probably does not represent a later addition but a simple scribal error.
1223 Matthew Mesley reads the beginning of distinctio 3 differently: he thinks that Giraldus did not speak of the Interdict in the past tense (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 245).
1224 Clarke, The Interdict in the Thirteenth Century, p. 125.
As James Dimock observes, the third distinction was probably added to the text before 1219, when Hugh’s canonization sped up. Surely, Giraldus would have mentioned when Hugh was canonized. The canonization took place in 1220, but the commission examining Hugh’s sanctity started work in 1219. It is unlikely that Giraldus knew about any official plans for canonizing Hugh as early as 1213/14 (the probable date of the composition of version two), though the veneration of St Hugh must have started shortly after his burial.

In the preface, Giraldus remarked on the rewards he hoped to achieve: he wanted Hugh of Wells to procure the canonization and translation of Remigius, *simul cum Hugone primo*, that is, “together with Hugh the first.” Brief praise of Remigius immediately follows Giraldus’ request for canonization. He emphasizes that Remigius transferred the location of the episcopal city from Dorchester to Lincoln and annexed Lindsey, as if Giraldus felt that the case of Remigius still needed some support. In contrast, he neither asked explicitly for support for the canonization of St Hugh, nor did he add some sentences of praise to support Hugh’s case himself. He only advocated the canonization of Remigius. I therefore conclude that in Giraldus’ eyes, the case of Hugh obviously did not need any further support, because the process of canonization was already under way. So, the passage must have been written during a later time, probably after the commission to inquire after Hugh’s sanctity had already started to work. Therefore I conclude that CCCC 425 was written around c. 1219.

Matthew Mesley interprets the additional praise of Remigius differently. He sees the passage as emphasis on the borders of Lincoln and adds that Remigius is depicted as a “protector and promoter of the see.” If this was Giraldus’ intention, why did he leave out the deeds of St Hugh? After all, he was the bishop who ended the custom of presenting a precious mantle to the king and is credited with the rebuilding of the cathedral. If Giraldus only intended to emphasize a bishop’s role

---

1225 *VR*, p. Ll.
1226 Farmer, *The Cult and Canonization of St Hugh*, p. 77.
1228 *VR*, p. 6.
1229 *VR*, p. 6.
1231 According to Giraldus, Robert Bloet granted the king that he would pay for the ‘gift of the mantle’, that is, a certain sum of money every year for the privilege to wear a mantle made of sable fur (*VR*, p. 33). Adam of Eynsham attributes the payment for the episcopal mantle to Bishop Alexander (*MV2*, p. 34). Cf. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England*, 1994 for further explanation on the gift of the mantle, and for economic
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as “protector and promoter of the see”, he could have added plenty of material for St Hugh as well. Yet obviously, Giraldus did not choose to do so.

My last argument concerning the dating of a third version of the life of Remigius is based on another hint in the preface. Giraldus mentioned that St Thomas of Canterbury would be translated “brevique dierum spatio”, that is, within a few days.

50 years after his violent death, Thomas Becket was translated on 7 July 1220. However, preparations for a new shrine must have started in 1216. Stephen Langton had probably established first plans for the translation as early as 1218.

The question is: what did Giraldus know about these plans?

Obviously, Giraldus and Stephen Langton had been in contact before the archbishop departed for Rome in September 1215. The possibility that Giraldus also knew about the archbishop’s plans cannot be denied. But if we bear in mind that Stephen Langton was abroad from 1215 to 1218 and that war was waging in England during that time, I doubt that Giraldus would be daring enough to announce as early as 1214 that the translation of Thomas Becket was to take place in a few days. In my opinion, CCCC 425 must have been up-dated by Giraldus in 1219, probably at the same time as he added distinctio III.

Consequently, we have to suppose that not only two, but three versions of the life of Remigius and not one, but two versions of the life of Hugh were written by Giraldus. The first version of the VR was probably finished before summer 1199. The second version of the VR (and the first version of the VH) were written somewhere around 1213/1214. A possible third version of the VR and the second version of the VH date from 1218/1219. Today, they are


1232 For example, how Hugh protected his canons when King Richard was furious after Hugh’s performance at the council of Oxford (cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.4 and MV2, p. 100–105).

1233 VR, p. 7.


1235 Of course, the jubilee must have already been on Stephen Langton’s mind before 1218 / 1219 (Vincent, Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 100).
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preserved in CCCC 425, our only textual witness to the lives of the bishops of Lincoln.\footnote{Given the glosses and marginal additions on the manuscript, it could even be argued that Giraldus had revised his work another time. Yet in the absence of another witness (for comparison) and given the fact that these additions may also be scribal errors, I would not argue for a version four of the VR, and a version three of the VH, respectively.}

5.2.3 The structure of the lives

The lives of Remigius and St Hugh share a common preface dedicated to Stephen Langton, the incumbent archbishop of Canterbury. Having addressed the archbishop, Giraldus outlines the structure of the whole text. The preface refers to both lives, which means the composition of CCCC 425 is not accidental. Giraldus writes:

\textit{Volumen hoc bipartitum, duorum quippe virorum illustrium vitas, exemplo praeclaras et memoratu dignissimas, principaliter et praecipue complectens, vestrae celsitudini destinare curavi.}\footnote{VR, p. 3.}

I have decided to dedicate this two-part volume to your highness. The work contains first and foremost the lives of two illustrious men, great examples that are very worth remembering.

Giraldus continues to refer to both bishops together. For example, Remigius and Hugh are referred to as two very bright lamps that have enlightened the church until the present day.\footnote{VR, p. 3: \textit{lucentissimas [...] lampades duas.}}

But another division can be applied to the present manuscript.\footnote{Cf. also VR, p. 13.} Although Giraldus explicitly distinguishes two lives in the preface, a third and fourth can be identified within the text: the third part deals with Remigius’ successors up to the time of St Hugh, while the fourth part was called by Giraldus “\textit{copula tergemina}”.\footnote{VR, p. 4.} It contains examples of six very praiseworthy bishops who are presented in three pairs.

\footnote{1238 VR, p. 4.}
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The *copula tergemina* is seemingly set apart from both the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh. Giraldus himself refers to the *copula* in the following way:

*Ubi et reperire poteritis, si tamen lectioni interdum vacare volueritis aut valueritis [...] imitabilia nonnulla et laudabilia*.1242

There you may find as well, if you want and intend to offer your mind a break from reading, [...] some examples that are worth to be followed and praised.

These words suggest that the *copula* had been intentionally composed for Stephen Langton and is meant to represent a collection of *exempla*. This impression is further corroborated by Giraldus’ future plans for the manuscript. He asks Stephen Langton to lend the book Bishop Hugh of Wells. Giraldus expresses his hope that Hugh of Wells would not only regard the deeds of Remigius and Hugh, but of his other predecessors as well.1243 Both lines seem to suggest that the *copula* may be regarded as a different part of the whole manuscript. Yet now, Giraldus’ previous statement about the two-partite structure of the manuscript seems odd. Why should he speak of a two-fold structure, if the manuscript consisted of more than two parts?

The answer is simple: Giraldus’ choice of words is misleading. In a passage of *De Jure*, he explicitly said that the *copula* forms part of the life of Remigius:

*Qui tamen ea de martiris illius laudibus et titulis, quae quasi specialia quidem et nova Giraldi stylo paucis perstricta sunt verbis sed dilucidis videre voluerit, tractatum eiusdem De Copula Tergemina, in Legenda S. Remigii, Lincolniensis episcopi pri mi, requirat*.1244

And who wants to read about the martyr [= St Thomas Becket] with praise and titles – those things which are some sort of special and new and are contained in the style of Giraldus with few but enlightening words – he shall ask for the treaty about him in De Copula Tergemina, in the life of St Remigius, first bishop of Lincoln.

---

1242 Cf. *VR*, p. 4.
1243 *VR*, p. 5.
1244 *JS*, p. 360.
This quotation proves that Giraldus considered the copula as a part of the life of Remigius. Consequently, he did not treat it as a third part of the present manuscript.

Now, one might ask whether the copula had always been part of the life of Remigius. After all, the earliest possible date of publication of *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae* was 1215. Thus, the statement quoted above may be true for version two and three of the VR, but not necessarily for version one of the VR, which had already been written in 1199. Giraldus’ plan that he laid out in the preface of the version of 1219 speaks of four parts: the biography, the miracles, Remigius’ successors and the copula. Did this structure of the VR develop over the years or had it been intended as early as 1199?

References taken from the text suggest that the passages about Remigius’ successors and the copula must have been composed during the lifetime of St Hugh. The successor-part ends with Giraldus’ wish that Hugh’s promising start as bishop may find an equally good ending, which means that it must have already existed in 1199 (Hugh died in 1200).

The same observation accounts for the copula: It starts with Giraldus’ affirmation that the copula includes an account of every bishop of Lincoln, omitting no-one. This statement cannot be applied to either version two (1213/1214) or version three (1218/1219) of the life of Remigius, because Bishop William of Blois (1203–1206) whom Giraldus did not mention, succeeded St Hugh of Lincoln (died in 1200) and was the predecessor of Bishop Hugh of Wells (consecrated in 1209). Thus, the statement is only valid, if it is applied to version one of Remigius’ life. Therefore, the structure of the VR, with the successor-part and the copula, must have already existed in 1199.

However, Giraldus must at least have added a paragraph at the very end of the copula. He speaks of Bishop Hugh, who “will not have obtained the purple crown and the crown of roses, but at least he may – with God’s grace – fruitfully gain the white favor, graced with the brightness of a lily.”

---

1245 Butler, Some New Pages of Giraldus Cambrensis, p. 143.
1246 VR, p. 3.
1247 VR, p. 42. Charles Garton seems to be more convinced of later emendations (*Hugh*, p. 3).
1248 VR, p. 42.
1249 VR, p. 43: *Quoniam autem de Lincolniae praetatis, nullum praetereundo, per ordinem disseruimus.*
1250 Cf. VR, p. 80. James Dimock had already observed that this section was an addition of the second edition of the VR (VR, p. 42–43).
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Hugh was alive when the first version of the VR was finished, this sentence, speaking of his death, must be a later addition (probably from version two).

On the other hand, it might be argued that the successor-part and the copula might have formed two separate texts written around 1199. After all, the very short preface to the first version of the VR – we can obtain it from Symbolum Electorum – does not mention passages about successors or contemporary exempla. Consequently, although the beginning of the successor-part may be interpreted as a short connection to Remigius’ biography, it might still represent a later addition.

This opposition is valid. We have, however, the testimony of Adam of Eynsham, that the narration of Hugh’s pet swan at Stow had already been part of the first version of the VR. Here, Adam has just quoted Giraldus’ account (more or less verbatim) and proceeds in the next chapter: “Whilst the holy man was still on earth the author I have already cited gave a veracious account of this matter.” This sentence suggests that the copula had already been written for version one of the VR.

The existence of part three (Remigius’ successors) and part four (the copula) may have caused Michael Staunton to note that most of the VR “has nothing to do with Remigius” and these parts may have been the reason why the VR was said to contain “idle gossip of the day.”

On the contrary, it is exactly this structure that displays Giraldus’ abilities as an author. The structure of the VR and the VH should be viewed as intentional, for Giraldus surely had a concept in mind when he created both lives of the bishops of Lincoln.

---

1251 Cf. VR, p. 8 and CTC 7.11, f. 95r.
1252 VR, p. 31: Igitur vita beati Remigii sub stili brevitate trans cursa, subsequentium antistitum nomina summatim et acta perstringere non incon gruum reputavi (Well, as I have written down the life of St Remigius with brief words, I do not consider it unfitting to name his successors in their chronological order, and to roam through their deeds).
1253 Translation taken from MV1, p. 107.
1255 VR, p. XLI.
1256 Grey, Historiography and Biography from the Period of Gildas to Gerald of Wales, p. 340.
1257 To use the words of Peter Kidson: the life of Remigius was “not a spontaneous, unsolicited exercise in biography, nor was it a speculative venture” (Kidson, St Hugh’s Choir, p. 32–34).
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5.2.4 Possible sources for the lives

Before we can start interpreting the lives on a micro-level, we have to answer one question: What sources could Giraldus have used for his compositions⁵²⁵⁸?

First of all, Giraldus could have relied on oral tradition. We know that Giraldus spent many years in Lincoln and that he was immersed in the town’s ecclesiastical life. However, Giraldus’ own first-hand experiences are not limited to the time he spent at Lincoln: Chapter six of the VH tells of Hugh’s behaviour when he was with the king’s court in Normandy during the first half of 1189 and, as James Dimock mentions, Giraldus himself had been with Archbishop Baldwin in Normandy during that time⁵²⁵⁹. We do not know if Hugh and Giraldus had indeed met during that period, but as Hugh was following the court and Giraldus received a special mission from Richard after King Henry had died, such a meeting would have been possible⁵²⁶⁰.

Even if we cannot be sure whether Giraldus was present at Lincoln during certain events⁵²⁶¹, he would have known people he could have asked for eyewitness accounts. Obviously, Giraldus was part of the local and ecclesiastical upper circles of Lincoln and, given his friendship with members of the Lincoln chapter, we may assume that he had heard, for example, stories about the previous bishops of Lincoln⁵²⁶². In the case of St Hugh, Giraldus had probably seen his bishop quite regularly, since there are many occasions on which they could have met in Lincoln. Thus, Giraldus could have been an eyewitness to some events that were later turned into parts of the VH, or could have heard about these events from his friends. The most probable candidates for these personal sources are

⁵²⁵⁸ As we have seen, different versions of the life of Remigius and two versions of the life of St Hugh have to be distinguished. In order to establish the sources Giraldus possibly drew upon, we would have to examine every single version of the lives. Unfortunately, only one manuscript exists, containing the latest version of both lives, wherefore this method of examination is not possible. Any statements on the previous version(s) of the lives, of which we have no witness, would have to be made with absolute caution. Thus, we can only safely make claims about the possible sources Giraldus may have used for the completion of CCCC 425.

⁵²⁵⁹ Cf. VH, p. 23 and VHP, p. 100.

⁵²⁶⁰ Cf. VHP, p. 100 for Hugh and RG, p. 80 for Giraldus.

⁵²⁶¹ For example, during the burial of St Hugh – cf. chapter 5.5.2 for further information.

⁵²⁶² The reference to the saying about Remigius’ day of death may be understood as a hint in that direction (Cf. VR, p. 21).
Dean Roger of Rolleston, Chancellor William de Monte, and Hugh’s personal chaplain, Adam of Eynsham.

Oral narrations may also have been the sources for the miracles Giraldus wrote down. For example, stories that circulated orally through Lincoln may have provided Giraldus with the information he encompassed in the second distinction of the life of St Hugh.

Furthermore, Giraldus could have used the Archives of Lincoln. As the catalogue of the Cathedral Library proves, Lincoln had a *Registrum Antiquissimum*, a book of foundation. As its heading suggests, it mainly consisted of charters. The book of foundation cannot represent the only source Giraldus consulted, because the information available would not have been sufficient to write Remigius’ biography. However, if Giraldus combined the knowledge he derived from the charters and the oral tales, he could have had enough information to compose the *VR*. To record the miracles taking place around Remigius’ and Hugh’s tomb, Giraldus might have accessed a *martyrologium* which was kept by guards.

In case of the *VR*, Giraldus could have used another source. Antonia Gransden has suggested that the narration about six praiseworthy bishops was “stylistically reminiscent” of Henry of Huntingdon’s *De Contemptu Mundi*. Matthew Mesley argued convincingly why such a connection is rather doubtful, although we cannot exclude the possibility that Giraldus consulted Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum*. After all, if we consider the popularity of the *Historia*, such a scenario is feasible.

---


1264 *VR*, p. 167. Only fragments of this supposed book have come down to us (Owen, Historical Survey, 1091–1450, p. 128–129). During the 1220s, Hugh of Wells had ordered the compilation of a *Registrum Antiquissimum* that contained about 874 charters that were relevant for the cathedral and the diocese (Campbell, The Landscape of Pastoral Care in Thirteenth–Century England, p. 194).

1265 *VR*, p. LI and p. 22. The use of miracle collections is only seldom mentioned by hagiographers (Sigal, Le Travail des Hagiographes aux XIe et XIIe Siècles, p. 155).


1267 Cf. Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 195 for further explanation. As chapter 5.4.1.1.1. will show below, we have, however, references that suggest that Giraldus did not consult the *Historia Anglorum*.

1268 Diana Greenway provides an overview of the existing manuscripts: *HA*, p. CXVIII–CXLIV. Interestingly, the *Historia Anglorum* is accompanied by Giraldus’ *Expugnatio*.
However, a short caveat has to be added: In her edition and translation of Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum*, Diana Greenway has sought to identify the sources which were consulted. Referring to the details of Remigius’ career at Lincoln, she constitutes that these passages are from unidentified sources, “presumably from Lincoln sources”\textsuperscript{1269}. Again, these unidentified sources possibly comprise oral tradition and the content of the Lincoln Archives that we cannot access anymore. Thus, similarities between both authors may also be explained with the circumstance that both men had consulted the same sources.

### 5.3 The general preface of CCCC 425

The general preface to the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh is shaped in the form of a letter\textsuperscript{1270}. Its main purpose was noted in red ink at the very beginning of CCCC 425, folio 6r: the text was intended to be a gift from Giraldus, and it should ensure the benevolence of the recipient, Archbishop Stephen Langton of Canterbury\textsuperscript{1271}. In the preface, Giraldus also explains the structure of his *libellus*: the book is two-partite, because it contains the *vitae* of two illustrious *viri*, namely, Bishop Remigius and Bishop Hugh of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1272}.

Giraldus invents a temporal sequence of saints, when he says that Remigius preceded Thomas Becket, the rose of Canterbury, who lived before St Hugh\textsuperscript{1273}. Although the death of Thomas Becket had created an “hagiographical aftermath”\textsuperscript{1274}, the appearance of the martyred archbishop in this text is no coincidence. Giraldus and Stephen Langton had both attended the Schools of Paris, where the cult of Becket flourished\textsuperscript{1275}. Stephen Langton himself revered Thomas Becket highly, and he knew how to use the saintly legacy of his predecessor for his own archiepiscopal representation\textsuperscript{1276}. Giraldus obviously knew which strings he had to pull to

---

\textit{Hibernica} in a manuscript dating back to the end of the thirteenth / beginning of the fourteenth century, which probably originated near Dublin (*HA*, p. CXXVI).

\textsuperscript{1269} *HA*, p. LXXXI.

\textsuperscript{1270} *VR*, p. 3 and p. 7.

\textsuperscript{1271} CCCC 425, f. 6r and *VR*, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{1272} *VR*, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{1273} *VR*, p. 4.


\textsuperscript{1275} Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools*, p. 192.

assure himself of Langton’s *gratia*, for the Becket-theme re-occurs throughout the *VR* and the *VH*.

Giraldus may have known even more about Stephen Langton than we might imagine. Interestingly, Giraldus calls the *copula tergemina* a collection of *imitabilia nonnulla et laudabilia*¹²⁷⁷. Although Stephen Langton may have been called ‘Stephen with the Tongue of Thunder’, Nicholas Vincent notes “a lack of direct contemporary *exempla*, that smacks of the schoolroom and which marks out Langton himself, even after 1207, as very much a school-master *manque*”¹²⁷⁸. It is tempting to think that Giraldus had this in mind, when he recommended the *copula*, a collection of *imitabilia* ‘from our lifetime’¹²⁷⁹ to the archbishop. After all, the following paragraph revolves around the didactic impact of saints’ lives on the audience¹²⁸⁰.

Any dedication to a (prospective) patron raises questions about the reward the author expected. In this case, Giraldus was not looking for money or an ecclesiastical position. Instead, he asked Stephen Langton that the *libellus* would be lend to Hugh of Wells, the incumbent bishop of Lincoln¹²⁸¹.

Giraldus’ intention is obvious: that Hugh of Wells should be persuaded of the holiness of his predecessors, Remigius and Hugh, to support the canonization of both men¹²⁸². At this point, Giraldus manages to kill two birds with one stone: while pretending to exhort Hugh of Wells, he promotes the canonization venture to Stephen Langton at the same time. This is obvious when Giraldus describes the incorporation of the see of Lindsey, which stretched “from the River Humber, which flows into the sea, to the River Witham, which flows and traverses through Lincoln”¹²⁸³.

Being the incumbent bishop of Lincoln, Hugh of Wells must surely have known the River Witham and where it flows, but Giraldus could not expect that the archbishop of Canterbury knew the rivers of Lincoln¹²⁸⁴.

---

¹²⁷⁷ *VR*, p. 4.
¹²⁷⁹ *VR*, p. 4.
¹²⁸⁰ Cf. *VR*, p. 4.
¹²⁸¹ Cf. *VR*, p. 5.
¹²⁸² *VR*, p. 5–6.
¹²⁸³ *VR*, p. 6: *ab Humbro marino usque Withemam fluvium, qui Lincolniam permeat et penetrat.*
¹²⁸⁴ Cf. also for this passage Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen.
Furthermore, by ensuring that the *libellus* would return to Lincoln for a time, Giraldus created the basis for a firm contact between the bishops of Lincoln and Canterbury. With the canonization of Remigius and Hugh in mind, for which the support of both ecclesiastical authorities was needed, this was a clever move.\footnote{1285}

### 5.4 Interpreting the content of the life of Remigius

Giraldus’ life of Remigius has received some unfavourable treatment by scholarship. For example, James Dimock, who is up to now the only one to edit the *vita*, criticized:

> It seems clear that Giraldus says much about him [= Remigius], that had no better authority than his own fancy of what was or ought to have been the case, or a like fancy of some of his Lincoln friends his informers, or, at the best, some vague traditions.\footnote{1286}

Later on, Dimock calls the life “simply a worthless fabrication.”\footnote{1287} Even if more recent comments on the *VR* are not as harsh, the value of this life has long been neglected. David Smith calls it “a piece of stylized hagiography of little historical value,”\footnote{1288} while Antonia Gransden contrasts the life of Remigius with the life of St Hugh and remarks on the biographical section of the *VR*: “This part of the work has no value to the historian.”\footnote{1289}

David Bates, who wrote a modern biography of Remigius, argues for the contrary. In his opinion, the fact that Giraldus wrote a hagiographical biography of Remigius is a living proof of appreciation of the bishop’s achievements.\footnote{1290}

\footnote{1285 For a more detailed explanation on this point, cf. chapter 5.7.}
\footnote{1286 *VR*, p. XVI. Remigius’ biographer, David Bates, remarks that these sentences show a “notable insensivity” on Dimock’s site to the miraculous (Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 34).}
\footnote{1287 *VR*, p. XXII.}
\footnote{1288 Smith, Hugh’s Administration of the Diocese of Lincoln, p. 24.}
\footnote{1289 Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 310. Cf. a similar statement of the editors of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* (*EH*, p. 268).}
\footnote{1290 Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 35–36. The only extensive treatment of the *VR* was undertaken by Matthew Mesley (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 178–240).}
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In the following chapter, I will examine the way in which Giraldus depicts these merits by comparing his account with other, independent sources. Out of the available accounts, four major texts were selected. These sources are Eadmer’s *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, William of Malmesbury’s *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum* and John of Schalby’s *Lives of the Bishops of Lincoln*. While Eadmer († c.1126), William of Malmesbury († c.1143), and Henry of Huntingdon († 1155) all predate Giraldus and his writings, John of Schalby († 1333) wrote more than 100 years later. The inclusion of John of Schalby’s account offers one big advantage: both Giraldus and John of Schalby likely drew on the same sources – the Lincoln Archives – yet John of Schalby does not depend on Giraldus’ account, as James Dimock observed.

Our selection offers another major advantage: the texts do not only represent views from the perspective of Lincoln (Henry of Huntingdon and John of Schalby had been canons at Lincoln), but also from the perspective of the see of Canterbury (Eadmer and William of Malmesbury). Thus, we take into account different sources written by different interest groups.

5.4.1 Part one: Remigius’ biography

After the general preface addressed to Stephen Langton, a list of *capitula* of the *Vita S. Remigii* is attached. It contains the headings of all 39 chapters, comprising the description of Remigius’ life, the miracles, notes about his successors and the *copula tergmina*.

The *proœmium* of the *VR* starts right after the list of chapters. Elaborating on the benefits of reading saints’ lives, its content echoes the beginning of Bernhard of Clairvaux’s life of St Malachy. Basically the

---

1292 *VR*, p. XV.
1294 *VR*, p. 9–10.
1295 A very short *praefatio* for a life of Remigius (possibly the first version) has been preserved in *Symbololum Electorum* (cf. CTC 7.11, f. 95r and *VR*, p. 8). It suggests religious devotion as a major *causa scribendi*.
same text can be read in the preface of the life of Caradoc\textsuperscript{1297}. The only difference between both prefaces lies in the last two paragraphs: in the case of CCCC 425, these last paragraphs refer specifically to Remigius, because Giraldus added an outlook to this text:

\textit{In quatuor itaque particulas libellus iste distinguitur. Prima viri sancti vitam singulariter et gesta completitur. Secunda virtutes ipsius et signa prosequitur. Tertia successorum eiusdem sex proprias seriatim exprimit actiones. Quarta praeelectorum Angliae nostri temporis antistitum tergeminorum mores et modos comprehendit}\textsuperscript{1298}.

This little book falls into four parts. The first part comprises particularly the life of the holy man and his deeds. The second part follows his virtues and signs. The third part depicts the actions of his six successors in temporal sequence. The fourth part unites the manners and way of life of three pairs of chosen bishops of England of our time.

\textbf{5.4.1.1 Remigius' early years}\textsuperscript{1299}

The description of Remigius' life comprises chapter one to five. Chapter one focuses on the events taking place during Remigius' earlier life and offers an outlook on future events. According to Giraldus, Remigius had been canonically elected to the diocese of Dorchester-upon-Thames at the beginning of the reign of William the Conqueror. He was consecrated by Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury. Furthermore, he had supported the Conquest of William and during his time as bishop, he showed the prototypical virtues of a saint.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1297} Cf. CTC 7.11 ff. 94r–95r and Plass and Thompson, (in preparation), The Scholar and His Saints: Gerald of Wales and the \textit{Vita S. Karadoci}.
\item \textsuperscript{1298} VR, p. 13.
\item \textsuperscript{1299} VR, p. 14–15.
\end{itemize}
The first chapter of Remigius’ life is interesting for several reasons: First of all, Giraldus lacks information of Remigius’ birth, family, and his homeland. But why did he leave out these details?

It could be argued that Giraldus was generally not interested in them. Yet such information is provided by him in the *Vita S. Davidis*, the *Vita S. Ethelberti*, and the *Vita S. Hugonis*. Another possible reason might be that Giraldus did not want to offer his intended audience information that clearly marked Remigius as a foreigner. This thought may be rejected, as Giraldus provided such information in the *Vita S. Hugonis*. Consequently, we may assume that Giraldus would have provided the information, if he had managed to gather any details about Remigius’ previous life. Our conclusion is supported by the relevant passages in the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, written by Canon John of Schalby. In his account, John of Schalby also did not describe Remigius, who is simply called a Norman and a former monk of Fécamp. We know that both authors probably consulted the Lincoln Archives, so the Archives probably did not offer any further information about Remigius’ previous life on the continent.

Nevertheless, if Giraldus had been interested in Remigius’ personal appearance, he could have consulted the *Historia Anglorum* of Henry of Huntingdon. The author describes Remigius in the following way:

*Erat siquidem statura parvus sed corde magnus, colore fuscus sed operibus venustus.*

---

1301 Cf. chapter 3.3.2.1, chapter 4.3.2.1, and chapter 5.5.1.1.1.
1302 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.1.1.
1303 J. Scawby, p. 193. In *Speculum Ecclesiae*, Giraldus calls Remigius a Cluniac monk (*Spec.*, p. 80). Benjamin Pohl and Steven Vanderputten have analysed the situation at Fécamp at the beginning of the 11th century. They concluded that the Cluniac tradition at Fécamp should be dated back to the end of the 11th century (cf. for further information Pohl and Vanderputten, *Fécamp, Cluny, and the Invention of Traditions in the Later Eleventh Century*, p. 1–41). Consequently, Remigius was probably not a Cluniac monk, because he must already have left the monastery around 1066.
1304 The Archives had moved from Dorchester to Lincoln. At least some material was lost on the way, cf. for a textual witness to the move: Blair, *Estate Memoranda of c. 1070 from the See of Dorchester-on-Thames*, p. 114–123.
1305 *HA*, p. 408.
He [= Remigius] was of little stature, but his heart was great, he had a dark complexion, but he was fair in his deeds.

A similar description is offered by William of Malmesbury, who remarks that “One could say that nature had wanted to make up things in him, when we consider that the most beautiful mind lived in such a very miserable body”\(^{1306}\).

The question is: why should Giraldus omit such descriptions of Remigius, if he had known of them? The most probable explanation is that Giraldus knew neither the text of William of Malmesbury nor the work of Henry of Huntingdon.

5.4.1.1.2 Remigius’ role during the Norman Conquest\(^{1307}\)

Remigius received the first vacant bishopric in England after the Conquest. Dorothy Owen pictures him as “a powerful and resolute supporter of the Norman rule”\(^{1308}\), Frank Barlow draws the picture of a great patron for scholars and clerks and counts him among the “excellent bishops”\(^{1309}\), and according to David Bates, Remigius “deserves to be numbered among the greatest of the makers of Norman England”\(^{1310}\). Surviving charters, entries in Domesday survey, and the testimony of medieval writers support this view. These sources suggest that Remigius had the favour of King William and other important laymen\(^{1311}\). These impressions fit with Giraldus’ depiction of Remigius. In the *vita*, Remigius had gained “fame that made him known to the king, he was very familiar with him, and the king was in favour of him”\(^{1312}\).

Daniel Gerrard considers this depiction of Remigius’ closeness to the Conqueror as an emphasis of “prestige, but likening this leader of ten knights to a Decurion is a much more direct statement of his status as a

\(^{1306}\) GP, p. 472: Quem ideo natura compegisse putaretur, ut sciretur beatissimum ingenium in miserrimo corpore habitare posse.


\(^{1309}\) Barlow, The English Church, p. 68.

\(^{1310}\) Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 1.


\(^{1312}\) VR, p. 14: regis notitiam, quamplurimam familiaritatem, atque favorem.
5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

warrior”. No doubt, depicting Remigius as a decurio attributes a chivalric flair to the bishop, like the emphasis on St Hugh’s aristocratic background had done with the saintly bishop. Furthermore, it could be argued that the military reference plays on the (prospective) saint as being a miles Christi in multiple ways and, finally, it may allude to the time of military service of St Martin, who will frequently be alluded to in the future chapters of the VR and the VH.

Giraldus explains the familiarity between king and bishop with the fact that Remigius arrived in England together with William, and had supported him during the Conquest. However, according to Giraldus, Remigius did not support William on his own account. As Giraldus explains, Remigius and his ten knights came to England, because the abbot (John of Ravenna) had sent a contingent to William’s aid.

The different sources paint different pictures of Remigius and his engagement in the Conquest. John of Schalby simply states that Remigius came to England “for a certain reason”. In stark contrast to Giraldus, Henry of Huntingdon explicitly states that Remigius took an active part in the fighting:

Tractandum autem erat de praecessore eius Remigio, qui cum Willelmo rege in Angliam venit et bello interfuit.

But we have to deal with his predecessor Remigius, who came with King William to England and took part in the war.

1313 Gerrard, The Church at War, p. 227 and p. 246, where he connects the vita with Giraldus’ Live of Geoffrey. Possible literary reactions to fighting clergy are listed on p. 205–221.
1314 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.1: Giraldus also emphasized the aristocratic background of Remigius’ saintly successor, Hugh of Burgundy (VH, p. 8).
1315 For more information on the concept of the miles Christi during this period, cf. Smith, Saints in Shining Armour: Martial Asceticism and Masculine Models of Sanctity, ca. 1050–1250, p. 572–602.
1316 Sulpicius Severus, Vita Martini, p. 96–98.
1318 Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 2–3. John of Ravenna, a former papal legate, was abbot of Fécamp from 1028 to 1078.
1319 Cf. VR, p. 14
1320 Ob certam causam (J. Scawby, p. 193).
1321 HA, p. 588. According to Diana Greenway, this statement is a concrete reference to Remigius’ presence at the battle of Hastings (HA, p. 588–589).
Which assertion can we trust? The sources are mostly silent on preparations for the Conquest, but fortunately, the so-called Ship List has come down to us. This list fills roughly one column of Oxford, Bod. Lib. E Museo 93, f. 8rv. It has been edited by Elisabeth van Houts. She argued that the original source of the Ship List was probably written at Fécamp, after December 1067 or 1072, and that the present manuscript had been copied from the original list at Battle Abbey. From Battle Abbey, the manuscript must have travelled to Brecon Priory, for it had been found there in the 16th century.

Giraldus had been Archdeacon of Brecon. Nevertheless, I consider it unlikely that he had accessed the manuscript when he was about to write the life of Remigius, because he was probably residing at Lincoln at that time.

The Ship List can be divided into three parts. The first (and longest) part contains a list of the names of fourteen secular and ecclesiastical magnates of Normandy. They provided ships and knights, which are listed (again) in the second part. The list specifies that a certain Remigius, almoner of Fécamp, had provided one ship and twenty knights for King William. This Remigius must have been our Remigius, because he is addressed as ‘bishop of Lincoln’. Unfortunately, the information provided by the Ship List are difficult to assess because of several reasons:

First of all, the Ship List mentions that Remigius had been almoner at Fécamp. This specific information is supported by no other medieval source. While Eadmer did not mention Remigius’ background, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Giraldus, and John of Schalby agree that he had been a monk of Fécamp. As neither Henry of Huntingdon nor Giraldus nor John of Schalby – all three of them canons of Lincoln – are silent about the specific tasks Remigius might have performed during his

---

1324 Houts, The Ship List of William the Conqueror, p. 165. Brecon Priory had been founded by Bernard of Newmarch in about 1110, and Battle Abbey was its mother house (Heale, The Dependent Priories of Medieval English Monasteries, p. 290).
1325 Houts, The Ship List of William the Conqueror, p. 166.
1327 GP, p. 472.
1328 HA, p. 408.
time at Fécamp, it seems probable that this information was not provided by the sources in Lincoln Archives.

The Ship List does not only mention Remigius’ monastic background, but claims that he had contributed one ship and twenty knights for the Conquest. Neither Eadmer, nor William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, or John of Schalby explicitly mention a contingent of knights accompanying Remigius to England. In contrast to these sources, Giraldus wrote about a contingent, yet he made it consist of ten (instead of twenty) knights\textsuperscript{1331}. Elisabeth van Houts remarks that the number given in the Ship List is twice as high as Giraldus’ number, and, furthermore, it speaks of twice as many knights as the abbey of Fécamp would have owed to William\textsuperscript{1332}. Thus, Giraldus probably invented Remigius’ troop of ten knights.

Overall, we have seen that Remigius had probably taken a more active part in the Conquest of England that Giraldus wanted to admit. In my opinion, Giraldus had two aims in mind, when he composed this particular description of events:

First of all, his audience has the impression that Remigius did not actively seek to come to England. The persons who were mainly responsible for Remigius’ involvement in the Conquest were the abbot, who owed William obsequium, and the Conqueror himself. Furthermore, Giraldus creates the impression that Remigius took no active part in the fighting, but was mainly responsible for administration (necessariorum ministratione). Overall, Giraldus avoids depicting Remigius as one of the Norman adventures seeking his fortune in England. In Giraldus’ account, Remigius instead displays behaviour “consistent with his monastic vocation”\textsuperscript{1333}. Thus, Giraldus takes the focus away from the worldly affairs Remigius engaged in, and manages to highlight Remigius’ ecclesiastical devotion\textsuperscript{1334}.

It has already been suggested that Remigius would have received the bishopric as a reward for his support. Of course, this assumption cannot be proven beyond doubt. But something must have compelled William the Conqueror to reward Remigius with the first vacant bishopric after 1066,

\textsuperscript{1331} VR, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{1332} Houts, The Ship List of William the Conqueror, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{1333} Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 212 connects this behaviour with Remigius’ obedience towards William the Conqueror.
\textsuperscript{1334} Remigius would not have been the only saint involved in military affairs. Remigius had a very famous predecessor, St Martin himself, whose monastic vocation had been highlighted by Sulpicius Severus (cf. Sulpicius Severus, Vita Martini, p. 96).
and it is very likely that it was some sort of military service. This conclusion was drawn by medieval chroniclers as well: Eadmer and William of Malmesbury remark that Remigius had bought himself the bishopric with his deeds during the Conquest.

William of Malmesbury, who is supporting the claims of Eadmer, comments:

*Remigius ex monacho Fiscannensi, qui Willelmo comiti Normannorum in Angliam venienti auxilium in multis praebuerit, episcopatum, si vinceret, pactus. Nec fuit Willelmus segnior in dando quam Remigius in accipiendō.*

Remigius, monk of Fécamp, who had offered count William of the Normans aid in many cases, when he came to England, had negotiated a diocese for himself, if William won. And William was not more idle in giving than Remigius in receiving the gift.

As chroniclers rarely state explicitly that a royal gift was rewarded for military activities, these similar statements are remarkable.

Interestingly, the connection between Remigius’ military activities and his position as bishop is not drawn by authors writing from Lincoln’s point of view. Henry of Huntingdon is silent about the matter and explains Remigius’ promotion with a simple “*rege largiente*.” While the passage in John of Schalby is, unfortunately, corrupted, Giraldus hastens to explain that Remigius’ promotion to the bishopric had been canonical, which would have rendered any accusation of simony unjustified. This is another effort to present Remigius in a favourable (and saintly) light.

---

1335 *GP*, p. 472 and *HN*, p. 11.
1336 Gerrard, *The Church at War*, p. 188.
1337 *HA*, p. 588.
1338 *J. Scawby*, p. 193–194. Some deeper meaning might be hidden in *competentior* or *laboriosissime*, yet these are mere speculations.
1339 *VR* p. 14, highlighted by me: *a clero loci illius canonice in episcopatum est electus* (He was canonically elected by the local clergy to this bishopric).
According to Giraldus, Remigius had been consecrated by Archbishop Lanfranc at Canterbury\textsuperscript{1341}. As James Dimock noted: “This is false [...] What, if any, was Giraldus’ authority for his consecration by Lanfranc, I cannot say. I have found no such statement elsewhere”\textsuperscript{1342}. The circumstances of Remigius’ consecration were rather difficult, for he was at first consecrated by Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury\textsuperscript{1343}. This first consecration is not mentioned by Giraldus, and we have to ask for what reasons he omitted this piece of information.

First of all, it is possible that Giraldus’ sources (the Archives) did not offer any information on Stigand. As John of Schalby is also silent on this matter, this possibility cannot be excluded\textsuperscript{1344}. The explanation may even be considered more probable, as Henry of Huntingdon offered no information on Remigius’ consecration either. Actually, none of these authors mentioned Stigand, wherefore it seems that the sources of the Lincoln Archives did not mention Remigius’ first consecration.

Of course, it might be argued that this piece of information was left out deliberately, because all three writers have a strong connection with Lincoln. This approach is taken by Matthew Mesley, who argues that Giraldus intended to erase any hint of simony and to adapt the process according to the conceptions of episcopal election of his own time\textsuperscript{1345}.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1340} VR, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{1341} VR, p. 14: \textit{a viro venerabili ac sancto, archipraesule Cantuariensi Launfranco, solemniter apud Doroberniam consecratus}.
\textsuperscript{1342} VR, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{1343} Our knowledge of Remigius and Stigand is provided by Remigius’ profession to Lanfranc (Richter, Canterbury Professions, p. 27). A 12\textsuperscript{th} century-manuscript previously kept at Christ Church Cathedral Priory has come down to us, but it is highly doubtful that Giraldus would have had access to it at Canterbury (Richter, Canterbury Professions, p. XXXVII).
\textsuperscript{1344} J. Scawby, p. 193–194.
\textsuperscript{1345} Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 213. He argues that any connection between Remigius and Stigand could have shed a negative light on the prospective saint (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 214).
\end{flushright}
Although the last part of this statement may be true, we should keep in mind that a consecration by Stigand and a resulting deposition of Remigius were not mentioned by the Canterbury-authors Eadmer:

*calumniatus est coram papa memoratus Thomas cum praefato Remigio, quod neuter illorum iure fuerit promotus ad pontificatum*\(^{1346}\).

Thomas and Remigius, who had already been mentioned, were damned in front of the Pope, because none of them had received their diocese according to law.

or William of Malmesbury, who reports that Remigius was accused of having been made bishop “because of the help he had given to William when he came to England”\(^{1347}\).

Both authors focus lies on the charge of simony (*neuter illorum iure fuerit promotus* or *pro auxiliis Willelmo factus esset episcopus*). Both accounts omit any reference to Remigius’ first consecration by Stigand.

Overall, it is difficult to determine whether a connection with Stigand would have cast doubt on Remigius. As none of the authors of Lincoln mentioned Remigius’ first consecration by Stigand, I conclude that Giraldus did not know about it.

### 5.4.1.2 Remigius’ virtues as bishop\(^{1348}\)

Giraldus first offers a summary of Remigius’ virtues at the end of chapter one. He proceeds with elaborating on these virtues in the following two chapters.

The first virtue Giraldus elaborates on is *caritas*. Remigius is depicted as *Martinus alter*, sacrificing not only his own goods but also the goods of the church to help the poor\(^{1349}\).
St Martin, of course, was one of the most popular saints. His vita can be counted among those lives that served as models for later hagiographers. Comparing Remigius with a powerful and famous saint like St Martin (and evoking the famous dividing of his cloak) would have clearly created a lasting impression on Giraldus’ intended audience.

Giraldus decided to elaborate on the positive quality of caritas. More than half of this chapter consists of quotations from biblical authorities, all proving how fitting it was for a true Christian to perform deeds of charity. Fittingly, the line of quotations ends with a quotation which could have been taken from Gratian, on whom Giraldus had lectured during his time in Paris.

But why should Giraldus have decided to pad a powerful image like St Martin’s sharing of the cloak with quotations taken from the works of ecclesiastical authorities?

First of all, an account of ecclesiastical authorities offered Giraldus the chance to display his knowledge. After all, he had studied fruitfully in Paris for a long time. The second possible reason is closely interwoven with this point: The current version of Remigius’ vita is addressed to two powerful prelates, namely Stephen Langton of Canterbury and Hugh of Wells. We may assume that Stephen Langton, a former magister of Paris, would have found such a display of knowledge to his liking.

Chapter three offers further examples of Remigius’ charity: The clothing and feasting of the poor and the foundation of the leper-house. Remigius paid aliments for the poor, he paid for clothes and meals for those not able to support themselves to earn a living. He even took his meals together with them. As Katherine Harvey remarked, one of the best ways to fulfil

---

1350 Adam of Eynsham, for example, used the life of St Martin written by Sulpicius Severus when he composed his life of St Hugh (Cowdrey, Hugh of Avalon, Carthusian and Bishop, p. 51).


1352 Many of these quotations have already been identified by the editor, James Dimock (cf. VR, p. 17–18). The quotations that were not identified by him were taken from the following authors: Ambrose (from Misericordiae vero to cum paupere partiatur: Ambrosius Mediolanensis, Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam; Fragmenta in Esaiam, p. 64) and not Bede, but Peter the Chanter (from Frustra manus to non extendit: Petrus Cantor, Verbum Abbreuiatum (Textus Prior), p. 446). The wrong attribution could be a sign that Giraldus’ used a florilegium here.

1353 Gratianus (de Clusio), Decretum Magistri Gratiani, p. 165.

1354 VR, p. 17.

1355 VR, p. 17–18. Cf. Matth. 25,35–36: esurivi enim et dedistis mihi manducare, sitivi et dedistis mihi bibere, hospes eram et collexistis me, nudus et operuistis me, infirmus et visitastis me.
Christian duties was to give alms in form of food and drink – and this was especially performed by saint-bishops\footnote{Harvey, Food, Drink, And The Bishop In Medieval England, CA. 1100–Ca. 1300, p. 166.}.

Prototypical Christian virtues can be found within this chapter: \emph{caritas}, \emph{pietas}, \emph{dilectio}, \emph{misericordia}, \emph{humilitas}, \emph{devotio}, \emph{patientia}, \emph{longanimitas}, \emph{miseratio}\footnote{VR, p. 17–18.}. Many of these words had already appeared at the end of chapter one, where Giraldus had drawn up a list of Remigius’ virtues.

James Dimock remarked that the heading of chapter three seems misplaced: he attributed it to chapter five and concluded that chapter three was meant to form the conclusion of chapter two\footnote{VR, p. 17.}. It is true that chapter three seems to provide further arguments for Remigius’ virtues, while the excesses of the believers and the bad state of the diocese (exactly what the heading of chapter three alludes to) are further elaborated on in chapter five\footnote{This elaboration can be found on VR, p. 20.}. The only instance of Remigius’ preaching can be found at the end of chapter three, when Giraldus tells how Remigius often visited the leper-house he had built at Lincoln and preached there\footnote{VR, p. 18. Lepers were especially considered outsiders who were highly dependent upon the benefices of the surrounding society (Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 174).}. I agree that the heading is misplaced, but I would suggest that these chapters should be regarded as later additions. As my arguments will touch the analysis on the macro-structure of the manuscript, they will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 5.6.

\subsection*{5.4.1.3 Moving the see from Dorchester to Lincoln\footnote{VR, p. 18 – 19. For the role of this chapter in Giraldus’ process of rewriting, cf. Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen.}}

During Remigius’ episcopate, the episcopal city was moved from Dorchester to Lincoln.

Lincoln was one of the largest towns in England and offered Remigius excellent possibilities for travelling the whole of his diocese\footnote{Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 12 and Owen, Introduction: the English Church in Eastern England, 1066–1100, p. 9.}. Furthermore, Lincoln was a wealthy town. Both arguments were also put forward by Henry of Huntingdon, when he described the relocation\footnote{HA, p. 408–410.}. 

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
1356 Harvey, Food, Drink, And The Bishop In Medieval England, CA. 1100–Ca. 1300, p. 166.
\footnotesize
1357 \textit{VR}, p. 17–18.
\footnotesize
1358 \textit{VR}, p. 17.
\footnotesize
1359 This elaboration can be found on \textit{VR}, p. 20.
\footnotesize
1360 \textit{VR}, p. 18. Lepers were especially considered outsiders who were highly dependent upon the benefices of the surrounding society (Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 174).
\footnotesize
\footnotesize
\footnotesize
\end{flushright}
Contrary to Henry of Huntingdon, Giraldus offers the simple explanation that Lincoln was a much better place for a cathedral than Dorchester\textsuperscript{1364}. Interestingly, the cult of St Birinus, which flourished in Dorchester, seemingly did not participate in the move to Lincoln\textsuperscript{1365}. A previously existing cult at Lincoln might have worshipped a confessor St Hibaldus, who also seems to have been forgotten or had lost his popularity\textsuperscript{1366}.

As Giraldus presents the situation, the most important event during this move was Remigius’ struggle against Archbishop Thomas of York († 1100). The struggle between Lincoln and York because of the incorporation of the former Anglo-Saxon diocese of Lindsey and the ensuing consequences have already been explained above\textsuperscript{1367}. Contrary to Giraldus’ assertion, Lindsey had not been bought out of York’s claims during Remigius’ lifetime. Instead, the whole conflict had been settled in the time of Remigius’ successor, Robert Bloet\textsuperscript{1368}.

Yet why would Giraldus construct such a legal case, if something similar did not happen during Remigius’ lifetime? A confession that Remigius did not manage to complete this ambitious project would have cast a negative light on the prospective saint. Giraldus had to construct another situation: With God’s help (\textit{Deo cooperante}), Remigius settled the conflict. Fittingly, the construction of the cathedral on a hill recalls memories of Matthew 16,18\textsuperscript{1369}. Interestingly, one of the most venerated saints at that time (and a

\textsuperscript{1364} VR, p. 18. The reasons behind this shortage of information may lie in the function of the \textit{vita}: it is doubtful whether administrative reasons for moving a cathedral see would have played any role in a process of canonization.

\textsuperscript{1365} Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 125.

\textsuperscript{1366} Blair, A Saint for Every Minster? Local Cults in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 486. In my opinion, evidence for Remigius’ attitude towards these Pre-Conquest saints’ cults is too vague to draw any conclusion from it. Diverging opinions prevail how the attitude of Norman bishops or abbots to Anglo-Saxon saints may be described. Cf. the summary of these opinions in Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 110–111.

\textsuperscript{1367} Cf. chapter 5.1.

\textsuperscript{1368} This is also found in the VR, p. 32. The existence of this doublet can be easily explained: as I have argued elsewhere, chapter four of the VR represents a later addition to the work (cf. Plass, (in preparation), Das Bistum von Lindsey in der Vita S. Remigii des Gerald von Wales: Eine Problemstelle als Resultat von Überarbeitungsprozessen).

\textsuperscript{1369} The description of Lincoln’s cathedral hill as a ‘mountain’ is not new: Alexander Neckam played on the word and the surname of William de Monte, when he said \textit{Transit ad montem Montanus, monte relictio}. The first \textit{mons} is a reference to the cathedral hill, \textit{Montanus} to William’s surname and the second \textit{mons} is a reference to Mont St Geneviève in Paris, where William had lectured (Goering, William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213), p. 6).
saint to whom Giraldus often refers in his œuvre) had the same concerns about restoring land of his diocese: St Thomas Becket\(^{1370}\).

The last point of evidence of a re-constructed reality can be found in the statement that Remigius did not only incorporate Lindsey into his own diocese, but into the diocese of Canterbury as well. This statement can be read in two ways: David Bates reminds us that Remigius had to orient himself towards Canterbury, because York had laid claim to Lindsey\(^{1371}\).

The second possible interpretation relies on the dedication of the \textit{vita}: the recipient is, after all, the incumbent archbishop of Canterbury. As Giraldus intended Remigius to be canonized, he naturally would have highlighted the connections between Lincoln / Remigius and Canterbury / Stephen Langton. After all, Stephen Langton was part of the commission for the canonization of St Hugh. Maybe Giraldus hoped to influence his former fellow student to accelerate the process of canonization for Remigius. This thought is corroborated by the life itself: Giraldus declares that, up to this point, the whole narrative has already confirmed Remigius’ sanctity, though no miracles had happened or any signs had yet been seen\(^{1372}\).

The chapter finishes with Remigius’ institution of a cathedral chapter based on the model of Rouen. Its institution had been celebrated in a lengthy account by Henry of Huntingdon\(^{1373}\).

It is obvious why Giraldus had to mention this institution: First of all, it was a secular and not a monastic chapter. Giraldus had never favoured the monastic chapters and had often quarrelled with monks. In his \textit{Epistola ad Stephanum Langton}, for example, he complains to Stephen Langton about a monk of Canterbury who had judged his works unfavourably\(^{1374}\). Fittingly,

\(^{1370}\) Cf. Staunton, \textit{The Lives} of Thomas Becket and the Church of Canterbury, p. 177–178.
\(^{1371}\) Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 7.
\(^{1372}\) VR, p. 19: \textit{Sicut longe ante miraculis quibusdam, signis, et prodigiis, multisque sanctorum tam virorum quam mulierum visionibus, praetor spem futurum esse divinitus fuerat declaratum}. I partly support Matthew Mesley’s argument, who comes to a similar conclusion, but focuses on the dispute between York and Canterbury (Mesley, \textit{The Construction of Episcopal Identity}, p. 206).
\(^{1373}\) HA, p. 588–592. Having to administer a very large diocese, Remigius had to deal with problems of communication, administration and authority. These problems were meant to be solved with the institution of archdeaconries (Crosby, Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England, p. 290). The relationship between Remigius’ successor, Bishop Hugh, and his chapter was extraordinarily good (cf. chapter 5.1). Angelo Silvestri proposes that the same accounts for the relationship between Remigius and his chapter, because Remigius had recently established the offices of these men (Silvestri, \textit{Power, Politics and Episcopal Authority: The Bishops of Cremona and Lincoln in the Middle Ages (1066-1340)}, p. 78).
\(^{1374}\) Cf. \textit{Ad S. Langton}, p. 401–407.
the *Vita* does not mention any dealings Remigius had with monastic communities, although he had, for example, re-established the monastery of Eynsham.

Finally, Giraldus was a canon at Lincoln, and his closest friends held posts in the aforesaid chapter. These men played an important role in his life. For example, before he followed the summons from St Davids, Giraldus had discussed his second election as bishop of this diocese with his friends at Lincoln. We may safely assume that these people played a major role when Giraldus was writing the lives. Consequently, Giraldus could not omit references to the secular chapter of Lincoln in his narrative.

### 5.4.1.4 Remigius’ death before the consecration of Lincoln cathedral

Chapter five comprises two major topics: the first topic is concerned with alterations and improvements that Remigius made in his diocese and the other one deals with Remigius’ death.

The chapter starts with the description of the bad state of the diocese and relates how Remigius altered this state through his successful preaching. As many a holy bishop before and after him, Remigius is fighting on two fronts: he defends the rights and property of his church and battles for the faith of his flock.

Against avarice, perjury, nepotism and many more vices, Remigius is depicted as a *strenuus pastor*. According to Giraldus, Remigius did not only confine himself to his new residence at Lincoln, but kept on travelling through his diocese. While Matthew Mesley sees another emphasis on

---

1375 *MV*, p. IX. Giraldus’ disposition towards monks in general might provide an explanation for Matthew Mesley’s puzzled statement “The vita […] omits any real mention of his [= Remigius’] role as a vigorous proponent of reformed monasticism” (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 217).

1376 Cf. chapter 2.2.2.

1377 *VR*, p. 20–22.

1378 *VR*, p. 20. James Dimock remarks that Giraldus was the only author to write about the bad state of the diocese (*VR*, p. 20), yet these words might have found an echo in Matthew Paris (*clericis doctrina et moribus probatissimis decoravit*, cf. Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora, Volume Two: A.D. 1067 to A.D. 1216, p. 20).

1379 Cf. for more information Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 292–300.

1380 *VR*, p. 20.
the “territorial limits of the Lincoln diocese”\textsuperscript{1381}, I would like to mention that Giraldus must have highly appreciated a travelling bishop. For example, travelling the diocese and getting to know one’s faithful was one piece of advice which Giraldus gave Archbishop Stephen Langton in \textit{De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae} \textsuperscript{1382}.

The second part of the chapter deals with Remigius rather untimely death, only days before he intended to consecrate the cathedral. It is remarkable how Giraldus highlights Remigius’ good character and his complete devotion to the project: Of course, the first part of this chapter prepared the ground for judgements of Remigius as a \textit{vir magnanimus et Deo plenus}\textsuperscript{1383}. Giraldus pictured how Remigius had set his mind on pursuing the dedication of the church\textsuperscript{1384}. He had already invited every clergy- and laymen who flocked together in great numbers from every part of the country\textsuperscript{1385} – a circumstance meant to show how popular Remigius must have been. When Remigius finally died on 6 May 1092, the \textit{vir sanctus}, as Giraldus labels him, entered heaven\textsuperscript{1386}. The day of his death is even remembered in a saying\textsuperscript{1387}.

Why did Giraldus put so much rhetorical emphasis on the description of Remigius’ death?

Obviously, the untimely death could have been interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure and could have been used by York to reinforce its claims on the former diocese of Lindsey. It was therefore necessary for Giraldus to emphasize every other aspect mentioned in this chapter, so that the good aspects of Remigius’ life could overshadow his rather unfortunate time of death. Other sources have had different approaches and offer different details of the events. William of Malmesbury recorded an interesting incident:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Nam et magnanimi viri hortatu omnes undique pontifices regium edictum acciperat. Solus Roberthus Herefordensis venire abnuerat, et certa inspectione}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1381} Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{1382} JS, p. 113–114.
\textsuperscript{1383} A generous man, devoted to God (VR, p. 20).
\textsuperscript{1384} \textit{Tota mentis intentione [...] tantopere desideraverat} (VR, p. 20).
\textsuperscript{1385} \textit{Convocatis autem [...] numerum undique confluentibus infinitis} (VR, p. 20).
\textsuperscript{1386} Note the beautiful picture of exulting angels waiting at the gates of heaven (VR, p. 21).
\textsuperscript{1387} VR, p. 21. As already stated above, it may be regarded as a hint to potential oral sources from which Giraldus benefited.
5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

siderum dedicationem tempore Remigii non processuram viderat, nec tacuerat.

An edict and a call of the generous man had summoned all the bishops from everywhere. Only Robert of Herford had declined to come. He had foreseen in the stars that the dedication of the church would not take place during Remigius’ lifetime, and he had not been silent about it.

Even if Giraldus had known about this story, he would have had to omit it. After all, it would have shed further unfavourable light on Remigius’ untimely death, if a fellow bishop had foreseen it.

Another incident was narrated by Florence / John of Worcester: According to this chronicle, Remigius had felt his death approaching and thus had set his mind to dedicating the church of Lincoln. He was opposed by Archbishop Thomas of York, who renewed his claim on Lindsey. The situation was solved by the king. William Rufus was bribed and called together the bishops of England to attend the dedication.

Of course, Giraldus could not re-narrate this story for obvious reasons: First of all, he would have contradicted himself, because he had stated in the previous chapter that the quarrel about Lindsey had been settled. Furthermore, the confession that Remigius had bribed the king would have had negative effects for the process of canonization. After all, Giraldus could not risk that any incident described in the vita could be interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure.

5.4.2 Part two: Interpreting the miracles

Giraldus narrated fifteen miracles performed by Remigius. If we assume that they appear in chronological order, we can divide them into older and newer miracles: the first eight miracles must have appeared before 1170, whereas the remaining ones appeared after 1170. Chapter fourteen (that is, miracle number nine) is crucial for this distinction: it features the saintly intervention of Thomas Becket. Among the remaining miracles, miracle

\[^{1388} GP, p. 474.\]
\[^{1389} Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicex Chronicis, Tomus II, p. 30.\]
\[^{1390} VR, p. 22–31.\]
\[^{1391} VR, p. 27–28.\]
five (chapter nine) and miracle five (chapter ten) can be assigned to a
certain date. The miracle concerning the cure of a Jewess mentioned Bishop
Alexander, and thus must have taken place between 1123 and 1148\textsuperscript{1392}.
Miracle number five remarked that Remigius’ tomb was opened after 32
years, after the cathedral had been damaged by a fire\textsuperscript{1393}. Thus, it must have
taken place in 1124 (again under Bishop Alexander).

First, we shall look at the miracles that had happened before 1170: Five of
these eight miracles involve the healing of cripples, of whom two belonged
to families of members of the church\textsuperscript{1394}. With the healing of cripples,
Giraldus hints at a very famous predecessor of Remigius: in his life of St
Martin, Sulpicius Severus explicitly narrated how St Martin rescued a girl
in Trier that had been afflicted with this disease\textsuperscript{1395}. The remaining miracles
involve the cure of deafness and the incorrupt state of Remigius’ body,
when the grave had been opened\textsuperscript{1396}.

Interestingly, Giraldus is able to provide witnesses and further information
for the first six miracles\textsuperscript{1397}. Miracle one and three involve members of
families of the church. In miracle two, Giraldus knows the name of the
woman who had been cured – Leviva. Miracle four, the healing of a Jewess,
features the Jewess’ consecration by Bishop Alexander of Lincoln. In
miracle five, Giraldus tells of a Norman named Richard, who had tried to
pull some hairs out of Remigius’ beard and later died of a grave illness. In
contrast to the majority of miracles, which are acts of mercy (that is, the
curing of illness), this miracle is an act of power, for Remigius took revenge

\textsuperscript{1392} For a discussion of this miracle, cf. Mesley, ‘De Judaea, Muta et Surda’: Jewish Conversion
in Gerald of Wales’s Life of Saint Remigius, p. 244–246.
\textsuperscript{1393} VR, p. 25: Although Remigius had been lying for 32 years in the earth, his body was found
incorrupt and on the spot where it had been placed (\textit{cum annis iam xxxii. in terra iacuisset, 
adeo integrum ut ibi positum fuerat est inventum}). As James Dimock mentions, the entry in
the Annales of Margan mention a fire in Lincoln in 1122, but the text clearly says that the
\textit{episcopium} was not afflicted by the disaster (Cf. the entry in Annales Monastici, Volume
One: Annales de Margan (A.D. 1066-1232), Annales De Theokesberia (A.D. 1066-1263),
\textsuperscript{1394} These are: a young man belonging to the \textit{familia} of the treasurer William and another
young man of 14 years, from the family of the treasurer Jordan.
\textsuperscript{1395} Cf. Sulpicius Severus, Vita Martini, p. 112–114.
\textsuperscript{1396} VR, p. 25–26.
\textsuperscript{1397} As André Vauchez has shown, miracle-collections from Italy also saw the need for (eye-
)witnesses at the beginning of the 12th century (Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle
Ages, p. 34). Giraldus might have followed the \textit{Zeitgeist} and adapted the miracle-section of
this life to the increasing need for trustworthy (eye-)witnesses.
on the Norman. The last miracle in which a name is mentioned is miracle number six. It deals with the cure of the cripple Alveva de Navenby. Her healing was attested by neighbours and a priest. Only miracle number seven and eight feature the cures of nameless persons.

St Thomas Becket makes an appearance in miracle number nine (chapter fourteen). He appears to a blind woman in a vision, directing her to the tomb of “blessed Remigius, the first bishop of Lincoln”, where she would be cured. St Thomas praises Remigius:

\[ \text{Hunc enim mihi socium in Anglia dedit Deus: quem multis, in brevi, coram omni populo, signis et virtutibus magnificabit.} \]

God gave him to me as a companion in England, and in a short time, he will be glorified by many signs and virtues before the whole population.

Why should the martyred archbishop of Canterbury make an appearance in the life of a saint of Lincoln?

First of all, the murder of Thomas Becket caused an “hagiographical aftermath”. Soon he became the “standard by which all other saints were measured, and his cult was by far the most visible, marked by great public occasions”. Giraldus himself was not free of this influence. Yet I would suggest that he did not insert St Thomas for personal reasons. As Robert Bartlett remarked, other saints could benefit from the popularity St Thomas Becket enjoyed if the archbishop appeared in their lives. Another prominent appearance of Thomas Becket occurs in the preface, when Giraldus paints the following picture: Among the bishops of Lincoln, Hugh and Remigius resemble two lilies that shine with a snow-white glow,

---

1398 Cf. the distinction drawn up by Benedicta Ward (Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 34).
1399 Admittingly, Giraldus speaks of a man of Lincoln, who was cured of his deafness by Remigius in miracle number eight. This may be a hint at an oral source for the story.
1400 VR, p. 28.
1401 VR, p. 28.
1402 Bartlett, The Hagiography of Angevin England, p. 40. According to John Crook, a renewed interest in hagiographical activities already started two decades prior to Becket’s death, which in turn gave new strength to this movement (Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 170).
and in their midst, Thomas Becket, the rose of Canterbury, is to be found. Yet references like this do not necessarily mean that Remigius and Hugh succeed Thomas Becket in his opposition to the Crown. On the contrary, for Remigius and Hugh are lilies, not roses. They did not obtain their saintliness by shedding their blood for the Church, but because of their virtues.

After the appearance of St Thomas Becket, Giraldus mentioned another six miracles. In contrast to the older miracles, Remigius seemingly did not restrict himself to curing cripples or deafness: he cured a head-ache that had lasted for 10 years, two cripples, a dropsical and paralytic woman, a madman, two feverish men (a monk and a priest, both are grouped together in miracle fourteen), and, finally, a blind man. Besides one name in miracle thirteen, the assignment of certain dates (chapter ten to twelve, chapter fifteen), and indications of the places of origin of the cured (chapter eleven, chapter fifteen), no further information can be deduced from the newer miracles.

Towards the end of this part, Giraldus assures that he has only noted down the more evident miracles. This could be a rhetorical topos as well as reality: Rachel Koopmans draws attention to the fact that a lot of miracles may have happened if we take into consideration the huge number of pilgrims who visited a shrine.

It should be noted that Giraldus takes up the words spoken by St Thomas Becket in miracle number nine. While Becket had announced:

\[ Hunc enim mihi socium in Anglia dedit Deus: quem multis, in brevi, coram omni populo, signis et virtutibus magnificabit. \]

\[ \text{VR, p. 28.} \]

---

1405 VR, p. 4. The symbolic colours were used by Becket’s hagiographers as well (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 283–284).

1406 As interpreted by Peter Raleigh (Raleigh, Fere tirannicus, p. 168).

1407 Most important medieval shrines did not specialize on specific illnesses. On the contrary, every illness presented was cured (Wilson, Introduction, p. 18).

1408 Stephen Marrit remarks that the miracle section of Remigius’ life does not contain any references to barons, whereas in the life of St Hugh, magnates appear every now and then (Marrit, Secular Cathedrals and the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy, p. 154).

1409 VR, p. 30: Certiora tamen, et evidentioris fulta testimonio veritatis, stili officio comprehendimus (We have only written down those miracles that are safer and more evident, because they are supported by the testimony of the truth).


1411 VR, p. 28.
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God gave him to me as a companion in England, and in a short time, he will be glorified by many signs and virtues before the whole population.

Giraldus assures his readers in this passage:

_Multis quidem et aliis quae non sunt hic scripta miraculis, Dominus mirificavit in terris sanctum suum, et in conspectu populi totius tam magnifice glorificavit_"^1412.

With many other miracles, which are not written down here, the Lord magnifies his saint throughout the lands, and glorified him so splendidly in front of the whole population.

With this reference, Giraldus creates the impression that St Thomas’ words had indeed come true.

Now we should turn to Giraldus’ last remark in this passage, for it is both interesting and puzzling. Giraldus finishes the miracle-section by writing:

_Porro et hoc notandum, et quasi pro miraculo habendum occurrit, quod usque ad consummabilem ecclesiae cumulum beneficiis et oblationibus confluenter undique populi tam sumptuosum opus plene perfectum fuerat, et non amplius, crebra ad tumbam viri sancti miracula coruscabant_"^1413.

Furthermore, it also should be noted (and could indeed be regarded as another miracle), that frequent miracles shone at the tomb of the holy man until the perfectible roof of the church, a very expensive labour, had almost – and not further! – been finished thanks to the benefits and offerings of the people that flowed together from everywhere.

When we remember the beginning of CCCC 425, we are reminded that Giraldus was looking forward to the canonization of both Hugh of Lincoln and Remigius. As the cult of St Hugh had already begun to flourish after the bishop had died, Hugh probably had the best chance to be canonized^1414. But what about Remigius, the first bishop of Lincoln? He had actually gained a strong rival in successor Hugh. Thus, Giraldus emphasized that

---

^1412 VR, p. 30.
^1414 Farmer, Hugh of Lincoln, Carthusian Saint, p. 13–14.
Remigius had been performing miracles continuously for more than 100 years, because the local population was very devoted to him.

5.4.3 Part three: Remigius’ episcopal successors

Igitur vita beati Remigii sub stili brevitate transcursa, subsequentium antistitum nomina summatim et acta perstringere non incongruum reputavi.

Well, as I have written down the life of St Remigius with brief words, I do not consider it unfitting to name his successors in their chronological order, and to roam through their deeds.

Part three of the *Vita S. Remigii* deals with Remigius’ successors: Robert Bloet (1094–1123), Alexander ‘the Magnificent’ (1123–1148), Robert de Chesney (1148–1166), Geoffrey Plantagenet (1173–1183), Walter de Coutances (1183–1184) and, finally, Hugh of Avalon (1186–1200). This part recalls the structure of a *Liber Pontificalis*. After a brief introduction to each bishop, Giraldus weighs up their positive and negative deeds.

Giraldus adheres to a fixed structure: Having given the name of the successor, he explains where each person came from. The only exception is made in the case of Geoffrey Plantagenet. Giraldus’ reason for doing so
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may be rather simple: it is unnecessary to explain which nation the son of the king belonged to.

Afterwards, Giraldus weighs up the good and bad deeds of each bishop. We may detect a pattern, because the situation for Lincoln worsens from successor to successor.

As Giraldus observes:

*Crevit ergo dioecesis Lincolniensis per Remigium; sed decrevit enormiter per Robertum et Robertum*\(^\text{1426}\).

So the diocese of Lincoln flourished because of Remigius, but its flourishing decreased enormously from Robert to Robert.

A turning point is reached when Geoffrey is made bishop of Lincoln, yet neither he nor Walter de Coutances stay in office until their deaths. At last, the tide is turned when Hugh of Avalon came to the see.

Although both Geoffrey and (with the exception of one grave criticism) Walter de Coutances seem to be good men, Giraldus chose to highlight how they owed their promotion to the king\(^\text{1427}\). In contrast, Giraldus uses the following phrase for Hugh of Avalon:

*Unde transmissus postmodum prior in Angliam in cellula de Witham, regis Henrici secundi, qui forestam ubi sita est cellula venandi studio frequentare, locumque ea occasione atque priorem visitare consueverat, familiaritatem in brevi et favorem adeptus, in Lincolniensi ecclesia est sublimatus*\(^\text{1428}\).

After he [= Hugh] had become prior of Witham, he was raised to the church of Lincoln, *after / because* he had in a short time gained the friendship and favour of the king, who had used to visit this place and its priory, when he had frequently hunted in the forest where the church lies.

The participle may either have temporal or causal connotation, and it is up to the reader to decide. Because most contemporaries probably imagined that King Henry insisted on Hugh as future bishop of Lincoln, any blunt lie

\(^\text{1426}\) *VR*, p. 35.
\(^\text{1427}\) *VR*, p. 36 and p. 38.
\(^\text{1428}\) *VR*, p. 39–40. Highlights in the translation are my own.
would have been detected easily\textsuperscript{1429}. So, Giraldus chose a wording that still contained the possibility of obscuring the connection between St Hugh, King Henry, and the latter’s involvement in the election of the bishop. In terms of the similarities between Remigius and St Hugh, it is remarkable that Remigius had the king’s familiaritas and notitia, whereas Hugh had obtained his familiaritas and favor in a very short time\textsuperscript{1430}.

Within these pages, Hugh rebuilds and renews what Remigius had begun in his diocese. Remigius had endowed the cathedral chapter with good men, and so did Hugh. Remigius had given prebends to the chapter and Hugh restored previously lost prebends. Remigius had built a church and Hugh rebuilt parts of it. Hugh even re-established the monastery of Eynsham that had been re-founded by Remigius\textsuperscript{1431}. Meanwhile, Hugh undid the wrongs his predecessors (that is, Remigius’ successors) had afflicted onto the diocese. For example, he stopped the paying of the gift of the mantle. Even in character, both men seemed to be alike, because, among other things, both men were extremely devoted to their see\textsuperscript{1432}.

For the successor-part of the VR, Giraldus chose to apply a circular structure. Starting with Remigius (a good bishop), the situation of the diocese gradually worsens under his successors, until the tide slowly turns when Geoffrey Plantagenet is promoted to the see\textsuperscript{1433}. Yet Geoffrey is not equal to Remigius, whose true successor is finally found in Hugh of Avalon. Obviously, we are dealing with a circular structure.

\textsuperscript{1429} In Hugh’s life, Giraldus insists on a canonical election (as in the case of Remigius): Cf. VH, p. 12. In Roger of Howden’s words, Henry gave Hugh the bishopric (\textit{dedit}, cf. R. Howd. 2, p. 308–309). According to Adam of Eynsham, Henry intended to give Hugh a bishopric when he was saved by Hugh’s intercession in a violent storm (MV1, p. 73–74).

\textsuperscript{1430} VR, p. 14 and p. 40.

\textsuperscript{1431} Cf. Bates, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{1432} Compare VR, p. 18: “Because of his character, his manners, and his good deeds, Remigius served as an exemplar to all good men” with VR, p. 42: “Because of so much goodness and uprightness, so much virtue and honour [… Hugh of Lincoln …] proved himself worthy of being offered as an exemplum”.

\textsuperscript{1433} A much more warlike portrait of Geoffrey is painted in Galf., p. 363–368.
And now we should look at the similarities between Remigius and Hugh that Giraldus constructed in his text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remigius</th>
<th>Hugh of Avalon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Normandy (that is, not from England)</td>
<td>From Burgundy (that is, not from England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading ten knights into battle</td>
<td>Born in a knightly family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Familiaritas</em> and <em>notitia</em> of the king</td>
<td><em>Familiaritas</em> and favor of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern preacher, devoted to his diocese</td>
<td>Devoted to his diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established the secular chapter</td>
<td>Doubles the prebends of the secular chapter and regains those previously lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds the cathedral</td>
<td>Re-builds the cathedral (choir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves the problem with Lindsey</td>
<td>Re-deems the payment of the mantle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Comparing Remigius and Hugh of Lincoln in the VR**

As we can see, similarities in the biography of both men are found remarkably often. It may be remarked that in the VR, Hugh’s deeds are measured against the deeds of Remigius – in Giraldus’ words, Hugh is the best bishop of Lincoln after the blessed Remigius (*post beatum Remigium*)!\(^{1434}\)

---

\(^{1434}\) *VR*, p. 42.
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5.4.4 Part four: The copula tergemina

The last part of the life of Remigius is the copula tergemina, a collection of exempla of six praiseworthy bishops of Giraldus’ lifetime who are presented in three groups of pairs.

Although the value of personal information contained in the copula is appreciated, this part of the VR has largely received poor treatment by scholars: James Dimock calls it “idle gossip of the day”, Brynley Roberts considers this part “wholly irrelevant to the main theme”, and Jon Cannon wonders – with regard to the treatment of St Hugh in the copula – whether “the incumbent bishop, rather than the dead one, was the real focus of attention”.

I would propose quite the contrary.

First of all, I do not think that this part would have survived Giraldus’ constant editing, adding, and re-writing, if it were indeed ‘wholly irrelevant’ to the life of Remigius. As already explained above in chapter 5.2.3, the copula tergemina must have belonged to the first edition of the life of Remigius. Thus, Giraldus must have intended to write this part from the beginning.

Another feature of this passage is interesting: in the copula, Hugh of Lincoln makes another appearance. Once again, he is the last of a group of six bishops – as he was in part three of the VR, the successor-part. At first, this might have been a chance-parallel: when Giraldus wrote the first version of the VR in about 1199, Hugh of Lincoln was still living and thanks to given circumstances, Giraldus was able to construct a parallel of six successors and six praiseworthy bishops in part three and four of the VR. This symmetry was created purposefully, because Giraldus did not change it when he added the life of St Hugh to the already existing VR and rewrote both parts. During his process of rewriting, it would have been easy to

---

1435 VR, p. 43–80.
1436 Cf. the statement of Jeffrey West, who judges that with regard to Giraldus’ description of Henry of Blois, “the value of Gerald of Wales’s account […] cannot be overstated” (West, A Taste for the Antique? Henry of Blois and the Arts, p. 213).
1437 VR, p. XLI.
1439 Cannon, Cathedral, p. 364. If so, Giraldus dedicated to him a “short and disorganised account” (Hugh, p. 3) in the copula.
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compose some lines on Hugh’s immediate successor, William of Blois (1203–1206) and add some more information until the text would have reached the time of Hugh of Wells. Adding two successors to part three would have even allowed Giraldus to add two more examples of praiseworthy bishops in part four. Given the events during the Interdict, we may suppose that Giraldus would have found bishops to whom he could assign values and behaviour already displayed by St Thomas. He could even have mentioned Stephen Langton, who was busy creating his own connection with his saintly predecessor. Indeed, Giraldus re-furnished passages of the copula for the second or third edition of the VR. A prominent alteration may be detected at the end of part four, where Giraldus said that Hugh of Lincoln would not be able to obtain the rose-crown of a martyr anymore. Giraldus could only have made such a statement for version two or three of the VR, because Hugh of Lincoln died in 1200.

Despite the rewriting of certain passages of the VR, Giraldus chose to keep the symmetry for the copula tergemina from version one of the VR. We thus have to conclude that it was important for him to begin the life of Remigius with Remigius and end the vita with Hugh of Lincoln.

Now, we may ask: What may have been the role and function of this fourth part of the life of Remigius?

The use of exempla in a narration is obvious: an exemplum may illustrate a virtue (or vice) easier than any theoretical remarks. Giraldus’ choice of illustrious bishops is not as obvious. Brynley Roberts suggested that the selection may show “a degree of personal predilection.”

This may well be true. Giraldus did not enter new territory within this part, for he had already written about each bishop on previous occasions. Thus, he was able to take many passages from other works and incorporate them into the respective description of each bishop. Giraldus knew Baldwin of

---

1440 For example, during his first exile on the continent (Vincent, Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 81).
1441 Cf. VR, p. 80.
1442 Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 33.
1443 A lot of these quotations have been identified by James Dimock (cf. the footnotes in VR, p. 43–77). He identified passages taken from De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, Gemma Ecclesiastica, Expugnatio Hibernica, De Principis Instructione, Itinerarium Kambriae and De Invectionibus.
Canterbury and Hugh of Lincoln personally. Moreover, he had been admiring Thomas Becket for years. We may suppose that he appreciated Henry of Winchester as well, for he appears in *Speculum Ecclesiae* and Roger of Worcester, who appears in *De Rebus*. Yet there may be more to Giraldus’ choice of bishops than meet the eye.

First of all, it is possible to assign each pair of bishops to a different group: the ecclesiastics close to the secular power (Henry of Winchester and Thomas Becket), the erudite bishops (the rhetorical abilities of Bartholomew of Exeter and Roger of Worcester are frequently highlighted) and, finally, the monk bishops (Baldwin of Canterbury and Hugh of Lincoln). They roughly reflect the groups from which bishops were promoted: those who had ties with the court (Robert Bartlett called them ‘royal clerks’), the ‘ecclesiastical clerks’ and the ‘monks/secular canons’. Thus, Giraldus would have picked an example of a good bishop from each of the groups that had been promoted to a bishopric. Furthermore, Remigius himself shows all these characteristics, as we have examined in the previous chapters: the former monk was close to the dominant secular power of his time, William the Conqueror, and he was “abundantly literate.”

If we examine the *copula tergmina*, we encounter three other remarkable features: first of all, the dominant topic and red thread of the *copula* is St Thomas Becket, to whom Giraldus attributes several wonders. He is not only one of the six praiseworthy bishops, but references to him can be found in every other *exempla*-passage: in the case of Henry of Winchester, the bishop’s deed during St Thomas’ consecration and his opinions on St Thomas (living and dead) are narrated. In the case of Bartholomew of Exeter, Giraldus narrated how the bishop received the confession of one of the miracles mentioned in this part concern Roger of Worcester (p. 64, the fall of the tower of Gloucester that caused no victims) and Hugh of Lincoln (p. 73–77, the mystery of his pet swan and his rescue from the temptations of the flesh). The scene with Hugh’s pet swan is quoted by Adam of Eynsham, who refers explicitly to Giraldus (MV, p. 104–106).

---

1444 They appeared as well in Giraldus’ other works. For example, in *Speculum Ecclesiae*, both Baldwin and Hugh are the only exceptions to Giraldus’ negative attitude towards bishops, who were regal appointees (*Spec.*, p. 345).

1445 Interestingly, besides Henry of Winchester, only Remigius of Lincoln and St Hugh of Lincoln are given as an exception to the rule that monks should not be made bishops (*Spec.*, p. 80). Henry of Winchester’s death is also described in *De Principis Instructione* (*PI*, p. 550).

1446 Cf. *RG*, p. 43, where Giraldus tells of a personal meeting with this bishop.

1447 For the changing importance of these three groups, cf. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, p. 397.

1448 *VR*, p. 14: *copiose literatus*.

1449 Mesley, *The Construction of Episcopal Identity*, p. 237. Cf. *VR*, p. 50–56, p. 65–66, p. 72. Further miracles mentioned in this part concern Roger of Worcester (p. 64, the fall of the tower of Gloucester that caused no victims) and Hugh of Lincoln (p. 73–77, the mystery of his pet swan and his rescue from the temptations of the flesh). The scene with Hugh’s pet swan is quoted by Adam of Eynsham, who refers explicitly to Giraldus (MV, p. 104–106).
St Thomas’ murderers and how the king swore an oath contrary to this confession. Roger of Worcester followed the example of St Thomas, when it came to not conferring benefices to his relations and a wonder announcing the martyrdom of the saint occurred in his diocese. Finally, Giraldus narrated how both bishops adhered to St Thomas when he was in exile in France. Of course, St Thomas appears also in the passages on Baldwin of Canterbury, for he was one of the later one’s predecessors. Allusions to St Thomas can also be found in the passages on Hugh of Lincoln. The saint is not only the connecting thread of the whole part of the VR, he also serves as a link between the different bishops.1450

We could also examine the selection of bishops from the point of view of time. Giraldus proceeded with his narration from the oldest bishop (Henry of Winchester) to Hugh of Lincoln, who had died recently. Each pair consists of bishops who were roughly contemporaries. As already observed for the life of St David and the life of St Ethelbert, Giraldus emphasizes the issue of continuity.1451

Finally, Giraldus’ choice of examples is remarkable, if we consider the geographical distribution of each see. If the diocesan towns are located on a map, we realize that they either form or are part of the Southern (Exeter, Winchester), Eastern (Canterbury), Western (Worcester) and Northern (Lincoln) boundaries of the diocese of Canterbury, when we omit cities and dioceses either located in Wales or at the Welsh border (Hereford, for example). This makes the six praiseworthy bishops part of a certain ‘landscape’. It is, indeed, a ‘holy landscape’, for the bishops all follow the example of St Thomas Becket. Thus, the copula tergemina is far from idle gossip of the day: it has the important function of linking the seat of Lincoln (and its bishops) with other, famous and venerable places of worship, both temporally and geographically.

---

1450 As S. T. Ambler remarks, Thomas Becket is not the only connection for the whole community of English bishops in the thirteenth century: they are also connected through the (English) saints, among whom St Hugh has to be counted (Ambler, Bishops in the Political Community of England, 1213–1272, p. 20–21).

1451 Cf. chapter 3.5 and 4.4.
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5.4.5 The micro-structure of the life of Remigius

As Giraldus states plainly in the preface, the life of Remigius had one major *causa scribendi*: it was written to corroborate Lincoln’s claim that its first bishop, Remigius, deserved to be canonized. We have observed how Giraldus is at pains to depict the bishop in a most favourable light during the biography-part. The same may be observed in the miracle section, in which St Thomas Becket appears. Giraldus probably wrote this passage so that Remigius (and Lincoln) might benefit from the enormous popularity the murdered archbishop of Canterbury enjoyed.

But in the life of Remigius, Giraldus not only advocated the cause of Remigius’ holiness. As I have laid out above, he drew close parallels between Lincoln’s first bishop and its incumbent one. When Hugh first appears is in the successors-part, he is Remigius’ true successor, who helps to rebuild the church of Lincoln (literally and figuratively speaking). Afterwards, in the *exempla*-section, Hugh makes another appearance.

This time, Giraldus manages to locate the seat of Lincoln in a continuity of (if not saintly, then illustrious) bishops, from Henry of Winchester to Hugh of Avalon. These bishops stand in line with the famous St Thomas Becket, on whose fame they draw. Becket’s cult in Canterbury may be regarded as the centre of a holy landscape, in which Lincoln is also located.
5.5 Interpreting the content of the life of St Hugh

Giraldus was the only author who undertook the task of writing a life for the prospective saint Remigius of Lincoln. The situation was different in 1200, when Hugh of Lincoln died. Several vitae of St Hugh have come down to us, among them a biography written by Adam of Eynsham, Hugh’s chaplain. In contrast to Adam of Eynsham’s Magna Vita, Giraldus’ life of St Hugh has not received the most favourable judgement. Consequently, scholars examining Giraldus’ life of St Hugh have felt the need to justify themselves:

Giraldus was certainly not Hugh’s equal in virtue, nor does his short life match the voluminous and persuasive detail of the Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis attributed to Adam of Eynsham. But there are grounds for recognising Giraldus as a man capable of appreciating Hugh of Avalon and for judging his Life of St Hugh a sensitive tribute to the Bishop of Lincoln that contributed significantly to his public cult.

Despite several harsh judgements from scholars, Giraldus’ vita must have been popular among his contemporaries. Dean Roger of Rolleston, who was not only a friend of Giraldus but also a witness during the canonization process of St Hugh, asked Giraldus to add further parts to the vita. Adam of Eynsham, who had obviously read the life of St Remigius (version one) hints at other texts, written by ‘more competent writers’, that he had studied for his Magna Vita. Furthermore, he admits that he left out some aspects of Hugh’s biography, because other writers had already written

---

1452 For the hagiographical material on St Hugh, cf. BHL, no. 4018–4030 and BHL_Suppl., no. 4018–4030b. Giraldus’ vita may be found under BHL, no. 4020 and BHL_Suppl., no. 4020.
1453 Cf. for example James Dimock’s harsh judgement: “This treatise is, in fact, except some small part from his own acquaintance with St. Hugh, a simple compilation of what he was told and found recorded at Lincoln. It has none of his usual classical and scholastic vagaries; it seems to have been penned without his heart or scholarly labour in it. He was not the man really to appreciate such a man as St. Hugh, notwithstanding his expressed admiration and reverence of him; and this life seems to me to have been the work of a man who was doing a task set him, not the work of a labour of love” (VR, p. LIII).
1454 Loomis, Giraldus de Barri’s Homage to Hugh of Avalon, p. 29. Richard Loomis has published the latest edition of the text (cf. VH) and the latest most extensive treatment of the whole life was undertaken by Matthew Mesley (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 241–316).
1455 VH, p. 68.
1456 MV1, p. 3 and p. 104–106.
about them\textsuperscript{1457}. And, a few years later, it was not Adam of Eynsham’s \textit{Magna Vita} that was partly incorporated into the canonization report for St Hugh, but Giraldus’ \textit{Vita S. Hugonis}\textsuperscript{1458}.

For the sake of comparison, Giraldus’ \textit{VH} will be contrasted with Adam of Eynsham’s \textit{Magna Vita}. Adam’s account is rich in very personal information about Hugh’s life. If Giraldus and Adam depict similar events of Hugh’s biography, we may even examine the different points of view and the diverse aspects both authors emphasized.

Two further sources for comparison have to be mentioned: the \textit{Legenda} of St Hugh and the \textit{Metrical Life of St Hugh}, written by Henry of Avranches († 1262). Both texts heavily depend on their textual predecessors: the commissioners’ report for the canonization process of St Hugh formed the basis of Hugh’s \textit{Legenda}\textsuperscript{1459}. The \textit{Metrical Life}, written after the canonization of St Hugh, leans on the accounts of Giraldus and Adam\textsuperscript{1460}.

Similar to the life of Remigius, a separate preface precedes the life of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1461}. The \textit{proœmium} starts right after the list of chapters, too. Dealing with the benefits of reading saints’ lives, it resembles the preface of the life of St Malachy written by Bernhard of Clairvaux\textsuperscript{1462}. At the end of this preface, Giraldus sets out the plan of his life. It consists of two parts, the first dealing with Hugh’s biography and the second narrating the miracles. Giraldus did not explicitly mention \textit{distinctio three}, that is, the miracle part whose chapter list appears on an additional leaf\textsuperscript{1463}.

\textsuperscript{1457} \textit{MV2}, p. 145. Although Giraldus’ life is not explicitly mentioned, Adam could have hinted at this text.
\textsuperscript{1458} Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{1459} Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 87–88.
\textsuperscript{1460} \textit{Hugh}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{1461} \textit{VH}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{1463} CCCC 425, f. 46ar.
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5.5.1 Distinctio I: Hugh’s biography

5.5.1.1 Part one: Hugh’s time in France

Hugh’s biography (that is, distinctio I) comprises chapter one to eleven. Chapter one starts with Hugh’s childhood and upbringing. It finishes with his promotion to the bishopric of Lincoln. Giraldus had already applied this structure in his depiction of Remigius’ biography: the first chapter contains the life of the saint up to his consecration as bishop of Lincoln, while the next chapters focus on his episcopal qualities.

5.5.1.1.1 Hugh’s early years

Giraldus starts his biographical part of St Hugh’s life by mentioning Hugh’s foreign, aristocratic origin: Hugh was from Burgundy (hence he is also called ‘Hugh of Avalon’) and he was a natural born son of a knightly family. As Karl Leyser noted, Hugh’s birth outside England marks him as a foreigner, an outsider in English society, and thus enables him to pursue a career as a holy man.

Giraldus describes how Hugh was educated from a very early age (aetate tenerrima) and how he became a canon at Villarbenoit at the age of ten years, when he and his father entered the convent. There, his education was deepened, and later, Hugh was made prior of the cell of St Maximus. According to Giraldus, Hugh fled from the women who used to frequent

1464 VH, p. 8–36.
1465 VH, p. 8–12.
1466 Cf. chapter 5.4.1.1. and 5.4.1.2.
1467 VH, p. 8–10.
1468 VH, p. 8. The Legenda follows the assertion that Hugh’s parents belonged to the ordo militaris (Legenda, p. 172). For the castle of Avalon and Hugh’s brothers, cf. VH, p. 109–110.
1470 VH, p. 8.
1471 VH, p. 10. Adam of Eynsham narrated how Hugh ruled the cell as its prior (MV1, p. 18–19).
this place, and made for the Grand Chartreuse, where he became a Carthusian monk.

In the first passages of chapter one of the *VH*, Giraldi emphasizes three points: first of all, Hugh’s aristocratic background and the benefits (that is, his education for God) he enjoyed because he belonged to the social upper class. Hugh’s noble birth was also emphasized by Adam of Eynsham. Interestingly, Giraldi also attributes an aristocratic air to Remigius, when he makes him a decurio leading ten knights of Fécamp to England.

Secondly, Hugh is depicted as being meant for God’s service from an extremely young age: he becomes a canon at Villarbenoit when he is about ten years old. At Villarbenoit, Hugh’s vocation (and his later path to saintliness) was soon recognized. Therefore, Hugh was prepared for his future achievements by his teacher, who is said to have prophesized: “To God above I send you, and to God you will go, there is no doubt.” In the end, Hugh was ordained prior when he was only fifteen years old. In Giraldi’s depiction, Hugh’s path to God was already chosen from the start: his route to holiness was not marked by a dramatic turning point, instead, it was a continuous process.

Finally, Hugh’s literacy is brought up several times: he was educated for God’s service from when he was very young, before he entered the convent. At Villarbenoit, Hugh was drawn to literary and theological studies by a teacher. Instead of pagan authors, Hugh read the 5th century author Prudentius (possibly his *Psychomachia*), Sedulius Scotus (9th century), possibly the Mythographer Fulgentius (6th century) and similar...
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authors\textsuperscript{1484}. This hard education paid off. Later in his life, Hugh was able to quote from a trustworthy and unfailing memory.

At the same time, Giraldus narrated that the process was sometimes too harsh for the child Hugh, and so the future saint had to be castigated by his teacher. In contrast to the life of St Ethelbert, Hugh is not depicted as an old child – at least not all the times, for if he were, the beating would not be necessary\textsuperscript{1482}. The whole passage might also contain echoes of the famous dream-vision of Jerome, where Jerome receives a holy beating for having read Cicero\textsuperscript{1483}. Even before Hugh would undergo the ascetic labours of the Carthusian order, he was already separated from his surrounding world. His hard work and obedience would later inspire awe in other men.

5.5.1.1.2 Hugh at the Grand Chartreuse and his mission in England\textsuperscript{1484}

Hugh embraced the Carthusian rigour of the Grand Chartreuse with “spontaneous and saintly devotion”\textsuperscript{1485}. He even forgot his native soil and chose not to visit friends or relatives, so as to embrace God with his whole being.

The Grand Chartreuse lies no more than 40 km distant from Saint-Maximin. The Carthusian order is famous for its strict rule, which Giraldus chose to highlight. He speaks of the severe life and the strong devotion to religion\textsuperscript{1486}, the strictness of the order\textsuperscript{1487}, and the permanent abstinence\textsuperscript{1488}. All these characteristics of a Carthusian lifestyle compelled Hugh to leave the Augustinian order. Giraldus depicts him as “truly given to God”\textsuperscript{1489} and adds the fact that Hugh also fled from the temptation of the women of Saint-Maximin\textsuperscript{1490}. The \textit{Metrical Life} dwells on this point by adding the story about a young woman who fell in love with Hugh and was rejected by

\textsuperscript{1481} VH, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{1482} Cf. chapter 4.3.2.1 and Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{1483} The dream of Jerome also appears in \textit{PI}, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{1484} VH, p. 10–12.
\textsuperscript{1485} VH, p. 10: \textit{spontanea sancta cum devotione}.
\textsuperscript{1486} \textit{Austerioris vitae causa et ar\textit{clitoris religionis gratia} (VH, p. 10).
\textsuperscript{1487} \textit{Duritiam ordinis} (VH, p. 10).
\textsuperscript{1488} \textit{Abstinentias ceteras et afflictiones corporis graves, omni loco et tempore carnium esum abhorret, et iugi cilicio riget} (VH, p. 10).
\textsuperscript{1489} \textit{Vir Deo datus} (VH, p. 10) and \textit{vir Deo ex toto datus} (VH, p. 12).
\textsuperscript{1490} VH, p. 10.
The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

5. The saints of Lincoln: The lives of Remigius and St Hugh

him⁴⁹⁸. Stories like these often function as both council and solace for its audiences, for they proved that even a saint might be troubled by the temptation of the flesh⁴⁹².

The focus on the Carthusian’s abstinence is an important detail for Hugh’s (expected) saintly career. First of all, saints were expected to fast even more than other people⁴⁹³. Gluttony was one of the major sins a Christian could commit. Being able to fast and reign over one’s gluttony means that other temptations could be resisted as well⁴⁹⁴. Furthermore, fasting could be more easily expected from monks than from bishops: from a practical point of view, fasting would have been too great a burden for a man already burdened with episcopal duties⁴⁹⁵. As has already been noted above in the case of Bishop Remigius, who cared for the wellbeing of the poor, bishops were expected to show a great amount of hospitality and had to act like good hosts⁴⁹⁶. Adam of Eynsham narrates how during his time as bishop, Hugh made an exception to this rule, to strengthen his body for the episcopal duties he had to perform⁴⁹⁷.

At the Grand Chartreuse, birds and squirrels serve as Hugh’s companions. He even shares his meals with them. Here, we may detect an echo of Jesus sharing bread⁴⁹⁸. On the other hand, Giraldus might also have been alluding to Hugh’s future time as bishop of Lincoln, where he would be surrounded by his canons and by his famous animal companion, the swan at Stow⁴⁹⁹. The animals serve as link connecting Hugh’s time at the Chartreuse with his time as prior of the English foundation, Witham. The topos ‘companionship of animals’ itself is not new, it can be detected quite early in saints’ lives⁵⁰⁰. In the scene at the Chartreuse, the animals’ behaviour serves to exemplify Hugh’s holiness. Animals are part of God’s creation, and are therefore loved by the saint⁵⁰¹. Furthermore, the

---

¹⁴⁹¹ Hugh, p. 18–22.
¹⁴⁹² Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 84.
¹⁴⁹⁷ MV1, p. 126.
¹⁴⁹⁸ Cf. Luc. 22,19, Matth. 26,26, or Marc. 14,22.
¹⁴⁹⁹ VH, p. 30–34.
¹⁵⁰⁰ Alexander, Saints and Animals in the Middle Ages, p. 35. For more examples of saints and their companion animals, cf. Walker-Meikle, Medieval Pets, p. 20–23. She also mentions Hugh and his swan at Stow (cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.5 for the appearance of the swan).
¹⁵⁰¹ Walker-Meikle, Medieval Pets, p. 21.
obedience of these animals serves as an indicator for the amount of grace Hugh has already reached\textsuperscript{1502}. After all, animals recognise his saintly virtues even earlier than the people\textsuperscript{1503}.

Hugh’s separation from the world gained intensity and he transformed more and more into a holy man. Consequently, his fame grew. Because of Hugh’s eminence, he was sent to the newly founded cell of Witham as its prior and teacher\textsuperscript{1504}.

Giraldus claimed that it was Hugh’s fame that gave the reason for his sending\textsuperscript{1505}. Carthusian tradition proclaims that Hugh came on the special request of King Henry II. As Adam of Eynsham puts it: Henry II had realized that he needed a worthy prior for the newly founded Witham, for the previous priors did accomplish nothing. He was given advice to ask for the Carthusian monk Hugh, living at the Grand Chartreuse. Henry accepted the advice and sent for Hugh\textsuperscript{1506}.

In the first chapter of the life of Remigius, Remigius is said to have gained \textit{regisque notitiam}, his \textit{familiaritas} and his \textit{favor}\textsuperscript{1507}. Similar to Remigius, Hugh is favoured by King Henry II. He is said to have gained \textit{regisque notitam}, the notion of the king, and his \textit{familiaritas} and \textit{dilectio}\textsuperscript{1508}. For St Hugh, Karl Leyser notes that, as long as kingship had not lost its sacrality, the spheres of holy men and kings seldom touched. Now that the Angevin kings were about to lose their sacral qualities, they meet holy men, like Hugh of Lincoln, to whom they could listen and from whom they would

\textsuperscript{1502} Alexander, Saints and Animals in the Middle Ages, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{1503} In the context of this scene, Giraldus claims that the animals recognise Hugh’s beniginity, his innocence, and the fact that he was a simple and unharming man (cf. \textit{VH}, p. 10–12), for “in the person of the saint, who is utterly obedient to God, the conditions of Eden are restored” (Alexander, Saints and Animals in the Middle Ages, p. 30).

\textsuperscript{1504} \textit{VH}, p. 12. King Henry II is credited with the foundation of Witham. For St Hugh and Witham, cf. chapter 5.1. The date of the foundation is rather unclear and the \textit{VH} does not help to solve this dating problem, because, in Giraldus’ words, the event took place recently (\textit{nuper}, \textit{VH}, p. 12). For further information, cf. the discussion in Knowles, The Monastic Order in England, p. 381.

\textsuperscript{1505} \textit{VH}, p. 12. In the \textit{successiores}-part of the \textit{VR}, Giraldus did not explain why Hugh was sent to England (cf. \textit{VR}, p. 39–40).

\textsuperscript{1506} \textit{MV}, p. 46–49 and p. 54–59. Cf. as well the similar account of Roger of Wendover (\textit{Wend.}, p. 302–303). The \textit{Legenda} and Henry of Avranches depict the king’s choice as some sort of amendment for his previous wrong doings (\textit{Legenda}, p. 173 and \textit{Hugh}, p. 44).


\textsuperscript{1508} \textit{VH}, p. 12. The fondness of King Henry for Hugh can also be found in the \textit{Metrical Life} (Hugh, p. 36).
receive help and guidance. Thus, the holy man’s field of action is notably enlarged\textsuperscript{1509}.

At the end of this chapter, Hugh is canonically elected as bishop of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1510}. In Giral当地’ account, Hugh already has the \textit{vox populi}, for the consent of the population (and of the chapter and noble men) is explicitly mentioned in his life\textsuperscript{1511}. It is tempting to argue that the \textit{vox populi} in this scene is also a first sign of Hugh’s future saintliness.

The story of Hugh’s election is told differently by Adam of Eynsham, who narrated how Hugh ignored the summons of archbishop and king, and afterwards the second, canonical election of the chapter of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1512}. Both authors agree that Hugh had been elected canonically, yet only Adam draws the parallel between Hugh’s behaviour and the behaviour of St Martin before his election as bishop of Tours\textsuperscript{1513}.

The question is, why did Giral当地us not refer to St Hugh as St Martin in a similar way to Adam of Eynsham? After all, a saint’s refusal to become bishop is an old, established hagiographical \textit{topos}. On the one hand, Giral当地us might not have known about the events of 1186. He had spent the previous year in Ireland, and had returned to Wales / England somewhere between Easter and Whitsun 1186\textsuperscript{1514}, but our knowledge of Giral当地us’ precise whereabouts as a royal clerk is unfortunately vague. Yet, Giral当地us had excellent connections to the chapter of Lincoln and it is very likely that a story about such an extraordinary behaviour would have circulated among Giral当地us’ colleagues. Maybe Giral当地us felt that a refusal may also have been interpreted as a sting against ecclesiastical careerists\textsuperscript{1515}. In that case, the absence of this popular hagiographical \textit{topos} could be explained with Giral当地us’ ambitions for becoming bishop of St Davids. He was one of those careerists against whom the \textit{topos} would have been partly directed.

\textsuperscript{1509} Leyser, The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man, p. 52–53.
\textsuperscript{1510} VH, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{1511} VH, p. 12: \textit{populique totius applausu}.
\textsuperscript{1512} MV1, p. 92–94 and p. 96–98. Cf. furthermore the emphasis on Hugh’s canonical election in the \textit{Legenda} (\textit{Legenda}, p. 173–174).
\textsuperscript{1513} Cf. Sulpicius Severus, \textit{Vita Martini}, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{1514} Davies, Giral当地us Cambrensis, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{1515} Cf. Reames, Popular Images of Saintly Bishops in Late Medieval England, p. 240.
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5.5.1.1.3 Hugh’s time in France: Comparison of the accounts of Giraldus and Adam of Eynsham

A comparison between Giraldus’ and Adam of Eynsham’s description of Hugh’s early years before he became bishop of Lincoln should be read with caution: we cannot deduce their reliability from the degree of intimacy they show with Hugh’s life. After all, both Giraldus and Adam were accompanied by Hugh. Admittingly, Adam was even closer to the bishop, for he served as his chaplain, and Giraldus was abroad for some years.

Furthermore, we do not know the extent to which both authors depend on each other. In the case of Adam’s *Magna Vita*, we can find some explicit remarks signalling that he was aware of other authors writing around the same time. For example, Adam claimed that he did not want to repeat what others have written about in great detail, for he knew that he was lacking the literary skill to do so1516.

In contrast to Adam, we do not know for sure what Giraldus knew about other activities concerned with a life of St Hugh. Neither do we know for sure if Giraldus knew about the books his friend from Eynsham abbey was writing. The following reference might be a hint at the knowledge that Giraldus possessed: When Giraldus explains that Hugh was a good prior of Witham, he claimed that it is not for his pen to describe Hugh’s rule in greater detail1517. Hugh’s connections with Witham were well known, so maybe – if Adam did not write of him – Giraldus could have guessed that Eynsham would care for the future memory of St Hugh.1518.

But even if the *Vita S. Hugonis* and the *Magna Vita* had no connection via their authors, in modern times, Giraldus’ life of St Hugh is almost always measured against the life of Adam of Eynsham. Thus, a short comparison of the content of both texts at this point seems justified.

First of all, we see some fundamental differences: Adam is able to go into much greater detail, because his life is considerably longer than Giraldus’ *vita*. The focus of both texts is on two separate audiences: while Adam of

---

1516 MV1, p. 3 and p. 45–46.
1517 Cf. VH, p. 12: *noster guidem digne explicare stilus non praevaluit*: Our pen cannot describe aptly [Hugh’s rule of Witham].
1518 In any case, Adam of Eynsham wrote about Hugh’s time at Witham in greater detail than Giraldus (cf. especially MV1, p. 59–89).
Eynsham wrote for his brethren at Witham\textsuperscript{1519}, Giraldus aimed at a wider audience.

Furthermore, Adam and Giraldus give us different dates for certain events. For example, while Adam claimed Hugh had been eight years old, when he entered the monastery with his father\textsuperscript{1520}, Giraldus depicts Hugh as slightly older\textsuperscript{1521}.

Some interesting details are missing, too: while Giraldus offers two occasions on which Hugh’s sanctity is shown through his interaction with animals, similar scenes are absent in the \textit{Magna Vita}. I propose that the animal-\textit{topos} would not have been a good fit for Adam’s monastic audience, which may have suspected that Hugh neglected his duties and love for God, when he played with his animal companions\textsuperscript{1522}.

Then again, it is remarkable that Giraldus left out any prophecies concerning Hugh’s bishopric or his contact with other saints, like Bishop Peter of Tarentaise\textsuperscript{1523}. Adam narrated that Hugh used to tell anecdotes about Bishop Peter, so Giraldus could have heard about their connection, too\textsuperscript{1524}. Furthermore, Walter Map also knew some stories about Bishop Peter\textsuperscript{1525}. Therefore, it is very likely that Bishop Peter was not an unknown person to Giraldus. Two possible solutions may explain the absence of the sainted bishop: Giraldus did either not know about the connection between the two (prospective) saints or he intentionally chose not to mention it. If the latter is true, Giraldus possibly decided thus because he thought that any reference to St Peter of Tarentaise would not have increased Hugh’s reputation in the eyes of an (English) audience.

\textsuperscript{1519} Because of his restricted audience, Adam of Eynsham differs greatly from, for example, the Becket biographers (Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 313).

\textsuperscript{1520} MV\textit{i}, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{1521} VH, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{1522} Cf. Salisbury, The Beast Within, p. 119 for examples in which superiors rebuke convents for pet dogs during the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textsuperscript{1523} Cf. MV\textit{i}, p. 36 (prophecy) and p. 38–40 (Peter of Tarentaise).

\textsuperscript{1524} MV\textit{i}, p. 40. Bishop Peter had already been canonized at the time when Giraldus was writing (MV\textit{i}, p. 38), so Giraldus must have known about his saintly status.

\textsuperscript{1525} Cf. NC, p. 134–140.
Chapter two to chapter eleven of the first *distinctio* deal with Hugh’s life as bishop of Lincoln. The different chapters can be grouped under certain headings. First of all, Giraldus lays out the general qualities of Bishop Hugh: in chapters two and three, he shows how serious Hugh took his episcopal offices (in this case, the confirmation of children). Chapter four depicts the Christian Hugh, who is caring for the poor and showing himself as generous and free-giving.

Chapter five describes how Hugh rebuilt the church of Lincoln. This chapter anchors Hugh in his historical context. The next chapters (chapter six to chapter nine) always depict Hugh and his relationship to the Angevin kings and the followers of the court. As Giraldus highlights, Hugh never put the king over God and still was on friendly terms with the secular sovereign. His familiarity with King Henry II (chapter six) and King Richard (chapter seven) is shown, too. In both chapters, Hugh’s zeal for appropriately burying the dead is depicted and contrasted with the behaviour of his fellow bishops, who put the king (and his commands) above God’s will.

Chapter eight and chapter nine show Hugh as a champion of the church despite his familiarity with the Angevin kings. Chapter eight also directly refers to St Martin, when Giraldus depicts Hugh’s care for lepers. His saintly behaviour is also depicted in chapter ten, when Giraldus mentioned the behaviour of Hugh’s animal friends (tit-mice and his famous pet swan). In chapter eleven, Hugh dies but prophesizes that his burial (depicted in distinction two, chapter one) would be attended by magnates and kings alike. This chapter implies that Hugh had acquired some kind of prophetic knowledge, which would be a clear sign of saintliness.

When looking for the thematic thread of distinction one, we realize that Giraldus interwove different themes. Peter Raleigh suggests that Giraldus defines Hugh’s sanctity in contrast to his secular counterparts and focuses...
on the “the proper relationship between royal (regnum) and ecclesiastical (sacerdotium) government”\textsuperscript{1529}. I propose the contrary. Similar to Remigius in the VR, Hugh is depicted as a holy bishop fighting both for the rights and property of his diocese and, at the same time, caring for the spiritual wellbeing of his flock\textsuperscript{1530}. As the following chapters will show, it is not Hugh’s relationship with the kings that was Giraldus’ focus, but Hugh’s devotion to God.

5.5.1.2.1 Hugh’s virtues\textsuperscript{1531}

Hugh’s emphasis on the sacraments is derived from two major authorities on whom he modelled his episcopal behaviour: Gregory the Great (especially his Cura Pastoralis\textsuperscript{1532}) and Peter the Chanter\textsuperscript{1533}. Giraldus repeats that the bishop showed great care for all officia that pertained to his episcopal office\textsuperscript{1534}. He basically applies the same statement to Hugh that he had already applied to Remigius: both bishops worked with much great zeal and modesty and took care that they did not put secular affairs over God’s will\textsuperscript{1535}. From Giraldus’ point of view, both Remigius and Hugh are portrayed as a welcome variety among pastors and bishops who sometimes behaved more like tax collectors\textsuperscript{1536}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1529} Raleigh, Fere tirannicus, p. 165.
\item \textsuperscript{1530} Cf. for more information on this picture Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 292–300.
\item \textsuperscript{1531} VH, p. 14–18.
\item \textsuperscript{1532} Silvestri, Power, Politics and Episcopal Authority: The Bishops of Cremona and Lincoln in the Middle Ages (1066-1340), p. 148.
\item \textsuperscript{1533} Campbell, The Landscape of Pastoral Care in Thirteenth–Century England, p. 193.
\item \textsuperscript{1534} VH, p. 14.
\item \textsuperscript{1535} VR, p. 14–15 and VH, p. 14 and p. 24.
\item \textsuperscript{1536} Cf. his laments in PI, p. 36. This clearly shows that the focus had gradually shifted away from the more secular achievements of bishops (royal service, management of the see’s estates) to pastoral qualities (spiritual authority, pastoral commitment, the bishop’s own learning and piety) (Marrit, ‘All This I Say Against the Rage of Archdeacons Against My Poor Fellow Citizens’: Archdeacon’s Authority and Identity in Twelfth-Century England, p. 916). The contrast between Hugh and his colleagues was not only mentioned by Giraldus. In his Metrical Life of St Hugh, for example, Henry of Avranches explicitly referenced the difference between Hugh and the ‘modern’ (modernis) bishops of his own time (Hugh, p. 52).
\end{itemize}
For Peter Raleigh, the chapters concerned with Hugh’s episcopal qualities depict “the contours of proper sacerdotium”\textsuperscript{1537}. From my perspective, this depiction is not meant to oppose the regnum, which is represented by King Henry and King Richard, but rather aims at proving that Hugh had the necessary episcopal virtues for a prospective saint.

In order to depict Hugh’s episcopal zeal, Giraldus chose to highlight the great care with which Hugh confirmed children\textsuperscript{1538}. To illustrate his claims, he narrated two incidents that show Hugh celebrating confirmation. Confirmation could only be performed by bishops. Despite the positive effect of the sacrament, it was not “necessary for salvation nor a prerequisite for sacramental confession or receiving the host during mass”\textsuperscript{1539}. Although the celebration of confirmation may have had a social impact, in general, it was not a social rite of passage, because it took place at very different ages\textsuperscript{1540}. This can be seen in the VH, when Giraldus narrated that an old man, who had long postponed confirmation, wanted Hugh to perform the rite\textsuperscript{1541}. Although a slap is part of the rite of confirmation, Giraldus implies that Hugh’s slap had quite a force behind it, so that the old man would feel the punishment for his carelessness\textsuperscript{1542}.

The problem underlying such narrations had already been recognized by the church. In the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, rules of the diocese of Worcester proclaimed that the confirmation should be performed within a year after baptism, whereas in the diocese of Wells, the period of time was three years, and Durham, it was five\textsuperscript{1543}. Part of the blame must also be attributed to absentee bishops who did not care for the wellbeing of their faithful.

Hugh, as Giraldus narrated in his first exemplum, was different than his episcopal colleagues. For example, in contrast to them, Hugh would never confirm on horseback\textsuperscript{1544}. Scenes like this prove that confirmation could be

\textsuperscript{1537} Raleigh, Fere tirannicus, p. 168.
\textsuperscript{1538} For the confirmation ceremony, cf. Orme, Medieval Children, p. 217–220.
\textsuperscript{1539} Campbell, The Landscape of Pastoral Care in Thirteenth–Century England, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{1540} Orme, Medieval Children, p. 220.
\textsuperscript{1541} VH, p. 14–16. The incident cannot be found in the Magna Vita.
\textsuperscript{1542} Cf. VH, p. 115. If Hugh thought that the parents had neglected the duty of confirmation far too long, he could get rough as well (cf. a scene narrated by Adam of Eynsham: MV1, p. 128).
\textsuperscript{1543} But even these rules were not strictly observed (Orme, Children and the Church in Medieval England, p. 576). According to Nicholas Orme, confirmation – being rather a ceremony than having any educational purpose – “lacked a specific place in the human life cycle” (Orme, Perceptions of Children in Medieval England, p. 320).
\textsuperscript{1544} Interestingly, this is an aspect that Adam of Eynsham dwelled much longer on (MV1, p. 127–128). This is also mentioned in the Metrical Life (Hugh, p. 48).
delivered during the daily episcopal business, because the act of confirmation itself was rather short\textsuperscript{1545}. Matthew Mesley refers to a similar incident depicted by the Becket-hagiographers, which could have inspired Giraldus\textsuperscript{1546}.

In the next scene, a rustic man asks for a child’s name to be changed. He believes that another name would bring the child a luckier life, a belief that Giraldus called an “old heathen error”\textsuperscript{1547}. Again, Hugh punishes the man, but this time, the punishment is not a slap in the face but a year’s penance on bread and water.

Chapter four shows the good Christian Hugh, whose liberality and pity for the poor is celebrated\textsuperscript{1548}. Two exempla illustrate Hugh’s qualities. The first example deals with the “Heriot Ox”. Although Hugh had rightfully inherited the ox of a peasant, he gave it back to the widow of the peasant, so that the family could feed themselves. An unnamed senescallus of the place warns Hugh against showing too much generosity, but Hugh, in contrast, warns him of showing too much greed and consequently ruining the widow’s and the children’s future\textsuperscript{1549}. The second example deals with money that was given to Hugh when an unnamed knight had died. Again, Hugh has no intention to burden the living any further, for they are burdened enough with the deaths of their relatives / family\textsuperscript{1550}. Both incidents are references to the biblical treasure in heaven that awaits those who leave all earthly treasures behind\textsuperscript{1551}.

\textsuperscript{1545} Orme, Children and the Church in Medieval England, p. 578.
\textsuperscript{1546} He notes, however, that the hagiographical topos had already been used by Bede (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 314).
\textsuperscript{1547} Antiquum gentilitatis errorem (\textit{VH}, p. 16). The incident is also mentioned in Hugh, p. 49. Maybe it was thought that a ‘mightier’ saint would offer the child better protection (for the importance of the saint’s name, cf. Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 95).
\textsuperscript{1548} \textit{VH}, p. 16–18.
\textsuperscript{1549} \textit{VH}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{1550} \textit{VH}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{1551} Cf. \textit{Matth.} 6,19–21, \textit{Luc.} 12,33–34, and \textit{1 Tim.} 17–19.
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5.5.1.2.2 Rebuilding the church of Lincoln

In chapter five, Giraldus looks back upon Bishop Remigius and his construction of the church of Lincoln. As already mentioned above, the cathedral had been ruined in 1185 by an ‘earthquake’ that caused part of the vault to collapse.

A necessary attribute of a ‘good bishop’ is the care for the wellbeing of his diocese. Of course, Hugh behaved according to that model. To finance the rebuilding of the Cathedral, he founded the Guild of Saint Mary at Lincoln, whose members paid an annual sum. The topos of bishops as builders is extended in the *Metrical Life*, which narrated how Hugh himself actively took part in the building process by carrying hewn stones.

In the second part of this chapter, Giraldus switches to a symbolic level: for Hugh rebuilt the church of Lincoln with *living stones*, which are more excellent and praiseworthy than any gold, silver or ebony. Learned and honest men are Hugh’s firm and trustworthy columns, on which he builds the church. The allegorical interpretation is extended by Henry of Avranches, who describes the building of the cathedral in great detail.

Although Adam of Eynsham did not focus on the rebuilding of the cathedral, he offered information about the ‘living stones’ Hugh brought to Lincoln. Adam narrated that Hugh asked Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury to recommend him trustworthy men, because Hugh intended to share the burdens of his episcopal duties with them.

Adam praises the qualities of these men. A particular phrase written by Adam of Eynsham deserves attention:

> *Hiis archiepiscopus auditis non modice gratulatur. Ex una quippe viri sancti petitione multa in eo animi bona evidentius perspiciebat.*

---

1552 *VH*, p. 18.
1553 Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 289–290.
1554 Hendrix, The Architecture of Lincoln Cathedral and the Cosmologies of Bishop Grosseteste, p. 102.
1555 *Hugh*, p. 52. Henry of Avranches described more parts of the building that Hugh actually had built (*Hugh*, p. 85).
1556 *VH*, p. 18. Cf. also *Pet* 2,5.
1557 *Hugh*, p. 54–60.
1558 *MV1*, p. 110–113.
1559 *MV1*, p. 112.
When the archbishop had heard this, he was very pleased. From this one request of the saint, he learned many good things about Hugh’s mind.

What did Baldwin learn from Hugh’s request? Hugh’s humility and his great care for the welfare of his diocese. Hugh’s desire for excellent helpers translates back onto himself. The same accounts for Giraldus’ statement: Hugh is only able to rebuild the church with learned and honest persons, because he himself has the same qualities.

Interestingly, Giraldus is content with a general statement about the qualities of the canons, whereas Adam chose to mention two of them specially: Master Robert of Bedford, who was already dead at the time when Adam composed his *Magna Vita*, and Dean Roger of Rolleston, who was still alive at the time of writing, wherefore Adam chose to retain his praise\(^{1560}\).

5.5.1.2.3 Hugh’s zealous burial of the dead\(^ {1561}\)

Hugh’s devotion to his episcopal duties is exemplarily demonstrated with Hugh’s zealous burying the dead, whenever the situation required it\(^ {1562}\). Chapter six confirms that Hugh always put the Lord’s commands above the king’s commands. As bishop, Hugh was only conditionally bound to the king, as long as obedience to a royal command would not make him neglect his religious duties\(^ {1563}\).

In her examination of popular accounts of saintly bishops written in late medieval England, Sherry Reames identified four main themes. Interestingly, in Giraldus’ depiction, Hugh fulfils most of these: He is exceedingly humble (as shown, for example, in his interaction with the animals), he prefers a simple, monastic life, and he “depends crucially on the king to reveal his sanctity to the public, sometimes by welcoming and

\(^{1560}\) *VH*, p. 18 and *MV*, p. 112–113.

\(^{1561}\) *VH*, p. 18–24.

\(^{1562}\) In Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita*, Hugh explicitly praises the grace God shows towards mankind in birth and death (*MV*, p. 75 and p. 77).

\(^{1563}\) Robert Grosseteste would later use this concept to defy even papal commands (Silvestri, Power, Politics and Episcopal Authority: The Bishops of Cremona and Lincoln in the Middle Ages (1066-1340), p. 110–111).
promoting his influence but more often by opposing him. In some sense, Hugh’s relationship with the king is one of the prerequisites through which his sanctity could be revealed. This may be shown in two incidents narrated by Giraldus:

The first incident took place in Lincoln. Giraldus narrated that Hugh delayed his meal to bury dead persons – probably much to the distress of his canons. The second incident took place in France, at Le Mans. Hugh had been summoned by King Henry II to a council. Instead of hastening to obey his king’s calls, Hugh takes his time to bury four dead persons on the way. Miraculously, his disobedience is not punished.

But Hugh does not only defy the king’s commands, if his episcopal duties command him to do so: he could also strictly rebuke persons of whatever rank if they behaved contrary to what the episcopal office demanded. This side of St Hugh is shown in two further examples.

The first incident that Giraldus narrated probably took place in England: Hugh is said to have punished one of his almoners, because the man had not told Bishop Hugh about a funeral. The second incident deals with Hugh Nonant, bishop of Coventry († 1198). In this exemplum, Hugh reprimands his colleague for preferring the command of his earthly lord – King Henry – over the commands of his heavenly lord. The reprimand is an example of Hugh’s rhetorical abilities, because his answer plays with the words ‘rex’ and ‘festinatio’. Both terms had been used by Hugh of Coventry when he urged Bishop Hugh to hurry on with mass:

*Properandum potius nobis esse propter regem, qui nos cum festinatione vocavit.*

We should better hasten because of the king, who had called for us to come in a hurry.

---

1564 Reames, Popular Images of Saintly Bishops in Late Medieval England, p. 237. As Peter Raleigh observed: contrary to Giraldus’ depiction (which may be explained by the requirements of a saint’s life), Hugh’s life would have probably been dominated by cooperation and not confrontation with his royal lord (Raleigh, *Fere tirannicus*, p. 169–170).

1565 VH, p. 20. Cf. as well for further examples for Hugh’s zeal MV2, p. 78–83.

1566 A similar, although more general statement is made by Adam of Eynsham: he narrated how Hugh used to interrupt his journeys if he came past a burial (MV2, p. 77).

1567 Hugh’s frankness even found his way in the *De nugis curialium* of Walter Map (NC, p. 10).

1568 VH, p. 20.

1569 VH, p. 20.
Hugh, however, was not impressed by the command. He answered:

\[\text{Quinimmo propter Regem regum, cui potis[s]ime est obsequendum et cuius obsequiis propter seculares curas nil subtrahendum, festive potius hoc festo et non festine est agendum}^{1570}.\]

Much more because of the king of kings, whose commands we should more readily obey, and whose commands should not be neglected because of earthly duties, this celebration has to be celebrated more festive, and not with haste.

Hugh’s wit and irony were obviously appreciated by his contemporaries and by Giraldus himself: in the third part of the \textit{VR, exempla} also dealt with the rhetorical ability to turn the king’s anger into laughter\textsuperscript{1571}. If we believed Giraldus’ etymological explanation, it was no wonder that Hugh had been made prior of Witham: the Carthusian foundation was either called ‘Witham’ because of its whiteness (fitting well with the Carthusian habit and Hugh’s saintliness) or Wittham because of its wisdom\textsuperscript{1572}. Hugh’s irony and wit mollified even the anger of kings, as Adam of Eynsham reports: when Hugh had offended Henry II, an ironical remark on Henry’s ancestor, William the Conqueror, made the king burst out laughing\textsuperscript{1573}. In this scene, the saint triumphs over the secular powers.

Fittingly, Giraldus finishes this chapter with the assurance that Hugh strictly observed all festivals according to the Lord’s command. “All divine duties shall always be preferred to secular duties”\textsuperscript{1574}, seems to have been Hugh’s maxim.

\textsuperscript{1570} \textit{VH}, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{1571} Cf. \textit{VR}, p. 63. This passage shows clearly how Giraldus usually connects the art of being ‘witty’ with erudition (Jones, Gerald of Wales’s \textit{Sense of Humour}, p. 155). Giraldus had been a disciple of the schools of Paris, where Horace and his \textit{ridentem dicere verum} was taught (Jones, Gerald of Wales’s \textit{Sense of Humour}, p. 149). It is therefore no wonder that Giraldus used the same rhetorical technique in his saints’ lives. For a discussion of Giraldus’ view of (improper) humour, cf. Jones, Gerald of Wales’s \textit{Sense of Humour}, p. 148–150 and for further examples for joking at secular courts, cf. Fonnesberg-Schmidt and Kynan-Wilson, \textit{Smiling, Laughing and Joking in Papal Rome: Thomas of Marlborough and Gerald of Wales at the Court of Innocent III (1198–1216)}, p. 162–165.
\textsuperscript{1572} \textit{VH}, p. 12. For Giraldus’ (false) etymological conjectures, cf. \textit{VH}, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{1574} \textit{VH}, p. 22: \textit{cunctis secularibus negotiis semper essent divina praeponenda}. A similar statement is made by Adam of Eynsham (\textit{MV2}, p. 29).
Chapter six assures its audience that Hugh’s neglect of secular duties in favour of ecclesiastical ones did not harm his relationship with the Angevin kings, although Hugh overstepped boundaries that no other would have dared to trespass\(^{1575}\). This was only possible because Hugh did not fully neglect his duties towards his king. Instead he simply postponed doing them if necessary. Hugh managed to render to Cesar the things that are Cesar’s and to God the things that were God’s\(^{1576}\). This behaviour separates Hugh from St Thomas Becket, because it ensured that Hugh would not face the same consequences. “In this sense, Hugh’s stands were a continuation of Becket’s, but in a much lower key and keeping a lower profile. It could also be the case, of course, that Becket’s example by itself had taught Henry II and Richard a lesson in caution”\(^{1577}\).

Chapter seven basically repeats the core message of chapter six. The main difference is that this time, Giraldus did not depict Hugh’s behaviour towards King Henry II, but towards King Richard, whose coronation on 8 September 1189 is mentioned.

Although Hugh lived through the reign of three Angevin kings, in Giraldus’ vita, only two of them make an appearance: Henry and his son Richard. Richard’s brother John is left out of the biographical part of the life. In this matter, Giraldus differs greatly from Adam of Eynsham, who offers many incidents and anecdotes about Lackland and his (sometimes) insufferable behaviour\(^{1578}\). This observation is astonishing, for King John had obviously favoured Giraldus when both men had travelled through Ireland\(^{1579}\). What could be Giraldus’ reason to omit King John’s presence in the narrative?

We should not forget that Giraldus only refers to King Henry and King Richard on a larger scale, when their relationship with Hugh had to be highlighted. This happened in chapter one (when Giraldus remarked on Hugh’s favour with Henry\(^{1580}\)) and in chapter six (when Hugh buries a dead

\(^{1575}\) VH, p. 22.


\(^{1577}\) Leyser, The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man, p. 72. Cf. the different interpretation by Peter Raleigh, who argued that the “reader is meant to be impressed with Hugh’s ability to forestall, by sheer holiness, the wrath of a king whose relationship with another bishop had ended so violently” (Raleigh, Fere tirannicus, p. 171).

\(^{1578}\) Cf. MV2, p. 137–232.

\(^{1579}\) Cf. for example RG, p. 65, where Count John offers Giraldus two Irish bishoprics and Giraldus declines.

\(^{1580}\) VH, p. 12. This topic is repeated on VH, p. 22 (chapter six).
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while on his way to Le Mans\textsuperscript{1581} or takes his time to perform the solemn rites\textsuperscript{1583}. Henry’s death is silently passed over. In Richard’s case, his coronation is mentioned (chapter seven, when Hugh buries a dead\textsuperscript{1583}) and the text dwells on Hugh’s behaviour at the council of Oxford. Again, Richard’s death and the coronation of John are left out of the narration. The list shows that the appearance of the king’s has a specific function in the narration, namely, to portray Hugh’s relationship with secular power. Thus, Giraldus may as well have chosen to omit any meetings of Hugh and King John because his focus was on St Hugh and not on the secular ruler\textsuperscript{1584}. Furthermore, any meeting of Hugh and John might as well not have fitted into the guiding thread of the narration, which culminates in Hugh’s heroic defence of the church (chapter eight), the final restoration of the original state of the diocese of Lincoln as it had been under Remigius (chapter nine, the mantle), and the prophecy of his own death (chapter ten).

5.5.1.2.4 The saint and the Lionheart: St Hugh and King Richard\textsuperscript{1585}

The most dramatic encounter between Hugh and the Angevin kings is depicted in chapter eight and chapter nine. The main antagonist of these chapters is King Richard. Chapter eight specifically contains a crucial scene, which historians have examined to assess the relationship between the king and his subjects\textsuperscript{1586}. They mostly agree that “St. Hugh opposed the mingling of the temporal and spiritual spheres”\textsuperscript{1587}, and that he “appears, not simply

\textsuperscript{1581} VH, p. 20
\textsuperscript{1582} VH, p. 20
\textsuperscript{1583} VH, p. 24. The coronation itself is almost silently passed over. Peter Raleigh interprets this omission as Giraldus’ portrayal of Hugh’s readiness to prefer sacral to secular duties (burying the dead vs. attending the coronation) (Raleigh, Fere tirannicus , p. 171). On the contrary, I propose that Giraldus did not want to draw too much attention to anyone other than Hugh.
\textsuperscript{1584} In chapter four, for example, senescalus and filius militis have no names, they only serve as minor roles, whereas Hugh is in the focus of the narration (VH, p. 16).
\textsuperscript{1585} VH, p. 26–30.
\textsuperscript{1586} Cf., for example, Russell, The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England, p. 279–290. Unfortunately, Josiah Russell seems to have overlooked the deliberate construction of Hugh as a ‘second Thomas Becket’, which will be explained in this chapter (cf. Russell, The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England, p. 281).
\textsuperscript{1587} Turner, Richard Lionheart and English Episcopal Elections, p. 11.
as the conventional saint, but as the vigorous rebuke alike of moral and political wrong.\footnote{VR, p. LIX. Note the more reserved statement by Douie and Farmer (MV1, p. XLIV).}

**The gathering of Oxford**\footnote{VH, p. 26.}

King Richard was engaged in a power struggle with King Philipp of France. After the parties agreed on a truce at Les Andelys in 1197, measures were taken to reinforce the troops. Having returned to England in November, it was Archbishop Hubert Walter’s task to raise money for this undertaking.\footnote{For the truce, cf. Berg, Richard Löwenherz, p. 247–249. For Hubert Walter’s return, cf. Landon, The Itinerary of King Richard I, p. 124.} On 7 December 1197, he called together a *concilium* at Oxford, where he intended to fulfil the king’s wishes.

Incidents that happened on the council of Oxford remain strange to us, although we have three sources telling us about the events – Giraldus’ account, Adam of Eynsham’s narration, and the chronicle of Roger of Howden († 1201). The differences and similarities between the three accounts are remarkable.

First of all, the meeting was probably not a council for the clergy, as Giraldus wants us to believe, but rather, as Adam of Eynsham calls it, a general gathering of both ecclesiastical and secular magnates.\footnote{Cf. VH, p. 26, MV2, p. 98, and R. Howd. 4, p. 40, where Roger of Howden falsely dated the council to 1198. John Gillingham suggests that this error might be explained with Roger’s absence, since he had been in Rome at the time of the council (Gillingham, Richard I, p. 280).}

Furthermore, Giraldus fails to mention in his account that Hubert Walter acted as King Richard’s spokesman on the council. In contrast to Giraldus, the archbishop’s role is explicitly mentioned in the accounts of Adam of Eynsham and Roger of Howden. While Roger’s account is rather brief,\footnote{R. Howd. 4, p. 40.} Adam elaborates the scene: He paints the picture of a furious Hubert Walter with trembling lips and barely concealed anger, who has just learned that his episcopal colleague refuses to follow the king’s petition.\footnote{MV2, p. 100. Charles Young concluded that this show of anger only benefitted Hubert Walter: not only did he avoid an escalation of the situation (so that more bishops would}
Giraldus’ account is imprecise. He claimed that Hugh rebelled against “heavy exactions”\textsuperscript{1594} which had been placed upon the church. Roger of Howden and Adam of Eynsham are more specific: they say that Richard demanded 300 knights or an equal sum to maintain them in arms\textsuperscript{1595}. Whereas Hugh refers to the huge burden he would bring upon his church in Roger of Howden’s narration, in Adam’s \textit{Magna Vita}, Hugh did not feel bound to provide money for a war on foreign soil\textsuperscript{1596}.

Finally, the questions remains as to who refused King Richard’s wishes. As Giraldus depicts the situation, the indignant refusal of the whole church came from the mouth of the bishop of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1597}. In Roger of Howden’s account, Hugh was the only one to reject the request\textsuperscript{1598}.

According to the account of Adam of Eynsham, Herbert le Poore, bishop of Salisbury, sided with Hugh\textsuperscript{1599}. That the alliance between Bishop Herbert le Poore and Hugh of Lincoln was not invented by Adam of Eynsham is suggested by an entry in the annals of Winchester: According to the annals,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Episcopus Saresbiriensis, imperio domini regis de omnibus possessionibus suis disseisiatus, transfretavit mense Februarii\textsuperscript{1600}}.
\end{quote}

side with Hugh), but he also could shift the blame for the failure to Hugh and his allies (Young, Hubert Walter, Lord of Canterbury and Lord of England, p. 122).

\textsuperscript{1594} \textit{VH}, p. 26: \textit{duris exactionibus}.

\textsuperscript{1595} \textit{R. Howd. 4}, p. 40 and \textit{MV2}, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{1596} Cf. \textit{MV2}, p. 99. But, as Karl Leyser noted, Hugh had to pay scutage – before and after the council of Oxford (Leyser, The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man, p. 67). The Chancellor’s Roll of 1196 and the Pipe Roll of 1197 both show that Hugh paid for the second and third scutage of the \textit{exercitus Normanniae} (The Chancellor’s Roll for the Eighth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, Michaelmas 1196, p. 247). Michaelmas 1196, the bishop of Lincoln paid 60 \textit{libra} for the second and for the third scutage, and Michaelmas 1197, he paid as well (The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Ninth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, Michaelmas 1197, p. 109 and p. 110). Cf. as well The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Tenth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, Michaelmas 1198, p. XIX–XXIV for more information on that matter and Leyser, The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man, p. 62–63 for the interpretation of the whole scene. We can easily explain this oddity if we remember that both Giraldus and Roger of Howden had also served in secular offices, whereas Adam of Eynsham did not share in this background.

\textsuperscript{1597} Cf. \textit{VH}, p. 26: \textit{in ore Lincolniensis}.

\textsuperscript{1598} \textit{R. Howd. 4}, p. 40. However, we have to remind ourselves that Roger was no eyewitness of the gathering, because he was in Rome at that time (Gillingham, Richard I, p. 280).

\textsuperscript{1599} \textit{MV2}, p. 100.

\textsuperscript{1600} \textit{Annales Monastici, Volume Two: Annales Monasterii de Wintonia (A.D. 519-1277), Annales Monasterii de Waverlei (A.D. 1-1291)}, p. 67. The annals confirm that the bishop of Winchester sailed in April of the same year (\textit{Annales Monastici, Volume Two: Annales Monasterii de Wintonia (A.D. 519-1277), Annales Monasterii de Waverlei (A.D. 1-1291)}, p.
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the bishop of Salisbury, who had been deprived of all his possessions by order of the Lord king, sailed across the Channel in the month of February.

This account would fit with the narration of Adam of Eynsham, who said that the possessions of the bishop of Salisbury were confiscated and bishop Herbert had to go to meet the king in France. Our three different accounts painted two different pictures. On the one hand, we have Giraldus’ depiction of Hugh as a true defender of the *libertas ecclesiae*. The secular participants of the council are not mentioned and Hubert Walter, the intermediary, is left out likewise. The whole narration concentrates on Hugh, the future saint, and King Richard, his secular opponent. Consequently, the answer of the whole church is given by Hugh and Hugh alone. There was no room for another bishop to side with Hugh against the king (and, of course, to share in Hugh’s fame).

On the other hand, we have the accounts of Adam of Eynsham and Roger of Howden. In these narrations, Hugh still plays an eminent role, yet he does not act like a spokesman for the whole church. We might rather assume a clash of two different opinions as the main reason for the conflict. On the one hand, there was a rigorous churchman like Hugh, who wanted a clean separation of the sphere of the church and the sphere of the king. One the other hand, there were ecclesiastics like Hubert Walter, who did not hesitate to serve both *regnum* and *sacerdotium*. Whichever account we prefer, all of them agree that Hugh had to cope with royal anger because of his behaviour. Part of his see’s property was

---

67) John Gillingham seems to imply that this departure to Normandy was also related to reprisals because of the Oxford council (Gillingham, Richard I, p. 280).
1601 MV2, p. 100.
1602 Matthew Mesley came to a different interpretation: He concludes that Giraldus left Hubert Walter out of the account either because Giraldus had overcome his anger towards the archbishop (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 297) or because Giraldus did not want to depict an incident of disobedience towards an ecclesiastical superior (Hugh’s actions could be interpreted in this way: Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 298). I am not convinced by this interpretation and would instead suggest that Giraldus intended to depict Hugh as a second Thomas Becket, who opposed the king and not an ecclesiastical authority.
1604 In his *De Principis Instructione*, Giraldus admonishes a ruler to stay away from anger (*PI*, p. 78). For the different Latin vocabulary used to denote royal anger, cf. McGrath, Royal Rage and the Construction of Anglo-Norman Authority, c. 1000–1250, p. 24–27.
confiscated, and his *familiares* had to endure royal wrath, too\textsuperscript{1605}. As Nicholas Vincent remarks, a depiction of exaggerated violence of the king’s rage might correlate with the *topos* that the king’s anger should be met with rational, clerical counsel\textsuperscript{1606}. Hugh’s first action, however, was not to give rational advice.

**The kiss of peace**\textsuperscript{1607}

*Tamen* (Finally), as Giraldus writes, Hugh gave in and travelled after the king to solve the matter. Again, he is portrayed by Giraldus as the only person resisting the king’s wrath: not only does he follow Richard against the explicit advice of his *familia*, he also travels alone\textsuperscript{1608}. Throughout the months after the council at Oxford, Richard had been in Northern France. In August 1198, he was present at Barneville-sur-Seine\textsuperscript{1609}.

Hugh and Richard met in the castle of Roche sur Andely and the narrations of Giraldus and Adam dwell on the importance of receiving the kiss of peace\textsuperscript{1610}. Hugh pressed (or rather, amused) King Richard enough to receive the kiss of peace. “The gesture mattered: it expressed in a very public fashion the bishop’s lack of favour, marked him out as someone who, by failing to possess the royal peace, would be unable to protect himself or his dependants”\textsuperscript{1611}.

This was not the case in Giraldus’ narration, because Hugh managed to secure the wellbeing of his *familia*. Similar incidents can be found in Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita*, when he narrated, for example, how Hugh protected his canons from being called to service by the king\textsuperscript{1612}.

\textsuperscript{1605} This is mentioned in the *VH*, p. 26 and in Adam of Eynsham’s *Magna Vita*, although Adam mentioned that the king confiscated all (*cunctis*) the property of Hugh and his canons (*MV*\textsubscript{2}, p. 6).
\textsuperscript{1606} Vincent, The Court of Henry II, p. 312. For further examples of ecclesiastical council in the midst of royal rage, cf. McGrath, Royal Rage and the Construction of Anglo-Norman Authority, c. 1000–1250, p. 177–182.
\textsuperscript{1607} *VH*, p. 26–28.
\textsuperscript{1608} *VH*, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{1609} Landon, The Itinerary of King Richard I, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{1610} *VH*, p. 26–28 and *MV*\textsubscript{2}, p. 101–102. Giraldus leaves out the vivid details of Adam’s narration. The whole scene was meant to mirror the kiss of peace between King Henry and Thomas Becket (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 299–300).
\textsuperscript{1611} Weiler, Bishops and Kings in England, c. 1066–c. 1215, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{1612} *MV*\textsubscript{2}, p. 110–113.
In Giraldus’ and Adam’s depiction, Hugh triumphed in the end\textsuperscript{1613}. The reason behind Hugh’s success is rather simple: In contrast to Thomas Becket, he wisely arranged that the king would save his face\textsuperscript{1614}. H. E. Cowdrey remarks that Hugh’s inner attitude was different to Becket’s attitude, because Hugh knew that the Carthusian way of life was not meant for everyone, and he acted accordingly\textsuperscript{1615}. Consequently, Hugh could defend the liberty of the church without risking his relationship with the Angevin kings\textsuperscript{1616}.

Indeed, Giraldus could have painted a different picture. We should keep in mind that, after all, Hugh acted due to his role: his task was to secure salvation of the Christian souls, and thus, he also had to care for the soul of his king\textsuperscript{1617}. Adam of Eynsham explicitly directs his audience to this matter, when he makes Hugh refer to the fact that King Richard is Hugh’s parochianus\textsuperscript{1618}. This reference is not found in Giraldus’ VH, although Giraldus, having followed the court for several years, must have been aware of this fact. Thus, we may conclude that Giraldus wanted to portray Hugh as a second Thomas Becket and King Richard as the submissive royal power. “One not need become a martyr to be a champion of the libertas ecclesiae”\textsuperscript{1619}, as this scene suggests.

Or, as Adam of Eynsham makes King Richard say:

\begin{quote}
Vere, […] si tales qualis iste est, essent passim et ceteri episcopi, nullus contra eos regum aut principum attollere praesumeret cervicem\textsuperscript{1620}.
\end{quote}

Indeed, if the other bishops were more like him, no king or ruler would dare to raise his head against them.

\textsuperscript{1613} Adam enhances this triumph: in his account, Hugh even politely refused the aid of powerful magnates like William Marshal (MV2, p. 107–108).
\textsuperscript{1615} Cf. MV2, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{1616} Cowdrey, Hugh of Avalon, Carthusian and Bishop, p. 54–55.
\textsuperscript{1617} McGrath, Royal Rage and the Construction of Anglo-Norman Authority, c. 1000–1250, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{1618} MV2, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{1620} MV2, p. 105.
Given his frequent interference in episcopal elections, it would have been easy for King Richard to ensure that more bishops were like Hugh. As John Gillingham remarks: “For all his reverence for Hugh of Lincoln, Richard had always been determined that other bishops should not be like him”. Ruling a kingdom was probably easier without having to deal with a second Hugh of Lincoln.

Contrasting regal and episcopal behaviour

The topic of feasting carries on throughout the lengthy chapter: From the feast with the king, Giraldus digresses to Hugh’s own housekeeping and his care for his canons. The behaviour of the king towards his subject is contrasted with the behaviour of Hugh: In contrast to the Lionheart’s anger, Hugh shows hilaritas (a saintly virtue) towards his surroundings. While King Richard extracted money, Hugh ensures his familia is well clothed and fed. His maxim is best summarized by his saying “Eat well, drink well, and you shall serve God well and devotedly”. This maxime fits well with Giraldus’ conclusion in De Principis Instructione that generosity is characteristic for great men.

We may assume that Hugh’s hospitality is no invention on Giraldus’ part: William de Monte, who seemed to have been called mons coagulatus, mons pinguis by his students (curdled mountain, fat mountain – a pun on his name and his eating habits), appears to have benefited from Hugh’s generosity in more than one way.

The relationship between Hugh and his canon must have been close. In Adam of Eynsham’s Magna Vita, we read that Hugh cared for the well-being of his canons and we also learn how Hugh protected his canons from being called to service in foreign countries by King Richard. Similarly,

---

1622 VH, p. 28–30.
1623 VH, p. 30: Bene comedatis, et bene bibatis, et bene ac devote Deo serviatis. Cf. 1 Tim. 3.2–5: Running his own household diligently is interpreted as a sign of a good bishop, as a good bishop needs to possess leadership qualities.
1625 Goering, William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213), p. 16.
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the canons prevented Hugh resigning his bishopric and living the life of a hermit by paying the final sum for the royal mantle.1627

Giraldus depicts this good relationship, too. Although Hugh takes his episcopal duties (in this case, the care for the sick, especially lepers) seriously, he does not allow his pride to distract him away.

When his chancellor, William de Monte jokes that Hugh’s kisses do not cure lepers, like St Martin’s kisses did, Hugh answers:

*Martinus osculando leprosum curavit eum in corpore. Leprosus autem osculo sanavit me in anima*1629.

When Martin kissed the leper, he healed his body. When the leper kissed me, he healed my soul.

Before depicting the scene with William de Monte, Giraldus enhances the effect of Hugh kissing a leper with a detailed description of their deformities. With this kiss, saint Hugh created a community with a “living icon of medieval poverty”1630, thus proving himself to be a true Christian. The *topos* that a (future) saint kisses a leper can be found in Sulpicius Severus’ life of St Martin.1631 According to Catherine Peyroux, the theme developed over the centuries: in the High Middle Ages, authors like Giraldus did not focus on the saint’s power to cure the disease, instead, they highlighted the saint’s *humilitas*.1632 Regarding Hugh’s zeal for burying the dead and kissing lepers, Karl Leyser concludes: “Bishop Hugh’s authenticity as a Holy Man was thus increased, rather than diminished, by his episcopal practice.”1633

---

1627 MV2, p. 34–37.
1628 VH, p. 30. Hugh’s care for lepers is also mentioned by Adam of Eynsham (MV2, p. 13) and in the *Legenda* (Legenda, p. 175).
1629 VH, p. 30. This is, unfortunately, the only story showing the personal relationship between William de Monte and Hugh that has come down to us (Goering, William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213), p. 16). The scene with William de Monte is also part of the *Legenda* (Legenda, p. 175).
1630 Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 179. Note that Peyroux regards this scene as an “ironic reference” (Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 182).
1631 Cf. Sulpicius Severus, Vita Martini, p. 116. The theme was taken up later by authors like Alcuin or Bernard of Clairvaux (Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 182).
1632 Peyroux, The Leper’s Kiss, p. 185.
1633 Leyser, The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man, p. 52. Studies of indulgences in Lincoln dating from the 13th and 14th century have shown what a huge effort was undertaken for the
In chapter nine, Hugh ensured that the payment for the mantle would be stopped. Obviously, this was a very specific beneficium and therefore very important for the diocese. Consequently, it was recorded in the Metrical Life and was hinted at in the Legenda. Yet this event was also recorded by sources outside Lincoln, for example, in the chronicle of Roger of Howden.

According to Giraldus, the sum which had to be paid for the pallium was centum librarum. Giraldus omits the details narrated by Adam of Eynsham, namely, that Hugh’s predecessor Walter de Coutances had withheld the payment and that Hugh was forced to pay these debts as well. Giraldus is also silent about the final sum Hugh paid, while Adam claimed it was 3,000 marks. Roger of Howden, however, neither mentioned the debts of Hugh’s predecessors nor confirmed Adam’s sum. This difference has already been noted by Karl Leyser, who adds that the corresponding entry in the Pipe Rolls speaks of another sum, namely, 2,000 marks.

As usual, Giraldus silence cannot be explained by any kind of ignorance: as he mentioned in a letter preserved in Symbolum Electorum, Hugh himself had talked to him about the exaction of the pallium. Giraldus also contributed towards the redemption of the pallium, for he reminds Hugh about the money he paid for this enterprise. Thus, we may conclude that Giraldus did not deem it necessary to mention the particular details of the undertaking, because the mere fact itself that Hugh redeemed the payment of the mantle was enough to show the care he displayed towards his diocese.

In the end, the situation at Lincoln resembles the situation under Bishop Remigius: The church is (re)built and adorned with learned men, and no

support of lepers (Swanson, Indulgences for Prayers for the Dead in the Diocese of Lincoln in the Early Fourteenth Century, p. 198).

1634 Cf. for the same story as told by Adam of Eynsham: MV2, p. 34–37. The royal charter was issued at Le Mans, 23 June 1194 (VH, p. 120).
1635 Hugh, p. 60.
1636 It was probably alluded to with the words servitude gravissima (cf. Legenda, p. 174).
1637 R. Howd. 3, p. 303.
1638 VH, p. 30.
1639 MV2, p. 34–35.
1640 R. Howd. 3, p. 303.
1642 Symb., p. 266.
1643 Symb., p. 267.
money has to be paid to the king. Consequently, the two remaining chapters of the VH focus on the manifestation of Hugh’s saintliness.

5.5.1.2.5 Further manifestations of Hugh’s saintliness

Chapter ten shows the love animals display towards Hugh. Just like at the Grand Chartreuse, a shy tit-mouse becomes Hugh’s animal pet at Thornholm. His pet swan at his manor at Stow had already been mentioned in the copula tergmina. Now, the incident is repeated and the miraculous story of the obedient wild swan serves to highlight Hugh’s saintliness. Nicholas Vincent argues that the depiction of Hugh’s friendship with animals is meant to counterbalance the violence of his secular opponents. In that case, the connection between the scene with Hugh and Richard and this chapter would have to be drawn, but as the situation depicted in the previous chapter had already been solved, such an argument is not particularly convincing. I would therefore propose that the appearance of the swan is meant as a sign of Hugh’s grace – after all, the animal only befriends Hugh and the whiteness of its plumage alludes to Hugh’s saintliness.

The last example of Hugh’s holiness happened during Hugh’s final days. After a pilgrimage to France, Hugh returned sick to England. He lay ill at the Old Temple, in London. The way he faced his approaching death is remarkable: In Giraldus’ account, Hugh would not derive from the Carthusian approach of wearing a hair-shirt and sustaining from meat, even if it could have brought him some relief during his illness.

Hugh’s saintly power is shown when he directed his clerks and canons to go to Lincoln and prepare for the royal congress. They left him against their will, but Hugh assured them that he would also be present at the congress.

1644 VH, p. 32–36.
1645 Cf. VR, p. 73–76. James Dimock has highlighted in his edition the passages that are used both in the copula tergmina and in the life of St Hugh (VH, p. 109–110). Having quoted this account, Adam of Eynsham offers even more details about the behaviour of the swan (MV1, p 107–109).
1646 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.1.2 for the topos that a saint befriends wild animals. Richard Loomis cautions against the interpretation of the swan as a portent (VH, p. XLVII).
1648 Even Giraldus speaks of the bird as a “prophetic sign” (VH, p. 32).
1649 VH, p. 34–36.
at Lincoln – as if he had acquired a prophetic spirit (\textit{quasi spiritu vaticinali}). The same prophetic \textit{dictum} is attested by Adam of Eynsham. The narration contains all the \textit{topoi} of an idealised death: the death is prophesized, and the doomed man dies patiently.

With a \textit{nec mora} – nothing more of that! – the account breaks rather rapidly off, especially if we compare it with the devotion with which Adam of Eynsham narrated the last weeks of St Hugh. Even Hugh’s testament is not mentioned, although it has come down to us. Giraldus finishes the first distinction with the statement that Hugh did not recover from his illness and died in the year 1200, when he was roughly fifty years old.

Hugh’s death is also commemorated in other texts, for example, in the Annales of Winchester, the Annales of Margan or in the \textit{Chronicon} written by Ralph de Coggeshall († 1227).

\textbf{5.5.2 Distinctio II: Miracles wrought before the Interdict}

\textit{Distinctio II} of the \textit{VH} can be subdivided into three different parts. Part one deals with the first miracle of St Hugh, namely, his splendid funeral. Part two revolves around the cures Hugh bestowed upon the faithful. The last part belongs to Giraldus: it contains an invitation to his fellow writers and successors to glorify St Hugh by actively contributing to his cult.

\textsuperscript{1650} \textit{VH}, p. 36. This is a hagiographical \textit{topos} and a clear sign of saintliness (Isaïa, La Prophétie dans l’Hagiographie Latine du Haut Moyen Âge (VIe-LIXe Siècle). L’histoire comme Destin, Prédestination et Providence, p. 15–16).

\textsuperscript{1651} \textit{MV2}, p. 189.


\textsuperscript{1653} Compare \textit{VH}, p. 36 and \textit{MV2}, p. 184–198. For example, Giraldus omits the sick calls of both King John and Archbishop Hubert Walter (cf. for the events \textit{MV2}, p. 188).

\textsuperscript{1654} \textit{MV2}, p. 187 and English Episcopal Acta IV, p. 143.

\textsuperscript{1655} This dating is false (\textit{VHD}, p. 112).


\textsuperscript{1658} Ralph de Coggeshall, Chronicon Anglicanum, p. 110–112.

\textsuperscript{1659} \textit{VH}, p. 38–66.
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5.5.2.1 The funeral of a saint

Giraldus declares that the first miracle of St Hugh was his own funeral. In comparison to the account of Adam of Eynsham, Giraldus’ narration seems to lack detail. This might be due to the fact that Adam was an eye-witness of the funeral, whereas, as has been suspected, Giraldus was not.

However, Giraldus’ whereabouts during this period of time cannot be determined precisely. Between 1199 and 1204, he was occupied with his fight as a champion of St Davids. Yet he did not spend the whole time abroad at Rome. Putting together the clues we find in De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, we can say that Giraldus must have been at Rome in May 1200, where he received papal letters. He left Rome and returned in March 1201. Of course, Giraldus never commented on his participation during the funeral procession of St Hugh, but there is, at least, the possibility that he had witnessed it.

Hugh had died in London, wherefore his body had to be transferred to Lincoln. The corpse arrived at Lincoln on the same day on which a general assembly was meant to be held at Lincoln. At this point in the text, Giraldus refers to chapter eleven of distinction one, thus creating a link between the biographical part and the miracle part of this life.

The funeral-procession itself was splendid. Adam of Eynsham claimed that Hugh merited such devotion, because during his lifetime, Hugh had shown such zeal for burying the dead.

According to Giraldus, three secular and ecclesiastical rulers respectively were present at the funeral: King John, King William of Scotland, and a regulus of Galloway, as well as the archbishops of Canterbury (Hubert

---

1660 Cf. for the content of this chapter VH, p. 38–42.
1662 Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 220.
1663 JS, p. 185.
1664 JS, p. 188.
1665 Hugh’s last words are called a vaticinale verbum (VH, p. 38).
1666 MV2, p. 1.
1667 A description of William of Scotland can be found in De Principis Instructione (PI, p. 388–390).
1668 This man was Roland, prince of Galloway (VH, p. 39). The Metrical Life only speaks of tres reges (three kings) (Hugh, p. 72).
Walter), Dublin (John Comyn) and Ragusa.\textsuperscript{1669} Besides many abbots and priors, nine bishops attended the funeral, but Giraldus did not note their names. Adam of Eynsham’s account is slightly different: on one occasion, he narrated that three archbishops, fourteen bishops, more than a hundred abbots, many earls and two kings attended the funeral\textsuperscript{1670}, whereas shortly afterwards, he said that Hugh’s funeral was attended by an Irish and a Slav archbishop, the prince of Galloway and the king of Scotland\textsuperscript{1671}. In contrast, the \textit{Legenda} only mentions the presence of two kings (John of England and William of Scotland), and three archbishops\textsuperscript{1672}.

Having met outside the city to greet the body, the procession moved to the church, where a great multitude of onlookers gathered. While Adam of Eynsham reports that miracles had already occurred on the way from London to Lincoln and shortly after the funeral of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1673}, Giraldus is silent about any previous incidents. We may thus conclude that he wanted to portray the splendid funeral as the first miracle that St Hugh had wrought. Thus, Giraldus strengthens the bond between St Hugh and his diocese / main place of veneration. The event was not only miraculous due to the number of twelve attendants, since, as Giraldus explains, if Hugh had died at the Chartreuse or at Witham, his funeral would have been accompanied by twelve brother monks, too\textsuperscript{1674}. But it was also an event of peace-making: between the hostile kings of England and Scotland and between King John and the Cistercians\textsuperscript{1675}. However, the reconciliation between King John and the monastic order is probably a misattribution, as it was due to the influence of Hubert Walter that the conflict was settled\textsuperscript{1676}.

\textsuperscript{1669} As James Dimock noted, the name of the archbishop of Ragusa – Anselm – was added later in the margin (\textit{VHD}, p. 114). Other sources call this archbishop “Bernhard”, and not Anselm (\textit{VH}, p. 122).
\textsuperscript{1670} MV2, p. 206. The second king was King William of Scotland.
\textsuperscript{1671} MV2, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{1672} \textit{Legenda}, p. 176.
\textsuperscript{1673} Cf. MV2, p. 219–225 and p. 230–231.
\textsuperscript{1674} \textit{VH}, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{1675} \textit{VH}, p. 40. Peter Raleigh detects an echo between the reconciliation of King John and King William of Scotland and the reconciliation of Hugh and King Richard at Les Andelys (Raleigh, \textit{Fere tirannicus}, p. 175).
\textsuperscript{1676} Cheney, Hubert Walter, p. 83–84. As Adam of Eynsham offers the same reason (MV2, p. 232), we may suppose that Giraldus misattributed the reconciliation because he did not know otherwise.
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5.5.2.2 Curing the sick\textsuperscript{1677}

The miracles Giraldus narrated in distinction two mainly involve curing the sick\textsuperscript{1678}. Many of the incidents pertain to people living close to Lincoln: The first cure that Giraldus reports deals with a nameless knight from Lindsey who is cured of cancer. Located equally close to Lincoln is the second miraculous cure of the rural dean from Marnam’s abscess (chapter three) and the healing of the mad boy from Ancaster (chapter seven), who had vainly been dragged to numerous shrines by his family before coming to Lincoln\textsuperscript{1679}. Furthermore, a blind man from Stubton (located about eighteen miles from Lincoln) was also cured by St Hugh.

Yet St Hugh did not only work miracles near his grave: the knight of Lindsey, the rural dean of Marnam and the mad boy are healed outside the city. All three came to Lincoln so the miracle could be testified and proclaimed in public. Besides the appearance of important members of the lay society of Lincoln in chapter ten, members of the cathedral chapter are usually involved in the attestation of the miracles\textsuperscript{1680}. In the case of the cure of the knight of Lindsey, Giraldus names specifically Roger of Rolleston as being present\textsuperscript{1681}. The chapter also goes as far as to enquire in the local community whether the disease was actually true. This was, for example, the case in the cure of the blind men of Stubton\textsuperscript{1682}.

Chapter three, which contains the miraculous cure of the rural dean of Marnam and his sick son, is special because it combines the elements of ailment and dreamlike vision\textsuperscript{1683}. The vision reveals that an unworthy man had been destined to be the successor of Bishop Hugh. This dreamlike element shows what Benedicta Ward called an act of power\textsuperscript{1684}: through this vision, St Hugh shows his care for the wellbeing of his diocese. He acts as

\textsuperscript{1677} VH, p. 42–64.
\textsuperscript{1678} Besides a few exceptions, most important medieval shrines were not famous for special cures – on the contrary, almost every illness presented was cured (Wilson, Introduction, p. 18).
\textsuperscript{1679} VH, p. 54: ad plurima loca sanctorum.
\textsuperscript{1680} Cf. VH, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{1681} VH, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{1682} VH, p. 56: super hoc certioriari cupiens.
\textsuperscript{1683} VH, p. 44–46. For the difference between dream, vision, and the possible mixture of both, cf. Bitel, \textit{In Visu Noctis}: Dreams in European Hagiology and Histories, 450–900, p. 51. Meeting a saint in a dream was considered as a vision (Bitel, \textit{In Visu Noctis}: Dreams in European Hagiology and Histories, 450–900, p. 52).
\textsuperscript{1684} Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 34.
an (immortal) landlord who is protecting his community and his diocese from heaven\textsuperscript{1685}. As it turned out, the interference of King John in the affairs of the diocese did not bear fruits, for three years later, William of Blois was elected as bishop of Lincoln.

During the vision, a bodiless voice commands the sick to build an image of St Hugh as a sacrifice. Ex-voto offers (models or images, often shaped like an affected body part that was cured) were given to thank the saint. At the shrine of St Thomas de Cantilupe, such offerings not only included images of the healed or of the formerly affected limb, but also ships, images of healed animals, crutches or even jewellery\textsuperscript{1686}. Local vendors could even try to earn their money by selling wax images representing an afflicted body part\textsuperscript{1687}. In Giraldus’ narration, the sacrifice is not in the form of the man’s head (or foot, which is later lost to the disease), but an image in the form of the saint. Although the offer does not pertain to the dean’s mortally sick son, he recovers as well.

Chapter four goes into some detail about the personal background of the sick woman of Keal, whose illness is portrayed as a punishment for working on Sunday\textsuperscript{1688}. This must have happened in the year 1200, as Giraldus mentions the presence of the abbot of Flaye in England\textsuperscript{1689}. Once again, the true nature of the disease and the cure are attested from friends, neighbours, and local authorities\textsuperscript{1690}. Interestingly, the woman had to come to Lincoln twice: on the first occasion, she met the penitentiary, William de Branfred, who did not believe her story but was not able to extract her hands\textsuperscript{1691}. Similar to the miracles of Remigius, St Thomas Becket makes a (hidden) appearance, because the woman visits the saint’s shrine at Canterbury. Like in the story of the Dean of Marnam, a bodiless voice commands her in a dreamlike vision to return to Lincoln where she will be healed at the tomb of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1692}. The promise is fulfilled during a mass said by the aforementioned Subdean William and testified by knights from Lindsey and very trustworthy men. The reappearance of William and the

\textsuperscript{1685} One of the most famous examples showing how people regarded their saint as their landlord is St Cuthbert, whose community was referred to as haliferfolk (community of the holy man) centuries after his death (Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, p. 142).
\textsuperscript{1686} Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{1687} Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{1688} VH, p. 46–50.
\textsuperscript{1689} VH, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{1690} VH, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{1691} VH, p. 48. Such pre-tests seem to have been more an exception than the rule (Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 101).
\textsuperscript{1692} VH, p. 50.
attestation of the knights serve to attribute a higher degree of credibility to the miracle.

Only chapter number nine dives equally deep into personal detail. It contains the story of the cure of a cripple named Alice, from Wigford, who fell sick because of a menacing dream. Healings of people from Wigford are also attested in chapters ten and twelve.

The sick woman of Keal is not the only woman healed by St Hugh: another, a dropsical woman from Beverley, also came to his tomb. The structure is similar to the miracle already mentioned: At first, the dropsical woman prayed in vain, but when she decides to seek help at the tomb of St Thomas Becket at Canterbury, she is miraculously cured by St Hugh. Again, a bodiless voice plays a part in this miracle. Remarkably, the cure is again attested by an official member of the church (in this case, the custos of St Hugh’s tomb), and also by bystanders and the chapter of Lincoln. The chapter even goes as far as to enquire about her previous state from the chapter of Beverley, which gives the miracle even greater credibility.

The chapter of Lincoln was also involved in the miracle concerning the cure of a blind boy, who had been a pensioner of the canons and citizens of Lincoln. Again, the chapter enquired whether the miracle was true. This time, it was not only a citizen who testified the healing, but Dean Roger himself. This is not the only explicit mention of Dean Roger, as he reappears in chapter twelve, when he places a healed girl in a hospital to work as a nurse.

The curing of the crippled girl Alice from Wigford has already been mentioned. The story, however, is not the only miracle that chapter nine contains: the chapter also dwells on the visionary dream of Philip the subdean, who had doubted the sanctity of St Hugh and was persuaded. A dreamlike vision is also part of chapter ten, when the mute boy from

---

1693 VH, p. 56–58.
1694 Wigford in VH, p. 57 passim and Wikeford in VHP, p. 129 passim. The scene shows that not necessarily every vision was sent by God; on the contrary, the purpose of some visions / dreams was to deceive and harm people (cf. Bitel, In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories, 450–900, p. 46–47).
1695 Her name was Mathilda (VH, p. 123).
1696 VH, p. 52.
1697 VH, p. 54.
1698 VH, p. 64.
Wigford imagines a woman of exceptional beauty and a venerably bishop. The curing of this boy has lasting consequences, as his miraculous healing inspired a mute boy from Pottergate to seek remedy at St Hugh’s tomb. This remark shows that miracles could indeed function like “advertisements” for a shrine. Furthermore, it proves that stories about miraculous healings performed by St Hugh circulated throughout the population. Giraldus himself remarks that crowds of young and old men and women were a usual sight when a miracle happened.

So far, we have seen that Giraldus attempts to wave a strong bond between St Hugh and his church. Many of the sick who are cured either come from Lincoln or from a city close by. This geographical restriction of the cult may be explained by its novelty. My examination has also showed that the chapter was involved in many examinations / attestations of these miracles. The frequent enquiries into the nature of the miracle and the patient’s history before the cure testify that the increasing importance of reliable witnesses was felt by Giraldus and his contemporaries – after all, performing wonder was not limited to God and his saints, for the devil was also capable of performing miraculous deeds.

---

1700 VH, p. 60. These people can probably be identified as the Virgin Mary and St Hugh. Meeting a saint (or, in this case, a saint and the Virgin Mary) in a dream was usually considered a vision (Bitel, In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories, 450–900, p. 52).

1701 VH, p. 62.

1702 Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 31.

1703 Cf. VH, p. 62: The decision to visit the shrine was made “after the miraculous cure of the mute boy of Wigford had been heard” (audito miraculo de muto de Wikeford). For the spreading of news of miracles, cf. in general Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 152–172.

1704 VH, p. 62.

1705 The earliest miracles would centre around the main place of veneration, whereas miracles far away from this veneration place are recorded when the cult is firmly established (Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 72–73).

1706 Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 37. The story of Alice of Wigford may serve as an example for this belief.
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5.5.2.3 As sort of an epilogue: Giraldus’ invitation to his successors

Chapter thirteen of the miracle section does not reveal further wonders performed by St Hugh. Instead, Giraldus chose to compose an epilogue. From this epilogue, we may deduce that the miracles had happened before the Interdict (March 1208 – July 1214).

Similarly to the end of the life of Remigius, Giraldus intersects a dictum from a Roman poet. While he had chosen Horace in the VR, the distinctio II of the VH finishes with Virgil. The core message of both sententiae is clear and tempts one to suggest that they were written around the same time: we, Giraldus, cannot deal with everything (non omnia possumus omnes) and therefore we will finish this work, ere our inability to finish it will cast an unfortunate light on it (Infelix operis summa est, quae apponere finem nescit).

In this epilogue, Giraldus commends his successors (the scriptores novos) to the patronage of Bishop Hugh of Wells. Interestingly, the invitation does not only refer to writing down the miracles of St Hugh, but also the deeds of his fellow bishops.

Hugh of Wells is grouped together with Remigius and St Hugh, for he is called the ‘third shining lamp of Lincoln’. Similar to his predecessor St Hugh, Hugh of Wells is admonished to promote good, literate men, so that he would be the third patron of the church. The close relationship between St Hugh and Hugh of Wells is also supported by the absence of Bishop William of Blois. Although he had already made an appearance in the miracle section, Hugh of Wells’ immediate predecessor is silently

---

1707 VH, p. 64–66.
1708 VR, p. 80 and VH, p. 66.
1709 VH, p. 64.
1710 VR, p. 80.
1711 VH, p. 66.
1712 VH, p. 66: tam sua quam coepiscoporum suorum gesta declarantes et scriptis egregiis Lincolniensem ecclesiam illustrantes.
1713 VH, p. 66.
1714 It could be argued that Hugh of Wells was bound by the bona exempla of his predecessors to show himself to be equally generous to the church of Lincoln (cf. Althoff, Causa Scribendi und Darstellungsabsicht: Die Lebensbeschreibung der Königin Mathilde und Andere Beispiele, p. 129 who made a similar observation for Adam of Bremen).
1715 VH, p. 50.
passed over in this last chapter, wherefore the connection between the two Hughs is emphasized even further.

**5.5.3 Distinctio III: Miracles wrought during the Interdict**

Although Giraldus had intended to finish the *Vita S. Hugonis* after distinction two, a request from his friend, Dean Roger of Rolleston, compelled him to add a third distinction to the manuscript. This distinction comprises six chapters, of which five contain a total of six healing-miracles.

A later addition of sections to a life is not new. In contrast, Giraldus and Dean Roger had a prominent model on which they could rely: extra material was also added to support the canonization of St Thomas Becket.

The six miracles are healing miracles. St Hugh helped the sick in cases of paralysis, blindness, and affection with cancer / tumour. It should be noted that of the six miracles in question, the names of four healed persons are given: a knight of Lindsey, a blind woman from Lindsey, a man from a village in Leicestershire, and another knight who belonged to the family of Richard de Sanford. Giraldus omits the names of the young paralytic (who is, according to other accounts, named John) and a bed-ridden man from the district of Lynn.

Furthermore, every miracle is attested by the local authorities: by Dean Roger (chapter two, chapter four), his almoner (chapter three), the chapter (chapter two), the subdean (chapter five) the precentor (chapter six) and archdeacons (chapter six).

In distinction two, Giraldus narrated that the sick had also travelled to different shrines throughout England before finally being healed by St Hugh. The case of Knight Milo is slightly different: as he fell ill in France, he had first turned to the local French saints. When neither the doctors nor the saints of France could help him, he returned to England. Similar to a miracle from distinction two, Milo offered a waxen image of his arm to St

---

1716 Cf. for the observations in this chapter *VH*, p. 68–80.
1718 *VHP*, p. 143.
1719 In this passage, Giraldus claims that Dean Roger examined this miracle, as well as all the others (*aliis cunctis, VH*, p. 74).
Hugh’s tomb\textsuperscript{1720}. However, in contrast to the miracle of distinction two, Milo is not commanded to do so.

The healing of the blind Mathilda was first proclaimed in a vision to the matrons of the city, and the healing itself takes place in a dreamlike vision\textsuperscript{1721}. A vision is also narrated in the cure of the young paralytic from Lincoln\textsuperscript{1722}. On both occasions, St Hugh twice commands the sick to rise. The command \textit{Surge} evokes references to the healing of Lazarus\textsuperscript{1723}. Echoing the healing of the blind Mathilda, women attest the miracle of the healing of the young paralytic; in this case, the sisters of the hospital who had cared for the boy confirm that the miracle truly happened.

The third dreamlike vision, when St Hugh appeared to the bed-ridden man of Lynn, is slightly different to the other two visions. First of all, in this vision, St Hugh’s name is explicitly mentioned, whereas in the case of the blind Mathilda and the paralytic boy, Giraldus only speaks of a figure clad in episcopal robes\textsuperscript{1724}. Furthermore, the man is not commanded to rise (\textit{Surge}), like Mathilda and the boy, instead, St Hugh offers his help. The curing itself does not take place at the tomb of Hugh of Lincoln, but at St Margaret’s Graves, which is a cell of Worksop Abbey\textsuperscript{1725}. When the prior and a canon of the cell hasten to Lincoln to proclaim the miracle, the canon arrives just in time for the proclaiming of paralytic boy’s cure\textsuperscript{1726}. This, as Giraldus claimed, is itself a miracle, for God had obviously arranged the time of arrival so that the miracles of St Hugh seem to multiply\textsuperscript{1727}. This is a fitting end for distinction three, because it shows Hugh’s popularity and his saintly powers at their height.

\textsuperscript{1720} VH, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{1721} VH, p. 70–72. For the differences between dream, vision, and the possible mixture of both elements, cf. Bitel, \textit{In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories, 450–900}, p. 51. Meeting a saint in a dream was usually considered a vision (Bitel, \textit{In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories, 450–900}, p. 52).
\textsuperscript{1722} VH, p. 76–78.
\textsuperscript{1723} Joh. 11,1–45.
\textsuperscript{1724} Cf. VH, p. 78 (\textit{sanctus Hugo}) and p. 72 (\textit{ornamentis episcopalibus congrue redimitus}) and p. 76 (\textit{episcopus quidam mitratus et episcopalibus competenter indutus}).
\textsuperscript{1725} VH\textsuperscript{D}, p. 145.
\textsuperscript{1726} VH, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{1727} VH, p. 80.
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5.5.4 The micro-structure of the life of St Hugh

Giraldus’ main *causa scribendi* for a life of St Hugh is the same as in the case of the life of Remigius: The *VH* was written to corroborate Lincoln’s claim that its recently deceased bishop deserved to be canonized. In Giraldus’ account, Hugh showed not only the necessary episcopal qualities, but he also proved himself to be a true champion of the liberty of the English Church. Against his stance, secular powers will achieve nothing. Divine signs, like his famous pet swan corroborate this impression. St Hugh was not only a responsible prelate for his own diocese, he also cared for the wellbeing of the whole church. Consequently, God already mystified his deeds at the end of Hugh’s life.

Especially if we contrast the *VH* with the accounts of Adam of Eynsham and Roger of Howden, we can observe how Giraldus shaped and reshaped details of Hugh’s life so that they would fit the saintly images Giraldus intended to create. A good example is the gathering at Oxford in 1197, when Hugh acts like a second Thomas Becket.

Similar to the miracle-sections of the life of Remigius, Giraldus draws on the popularity of St Thomas Becket. The miracle-sections also show a remarkable degree of sensitivity towards the newly required specifications for a canonization process at Rome. Here, we can observe an increasing number of witnesses’ names.

Furthermore, Giraldus narrated that local authorities had often inquired into the nature of the miracle. Specific members of the chapter, like Dean Roger of Rolleston, contribute to the truthfulness of the miracle-section. But Giraldus also mentions the testimony and the devotion of the lay population towards St Hugh. This may be an unconscious recurrence to the principle *vox populi, vox Dei.*
5.6 Examining the macro-structure of the lives

We have already established which role is played by particular elements on the micro-structure of each *vita*. The following chapters are devoted to a comparison: I will argue that the life of Remigius was significantly remodelled based on the life of St Hugh, when Giraldus revised the original concept of the *VR* in 1213/1214. This réécriture of Remigius’ life (version one) may explain certain inconsistencies and oddities within the life of Remigius that has come down to us (version three).

5.6.1 The arrival of two foreigners

It has already been mentioned that Hugh’s birth rank in an *ordo militaris* may well resound in the depiction of Remigius leading ten knights in the battle for England. There are, however, more similarities between the bishops.

First of all, both men are foreigners and in both cases, Giraldus remarks on this. Remigius, a monk from Normandy (*de Normannia oriundus*)1729, arrives in the wake of William the Conqueror, whereas Hugh stems from the remote parts of Burgundy, not far from the Alps (*de remotis imperialis Burgundie finibus, haut procul ab Alpibus*1730). Both men have a monastic background, on which Giraldus dwells much longer in Hugh’s case than in Remigius’ case. Their friendship with the king – William the Conqueror and Henry II, respectively – smooths their way to episcopal office. Whereas Remigius has *regis notitiam, quamplurimam familiaritatem, atque favorem*1731, Hugh has *regisque notitiam, [...] familiaritatem plurimam et dilectionem*1732. Giraldus used very similar phrases in both texts, which is striking.

1730 *VH*, p. 8.
1732 *VH*, p. 12.
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There are more similarities between Remigius and Hugh: Both men are said to have been elected canonically[^1733]. We have already mentioned that in Remigius’ case, this canonical election is probably wrong, and that Adam of Eynsham adds greater detail to the process of Hugh’s acceptance of being a bishop[^1734]. This comparison suggests that the similarities between Remigius and Hugh are not accidental. If we remember that Remigius acting as a *decurio* and having been canonically elected is probably incorrect (or, at least, singular in comparison to the other accounts we consulted), there is only one possible explanation for this oddity: The life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh were re-modelled by Giraldus, so that his audience could recognize the connection between both bishops.

### 5.6.2 References to St Martin[^1735]

Based on the assumptions that we have to deal with three possible versions of the *VR*, of which only version three has come down to us, I would suggest that chapter two and chapter three represent additional alterations to the original version one of the *VR*.

First of all, both chapters interrupt the structure of the life. While chapter one finishes with a rather long sentence enumerating Remigius’ different virtues, chapter four explicitly draws on them, beginning with the phrase *his itaque Remigius et moribus ornatus* (Remigius, equipped with these things and character traits)[^1736]. Yet the end of chapter three makes no reference to virtues (*mores*), but to Remigius’ preaching to the lepers. The beginning of chapter four makes only sense, if the previous chapter is not number three, but number one. The transition between chapter one and chapter two does not flow smoothly either: At the end of chapter one, Giraldus had already summarized Remigius’ virtues in a very long sentence[^1737]. It reads like a conclusion. Chapter two breaks up this summarization by elaborating on Remigius’ greatest virtue, his charity. This elaboration is protracted by numerous quotations, which form the majority of this chapter. Thus, if we eliminated chapters two and three, the

[^1733]: *VR*, p. 14 and *VH*, p. 12.
[^1734]: Cf. chapter 5.1.1.2.
[^1735]: *VR*, p. 15–18.
[^1736]: *VR*, p. 18.
[^1737]: *VR*, p. 15.
whole *vita* would not lose substantial material, but only details added to an already existing picture.

Chapter two and chapter three not only show Remigius performing Christian duties, they even connect Remigius with St Martin. While the reference in chapter two is very obvious (Remigius is called *quasi Martinus alter*)\(^{1738}\), the reference in chapter three is more subtle, because Giraldus only mentions the foundation of the leper-house next to the city of Lincoln. This allusion is remarkable: Giraldus breaks the time continuum, because he mentioned an aspect of Remigius’ life at Lincoln before Remigius had transferred his diocesan city at all.

As James Dimock remarked, Giraldus confused Remigius and King Henry I as founders of the hospital\(^ {1739}\). I suspect that this confusion did not happen by mistake, but on purpose. Joshua Byron Smith has shown for the life of Ethelbert that Giraldus displays a “typical willingness to invent historical fact when needed”\(^ {1740}\). If Giraldus was indeed lacking the necessary sources, he decided to invent a historical fact that would have suited his goals best. After the direct reference to St Martin, a reference to lepers would, of course, remind any reader of the saintly bishop of Tours.

The topic of St Martin is important for several reasons. First of all, the majority of references to St Martin are found in chapter two and three of the *Vita Remigii*. This shows that both chapters form a unity that has to be distinguished from the remaining ones.

Furthermore, the St Martin-theme establishes a connection between Remigius and Hugh. Obviously Giraldus could not have invented this connection for version one of the *Vita S. Remigii*, because no life of Hugh existed in 1199.

---

\(^{1738}\) *VR*, p. 15.
\(^{1740}\) Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70.
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5.6.3 The problem with Lindsey and the mantle

One great inconsistency obscured chapter four of the life of Remigius: the case of Lindsey. In part one of the VR, Giraldus said that an *excambium* took place during Remigius’ lifetime, while he later claimed in part three of the VR that Remigius’ immediate successor, Robert Bloet, solved this problem. How can this inconsistency be explained?

The first possible scenario is, in my opinion, most unlikely: While Giraldus was writing the life of Remigius, he simply forgot that he had already mentioned that the problem had been solved by Remigius and, consequently, he mentioned it again when he wrote the passage about Robert Bloet. Thinking of the huge amount of literature Giraldus had written throughout his life, this explanation seems highly unlikely.

We thus have to consider another scenario, which is, in my opinion, the most probable explanation for the Lindsey-doublet. In this scenario, part one of the VR (version one) originally did not contain any reference to the bishopric of Lindsey. Instead, Giraldus depicted the (historically correct) sequence of events and narrated in part three of the VR that Robert Bloet had solved the problem. In 1213 / 1214, Giraldus decided to combine the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh in a single manuscript. Consequently, the life of Remigius had to be updated and adapted to the standard Hugh’s life had set. Hugh had done his diocese a huge favour, since he had solved the financial problem with the ‘gift of the mantle’. What extraordinary favour did Remigius bestow on his diocese?

Giraldus chose to depict Remigius as the bishop who incorporated the diocese of Lindsey into the bishopric. And Remigius did so with an *excambium*, whereas Hugh bought out Lincoln with a single, perpetual transaction.

Both contributions are mentioned towards the end of each bishop’s life. This position is not random: in case of the VH, Giraldus altered the sequence of events. The royal charter which confirmed the final tax

---


1742 Cf. chapter 5.4.1.3.

1743 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.4.

1744 VR, p. 19. This term denotes either an exchange of land or monetary compensation.

1745 VH, p. 30.
payment was issued on 23 June 1194 (chapter nine)\textsuperscript{1746}, but the council of Oxford was summoned on 7 December 1197 (chapter eight). Giraldus broke up the expected temporal sequence of events to highlight the parallels between Remigius and St Hugh.

It would have been dangerous for Giraldus to invent a beneficium for Remigius which no one in Lincoln had ever heard of, as such a lie might have been detected very quickly\textsuperscript{1747}. This time, Giraldus chose instead to alter the facts (instead of inventing them) and so he attributed the incorporation of Lindsey to Remigius.

5.7 Reasons for composition and intended audience

As we have seen in the previous chapters, the structure of CCCC 425 was not created accidentally: Giraldus modelled and re-modelled his saints on each other.

Scholars have had different opinions about the purpose of CCCC 425. Did it have a documentary purpose, so as to record Hugh’s cult and miracles\textsuperscript{1748}? Was it meant to be “a concise, dignified portrait, written to enlighten and move a general audience”\textsuperscript{1749}? Did Giraldus undertake the task of creating saints for Lincoln\textsuperscript{1750}, maybe as an effort to please the chapter of Lincoln, or was the text even commissioned by the chapter\textsuperscript{1751}? What was the purpose of CCCC 425?

In my opinion, the primary purpose of CCCC 425 was probably not to serve as permanent documentation for the cult of St Hugh. In that case, neither the specific dedication to Archbishop Stephen Langton nor the addition of the life of Remigius would make sense. If Giraldus was aiming at a more

\textsuperscript{1746} VH, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{1747} Cf. the observation in Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 186–187.

\textsuperscript{1748} Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 244.

\textsuperscript{1749} VH, p. XLIV.

\textsuperscript{1750} Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 310 and Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{1751} Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307, p. 310 and Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 187. For example, when looking at the miracle section of the life of St Hugh, Matthew Mesley concludes it shows how the chapter intended to control the cult of St Hugh (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 261). John Crook suggests that the life of Remigius might have been written at the request of St Hugh (Crook, English Medieval Shrines, p. 222).
general audience, he failed to achieve his goal, for his work would very soon be supplanted by the *Legenda of St Hugh*. For example, Roger of Wendover, writing not long after both Hugh and Giraldus had died, copied the *Legenda* into his *Flores*, instead of quoting Giraldus’ *VH*.

In my opinion, Giraldus wrote a combined life of Remigius and St Hugh to create new saints for Lincoln. But was it a commissioned work by the chapter? Or did Giraldus compose both lives to please his friends there?

As we have seen, the chapter of Lincoln rarely makes an appearance in the biographical parts of either life. In chapter four of the *VR*, Giraldus had an excellent opportunity to praise the qualities of the newly instituted chapter (as one of his potential sources, Henry of Huntingdon, did). Yet he chose not to use this opportunity. He had a similar possibility in, distinction one, chapter five, of the life of St Hugh, when Hugh rebuilds the cathedral begun by Remigius. Again, Giraldus decided to let this opportunity slip. The *Metrical Life* of Henry of Avranches dwells intensively on the relationship between the rebuilding of the cathedral and the magnificence of the chapter.

Furthermore, Giraldus’ personal friends only make rare appearances. We know from the work of Adam of Eynsham that Giraldus could have selected scenes in which Walter Map, Adam of Eynsham or Roger of Rolleston are shown in direct interaction with St Hugh. But Giraldus did not do so. Thus, I conclude that CCCC 425 was not solely written to please an audience from the chapter of Lincoln.

Instead, in my opinion, CCCC 425 is primarily a commissioned work which should function as advertising material for the canonization of Remigius and St Hugh. Aviad Kleinberg spoke of “new Lives” which reflected the new papal position and its special demands for information. As I will argue in the following, in case of CCCC 425, the formation process of the manuscript shows traces of the first stages of the process of canonization at the beginning of the 13th century. Thus, the manuscript may be counted as one of the earliest manuscripts of this type of “new Lives”.

---

1753 For example, *MV2*, p. 131.
1754 For example, *MV1*, p. 110–113.
1755 Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 188.
1756 It is beyond the scope of this work to set out the details of how the papacy gained control over the cult of saints, so only details can be included here. Cf. for further information Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 22–57.
The process of canonization developed gradually, and it was not until the end of the 13th century that its components were set. The twelfth century was a crucial period of transition in the process of the control over the cult of saints. Within the course of Gregorian reform movements, the papacy gained prestige immensely. 1146 marks an important shift, when Pope Eugenius III († 1153) declared that he was the only rightful proclaimer of saints. This claim was picked up by his successors. Over the next decades, a “creeping centralisation of control over new cults” emerged. During the pontificate of Pope Innocent III, the papacy fully monopolized the right to judge the saintliness of possible saints. Among the first examples to which Pope Innocent III applied his new rules for sanctification were the canonization processes of Gilbert of Sempringham (canonized 1202) and Wulfstan of Worcester (canonized 1203).

Wulfstan of Worcester was canonized on 14 May 1203. Giraldus had been in Rome during the first half of 1203, so we may assume that he had gained some insights into the canonization process of St Wulfstan. Judging from these experiences, he probably knew about the importance of a strong advocate in the process. So perhaps Giraldus did not show “a degree of foresight”, as Matthew Mesley comments, instead, he simply knew about papal regulations, when he dedicated CCC 425 to Stephen Langton. Like his predecessor, Hubert Walter, who was important for the canonization of Gilbert of Sempringham and Wulfstan of Worcester, Stephen Langton would be important for the canonization of Hugh of Lincoln.

For the Late Middle Ages, scholars have determined the following components of a canonization process: First, there was the petition to the pope (commonly letters that were first sent to high ecclesiastical figures and later to the papacy, or the sending of a representative to the papal court), and, when the Pope was convinced that the matter deserved to be

---

1758 Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 205.
1759 Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 24.
1760 Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 188.
1762 This right was now considered part of papal plenitudo potestatis (Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 27). Cf. for further information on Pope Innocent III and canonization processes Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 36–40.
1763 Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 39.
1764 Cf. for example JS, p. 241 and Butler, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, p. 266.
1766 Richard Loomis argued for the contrary (VH, p. XLVI).
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investigated, then a commission was appointed which investigated the case at the location in question. In Hugh’s case, the commission consisted of three high-ranking ecclesiastics: the bishop of Coventry, the abbot of Fountains and Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury. Hugh Farmer has also shown that Giraldus’ life was incorporated in the commissioner’s report. This incorporation was probably not accidental, for, thanks to Giraldus’ *Vita S. Hugonis*, Stephen Langton already had material at hand. Based on the information we have gathered, I propose the following scenario for the formation process of the lives of the bishops of Lincoln:

Obviously, Giraldus was well integrated and respected in and by the chapter of Lincoln and its spokesman, Dean Roger of Rolleston. After Hugh died in 1200, plans for a canonization were probably quickly laid, because Hugh had already had a reputation for saintliness during his lifetime. Historical events under the reign of King John prevented the early realization of the plan, as the see lay vacant for three years, until William of Blois became bishop of Lincoln. Maybe plans for an attempt at canonization had been made, maybe not – in any case, Giraldus was probably not integrated within them, since, after his defeat by Archbishop Hubert Walter, he travelled through Ireland and went on pilgrimage to Rome. If the hostility between St Hugh and Hubert Walter, as described by Adam of Eynsham in his *Magna Vita*, really existed, a positive outcome of any attempts at canonization may have been doubted anyway. The cult of William of Norwich (died 1144) may serve as an example: it only started to flourish when the main witnesses of the boy’s death, who could have opposed the veneration, had passed away. Of course, the events leading to the canonization of Thomas de Cantilupe († 1282, canonized 1320) show that opposition, even from the archbishop of Canterbury, might be overcome. However, this is more a lucky coincidence than the rule, and it required great efforts from the clergy.

---


1769 Robert Bartlett highlights the fact that this was an example of an ideal commission, because it shows “a balance of local knowledge and impartiality”, because no commissioner came from Hugh’s monastic order or from his diocese (Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 61).

1770 Farmer, The Canonization of St Hugh of Lincoln, p. 88.

1771 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.4.


1773 Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 219–221.
When Bishop William died in 1206, the see of Lincoln fell vacant again. Lincoln remained without a bishop until Hugh of Wells was consecrated in 1209\textsuperscript{1774}.

When Giraldus arrived back in Lincoln in 1207 or 1208, the situation had shifted, because Stephen Langton was the newly consecrated archbishop of Canterbury. Because Giraldus and Stephen Langton had probably met during their time in Paris, the chapter may have felt that the moment for a canonization-attempt was upon them. Yet again, historical developments prevented any plans coming to fruition, because King John violently opposed the newly consecrated archbishop. It was not until 1213 that Stephen Langton was able to return to England\textsuperscript{1775}. Now, Lincoln did not only have a bishop – Hugh of Wells, the second addressee of CCCC 425 – but also an archbishop who was likely to favour the case of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1776}. Giraldus had probably not forgotten that his own attempt to secure the status of saintliness for St Caradoc of St Davids had failed, because the case was not supported in his own diocese\textsuperscript{1777}. He could have concluded that a beneficial local bishop was as necessary for a successful appeal to the papal curia as a supportive archbishop. The importance of the support from local church authorities can be seen in the many unsuccessful cults that only existed for a short time, like the veneration of the rebel William Longbeard (executed in London in 1196)\textsuperscript{1778}. We should not forget distinction two, chapter thirteen, of the life of St Hugh: this chapter shows that Giraldus had intended to finish the life of St Hugh at a point which invokes the patronage of Hugh of Wells for other writers who intended to continue the work of Giraldus (that is, his efforts to promote the cult of St Hugh)\textsuperscript{1779}.

Now, the chapter could turn to Giraldus – or maybe he had had his share in the idea, we do not know – and a life of St Hugh was commissioned. The importance of a talented biographer for a blossoming saint’s cult can be shown for the cult of St Frideswide in Oxford\textsuperscript{1780}. As I have shown, the first

\textsuperscript{1774} Meanwhile, non-sacramental spiritual duties may have been performed by Dean Roger and the archdeacons (The Acta of Hugh of Wells, Bishop of Lincoln 1209–1235, p. XXX).

\textsuperscript{1775} Vincent, Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{1776} Unfortunately, we do not know for sure whether Hugh of Wells actively promoted the saints of his see (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 258).

\textsuperscript{1777} JS, p. 182–183.

\textsuperscript{1778} Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 130–131.

\textsuperscript{1779} VH, p. 64–66. Note that Matthew Mesley concludes that Giraldus sought patronage from Hugh of Wells (Mesley, The Construction of Episcopal Identity, p. 257). Based on Giraldus’ contradictory statement in the preface and my conclusions about the wealth he had acquired at Lincoln, I doubt this.

\textsuperscript{1780} Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 83.
version of the life of St Hugh was probably written not earlier than c. 1214, so the date of composition and the historical events would match. Stephen Langton received the first copy of the lives of Remigius and St Hugh (now lost) probably somewhere before the events leading to the issuing of the Magna Carta.

Unfortunately, the archbishop of Canterbury had no time to support the case of St Hugh, for he was on his way to Rome as early as September 1215\textsuperscript{1781}. War raged in England until 1217. In November 1217 and March 1218, peace was secured through different treaties and Stephen Langton would return in May 1218\textsuperscript{1782}.

Finally, the starting conditions for the canonization of St Hugh were favourable. The chapter would have understood the change of situation as well, for Giraldus was asked to add a third distinction to the life of St Hugh – the miracles that happened during the Interdict\textsuperscript{1783}.

The present text shows further traces that its composition was undertaken with the bureaucratic aspects of a canonization process in mind: First of all, the focus in the life of Remigius and the life of St Hugh lay on the saint. For example, in the \textit{VH}, neither the deaths of King Henry II or King Richard (although Hugh could have been portrayed as a support for Richard’s grieving widow\textsuperscript{1784}), nor the ascension of King John are mentioned. As shown above, the names of side characters had been reduced to a minimum, except for cases where they function as witnesses.

It should not be forgotten that Stephen Langton was not the only addressee of CCCC 425: Giraldus explicitly asked the archbishop of Canterbury to send the manuscript back to the incumbent bishop of Lincoln, Hugh of Wells. Why should the manuscript be sent back to Lincoln, if it was not meant to be kept in the cathedral library?

Thus, Giraldus’ long-term objective was not to write a saint’s life to be read on feast days (and, as already said, his text was soon surplanted by the \textit{Legenda} of St Hugh). Instead, he aimed at a place among the books of the

\textsuperscript{1781} Baumann, Stephen Langton, p. 187. David Farmer thinks that the reign of King John would not have been a good time to attempt the canonization of Hugh (Farmer, The Cult and Canonization of St Hugh, p. 77).
\textsuperscript{1782} Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 94–95 and Vincent, Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{1783} The connection between \textit{distinctio III} and the upcoming canonization is also drawn by Walter Berschin (Berschin, Biographie und Epochenstil im Lateinischen Mittelalter, Band IV: Ottonische Biographie. Das Hohe Mittelalter 920-1220 n. Chr., p. 418).
\textsuperscript{1784} MV2, p. 136.
cathedral library. Although the library was not open for public consultation, Lincoln’s school may well have been allowed to access its resources\textsuperscript{1785}. By ensuring that the VR and the VH were both kept at the cathedral library, Giraldus made sure that his works and the messages they contained would be remembered by future generations, just like he spoke about in the Epistola ad Capitulum Herefordense\textsuperscript{1786}.

Here, we may detect a similarity between the approach undertaken by Bishop Leofric of Exeter and Giraldus’ composition of CCCC 425: Lincoln was not an old, venerable episcopal city, instead, it “lacked both age and sanctity”\textsuperscript{1787}. During Giraldus’ lifetime, Lincoln already possessed means of remembering the tradition of the see\textsuperscript{1788}. The see possessed a book of foundation comprising important charters, the catalogue of the cathedral library, and the obituary. Through these mediums, it was possible to connect the Lincoln of Giraldus’ days with the beginnings of Lincoln as an episcopal centre\textsuperscript{1789}.

A striking effect has been detected in the examination of the large-scale programme of hagiographical work composed in and for Ely during the decades after the Conquest: these authors intended to create a continuity between the old place of veneration (in Ely’s case, the old abbey) and the new one (in Ely’s case, the new bishopric)\textsuperscript{1790}. We may presume that Giraldus composed CCCC 425 with a similar effect in mind, for its structure is not accidental. On the contrary, Giraldus intentionally stretched the bow from the see’s beginnings under Bishop Remigius to his successor Hugh. We have seen that the situation deteriorated under Remigius’ immediate successors and gradually improved until the initial situation was restored under Bishop Hugh. Similar to Bishop Leofric of Exeter, who compared himself to King Æthelstan, founder of the monastery of St Peter and St Mary at Exeter (Æthelstan being the ‘founder’ and Leofric the ‘restorer’ of the monastery\textsuperscript{1791}), Remigius is the saintly ‘founder’ of Lincoln as an episcopal town, and Hugh is its ‘restorer’. By composing CCCC 425, Giraldus set out “to reconstruct a past that explained and legitimised the

\textsuperscript{1785} Campbell, The Landscape of Pastoral Care in Thirteenth–Century England, p. 205.
\textsuperscript{1786} LS, p. 419.
\textsuperscript{1787} Cannon, Cathedral, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{1788} Cf. for the following argument Insley, Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century, p. 41–60.
\textsuperscript{1789} Insley, Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{1790} Ridyard, Con digna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{1791} Insley, Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century, p. 52.
In conclusion, CCCC 425 had a twofold purpose and, consequently, a twofold audience: first of all, the manuscript served as advertising material for the canonization of Remigius and St Hugh. To support both cases, assistance was required not only from within the diocese of Lincoln, but also from its bishop and the primate of England. As a result, CCCC 425 was addressed to both men.

Finally, the manuscript was meant to be kept at Lincoln, from where CCCC 425 may even originate. By linking Remigius, who was the first bishop after the Conquest and founder of Lincoln as an episcopal centre, with Hugh of Avalon, Giraldus reconstructed and wrote down the history of the see, and by referring to six praiseworthy bishops in the copula tergemina, he anchored the see’s tradition not only in time but also geographically. Overall, with CCCC 425, Giraldus managed to connect the presence with the beginnings of Lincoln and embedded the cathedral, the chapter and the bishops in a (saintly) sequence of events and persons and located Lincoln in a holy landscape.

---

1792 Insley, Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century, p. 56.
1793 VH, p. L–LI.
6. A scholar and his saints: Conclusion

6.1 The hagiographer and his œuvre

At the beginning, I proposed to examine the art of hagiographical writing of Giraldus Cambrensis. To achieve my aim, I have analysed Giraldus’ four saints’ lives which have come down to us. I have obtained different results, depending on different points.

First of all, there are issues like the different length of the texts and their connections to each other. The lives of the bishops of Lincoln, for example, therefore underwent a different type of examination than the life of St David or that of St Ethelbert.

Moreover, the number of manuscripts that have come down to us has influenced the process of examination, too. Whereas we have two manuscripts containing two different versions of the life of St David, in the case of the three remaining lives, I could only conclude that different versions must have existed. My conclusions were based on textual evidence, which means, on hints and traces of rewriting that still exist in Giraldus’ texts.

Another major difference between the four vitae concerns the question of whether we are dealing with cases of réécriture or whether these manuscripts represent Giraldus’ original compositions.

In the case of the réécritures, I was able to compare the hyper- and hypotexts with each other. We have seen that Giraldus usually followed his templates quite closely throughout the major parts of the narratives (especially in the VE). However, he also added his own touches to these texts: for the VD, for example, he changed the sequence in which the events before David’s birth were narrated\(^\text{1794}\). To the VE, he added his own collection of miracles\(^\text{1795}\). Characteristically, Giraldus re-worked his templates, when it came to style and the choice of words (the term he usually used was scholastico stilo). This habit is very obvious in both the VD and the VE.

\(^{1794}\) Cf. chapter 3.3.2.1–3.3.2.2.
\(^{1795}\) Cf. chapter 4.3.3–4.3.4.
As for the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, Giraldus had no template whose structure he could follow. To examine his original compositions, we had to include a variety of primary sources in order to identify the points on which Giraldus focused.

For the VR, we have demonstrated that Giraldus was at pains to picture Remigius as a humble, literate man highly devoted to God and charity, instead of evoking the portrait of a Norman venturer seeking riches in England. Giraldus even re-worked his sources: in his vida, the dispute between Lincoln and York which concerned the former bishopric of Lindsey was rather easily solved, whereas our examination of the historical framework has proven the true scope of the Lindsey-question.

As we have seen for the VH, Giraldus focused his narration on the saintly qualities of St Hugh. We also discovered that Giraldus used certain authorial techniques to alter the characteristics of certain events. A good example is the meeting at the council of Oxford, where Giraldus constructs a clash between sacerdotium and regnum that probably did not happen in the way Giraldus would have it.

Depending on the particular life, different saints served as models for each text. For example, in the VD, a lot of Irish saints appeared throughout the text. For his original compositions, Giraldus chose to use St Martin as a role model for his depiction of both saints. The references to each saint are sometimes covert, sometimes obviously interwoven in the fabric of the text. We found, for example, explicit phrases like Martinus alter (VR) as well as allusions to biblical events like the beheading of John the Baptist (VE).

Finally, we have proven that Giraldus was very much influenced by the ‘Anglo-Norman’ hagiographical way of writing. On the one hand, St Thomas Becket serves as the thread running throughout the lives of the bishops of Lincoln, and on the other, Giraldus’ way of depicting the miracles of a saint was also influenced by Anglo-Norman standards. This not only includes the appearance of Normans in St Ethelbert’s post-mortem miracles: Although Welsh tradition would have limited itself to a depiction of the miracles St David wrought during his lifetime, Giraldus finished his narration with an invitation to his fellow writers. He invited them to add further miracles, which St David had performed after his death. This

1796 Cf. chapter 5.4.1.1.
1797 Cf. chapter 5.4.1.3 and chapter 5.6.3.
1798 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.
1799 Cf. chapter 5.5.1.2.4.
invitation was still being followed by Giraldus’ fellow writers even centuries later, as a manuscript proves\textsuperscript{1801}.

However, despite their obvious differences, the vitae share some common features.

As we have seen, Giraldus was extremely interested in each saint’s genealogy: St David and St Ethelbert have a royal background, and the aristocratic origin of St Hugh is highlighted as well\textsuperscript{1802}. Giraldus also emphasizes the erudition of his saints\textsuperscript{1803}. In some way, he neither distinguished between ‘old’ or ‘newly established’ saints, nor between Welsh, Anglo-Saxon, and Anglo-Norman saints. The saint’s genealogy, his erudition, and his defiance of opposing forces\textsuperscript{1804} seem to be of greater importance for Giraldus. Of course, these features should not be confused with the core attributes of saintliness\textsuperscript{1805}, although saints tended to be from the upper classes\textsuperscript{1806}. On the contrary, these are the features which unite Giraldus’ saints and thus are probably the points on which Giraldus himself would have placed the greatest emphasis, if he had been asked to give the characteristic features of saints.

Besides these connections between the various saints, the texts themselves also share some features that may be attributed to writing techniques. First of all, Giraldus reduced the numbers of side-characters in his texts to a minimum. This was especially obvious in case of the réécritures, but our comparison of the life of St Hugh and the *Magna Vita* of Adam of Eynsham has also shown that Giraldus probably could have included a lot more personal anecdotes about Hugh which would also have proven his saintliness\textsuperscript{1807}. This technique was used in order to keep the focus on the major character of the text, namely, the saint. Giraldus made his purpose

\textsuperscript{1801} Cf. chapter 3.2.1.
\textsuperscript{1802} Remigius is the obvious exception, but, given the paucity of information about his life before 1066, we may suppose that Giraldus simply did not possess the information and that he would have included Remigius’ family background if he had known about it (cf. chapter 5.4.1.1).
\textsuperscript{1804} Cf. *VD*, p. 387–389 (David battles Boia for control over the country, the *VE* (Ethelbert is killed by King Offa / his henchmen), *VR*, p. 18–19 (Remigius removes the see and adds Lindsey to his diocese) and *VH*, p. 26–30 (St Hugh and King Richard).
\textsuperscript{1805} Cf. Kleinberg, Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages, p. 185–186.
\textsuperscript{1806} Cf. the examination of Weinstein and Bell from the 11th to the 17th century (Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 196).
\textsuperscript{1807} Cf. above, chapter 3.3, chapter 4.3, and chapter 5.5.
obvious in the life of St David, when he directs readers interested in St Patrick to Patrick’s *vitae*.

Another feature that is shared by Giraldus’ saints’ *vitae*: James Wyn Evans has drawn our attention to the fact that, especially in the life of St David, Giraldus presents us a story of unbroken continuity between the saint, the site at St Davids and the passage of time – a story which seemed to say that there had been neither disruption nor transition over the previous centuries [...]. Indeed, we are looking not so much at a transition but a successful transfiguration of events.1808

This happened also in case of the lives of Remigius and St Hugh, where Giraldus created the image of unbroken continuity from the times of Lincoln’s founder, Bishop Remigius, to the times of his worthy successor, St Hugh of Lincoln (and, ultimately, to Bishop Hugh of Wells). We may also detect traces of this writing technique at the end of the life of St Ethelbert, when Giraldus connects the text with miracles of his lifetime, and at the end of the life of St David, when Giraldus invites his successors to include future miracles.1809

The cathedrals which housed the saints’ shrines towered over the holy landscape. We only have to remind ourselves how St Ethelbert is portrayed as a universal landlord, how the *copula tergmina* of the life of Remigius situates Lincoln on an imaginary map among other places of worship or we may think about the links Giraldus created in his life of St David between Wales and Ireland. Giraldus’ *vitae* have a strong geographical attitude which matches Giraldus’ personal interests: Giraldus provides Stephen Langton with a description of the boundaries of the diocese of Lindsey and of the rivers of Lincoln, he offers us the different names for the city of ‘Hereford’ and he has a tendency to locate the different places in the life of St David precisely. His *Topographia Hibernica*, his *Itinerarium Kambriae*, and his *Descriptio Kambriae* serve as obvious

---

1808 Wyn Evans, *Transition and Survival*, p. 31.
1809 *VE*, p. 236.
1810 *VH*, p. 404.
1811 Cf. chapter 4.3.3.3.
1812 Cf. chapter 5.4.4.
1813 Cf. chapter 3.5.
1814 *VR*, p. 6.
1815 *VE*, p. 230.
1816 Cf., for example, the description of the meeting place of Sanctus and Nonnita (*VH*, p. 379).
examples that Giraldus was interested in the topography of a country. However, his interests run even deeper: the *Descriptio Kambriae* was equipped with a map which Giraldus had made (or had found)\(^{1817}\). Brynley Roberts supposes that Giraldus may have shown this map to St Hugh during his time at Lincoln\(^{1818}\). Giraldus must have been proud of his map, because he commented on it in his catalogue of books and in his letter to the chapter of Hereford\(^{1819}\).

Obviously, Giraldus’ geographical interests are also reflected in his saints’ lives. When we put St Davids, Hereford, and Lincoln on an imaginary map, the cathedrals which housed the saints’ shrines formed part of a holy landscape and thus create a map of ecclesiastical influence\(^{1820}\). This map was also revised, for example, when Giraldus claimed a sphere of influence for St Davids that used to be attributed to its rivals\(^{1821}\). At the same time, these geographical landmarks served as a living proof that the past was not to be forgotten.

From Giraldus’ point of view, the past was not simply past, instead, it was a past integrated in Giraldus’ present. The past, of course, was not a ‘historical correct’ past, as modern readers might imagine. Instead, Giraldus, like many other medieval writers, shaped the past according to the needs of his texts\(^{1822}\). This observation is very important, since saints’ lives represent the best cases of malleable memory\(^{1823}\). A famous example of Giraldus’ reworking of past events may be found in the life of St Hugh: while Giraldus presented Hugh as the spokesman and champion of the church, the sole defender of its liberty, and the main actor behind the resistance at the council of Oxford in 1197, a comparison with the narrations of Adam of Eynsham and Roger of Howden casts some doubts over this depiction of events.

\(^{1817}\) Birkenholz, Hereford Maps, Hereford Lives, p. 231.

\(^{1818}\) Roberts, Gerald of Wales, p. 65–66. The map seems to have been lost in a fire in 1695 (Williams, Giraldus Cambrensis in Wales, p. 11). Cf. also Birkenholz, Hereford Maps, Hereford Lives, p. 228–236.


\(^{1820}\) We only have to think about the Ferns-episode in the life of St David (*VD*, p. 391–392).

\(^{1821}\) Cf. especially chapter 3.3.3.2 and 3.3.5, or the Lindsey-episode in the life of Remigius (*VR*, p. 18–19).

\(^{1822}\) See Joshua Byron Smith’s comment on Giraldus’ “typical willingness to invent historical fact when needed” (Smith, Gerald of Wales, Walter Map and the Anglo-Saxon History of Lydbury North, p. 70) or the observation of Huw Pryce: Giraldus “valued the past for its exemplary power – as a source of examples that could legitimise a particular viewpoint or teach moral lessons” (Pryce, Gerald of Wales and the Welsh Past, p. 20).

\(^{1823}\) Bouchard, Rewriting Saints and Ancestors, p. 231–232.
Giraldus’ aim was not a ‘historically correct’ depiction of the course of events; on the contrary, he wanted the events to be remembered in a way that would have suited the case of St Hugh’s canonization in the most supportive way\textsuperscript{1824}.

6.2 The hagiographer and the art of hagiographical writing

The results of my examination of Giraldus’ hagiographical œuvre offer an impression of the art of hagiographical writing which was practiced in the Anglo-Norman realm at the turning from the twelfth to the thirteenth century. Fortunately, Giraldus is not a ‘genuine’ British author. On the contrary, Giraldus was influenced by norms, values, and concepts of saintliness which prevailed in a major part of Europe during these days, as we have seen especially in chapter two. Thus, Giraldus’ art of hagiographical writing is not a ‘genuine British’ art. Instead, it should be regarded as ‘West European’.

In turn, this art was determined by several other factors. As Robert Bartlett put it: “Saints’ lives are both part of a genre of immense longevity and the products of individual circumstances and environments”\textsuperscript{1825}.

Chapter two was dedicated to these “individual circumstances and environments”. We have examined Giraldus’ biography and his personal involvement in the cult of each saint. This personal involvement can be deduced from explicit references, like the reference to Dean Roger of Rolleston in the life of St Hugh\textsuperscript{1826} or Giraldus’ reference to his con-canonici in the chapter of St Davids\textsuperscript{1827}. But Giraldus’ involvement runs even deeper and may be detected in the sub-layers that were carefully interwoven into the hagiographic fabric of the text\textsuperscript{1828}.

It has been concluded that hagiography of the 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries was “primarily a literature of local attachments”\textsuperscript{1829}. This conclusion would fit

\textsuperscript{1824} Cf. the observations of Constance Brittain Bouchard (Bouchard, Rewriting Saints and Ancestors, p. 1).
\textsuperscript{1825} Bartlett, Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales, p. 598.
\textsuperscript{1826} VH, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{1827} VD, p. 377.
\textsuperscript{1828} As Stephanie Coué concluded in her examination of bishops’ lives written during the 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} century, very different causa scribendi shaped the text, but it was not necessary to openly address them (Coué, Hagiographie im Kontext, p. 2).
with the examination of Weinstein and Bell: they observed that the majority of cults on the British Isles during the 11th to the 14th century were local cults\textsuperscript{1830}.

However, both statements are only partly true for Giraldus. First of all, not all his saints’ cults are local cults. The veneration of St David was not defined to the Western coast of Wales. Instead, his cult had spread through Ireland and it had also reached the boundaries of England\textsuperscript{1831}. Furthermore, Giraldus’ intended audiences are not only located at the saint’s main place of veneration. On the contrary, they could also have been read by audiences in a geographical remote area. The life of St Ethelbert was probably directed at an audience in Hereford\textsuperscript{1832}, whereas the preface of the lives of Remigius and St Hugh clearly takes into consideration the limited local knowledge of the addressee, Archbishop Stephen Langton of Canterbury\textsuperscript{1833}. As I established in chapter 3.5, it is possible that the life of St David was not only written for the chapter of St Davids, but may have been read to the pope, too.

Now, with his widespread family connections and his education in Paris, Giraldus may represent a special case. Part of Giraldus’ life was not confined to the boundaries of the British Isles, which must have broadened his horizon considerably\textsuperscript{1834}. During his travels to Rome, he must have witnessed the beginning standardization of the canonization process, which, in turn, influenced the composition of the lives of the bishops of Lincoln.

Giraldus possessed the knowledge and abilities to adapt his texts to the tastes of audiences which were both local and remote. Giraldus knew of the tastes of the local authorities because of his strong biographical links with St Davids, Hereford, and Lincoln\textsuperscript{1835}. We only have to think of the appearance of Ferns in the life of St David or Giraldus’ hope that the manuscript containing the lives of Remigius and St Hugh would be included in the cathedral library of Lincoln\textsuperscript{1836}.

Because of these local authorities, Giraldus’ saints’ lives were gradually incorporated into the saint’s cult. We know from the \textit{Magna Vita} that Adam\textsuperscript{1830} Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, p. 88–90.\textsuperscript{1831} Cf. chapter 3.1.\textsuperscript{1832} Cf. chapter 4.4.\textsuperscript{1833} We have to think of Giraldus’ explanation on the rivers of Lincoln (\textit{VR}, p. 6).\textsuperscript{1834} Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 12.\textsuperscript{1835} Cf. chapter 2.2.\textsuperscript{1836} \textit{VD}, p. 391–392 and chapter 5.7.
of Eynsham had obviously read Giraldus’ life of Remigius\textsuperscript{1837} and we may speculate whether William de Monte had really read the saint’s life after Giraldus had recommended it to him\textsuperscript{1838}.

According to Brigitte Cazelles, saints’ lives were of a primarily didactic nature\textsuperscript{1839}. However, as shown in chapter 1.2, saints’ lives could have been written with many different secondary aims in mind. Many of these secondary aims were of a secular type: for example, the commissioners of a saint’s life could also have had economic motives in mind when they intended to foster the cult of a saint. This leads us to the consideration of the different types of \textit{vitae} that Giraldus composed.

Overall, we may distinguish between two completely different types of \textit{vitae}\textsuperscript{1840}: On the one hand, we find lives of a saint which have primarily an advertising nature, like the lives of Remigius and St Hugh. On the other hand, Giraldus was also able to write lives of the primarily liturgical type, as we have seen in the case of the life of St Ethelbert.

\textit{Vitae} of primarily liturgical type were usually only written in the case of saints who had been venerated for decades and centuries\textsuperscript{1841}. This type of saints did not need the approval of the pope and the canonization process, because their saintliness had already been recognized \textit{vox populi}\textsuperscript{1842}. St David and St Ethelbert were ‘old’ saints, whose veneration had been established long ago. Although the power of both saints may have dwindled since the Conquest of England because of non-ecclesiastical developments – we only have to think of the land the diocese of St Davids lost to Giraldus’ own family – their cults were strong enough to endure nevertheless. It was not necessary to advertise the power of these saints first and foremost\textsuperscript{1843}.

The life of St David, however, has a strong advertising undertone, like the lives of Remigius and St Hugh. However, we have to remember that the

\textsuperscript{1837} MV, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{1838} SD, p. 172–173.
\textsuperscript{1839} Cazelles, Introduction, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{1840} Of course, these types only represent the endpoints of a scale. To a varying degree, each type can incorporate elements of the other type.
\textsuperscript{1841} The rule of thumb could be that lives with an advertising nature were usually meant to be the cause of a cult (or to stimulate the veneration further), whereas lives with a preserving nature integrated themselves in a saint’s cult already established. Therefore, this type of lives is a result of the cult, and not its cause (cf. for the distinction between cause and effect Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 37).
\textsuperscript{1842} Cf. Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{1843} Although, of course, the different Welsh dioceses competed for the support of the Norman arrivals nevertheless.
reasons for this advertising undertone are contrary: while, in case of the bishops of Lincoln, Giraldus’ purpose was to secure the canonization of Remigius and St Hugh, in case of the life of St David, he intended to (re-)create an archbishopric at St Davids. There is another difference between the lives of the bishops of Lincoln and the life of the patron saint of Wales: while the cult of St David had been firmly established hundreds of years earlier, Giraldus could rely on no (or, in the case of Remigius, at least no firmly established) pre-existing cult in case of the two bishop-saints. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the veneration of St Hugh may have been overwhelming, but the strong tradition of a saint’s cult was lacking in Lincoln. The vitae were part of the diocese’s advertising measures for their new prospective saints. These advertising activities were directed at the highest possible place from which support was to be expected, and in this case, this ecclesiastical authority was no one else than Stephen Langton, the incumbent archbishop of Canterbury. Thus, the lives of Remigius and St Hugh show traces of the upcoming fixed canonization procedure\(^{1844}\): within the miracle sections, the names of cured and witnesses or, at least, an assertion of their existence, are given quite often. Frequently, the witnesses are characterized as \textit{fide dignus}, and especially in the life of St Hugh, Giraldus assures that each miracle had been investigated thoroughly by the bishop, the chapter, or at least a representative of these parties. Finally, Giraldus and the diocese of Lincoln must have realized that a petition for canonization was best backed up by strong supporters\(^{1845}\), and the fact that Stephen Langton and Giraldus had both been students at the schools of Paris may have been regarded as a very fortunate coincidence.

My results prove that Giraldus knew exactly in what way he had to compose a saint’s life in order to please his commissioners. Now, it might be argued that Giraldus could have earned his living with writing, maybe even with writing saints’ lives.

Robert Bartlett coined the term of ‘professional’ hagiographer. He counts among the ‘professional hagiographers’ every author who is “both a writer who produces substantial amounts of hagiography and one who expected

\(^{1844}\) Among the first saints whose canonization was examined according to the new rules set up by Pope Innocent III were Gilbert of Sempringham and Wulfstan of Worcester (Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 39). The \textit{Vita S. Waldevi}, written by Jocelin of Furness, also shows traces of the newly established rules for the canonization of saints (cf. for further information Birkett, The Saints’ Lives of Jocelin of Furness, p. 201–225 and for further examples Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 515).

\(^{1845}\) Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages, p. 40.
to support himself, in some sense, from that writing\textsuperscript{1846}. During the time of 1180 to 1220 – the time during which Giraldus, the hagiographer, composed his lives – no author may be unreservedly called a ‘professional hagiographer’ according to his definition\textsuperscript{1847}. He proceeds that Goscelin of St Bertin or poets like Henry of Avranches, who “travelled in Germany, England, Italy and France, living apparently by his pen”\textsuperscript{1848}, could fall into that category\textsuperscript{1849}.

Now, should Giraldus be attributed to this category?

I consider Robert Bartlett’s definition slightly problematic, for it is difficult to assess the monetary dimension of writing in the (High) Middle Ages and, furthermore, to separate it from attempts to gain patronage of whatever sort. How are we supposed to distinguish whether Giraldus wrote his saints’ lives (like, for example, the lives of Remigius and St Hugh) to gain and strengthen friendships with members of the chapter of Lincoln, or because he hoped to find in Stephen Langton a “powerful and encouraging patron”\textsuperscript{1850}? To the best of my knowledge, we have no information about the monetarian rewards Giraldus received for his writing\textsuperscript{1851}. In contrast to Giraldus, we know that Henry of Avranches received royal payment for his work as a \textit{versificator}\textsuperscript{1852}.

Furthermore, this definition excludes certain groups of authors because of its monetary dimension. Some authors who composed saints’ lives – and Giraldus was probably one of them – had no need to sustain themselves by their literary skills. Nevertheless, these authors produced “substantial

\textsuperscript{1848} \textit{Hugh}, p. 4–5.
\textsuperscript{1850} Bartlett, Gerald of Wales, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{1851} Of course, Giraldus may have benefited from the support and recognition he received from the community he wrote for. In the case of the life of St Hugh, we may argue that Bishop Hugh of Wells may have been inclined to support a talented artist (the \textit{vita} promises \textit{ampla} beneficia, cf. \textit{VH}, p. 66). There is, however, no direct evidence that Giraldus benefited from the bishop’s support in any monetary way.
\textsuperscript{1852} Bartlett, The Hagiography of Angevin England, p. 38.
amounts of hagiography” and thus fulfil the first half of Robert Bartlett’s definition. Some of these authors were monks, like William of Malmesbury.

While these writers were not professionals in the sense that they earned their living by writing texts, they nevertheless possessed the skills that a talented author would display. These authors had acquired some fame for their talent and became known for their literary qualities. Of course, they could still have a connection with the saint or the commissioner for whom they were writing. They may not have been professional hagiographers, but their style of writing was, at least, professional.

In my opinion, Giraldus is not a professional hagiographer in the sense that he earned his living with his works. However, he obviously had the literary skills that were required of a professional. A slightly better term for Giraldus may be “freelance writer of saints’ lives”, as Diana Webb called Goscelin of St Bertin. However, Giraldus is not neutral towards his works, as Goscelin of St Bertin may have been: His familiar ties or his personal integration into the saint’s community led to much more personal involvement in each saint’s cult than would have been the case for a professional hagiographer.

It may be argued that memoria was one of the key topics that overshadowed the last years of Giraldus’ life. Especially during this time, his works assume the tone of resignation: gone was the pride that seemed to have coloured the “passages of bombast and self-adulation which irritate his readers ever since.” For example, a large part of his letter to the chapter of Hereford reads more like the self-defence of a writer. Obviously, Giraldus’ focus had shifted from a career in the church towards a career as an author. In case of the saints’ lives, he definitely succeeded, for nearly every life was somehow integrated in other texts connected with the cult of a saint.

---

1854 According to John Scott, William of Malmesbury “had been hired” by the monks of Glastonbury to compose saints’ lives (Scott, The Early History of Glastonbury, p. 4).
1856 Webb, Pilgrimage in Medieval England, p. 16.
1857 Cf. Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 514. At the other end of the scale, we would find Thomas of Monmouth, who was extremely dedicated to his saint, St William of Norwich (Bartlett, Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?, p. 516).
1858 Walker, Medieval Wales, p. 75.
1859 Cf. LS.
1860 Our only exception is the life of Remigius.
With his hagiographical vitae, Giraldus earned himself a place in the tradition of each saints’ cult.

But Giraldus became more than a (famous) hagiographer, more than a famous writer. Today, he serves as a window through which we can look at the past. If we think of the place his writings have earned himself in today’s scholarship, we may safely state that he has obtained all the glory he sought:

\[
\textit{Et quoniam diu vivere datum non est, id elaborandum in hac vita brevissima,}\\
\textit{ut aliquo egregio conamine memoriaque digno et gloria nos saltem vixisse testemur}^{186a}.
\]

And, as we do not live long, we have to create something during our very short life, so that – when we are worthy of memory and glory because of our outstanding effort – we shall at least testify that we have lived.

---

186a \textit{PL}, p. 32.
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The life of Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald of Wales (c.1146 – c.1223) represents many facets of the Middle Ages: he was raised in a frontier society, he was educated in Paris, he worked for the kings of England and he unsuccessfully tried to climb the ecclesiastical ladder. He travelled widely, he met many high-ranking persons, and he wrote books in which he included more than one (amusing) anecdote about many persons. Up to this day, scholars have devoted a different degree of attention to Giraldus’ works: his ethnographical and historiographical works have been studied thoroughly, whereas his hagiographical writing has been left largely unexamined. This observation is quite surprising, because Giraldus’ talent as a hagiographer has been acknowledged long ago.

Scholars have already examined Giraldus’ saints’ lives independently, but an interpretation of his whole hagiographical œuvre is still a desideratum. This thesis proposed to fill this gap by following two major research questions. First of all, this thesis examined the particular way in which Giraldus depicted each saint. Furthermore, it explained why Giraldus chose / preferred a certain depiction of a particular saint.

Overall, an examination of the hagiographical art of writing of Giraldus Cambrensis offered insight into the way hagiography was considered by authors and commissioners and how this art was practiced during the twelfth and thirteenth century.