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ABSTRACT

At the heart of much scholarship on the Central Middle Ages (c. 950-1150) in western Europe is a debate about the rapidity and nature of change after the disintegration of the Carolingian empire. On the one hand, there is the traditional “mutationist” position, represented by such scholars as Marc Bloch, Jean-Pierre Poly, Eric Bournazel, Georges Duby, and T.N. Bisson. Scholars who adopt this position argue that a revolution, a radical and sharp break with the past, occurred in the structure of western European society around the turn of the millenium. On the other hand, a diverse group, including Dominique Barthélemy, Susan Reynolds, Timothy Reuter and Chris Wickham, has either argued for less rapid change or questioned key aspects of the traditional position.

In Phantoms of Remembrance, Patrick Geary has suggested that the debate over the mutationist interpretation has ceased to bear positive fruit, and that the important question in studying the Central Middle Ages is “why and how generations perceived discontinuity, and how these perceptions continued to influence the patterns of thought for a thousand years.” According to Geary,
although people in the eleventh century were surrounded with the residue of
the previous two centuries, they were unable to make sense of the structures
that had given this residue its coherence. Nevertheless, people in the period
still attempted to make sense of the past, shaping it to fit contemporary needs.
This process is important because it determined both the information people
chose to make available to future generations and the form it would take. Put
simply, how they chose to remember their past influences how we remember it.

My dissertation examines how the hagiography produced for the
eleventh-century, Flemish abbey of Saint-Winnoc remembers the past. More
specifically, it approaches these texts from three perspectives. First, it identifies
the literary strategies their authors employed to construct the past. Second, it
examines how these strategies would have operated in the historical context in
which they were composed. Finally, it points to some of the ontological,
epistemological and ideological implications of recording the past in
hagiographic narratives.
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QUOTATIONS AND TRANSLATIONS


All translations of passages from the Vulgate have been taken from the Douay-Rheims translation (1582-1610) found at: http://www.scriptours.com/bible/, though I have occasionally modified these translations to render them more idiomatic.

All other translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
Because the area that was medieval Flanders straddled a linguistic divide between Germanic and Romance language groups, and because today it straddles a national divide between France and Belgium, almost all Flemish names can be rendered in at least two forms. As David Nicholas has noted, “any effort to be unfailingly consistent in an English publication about Flanders will founder on the shoals of incomprehensibility.”\(^1\) Therefore, I have generally adopted a policy of using the form of a name designed to cause the least confusion to English readers. Thus, the Latin Balduinus is rendered in the English form Baldwin rather than the French Baudoin or Flemish Boudewijn. For ecclesiastical institutions, I have generally used the hyphenated French versions to avoid confusion with the saints after whom those institutions were named. Thus, I use “Saint-Pierre” rather than “St. Peter’s.” For the names of places in modern Belgium and most rivers I tend to use the Flemish form. For example, Antwerp is used, rather than the French Anvers, and Scheldt rather than the French Escaut.

1.1 Introduction

According to Dudo of Saint-Quentin, the author of the De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum (frequently called The History of the Normans), in 911, Charles III the Simple, king of the West Franks (r. 893-922), concluded an agreement at Saint-Claire-sur-Epte with Rollo (d. 933), the leader of a group of Vikings who had been devastating Rouen and its environs. Rollo was to stop his depredations, become a Christian and pledge himself as the king’s vassal. In return, Charles would make the Northman duke of Rouen. The De moribus states that Rollo reached the point in the homage ritual where it was traditional to kiss the king’s foot but balked, saying “I will never bow my knees at the knees of any man, and no man’s foot will I kiss.”¹ After some persuasion, however:

[Rollo] ordered one of the warriors to kiss the king’s foot. And, the man immediately grasped the king’s foot and raised it to his mouth and

---

planted a kiss on it while he remained standing, and laid the king flat on his back. So there rose a great laugh, and a great outcry among the people.\textsuperscript{2}

Dudo’s account paints an amusing picture of the origins of the Norman dynasty, a dynasty that later gained control of the English throne and much of France.

The story of the meeting with the Carolingian Charles the Simple is also emblematic of the trends in western Europe between c. 840 and c. 1150. From c. 840 to c. 940, conflict undermined the Carolingian monarchy’s footing almost as effectively as Rollo’s warrior undermined the king’s. Civil wars that began as rivalries within the Carolingian dynasty eventually led to the creation of rival dynasties, dividing western European society from within. At the same time, invasions by the Vikings, Magyars and Muslims also wrought havoc from without. Between c. 940 and c. 1150, after the invasions tapered off, a new order emerged that determined the broad contours of western Europe into the modern era. During these latter two centuries – a period some historians call the Central Middle Ages – the kingdoms of England and France were born, the long, slow unification of most of the Iberian peninsula under the Spanish \textit{Reconquista} began and the papacy rose as a major power. At the same time, the Holy Roman Empire developed as an agglomeration of fractious polities, preventing German

\textsuperscript{2} Dudo, \textit{De moribus}, ii.XXI.29, p. 49.
and Italian unification until the nineteenth century. Men like Rollo’s descendents Richard I (r. 942-96) and Richard II (r. 996-1026), for whom Dudo wrote the *De moribus*, played key roles in the creation of this new order.

Given these developments, one might be tempted to accept medieval narratives that posit a radical break with the past. For example, in the 1030s, Rodulphus Glaber wrote a now-famous description of ecclesiastical renewal around the millenium:

> Just before the third year after the millenium, throughout the whole world, but most especially in Italy and Gaul, men began to reconstruct churches, although for the most part the existing ones were properly built and not in the least unworthy. But it seemed as though each Christian community was aiming to surpass all others in the splendour of construction. *It was as if the whole world were shaking itself free, shrugging off the burden of the past*, and clothing itself everywhere in a white mantle of churches [my emphasis].

*Igitur infra supradictum millesimum tercio iam fere imminente anno, contigit in uniuerso pene terrarum orbe, praecipue tamen in Italia, et in Galliis, innouari ecclesiarum basilicas, licet pleraeque decenter locatae minime indignissent,*
Glaber’s description suggests a wholesale exchange of old for new, even when there was no particular reason to dispose of the old. The actual relationship between western European society in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries and its past was, however, more complex than Glaber’s description suggests. Dudo’s account is again illustrative. Although the account implies the weakening of Carolingian authority – it is difficult to imagine Charlemagne (r. 768-814) being subjected to or tolerating the insult of being toppled – it also highlights Rollo’s submission to that authority. According to Dudo, Rollo “put his hands between the hands of the king, which neither his father, nor his grandfather, nor his great-grandfather had done for any man.”

He did this at some cost to his own honor: as Emily Albu has pointed out, Rollo’s warrior was less concerned with humiliating the king than with reproving his chief for subordinating himself, an act unbecoming a Viking warleader.

---


4 Dudo, *De moribus*, ii.XXI.28, p. 49.

even as the *De moribus* indicates that great changes were occurring in the structure of western European society, it also points to continuity.

The complexity (one might even say ambiguity) of the relationship between society in the Central Middle Ages and its past has had a significant effect on modern scholarship. At the heart of much of this scholarship is a debate about the rapidity and nature of change after the disintegration of the Carolingian empire. On the one hand is the traditional “mutationist” position, represented by such scholars as Marc Bloch, Jean-Pierre Poly, Eric Bournazel, Georges Duby, and T.N. Bisson. Scholars who adopt this position argue that a revolution, a radical break with the past, occurred in the structure of western European society around the turn of the millenium. On the other hand is a diverse group, including Dominique Barthélémy, Susan Reynolds, Timothy Reuter and Chris Wickham, whose members have either argued for less rapid change or questioned key aspects of the traditional position.

---


In *Phantoms of Remembrance*, Patrick Geary has suggested a new line of questioning to redirect the debate. According to Geary, medieval sources have led to unproductive semantics debates about the meaning of the word revolution that miss the important questions in studying the Central Middle Ages. *Phantoms of Remembrance* argues that scholars should study “why and how generations perceived discontinuity, and how these perceptions continued to influence the patterns of thought for a thousand years [my emphasis].”8 It argues that although people in the tenth and eleventh centuries were surrounded by the residue of the eighth and ninth centuries, they were unable to make sense of the structures that had given this residue its coherence. For example, around 1097, Count Fulk le Réchin of Anjou stated that he did not even know where his ancestors were buried.9 Losing the graves of one’s ancestors was, to a great extent, the loss of one’s origins, a significant thing in a society where nobles liked to trace their genealogies into the distant, and even heroic, past. Despite the obscurity of the past, people in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries still attempted to make sense of it, shaping it to fit contemporary needs. This process of interpreting and molding the past is important because it determined both the

---


information people chose to make available to future generations and the form it would take. Put simply, how they chose to remember their past influences how we remember it.

The following chapters examine how hagiography – literature about saints – from the Central Middle Ages remembers the past. More specifically, they examine the hagiographic texts produced about the patron saints of the eleventh-century Flemish abbey of Saint-Winnoc from three perspectives. First, the chapters identify the literary strategies authors writing about the abbey’s patron saints used to construct hagiographic presentations of the past. Second, they examine how these literary strategies would have operated in the historical context in which they were composed. Finally, they briefly consider the ontological, epistemological and ideological implications of the texts in order to arrive at a more general sense of how the hagiographers who wrote the texts and their audiences might have viewed the past.

1.2 *Virtus virtutem comitatur*

According to the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc, saints occupy a special place in a bifurcated universe. The texts state that saints are people who gained eternal life in the kingdom of heaven immediately after their deaths, yet continue to act in this world. They signal the achievement of this eternal life by referring to the date of a saint’s death as his or her “birthday” (*dies natalis*).
Saints merit this special treatment (most people are too sinful to go directly to heaven) from God because they were especially holy in their mortal lives – the term saint derives, in fact, from the Latin word sanctus (holy). From their places in heaven, the saints continue to act in the world by channeling divine power, usually through miracles benefiting people in the saint’s patronage network.

The key to understanding the literary strategies that the medieval hagiographers who wrote for Saint-Winnoc adopted lies in the relationship among the three different ways they used the term virtus. First, virtus could denote the spiritual virtues that saints exhibited during their mortal lives. For example, the *Vita s. Oswaldi* (examined in Chapter 3) states that St. Oswald of Northumbria “embraced the four [cardinal] virtues, prudence, justice, fortitude, [and] temperance” (*quatuor virtutes, prudentiam, justitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam amplexabatur*). On account of their virtue or virtues, the saints were exemplars of Christian ideals. Sometimes, the hagiographers used literary strategies to provoke awe and wonder at the saint’s unattainable virtue. At other times, they used strategies to offer a saint as a model of Christian behavior, encouraging audiences to imitate the saint’s life or specific parts of it.

Second, virtus could also denote the divine power that manifested itself through one who exhibited virtues. For example, the *Historia translationis s. Lewinnae* (examined in Chapter 4) states that St. Lewinna “was of such great

---

10 *VO*, III.25 (col. 99A).
account and of [such great] merit that the heavenly power displays itself through
her each day” (quanti sit, cuius meriti; cælestis uirtus per eam omni die ostendit).\textsuperscript{11}
Saints were powerful because they could petition God on behalf of mortals.
Hagiographers, like most people, usually articulated their beliefs in concrete
metaphors and analogies drawn from their own society. Just as the non-elite in
eleventh-century Europe generally did not directly petition earthly kings,
ordinary mortals usually did not directly petition God, the “eternal King”
(aeternus Rex).\textsuperscript{12} In both cases, it was best to have an intercessor who could speak
on one’s behalf. In the kingdom of heaven, these intercessors were the saints
(and, as Geoffrey Koziol has pointed out, ordinary people often needed
intercessors for the intercessors – usually the monks who tended most shrines).\textsuperscript{13}
The saints then delivered God’s aid to mortals in form of miracles. (It is
important to note, however, that a saint did not have to be dead to perform
miracles, though posthumous miracles were more common than those
performed \textit{in vita}.\textsuperscript{14} In this sense, \textit{virtus} was actually the power of God, and some
of the literary strategies employed in the texts from Saint-Winnoc were designed
to prove that a saint had such power or to convince people to petition a saint.

\textsuperscript{11} HT, i.I.12 (col. 615D).
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 15 (ed. Wilhelm Levison, \textit{MGH SSRM}, V
(Hanover, 1910), p. 763).
\textsuperscript{13} Geoffrey Koziol, \textit{Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early
Third, *virtus* could occasionally denote a miracle. The *Historia translationis* states that “sheets of parchment [were] affixed to the wall [of the church where Lewinna’s body rested], and described on those same sheets were the powerful deeds, which the omnipotent Lord had done through his saint” (*scedas membranarum parieti affixas, & uirtutes quas per sanctam suam fecerat omnipotens dominus in eisdem esse descriptas*).¹⁴ A saint’s collected miracles represented his or her *patrocinium* (patronage), both the aid dispensed in the past and the promise of aid in the future. Descriptions of how miracles had been obtained could instruct petitioners in how to obtain such intercession or what kind of intercession to expect.

The application of the same word to virtues, divine power and miracles is symbolic of the close relationship among these three uses of *virtus*. As the *Vita secunda s. Winnoci* (discussed in Chapter 6) states in its preface to one of St. Winnoc’s miracles, “power accompanies virtue” (*virtus virtutem comitatur*).¹⁵ Virtuous people had the ability to channel divine power in miracles.

The *virtutes* associated with sainthood, with types of saints and even with individual saints often changed over time and from place to place. For example,

---


¹⁵ VS, i.XI (coll. 271B-D).
the first saints (the martyrs) were those Christians who had suffered death at the hands of the pagan Roman state. After the end of the persecutions largely halted the production of martyrs, the model of sanctity shifted to encompass those Christians (the confessors) who had suffered a metaphorical death to the world for their faith by isolating themselves in deserts and monasteries. Later, even people who remained in the world, like Francis of Assisi, were recognized as saints.16 In addition, as Benedicta Ward has noted, the most frequent type of miracle a saint performed could also change. In times of danger and disruption, a saint tended to benefit those under his or her *patrocinium* with “acts of power,” such as killing nobles who usurped monastic property. When times were more settled, a saint tended to perform “acts of mercy,” such as healing the blind and the lame.17 Such changes demanded that hagiographers explain how specific saints were relevant to their contemporaries. The hagiographers from Saint-Winnoc, for example, had to explain how the *virtutes* associated with seventh- and eighth-century saints were relevant to their eleventh-century

---


contemporaries. As a result, changes in the application of the term *virtus* by hagiographers can reveal both attitudes toward and aspects of the past.

The hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc presuppose, and sometimes explicitly describe, a complex ontological framework. This framework was constructed around the belief that the temporal world, which includes both the past and the present, is inferior to the eternal world, which exists outside time. The inferiority of the temporal world is the result of the original sin perpetrated by the first humans. Now, beings in the temporal world suffer a mortal existence bounded by death while beings in the eternal world are immortal. In addition, the temporal world is contingent, dependent for its existence on the reality of the divine essence, which is most fully apparent in the eternal kingdom of heaven.

There is no evidence that either the hagiographers or their audiences considered the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc to be anything but what today would be called non-fiction. Because of the hagiographers’ ontological beliefs, however, the texts describe a substantially different universe than most works of modern non-fiction. Modern works of non-fiction generally describe connections between events in the temporal world – either between two points in the past or between points in the past and the present. The hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc, however, present links forged by the abbey’s patron saints between the eternal and temporal worlds, and use the past to facilitate these presentations. At times, the past becomes almost a literary device in the texts.
The ontological subordination of the temporal to the eternal also extended to knowledge as well. The texts reveal a belief that just as the temporal world was subordinate to the eternal world, knowledge of the temporal world was subordinate to knowledge of the eternal world. When the record of the past conflicted with what was believed about the eternal world in the present, hagiographers altered the record of the past to align it with their understanding in the present, rather than *vice versa*. For example, hagiographers assumed that saints in heaven possessed the virtues associated with the ideal Christian life at the time that they wrote, rather than the virtues assigned to the saints by previous hagiographers. This assumption applied not only to the first presentations of recently deceased saints but also to revised presentations of long-dead saints. This explains how descriptions both of types of saints and of specific saints evolved over time. In addition, since access to a saint’s miraculous assistance usually depended on that saint’s association with a particular shrine, the hagiographers occasionally inserted a relationship into the record of the past where none was previously apparent.

The hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc also adopt a different epistemology than that assumed by many modern audiences, an epistemology based on miraculous revelation rather than empirical observation. According to the texts, miracles are deeds that God performs through the saints in order to honor them, and they reveal reality in two ways. First, miracles can be signs
(signa) that a person is holy and in heaven (or, soon will be). Since these signs prove a saint’s general holiness, they also prove the saint’s specific holiness. In other words, miracles offer proof that a saint possesses the virtues attributed to him or her by contemporaries, even if previous generations have attributed different virtues to the saint. Second, miracles can also be wonders (miracula) that reveal God’s power. Although theologians such as Augustine considered even the normal operation of the universe miraculous, the sorts of miracles performed in honor of the saints are intended to provoke awe in people who have grown jaded with the wonder of creation. Miracles usually occur at the shrines of the saints where their corporal remains – most often referred to as relics (reliquiae), bones (ossa) or pledges (pignora/pignera) – are housed. When a shrine moves, new miracles reveal that the connection forged by the saint between the eternal and temporal worlds has moved as well. In both cases, this epistemology of miraculous revelation justified new knowledge about saints and its application to new situations.

It is unclear how much the members of eleventh-century society subscribed to the ontological and epistemological views described above, but the evidence suggests that these beliefs extended beyond the literate minority that formed the most immediate audience for texts in Latin like those discussed in the following chapters and that the written hagiographic record of the past was not solely a creation of the elite. This means that the texts from Saint-Winnoc have
ideological implications that reach beyond the monastic communities where they were composed, read and revised. Not only did these texts help define Christian ideals, but they also helped form communal identities in both ecclesiastical and lay society. In addition, despite the elite status of the texts’ primary audiences, non-elite elements in society seem to have had roles in their composition, providing insight into the formation of religious beliefs.

The conclusions reached in the following chapters about medieval hagiographic presentations of the past are important because hagiography was an important form of medieval literature. Not only did hagiography have great influence over the literate ecclesiastics who recorded the past in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, but it was one of the most widely accessible forms of literature to the illiterate. By analyzing how hagiographic texts like those from Saint-Winnoc approached the past, we come closer to understanding perceptions of the past in the Central Middle Ages.

1.3 Hagiography in the Central Middle Ages

Since Dudo of Saint-Quentin’s De moribus adopts an air of versimilitude, most modern readers would probably classify it as a work of history: a severely deficient work of history. For example, rather than an indication of his strength, the Viking leader Rollo’s conversion to Christianity and initial appointment to defend Rouen and Upper Normandy were actually the results of a major defeat
he suffered at Chartres around 910. Nor did the appointment by King Charles the Simple confer the title of duke (dux) or even that of count (comes) – in the tenth century, dukes had authority over counts. Contrary to what the title *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum* (*The customs and deeds of the first Norman dukes*) and Dudo’s references to Rollo as a duke might suggest, Richard II (r. 996-1026) was the first member of the dynasty to use the title. Even Richard II’s application of *dux* was a bold bit of self-promotion considering that Count Hugh Capet had installed Richard’s father, Richard I (d. 996), as his pawn at Rouen.\(^{18}\) The text also lashes out at the Norman dynasty’s political opponents. In 942, Count Arnulf I of Flanders invited Rollo’s heir, William Longsword (r. 933-42), to a meeting to discuss a truce but killed him in an ambush instead. The *De moribus* denigrates Arnulf by stating that Charles the Simple initially offered Flanders to Rollo but the Viking rejected the territory “on account of the obstructive marshes,” which made it unfit for the Normans.\(^{19}\) The text also attempts to confer sainthood on William by stating that he was martyred, casting an evil light on the Flemish count.\(^{20}\)


\(^{19}\) Dudo, *De moribus*, ii.XXI.28 (p. 49).

As Geary has noted and as *De moribus* illustrates, when medieval authors wrote about the past, they generally displayed a willingness to shape their descriptions of it in the service of contemporary goals. They had few compunctions about embellishing, forging, and/or destroying records of the past to serve their patrons or their arguments in the present. By modern standards, many medieval accounts seem to be not only flawed but also blatantly unethical. For example, Eric Christiansen has stated that:

> anachronism, mistaken identity, and misinformation are woven into the narrative [of the *De moribus*], quite apart from political partisanship, rhetorical exaggeration, and hearty plagiarism; all of the faults of a great historian, but none of the virtues of a monkish chronicler. Dudo is not a reliable source for the early history of the Normans; nor did he know of any; nor do we.

Modern people would also deplore the fact that despite its biases, Dudo’s account became the standard interpretation of the early history of the Norman dynasty for over eight hundred years.

> It is tempting simply to condemn medieval authors for distorting the past. Many scholars have succumbed to this temptation, especially with regard to

---


22 Christiansen, Introduction, p. xv.

medieval forgeries, describing the abundance of forgeries in the Middle Ages as an expression of a general disregard for the past in the service of greed.\textsuperscript{24} Other scholars have, however, been more charitable, ascribing the blame less to immorality than to gross inaccuracy. For example, Lucien Febvre has written that “everywhere there was fantasy, imprecision, inexactitude,” and that “the masses abdicated every care for precision.”\textsuperscript{25} Still others have attributed forgeries to “traditionalism, conservatism, or mythomania,” essentially the attitude that the past should be made to fit the needs of the present. As Giles Constable has pointed out, however, such condemnations have impeded our efforts to understand the mindset that produced so many forgeries.\textsuperscript{26}

Judging medieval sources – whether forgeries or otherwise – by modern standards has also caused scholars to underestimate the importance of hagiography. Hagiography, with its miracle stories and idealized characters, was at odds with the empiricist sensibilities of many scholars in the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. The positivists who were so instrumental in establishing a scientific study of ancient and medieval texts saw only kernels of truth mixed in with the "pious fictions" of hagiography. For

\textsuperscript{24} Giles Constable, “Forgery and Plagiarism in the Middle Ages,” \textit{Archiv für Diplomatik}, 29 (1983), pp. 15-6, 22.


\textsuperscript{26} Constable, “Forgery,” p. 20.
them, hagiography was merely poorly written history from which the ‘factual’ kernels could be extracted. They demonstrated little consideration for the literary contexts within which the facts were embedded.

Despite the positivists’ opinions, hagiography has proven an important source of information about the Middle Ages for four reasons. First, hagiographic texts form one of the largest groups of extant medieval sources. It is difficult to estimate what percentage of medieval literature hagiography comprised (to my knowledge, no comprehensive statistical survey of medieval literature has appeared) but it would clearly rank among the most abundant. Perhaps, it is enough to echo Thomas Head in noting that there were a wide variety of hagiographic genres, from *vitae* (lives), to *passiones* (martyrdom accounts), *libri miraculorum* (books of miracles), *historiae translationum* (translation accounts), sermons, and after the twelfth century, papal canonization dossiers and bulls. In fact, Head has suggested that hagiography might be more properly thought of as a collection of genres rather than a single literary genre.27

Second, hagiographers were especially prolific in the Central Middle Ages. According to a study by Guy Philippart and Michel Trigalet, roughly 57% of the 13,576 “literary units” catalogued in the *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina* (a modern index of hagiographic productions between 101 and 1550) may date to

---

the period between 901 and 1200. In the same analysis, a sampling of 200 such literary units revealed that roughly 53% did actually date to this period. Individually, the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries claimed the fourth, second, and first highest percentages respectively of the total hagiographic output between 101 and 1550 – just under 10% for the tenth, just over 20% for the eleventh, and about 23% for the twelfth. (The third highest, the fifteenth century, produced about 15% of the total.)

Obviously, the Central Middle Ages was a critical period for hagiographic production.

Third, hagiography probably played a key role in how the literate minority that composed the record of the past – chiefly monks – perceived the past. According to Head, most ecclesiastics – monks, nuns, canons, other secular clergy, etc. – believed that they were subordinate to the saints whose relics their communities housed, just as clients were to their patrons or medieval serfs were to their lords. In return, patron saints acted as advocates in heaven for their familiae (the ecclesiastics, their serfs and even the residents of ecclesiastical properties). Because ecclesiastics generally believed that their communities’

---


welfare depended upon the favor of their patron saints, hagiography became one outlet for the expression of communal identities, especially where a saint had been the founder or head of the community. As Sharon Farmer has demonstrated, one can find a community’s story of its origins, its self-perception, fears and aspirations in its hagiographic texts. Sometimes, texts could even chart institutional history across centuries.\(^{30}\) Hagiography also played an important role in shaping broader perceptions of the past among ecclesiastics. Not only was it an element of private devotional reading, but excerpts from hagiographic texts were also read during liturgies, especially on a saint’s feast day. As a result, ecclesiastics had far more exposure to hagiographic reconstructions of the past than to any other type of literary reconstruction except the scriptures. This is important because, according to Geary, in the early part of the Central Middle Ages, monks replaced women as the conservators of family memories in West Francia.\(^ {31}\) They also composed most of the period’s hagiography. Thus, at the same time that monks were producing more hagiography than they ever had before or would again, they were also composing the majority of secular “histories” (like the De moribus) for the west Frankish nobility.

---


Considering hagiography alongside other types of sources can significantly increase our understanding both of the past and of medieval perceptions of the past. For example, Felice Lifshitz in *The Norman Conquest of Pious Neustria* has provided a striking demonstration of the value of treating hagiography more seriously. *Pious Neustria* argues that over several centuries, medieval authors consciously fostered perceptions of discontinuity in order to further the dynastic interests of their Carolingian and Norman patrons. According to Lifshitz, authors working first for the Carolingians then for the Normans used contemporary definitions of Christianity to brand the Neustria their patrons inherited as either non-Christian or deficient in its Christianity. (The Carolingians succeeded the Merovingians and the Normans succeeded the Carolingians as the rulers of the Frankish sub-kingdom of Neustria – roughly modern northwestern France with the exception of Brittany.) As a result, hagiographers and authors in each era were able to present first the Carolingian and then the Norman, dynasties and the saints connected to each dynasty as the true evangelists of Neustria. Their efforts have caused modern scholars to posit the survival of paganism in western Europe long after it had disappeared. *Pious Neustria* argues that the key question is not how long paganism survived but
how medieval people defined Christianity.\textsuperscript{32} Without her critical examination of both hagiographic and medieval historical sources, Lifshitz’s insight would not have been possible.

A fourth reason to study hagiography is that as a key element in the cult of the saints, its influence over conceptions of the past extended beyond the literate minority to all levels of medieval society. The laity also thought of the saints as patrons. For example, the *patrocinia* of the saints extended to the lay members of monastic *familiae*.\textsuperscript{33} In return for intercession, some people even pledged themselves as serfs to the saint who had provided them with aid, placing themselves within the saint’s *familia*.\textsuperscript{34} In addition, there are numerous indications of a broad-based upsurge in popular devotion to the cult of relics in the Central Middle Ages. Large crowds, made up of all elements in medieval society, appeared at meetings called to declare the Peace of God, an attempt by ecclesiastical and lay leaders to restrict the violence of the lesser nobility and their warriors. The laypeople were attracted mainly by the presence of large numbers of relics brought to the councils to witness oaths.\textsuperscript{35} Pilgrims also


\textsuperscript{33} Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of the Saints*, p. 188.

\textsuperscript{34} Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of the Saints*, p. 189.

flocked to saints’ shrines, necessitating the construction of churches far larger than what was needed to accommodate local populations. At the same time, ecclesiastical communities transferred the relics of their patron saints from underground crypts to portable reliquaries that could be displayed to pilgrims in the upper church or taken on processions.\textsuperscript{36} Hagiographic literature played an indirect, but still significant, role in how lay populations perceived saints, because works in Latin usually formed the basis for other types of presentations. For example, a good deal of evidence indicates that monks, often abbots themselves, delivered public sermons in the vernacular on saints’ feast days. These sermons were usually excerpts translated from Latin \textit{vita}e or \textit{libri} \textit{miraculorum}.\textsuperscript{37} In addition, religious art and architecture at shrines could also depict scenes taken from hagiographic literature for the benefit of pilgrims who journeyed to these places.

1.4 The Hagiography from Saint-Winnoc

One of the destinations for eleventh-century pilgrims was the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Winnoc at Bergues (modern French Flanders), which housed

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
the shrines of three saints – Oswald of Northumbria (605-42), Lewinna (d. 664-73) and Winnoc (d. 717). Although the hagiographic texts produced for this abbey in the eleventh century are only a small sampling of the hagiography produced in the Central Middle Ages, they are appealing sources for several reasons. First, although the abbey was not founded until 1022, all three of its patron saints lived in the Early Middle Ages. As a result, the hagiographers who wrote about these saints had to explain how they related to eleventh-century society.

Second, the texts’ motifs place them in the period when authors in northern France grappled most directly with the residue of the past. Ienje Van’t Spijker has described a fundamental shift in the hagiography of northern and western France (the ecclesiastical provinces of Tours, Rouen, and Reims where Flanders was located) in the Central Middle Ages. Between the end of the Carolingian period and roughly 1050, hagiographers produced texts that sought to revive earlier connections, both real and imagined, among ecclesiastical institutions, the communities they served and their patron saints, connections that the Viking invasions had severed. As a result, hagiographers focused on the Merovingian- and Carolingian-era saints who had Christianized the barbarian North.38 After the middle of the eleventh century, the focus of hagiography in

the region shifted as a result of a “new religious fervor” (le nouvel élan religieux). In addition to producing new lives of earlier saints that emphasized elements of poverty, asceticism, and the vita apostolica (apostolic life) already present in their legends, this later hagiography increasingly honored contemporaries as saints, especially the founders of new religious houses. Although the hagiographic texts produced for Saint-Winnoc appeared between roughly 1052 and 1078, their major themes identify them as part of the effort to recover from the dislocations caused by the Viking invasions.

Third, the corpus at Saint-Winnoc is diverse. It includes a variety of hagiographic genres – three vitae, four sermons, one historia translationis, and one liber miraculorum. The texts are:

1) Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci [No BHL] (c. 1052)
2) Vita s. Oswaldi [BHL 6362] (1055-59)
3) Sermo primus de s. Oswaldo [BHL 6363] (1055-59)
4) Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo [BHL 6364] (1055-59)
5) Vita interpolata s. Winnoci [No BHL] (c. 1060)
6) Historia translationis s. Lewinnae [BHL 4902] (c. 1060)
7) Sermo de s. Winnoco [No BHL] (c. 1060)
8) Vita secunda s. Winnoci [BHL 8954, 8955] (c. 1064)
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9) *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* [BHL 8956] (1068-78)

These texts also discuss patron saints with different types of connections to the monastery of Saint-Winnoc. In the eleventh century when the texts were composed, the abbey possessed only non-corporal relics from Oswald, not his more important, corporal relics. Although the community did possess Lewinna’s corporal relics, it only acquired them in 1058 and as a result of a *furtum sacrum* (sacred theft) from an English minster. By contrast, Winnoc’s corporal relics had been located in Flanders since his death in 717 and had been located at the town of Bergues for one hundred twenty-two years by the time Count Baldwin IV (r. 988-1035) founded the abbey of Saint-Winnoc there. This *corpus* allows for an examination of hagiographic approaches to the past from a variety of perspectives.

The fact that Drogo of Saint-Winnoc composed five of the abbey’s nine texts – numbers two, three, four, six and nine above – is a fourth reason to study the *corpus* from Saint-Winnoc. According to Philippart and Trigalet, Drogo ranks as one of the ten most prolific, known eleventh-century hagiographers. This is true even though the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries are exceptional for the number of hagiographers whom we know by name and to whom we can thus attribute multiple works. (Medieval hagiographers, like many medieval authors, did not always identify themselves in their compositions.) We have the names of
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slightly more than sixty hagiographers from the tenth century, just over one hundred twenty from the eleventh century and one hundred ten from the twelfth century. For the next highest century, the ninth, we know the names of just over sixty.\footnote{Philippart and Trigalet, “L’hagiographie latine,” p. 288.} To put this ranking in better perspective, in a limited examination of indices of all medieval sources, I found only one hundred thirteen medieval hagiographers with two or more works attributed to them, and only fifty-one of these with four or more works.

Finally, although scholars have examined individual texts from the abbey’s corpus, they have not considered the texts together. By studying them in relation to each other, it is possible to notice common attitudes toward the past.

1.5 Modern Scholarship and Methodology

Hagiographers were not usually willing to admit the extent of their influence over contemporary opinions. Often, they represented themselves as merely the conservators of a saint’s memoria (the report of a saint’s virtues, deeds and development of his or her cult). For example, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc wrote the following passage about Lewinna’s relics:

I took up a matter serious and very difficult for me, that is, that I might leave to future generations in writing how the holy bones of the venerable Lewinna, virgin and martyr, were carried from Anglia to Flanders...
was made anxious by a certain interval of time [passing], lest the arrival of
the virgin [Lewinna] arranged by the highest Craftsman should be
consigned to oblivion, and lest by this same [forgetting] I should be
accused as an accomplice in this crime [of consigning its memory to
oblivion].

*rem gravem nimiumque michi difficilem suscepi, idest, ut qualiter sancta ossa
venerabilis Leuwinæ virginis & martiris ab Anglia ad Flandriam sint delata,
scripto posteris relinquere... aliqua intercapedine temporis mihi timebam, ne
oblivioni traderetur adventus virginis a summo opifice dispositus, & ne ab eodem
arguerer hujusce criminis reus.*

The process of preservation was, however, a process of selection. Hagiographers
frequently claimed that because the material about their subjects was so
abundant they had winnowed the superfluous from the salient, fearing that too
much material would become tedious to their audiences. Even in the cases
where this statement was merely the expression of a trope, hagiographers still
elected to accept or reject bits of information about a saint. Thus, hagiographers
had great power over how a saint would be remembered. Indeed, Drogo’s text
remains the only source on Lewinna.

---

43 *HT, Epistola*.1-2 (coll. 613B-C).
In addition to the choices hagiographers made about content, they also employed literary strategies to convey the importance of what they preserved. Growing attention to these strategies has been a key development in the modern study of hagiography. In the early twentieth century, the works of the Bollandist, Hippolyte Delahaye, which display an obvious respect for hagiographic productions and a sensitivity for their literary value, caused scholars to reassess their impressions of hagiography.\textsuperscript{44} In particular, František Graus did much to encourage research on medieval hagiography after Delahaye.\textsuperscript{45} Graus’s study of Merovingian hagiography shifted the focus of scholarly analysis from the saints themselves to the literary productions that transmitted their \textit{memoriae}.\textsuperscript{46} His discussion of changing literary \textit{topoi} in Merovingian hagiography made possible André Vauchez's classic analysis of saintly typologies between 1180 and 1418.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} See especially Hippolyte Delehaye, \textit{Les légendes hagiographiques} (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1906); Hippolyte Delehaye, \textit{The Legends of the Saints}, trans. Donald Attwater (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1998).
\item \textsuperscript{45} František Graus, \textit{Volk, Herrscher, und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger: Studien zur Hagiographie der Merowingerzeit} (Prague: Nakladatelství Ceskoslovenské akademie ved, 1965).
\item \textsuperscript{46} See especially Graus, \textit{Volk}, p. 60.
\item \textsuperscript{47} André Vauchez, \textit{La sainteté en occident}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
As a result of these and other efforts, scholars have broadened the disciplinary approaches to which they have subjected hagiography. Donald Weinstein and Rudolph Bell have worked on the sociology of sainthood.\textsuperscript{48} Sharon Farmer has analyzed the construction of medieval group identities and categories of difference.\textsuperscript{49} Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn, in \textit{Writing Faith}, a study of the cult of St. Foy (Faith) at Conques, have gone so far as to classify their approach as “post-disciplinary,” meaning that they examine each text from a variety of disciplinary perspectives – literary, historical, anthropological and folkloric among others.\textsuperscript{50}

\textit{Writing Faith} is particularly notable because its authors, like Graus, have treated hagiographic works as literary productions which adhere to their own, medieval norms rather than those of modern authors. Their book begins with an analysis of the literary strategies adopted by the hagiographers who wrote about Foy, then places each work in its specific historical context. While my analyses are methodologically more limited than those from \textit{Writing Faith}, I have attempted to reproduce this general approach to the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc.

\textsuperscript{48} Donald Weinstein and Rudolph M. Bell, \textit{Saints and Society: The Two Worlds of Western Christendom, 1000-1700} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

\textsuperscript{49} Farmer, \textit{Communities of Saint Martin}.

1.6 An Outline

The following chapters explore hagiography’s role in creating a version of the past at Saint-Winnoc. Chapter 2 begins by discussing the historical development of Saint-Winnoc, Flanders, and Flemish hagiography. It outlines the Flemish counts’ rapid rise to become the first territorial princes in northwestern Europe. It also discusses hagiography’s development as a competitive enterprise conducted by Flemish ecclesiastical communities, and it details the community of Saint-Winnoc’s efforts to use hagiography to elevate its own prestige.

Chapter 3 discusses Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s texts on the Anglo-Saxon king-saint Oswald of Northumbria. These texts include the Vita s. Oswaldi, rex ac martyris [BHL 6362] and two sermones on the saint – the Sermo primus de s. Oswald [BHL 6363] and the Sermo secundus de s. Oswald [BHL 6364]. This chapter argues that although much of Drogo’s presentation of Oswald depended on Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, Drogo updated Bede’s presentation to align it with eleventh-century ideas concerning the virtues associated with royal saints. It also argues that even though Saint-Winnoc did not possess Oswald’s corporal relics in the eleventh century and therefore, could
not claim to be under his *patrocinium*, Drogo presented the king-saint to the
Flemish community as an exemplar of Christian rulership. In doing so, he
commented on the ideological program constructed by the counts of Flanders.

Chapter 4 discusses Drogo’s text, the *Historia translationis s. Lewinnae
virginis et martiris* [BHL 4902], about the theft of the Anglo-Saxon virgin martyr
Lewinna’s relics from a small English minster in East Sussex, their arrival in
Flanders, and the miracles that the saint later performed. The chapter argues
that Drogo intended to memorialize Lewinna’s acceptance as a patron saint of
the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc and of the lay community in the region
surrounding Bergues. The text describes the connection between heaven and
earth created by Lewinna’s ability to deliver divine intercession.

Chapters 5 traces the confessor Winnoc’s cult from the seventh through
the tenth centuries. Winnoc’s cult was much more deeply rooted in Flanders
than either Oswald’s or Lewinna’s. He had actually lived in the region during
the Early Middle Ages and had been the chief patron saint of two previous
Flemish ecclesiastical communities before being housed at Saint-Winnoc. This
chapter discusses the development of his cult before the abbey acquired his
relics. Specifically, it discusses four texts on the saint – the *Vitae s. Audomari,
Bertini, Winnoci* [BHL 764, 0000, 8952], the *Vita antiqua s. Winnoci* [BHL 8952], the
*Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci* [BHL 8953] and the *Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci*
[No BHL]. The chapter argues that vigorous comital intervention in Flemish
ecclesiastical affairs created a rupture in the saint’s cult. During the Viking invasions, Winnoc’s relics were moved from their original shrine but were not returned after the invasions subsided. Instead, Count Baldwin II (r. 879-918) had the relics translated to a chapter of canons he founded at Bergues. Despite the relics’ new location, however, the hagiographic texts produced by the canons indicate that the saint continued to be venerated almost exclusively at his old shrine. The institution that housed his relics was not the place where he established a connection to heaven.

Chapter 6 argues that the rupture in Winnoc’s cult was healed when the Benedictine monastic community of Saint-Winnoc, which replaced the chapter of canons at Bergues, thoroughly revised his memoria. Revised versions of the Vita antiqua and Miracula antiquiora appeared as the Vita interpolata s. Winnoci [No BHL] along with a revised version of the Miracula recentiora and the Sermo de s. Winnoco, a sermon in rhymed prose concerning what seems to be the first miracle the saint performed after the foundation of the abbey. Moreover, it is likely that Rumold, the abbot of Saint-Winnoc (1031-68), composed the Vita interpolata and Sermo. The revised texts then served as the “rough draft” of another revised vita – the Vita secunda s. Winnoci [BHL 8954, 8955]. Finally, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc produced the Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci [BHL 8956], which contains accounts of thirty miracles Winnoc performed after the foundation of the abbey of Saint-Winnoc. The revised texts produced for Saint-Winnoc place greater emphasis on
the saint’s virtues as a Benedictine saint and unambiguously identify Bergues as the location of his shrine. They also shed light on how a saint’s cult evolved over time, since they preserve multiple versions of certain texts. While Chapter 5 provides the background for the development of Winnoc’s cult discussed in Chapter 6, together the two chapters reveal how the saint became a critical element in the identities of the communities that housed his relics.

Chapter 7 outlines the ontological, epistemological and ideological framework of the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc. It also attempts to note some of this framework’s implications for the study of other medieval hagiographic texts.
CHAPTER 2

SAINT-WINNOC

2.1 Introduction

In *Phantoms of Remembrance*, Patrick Geary has described a fundamental political transformation in the medieval West. According to Geary, the structure of the Carolingian empire was “horizontal,” meaning that a relatively centralized state with a culturally homogeneous aristocracy stretched over an extensive territory with a culturally heterogeneous population. In this structure, the Carolingian aristocracy maintained familial relationships across the territories that comprised the empire. As the Carolingian state apparatus broke down, however, a more localized, fragmented structure took its place. The aristocracy lost its transregional connections, replacing them with “vertical” structures that operated within, not across, regions. While many of the regional aristocrats of the Central Middle Ages emerged from the Carolingian aristocracy, most forgot these origins. By the twelfth century, most lords could not trace their genealogies outside the territories they controlled, leading them to construct
Legends that placed their origins inside the regions they controlled. The development of Flanders from the ninth through the eleventh centuries supports Geary’s general characterization. During these centuries, Flanders developed from a distant, border region of the Carolingian empire to a coherent and nearly autonomous regional state under the control of a strong comital dynasty.

Two developments in the evolution of Flanders affected the production of hagiography at the abbey of Saint-Winnoc. First, the Flemish counts were the first lords to cast themselves as “territorial princes,” a term that implied that they had a role in governing the west Frankish kingdom alongside or only slightly below its kings. The term also granted them a role in ecclesiastical affairs as patrons of the Church in their own territory, just as the king was theoretically patron of the Church in his kingdom. As a result, the Flemish counts frequently intervened in ecclesiastical affairs within the county, including in the internal affairs of Saint-Winnoc. Second, two great ecclesiastical centers – one at the town of Sithiu in western Flanders and the other at the town of Ghent in eastern Flanders – dominated the religious topography of the county. (See Map 1.) Two ecclesiastical institutions developed at each of these centers – Saint-Omer and Saint-Bertin at Sithiu and Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon at Ghent. Disputes between these institutions turned Flemish hagiography into a competitive
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enterprise. The power of the Flemish counts and the competitiveness of Flemish hagiography outline the essential historical context for the texts from Saint-Winnoc. These elements are discussed in the following sections along with the development of the abbey of Saint-Winnoc itself.

2.2 The Early Principality of Flanders

The Flemish comital family is notable exception among the dynasties of the Central Middle Ages because it did not suffer the genealogical amnesia cited by Geary. Since the Flemish counts were actually related to the Carolingians themselves through marriage they carefully preserved their family history. (See Appendix A for a genealogy of the counts of Flanders.) Despite this connection to the old order, the counts built one of the strongest regional powers in the new structure of the Central Middle Ages. In fact, it was probably a keen sense of their past that led the counts to adopt a Carolingian model of rulership in their territory. In imitation of the Carolingians, they promoted themselves as the primary rulers of Flanders, rulers who derived their legitimacy from God, not a king. The territorial principality of Flanders was mainly the creation of three men. Baldwin I the Iron One (r. 863-79) created a dynasty with blood ties to the Carolingians; his son, Baldwin II the Bald (r. 879-918), defined the Flemish principality’s core territory; most importantly, Arnulf I the Great (r. 918-65),
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Baldwin II’s son, constructed the dynasty’s ideology. Together, they created a largely autonomous political territory on the border between the Western and Eastern Frankish kingdoms.

The heart of the territorial principality of Flanders (what is now northern Belgium and northeastern France) lay on the coastal plain between the Canche, Scheldt and North Sea, and was relatively poor in the Early Middle Ages. The land was close to sea level, marshes were frequent and the soil sandy, making the region mostly unsuitable for agriculture. Flanders probably gained its name from the Frankish word, *Flam* or *Floem*, which refers to the artificial and natural mounds on which the Celtic population lived when the Franks began settling there in the seventh century. Although Flanders at times supported extensive flocks of sheep and clothmaking, the woolen industry that would make it famous did not develop until the twelfth century.\(^{52}\) Under the Merovingians and Carolingians, Flanders was a frontier district. The primary political units were relatively small *pagi*, each administered by a count (*comes*), often a local strongman, though sometimes several *pagi* could be grouped into a county (*comitatus*) under the control of a single count. Neither the Merovingian nor the Carolingian kings paid much attention to the area, except as a staging ground for defense against the Vikings.\(^{53}\)
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The first count of Flanders, Baldwin I the Iron One (r. 863-79), emerged from this frontier district during the reign of Charlemagne’s grandson, the West Frankish king Charles II the Bald (r. 840-77). According to later Flemish genealogies, Baldwin was the son of one Audacer from a family that had produced several counts in the region around Ghent. By the middle of the ninth century, Baldwin was probably himself count of the pagus Gandensis (Ghent). Baldwin I established the comital dynasty of Flanders in a feat of daring that later earned him the epithet Ferreus (the Iron One). In 861, he fell in love with Charles the Bald’s daughter, Judith, who was staying at the fortress of Senlis, between Paris and Soissons. Around Christmas of the same year, he eloped with her, perhaps with the assistance of her brother, Louis II the Stammerer (r. 877-79). Charles the Bald was furious and called for the pair’s excommunication. Baldwin, astutely observing the troubled relations between


56 On Louis II’s possible role, see Dhondt, Les origines, p. 25.
Charles and Pope Nicholas I (858-67), fled to Rome with Judith, where they were taken into Nicholas’s protection. In 862, the pontiff convinced Charles to forgive them, and they married.\textsuperscript{57} 

Baldwin’s choice of a bride was a fortunate one. Not only was Judith herself of royal blood, but at age sixteen, she was already the widow of two West Saxon kings, Æthelwulf (d. 858), and his son, Æthelbald (d. 860). According to contemporary standards, the marriage of a minor figure like Baldwin to a royal princess and royal widow was a great coup. It increased the prestige of Baldwin’s stock immensely by implying that his bloodline was worthy of union with royalty. In addition, Charles, influenced by those same standards, was unwilling to allow his daughter to remain the wife of such a mean figure. In 863, the king granted Baldwin several pagi along the North Sea coast and the lay abbacy of Saint-Pierre at Ghent, the most powerful abbey in the eastern part of Baldwin’s new territory. (See Map 2.) In return for these holdings, the king charged his son-in-law with defending the coast against the Vikings.\textsuperscript{58} 

Baldwin I died in 879, and his son, Baldwin II the Bald (r. 879-918), became count. It was an unfortunate time to assume control because the Viking invasions were increasing in both frequency and ferocity. In 879, Alfred the


Great, king of Wessex (r. 871-99), chased a party of Vikings out of England, and they subsequently landed on the continent between Boulogne and Calais. From 879 through 892, they invaded the region several times, causing terrible damage as far south as the Remois. Baldwin II was initially unable to defend against the invaders. He seems to have retreated into the marshes of the *pagus* 
*Flandrensis* (the area originally called Flanders) to wait out the worst of the attacks, losing control of most of his lands.

Surprisingly, the Viking invasions eventually helped the count more than they harmed him. The chaos and dislocations following in their wake caused many of the region’s lords to flee, resulting in a sort of territorial *tabula rasa*.

Beginning in 883, with the Viking threat diminished by a chain of new fortifications, Baldwin turned to seizing the abandoned lands. (See Map 3.) Then, emboldened by the cessation of the invasions, in 892, he began a major push into the more fertile lands of the south. Three years later, he exploited the conflict between the Robertian king Eudes/Odo of West Francia (r. 888-98), and
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the Carolingian king Charles III the Simple (r. 893-922), to seize the rich fields of
the Artois, the Arras, and a portion of the Vermandois. (Charles had created a
furor when he claimed the kingship of West Francia in 893.)

Baldwin II turned the Viking attacks to his advantage in another way as well. The Flemish count held his comital powers, but not the actual territory of
the county, in fief to the kings of West Francia. This meant that his power was
concentrated in the north around Bruges and Ghent where most of his familial
properties were located. By installing himself as lay abbot of or simply by
usurping properties from monastic communities weakened by the attacks, he
was able to place extensive tracts of the county under his direct control.
Baldwin’s dealings with Folcuin, the archbishop of Reims (883-900), reveal the
importance the count placed on this strategy. In the late 880s, Folcuin had
temporarily blocked Baldwin’s attempts to gain the lay abbacy of Saint-Bertin at
Sithiu, the most powerful abbey in the western part of the count’s territory. In
revenge for this obstruction, Baldwin had the archbishop assassinated in 900.
The count would not permit even a powerful ecclesiastical lord to stand in the
way of his ambition if he could help it.
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62 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 18; Ganshof, La Flandre, pp. 19-21; Dhondt, Les
origines, pp. 30-6; Monier, Les Institutions, p. 8-9.
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By 900, Baldwin had lost his conquests in the south, and the remaining territories between the Zwin and Canche became the core of the county known then collectively as Flandrae and later Flandria. From that time, he seems to have enjoyed almost two decades of peace, though few sources survive for the period. He died in 918, and Arnulf I, his elder son, received the lands in the east while Adalolf, his younger son, received the Boulonnais and the Ternois including the lay abbacy of Saint-Bertin. (See Map 4.)

Arnulf I the Great (r. 918-65) was the ruler most responsible for elevating the counts of Flanders to the status of territorial princes. Like his predecessors, he worked to expand the area under his control. As early as 930, he had already occupied the fortress of Montreuil-sur-Mer, which guarded the mouth of the Canche and was the gateway to the Artois and the Vermandois in the south. This initiated a protracted conflict with the Normans, who also wanted the fortress. In 931 and 932, Arnulf pushed southward into the Artois and Ostrevant. In 933, his brother, Adalolf, died and Arnulf seized his brother’s territories, disinheriting Adalolf’s sons. Then in 942, Arnulf invited the Norman count of Rouen, William Longsword (r. 933-42), to meet and discuss a possible truce but had him assassinated instead. Although the conflict between the
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Normans and Flemish continued for another decade, Arnulf was in control of Ponthieu by 949. In 943, he also succeeded in recapturing the portion of the Vermandois that his father had briefly held.66

While Arnulf’s territorial gains made him a force to be reckoned with, his real achievements lay in being the first to give the position of territorial prince a coherent ideology. Numerous rulers of varying prestige and power bore the title count or duke in the Central Middle Ages. Some controlled vast stretches of land and vied with kings for power, while others were little more than local strongmen. In the latter part of his reign, Charles the Bald granted a series of great lords power over large portions of his kingdom.67 In order to distinguish between these lords and less important figures, modern historians have taken their cue from Jan Dhondt in applying the term princes (principes) to the great lords and territorial principalities (monarchia) to the lands they ruled. Though the terminology is somewhat anachronistic – principes was only one of the titles medieval authors applied to these lords – the distinction is not. The rulers of large territories fostered the idea that they were superior to ordinary

66 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 39-40; Ganshof, La Flandre, pp. 21-3; Dhondt, Les origines, pp. 39-45.

officeholders, more comparable to kings than to less powerful men. As a result, several mostly autonomous territorial principalities emerged in the Central Middle Ages. Flanders under Arnulf I was among the earliest.\footnote{Dunbabin, \textit{France}, pp. 44-9.}

Aware that neither his office, nor his military power, nor even the extent of his territories could effectively distinguish him from other, lesser lords, Arnulf began a successful campaign to elevate his status. First, he applied traditional titles and formulas to his office in new ways.\footnote{Geoffrey Koziol, \textit{Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France} (Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), p. 109.} For example, he frequently referred to himself as “count by the grace of God” (\textit{comes gratia Dei}), a formula that implied that, like a king, he had received his office not by appointment, but from God alone.\footnote{Koziol, \textit{Begging Pardon}, pp. 38-9.} A second element in his campaign was to make the most of his exceptional bloodline. Arnulf commissioned genealogies that detailed his ties to the Carolingians and other royal families, including the royal family of Wessex. (About 883, Baldwin II had married Alfred the Great’s daughter, Æthelfryth/Elftrude).\footnote{Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 20; Chapter 3 discusses this part of his program in more detail.} He also promoted an image of himself as the chief patron of the Church in Flanders, a role inspired by the Carolingians.\footnote{Dunbabin, \textit{France}, pp. 72-3; See also Rosamond McKitterick, \textit{The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians}, 751-987 (London: Longman, 1983), pp. 252-54.}
example, he invited the Lotharingian monastic reformer Gérard de Brogne (d. 959) to take control of several ecclesiastical institutions in Flanders. As Jean Dunbabin has suggested, this was probably an attempt to imitate the relationship between the Carolingian Louis the Pious (r. 814-40) and the ecclesiastical reformer Benedict of Aniane.\textsuperscript{73} It may even have been Arnulf who had the comital chapel of Saint-Donatian at Bruges constructed in imitation of Charles the Bald’s chapel at Compiègne. This would have emphasized Arnulf’s relationship to Charles the Bald through his grandmother, Judith. It would also have been symbolic because Charles the Bald’s chapel was itself a copy of Charlemagne’s chapel at Aachen.\textsuperscript{74} Such parallels would have promoted the idea that Arnulf was patron of the Church in Flanders as the Carolingian king had been patron of the Church in \textit{Francia}. By 961, Arnulf had also earned the honorific “the Great” like Charlemagne.\textsuperscript{75}

As patron of the Church, Arnulf made extensive donations to the abbeys of Flanders.\textsuperscript{76} Among these, he lavished particular attention on two monasteries, Saint-Pierre at Ghent and Saint-Bertin at Sithiu. Several factors accounted for
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this special attention. First, both abbeys were situated at strategically important
locations. In the east, Saint-Pierre overlooked the confluence of the Leie and the
Scheldt and the route into the Flemish interior. In the west, Saint-Bertin sat at
Sithiu amid the canals and marshes of the Audomarois. After the decline of
Quentavic on the Canche in the ninth century, Sithiu became a major continental
port for travelers moving between England and Rome.77

Both monasteries had already developed close relationships with Arnulf’s
family. Baldwin I was buried at Saint-Bertin in 879. After Baldwin II died in 918,
his wife, Ælfthryth, had begun to make provisions to have her husband buried
there as well. When she discovered that the monks would not allow her to be
interred next to her husband, however, she had him buried at Saint-Pierre. (The
monks of Saint-Bertin refused to allow a woman – even a dead one – to enter the
cloister.) Later, probably in 929, she joined him. As a result of Ælfthryth’s
actions, Saint-Pierre became a sort of comital necropolis (in 965, Arnulf I was
buried there as well).78 Although these developments made Saint-Pierre the
county’s premier monastic institution, Saint-Bertin remained a close second. It

77 Philip Grierson, “The Relations between England and Flanders before the
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78 M. Guérard (ed.), Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Bertin, Collection des cartulaires
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was at Saint-Bertin that a monk, named Witger, composed the first genealogy of the comital family for Arnulf I. In addition, in 962 after his only son, Baldwin III, died from a sudden illness, Arnulf I had him laid to rest at Saint-Bertin.

Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bertin were also the two most important centers of Christianity in tenth-century Flanders. Both were connected to the conversion of the region in the seventh century. Between 629 and 639, the missionary St. Amand (Amandus) (c. 584-679) proselytized in the area around the old Roman fortress of Ganda from which Ghent later took its name. During this period, he founded an abbey dedicated to St. Peter at Ganda, then appointed St. Florbert (Florbertus) (d. 660) as its abbot. He also endowed the community with a portion of the royal fisc granted him by the Merovingian king Dagobert I (r. 628-39). Amand also converted a nobleman, named Alwinus (d. c. 655), and during Florbert’s abbacy the man lived as a penitent in a small cell owned by the community. When Alwinus (later known as Bavon) died, Florbert buried him in the church of Saint-Pierre which became known as the church of Saint-Bavon.
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Between 650 and 660, Amand’s friend, Johannes, founded a separate community at Ghent. He built it on Mont Blandinium and dedicated it to Ss. Peter and Paul. At first, Saint-Pierre as it became known was less prestigious than its older sibling. Then, Saint-Bavon suffered repeated destruction by the Vikings who used its grounds as their winter quarters while Saint-Pierre remained relatively unscathed. In 846, the monks of Saint-Bavon fled from Ghent with the relics of their patron saints, Bavon and Pharaïlde (Pharaildis) (d. c. 740), and their treasury. Between 879 and the early tenth century, Saint-Bavon remained uninhabited, promoting Saint-Pierre to the chief ecclesiastical community in eastern Flanders.

Saint-Bertin had a similar story. In 637, the Merovingian king, Dagobert I (r. 623-39), asked St. Acharius, bishop of Noyon-Tournai (626-38), to appoint a worthy monk as bishop of Thérouanne. Acharius turned to his former monastery of Luxeuil and chose St. Omer (Audomarus) (637-70) for the position. Omer governed the region as bishop from 638 until his death in 670 and was particularly active in proselytizing the Morini, a local tribe that had reverted to
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paganism after a first missionary effort. Three other monks from Luxeuil, Ss. Mommelin (Mommelinus) (d. 686), Bertin (Bertinus) (d. 700), and Bertram (Ebertramnus), assisted his efforts.  

Early in his episcopate, Omer built a church dedicated to Peter at the town of Sithiu and appointed Mommelin as abbot of the monastic community he founded there. A short while later, Omer constructed another church at Sithiu, this one dedicated to Mary (Notre-Dame), and gave it to the monastic community as well. (The monks had apparently complained that they were unable to bury their dead in the swampy ground around the church of Saint-Pierre.) When Mommelin became bishop of Noyon (c. 661-686), Omer made Bertin abbot of Sithiu. (Bertram became the first abbot of Saint-Quentin, Mommelin’s foundation at Noyon.) After their deaths, Omer was buried in the church of Notre-Dame and Bertin in the church of Saint-Pierre.

Sithiu remained a single community with two churches until the early ninth century. Between 820 and 834, the Englishman Fridegis governed as abbot at Sithiu. In addition to serving as imperial chancellor under Louis the Pious (r. 814-40), Fridegis was also the abbot of Saint-Martin of Tours. He split the


community at Sithiu, founding a chapter of canons at the church of Notre-Dame and reducing the size of the monastic community serving at the church of Saint-Pierre. Two thirds of the original community’s holdings went to the monks and the remaining third to the canons, making the former the more prestigious of the two. The monastic community at the church of Saint-Pierre became known as Saint-Bertin, while the community of priests at Notre-Dame became Saint-Omer.85 Both communities at Sithiu suffered damages at the hands of the Vikings but the marshes of the Audomarois protected them from the worst of the attacks. The chapter of Saint-Omer either fled or was eclipsed by Saint-Bertin, however, since the latter is the only institution at Sithiu for which we have records through the end of the ninth century.86 Thus, by favoring Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bertin, Arnulf I linked himself to the two most prestigious Flemish religious institutions, whose foundations dated to the earliest days of Christianity in his territory.


Arnulf I’s patronage of the Church in Flanders also included participation in the cult of the saints. He seems to have been aware of the symbolic convergence of political power, divine power and Christian identity in the cult of the saints. The donation of relics to Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bertin became tangible ways for him to emphasize his power as ruler.\(^{87}\)

Baldwin I had given scant attention to the cult of relics. According to later sources, he sponsored only two relic translationes (ritual transfers or “translations” to cite the commonly used cognate). In 863, he fortified his residence at Bruges and built a chapel within the castrum there. Following canonical guidelines regarding the construction of new altars, he had the relics of St. Donatian, the fourth bishop of Reims (379-89), translated from Torhout to this chapel. Between 863 and 879, he also translated the relics of St. Amalberga (d. 819) from the domain of Tamise in eastern Flanders to Saint-Pierre at Ghent.\(^{88}\)

The majority of translations that occurred under Baldwin II resulted from monastic rather than comital initiative. He did, however, directly arrange for the movement of two saints. On 30 December, 899, he had the relics of Winnoc translated from Saint-Bertin, where they had been taken in 846, to Bergues, where Baldwin had recently constructed a castrum and a church dedicated to Ss.
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Martin and Winnoc. In addition, around 915, Baldwin II and Airard, bishop of Noyon (915-30), translated the relics of St. Gerulf (d. 746) from Mérendrée northwest of Ghent to nearby Tronchiennes.\footnote{Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” pp. 275-76.}

Under Arnulf I, the nature of the translations sponsored by the count changed significantly. In 858, the Vikings had driven the monks of Fontanelle (later called Saint-Wandrille) from their abbey. The monks fled with a large collection of relics, including the bones of Ss. Wandrille (\textit{Wandregisilus}) (d. 668), Ansbert (\textit{Ansbertus}) (d. c. 695), Wulfram (\textit{Vulfrannus}) (d. c. 703), Condé (\textit{Condedus}) (d. c. 685), Erembert (\textit{Erembertus}) (d. c. 672), Ermeland (\textit{Ermelandus}) (639-710) and Vulmer (\textit{Vulmarus}) (d. c. 700). After wandering for several years, the community settled in Boulogne, where they eventually died out without recruiting new members. The relics remained at the town, generating reports of numerous miracles. In August of 944, Arnulf marched to Boulogne at the head of a procession of monks and knights, seized the relics, then donated them to Saint-Pierre at Ghent. Later, he added the relics of Ss. Gudwal (\textit{Gudwalus}) (sixth century) as well as portions of the relics of Bertulf of Renty (\textit{Bertulfus de Rentiacensis}) (d. c. 705), Omer and Bertin.\footnote{Nicholas N. Huyghebaert, \textit{Une Translation de Reliques à Gand en 944: Le Sermo de Adventu Sanctorum Wandregisili, Ansberti et Vulfranni in Blandinium} (Bruxelles: Académie royale de Belgique, 1978), pp. II-III; Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” p. 278.} In addition to making a statement
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\textit{Sermo de Adventu Sanctorum Wandregisili, Ansberti et Vulfranni in Blandinium}
about Arnulf’s role as patron of the Church in Flanders and Saint-Pierre’s status as the comital favorite, the translations from Boulogne and Sithiu also marked off the boundaries of comital power. The count had only acquired the Boulonnais and the Ternois after his brother Adalolf died in 933.\textsuperscript{91} By transferring the relics of Fontanelle from Boulogne (the capital of the Boulonnais) and portions of Omer and Bertin from Sithiu (the religious center of the Ternois) to Saint-Pierre, he was both asserting power in these areas and associating them with the comital family.

Arnulf also donated relics to Saint-Bertin. Shortly before 939, the count solidified his hold on the fortress of Montreuil-sur-Mer and the surrounding territory of Ponthieu. To trumpet his victory over the Normans in the competition for Montreuil, he translated the relics of Ponthieu’s two greatest saints, Riquier of Centula (\textit{Richarius}) (d. c. 645) and Valéry of Leuconay (\textit{Walaricus}) (d. c. 620), to the fortress. In 950 or 951, when his hold over Montreuil was becoming more tenuous, he translated the relics to Saint-Bertin.\textsuperscript{92} Just as at Saint-Pierre, Arnulf used his position as patron of the Church in Flanders to display the extent of his power. As a result of his efforts, Arnulf I achieved a virtual monopoly on church patronage in Flanders.

\textsuperscript{91} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{92} Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” p. 277; In 981, Hugh Capet returned the relics of both Riquier and Valéry from Saint-Bertin to their original monasteries in Ponthieu (Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” p. 278).
By the end of the ninth century, Saint-Omer, Saint-Bertin and Saint-Bavon, had produced hagiographies honoring their saintly patrons. Before 850, Saint-Bavon produced the *Epistola encyclica monachorum s. Petri* [BHL 3029] on Florbert and the *Vita s. Bavonis confessoris* [BHL 1049]. Around the same time, the united community at Sithiu produced the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, a joint text on Omer, Bertin and Winnoc. After Fridegis divided the community at Sithiu in the 830s, new versions of these last three saints’ *vitae* also appeared: 1) Saint-Omer’s version of its patron’s *vita*, the *Vita altera s. Audomari* [BHL 765, 766], 2) Saint-Bertin’s version of Omer’s *vita*, the *Vita altera s. Audomari* [No BHL], 3) Saint-Bertin’s version of Bertin’s *vita*, the *Vita altera s. Bertini* [BHL 1290], and 4) the *Vita antiqua s. Winnoci* [BHL 8952, 8953].

After the Viking invasions, hagiographic production in Flanders began to indicate the rising power of the counts. Baldwin II (r. 879-918) had placed fortifications along the coast of the North Sea after the Vikings attacked in 891,
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and the defenses appear to have been relatively successful. Around 900, a monk of Saint-Bertin produced the Liber miraculorum s. Bertini [BHL 1291] as part of its recovery from the invasions that had struck Saint-Bertin in 861 and 891. This book of miracles was an important tool for proving that the institution had retained the relics of its patron saint through the chaos. It also confirmed the relics’ continuing ability to channel divine intercession. During this same period, a hagiographer at Tournai also produced the Vita prima s. Eleutherii Tornacensis [BHL 2455] on Eletherius (d. before 540), the first bishop of Tournai.

Although surprisingly few works of hagiography appeared in Flanders under Arnulf I’s rule, those that did bore the stamp of his influence on ecclesiastical affairs. Around the middle of the tenth century, Saint-Bertin produced another revised vita for Bertin – the Vita tertia s. Bertini [BHL 1293] – as well as the Vita s. Gerulfi Trunchiniensis [BHL 3507] for the abbey of Tronchiennes near Ghent. In addition, Huyghebaert has argued for a third work, an account of the translation of the relics of Fontanelle from Boulogne to Saint-Pierre at Ghent that is no longer extant. The monastic reformer Gérard de Brogne, Arnulf’s partner in monastic reform, links all three of these works. The Vita tertia Bertini appeared shortly after Gérard took control at Saint-Bertin. A monk of
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Saint-Bertin dedicated the *Vita Gerulfi* to Gérard, and Arnulf translated the relics of Fontanelle to Saint-Pierre at Ghent after appointing Gérard, an enthusiastic relic collector, to reform the abbey. Under Arnulf I, hagiography appeared in those places touched by the count’s role as patron of the Flemish Church.

By 961, Arnulf I had created a territorial principality that was a model for the other great territorial lords of West *Francia*. The Flemish count was firmly in control of his territory and had an ideology to match his power. He had built a reputation as a ruthless opponent and had taken vigorous measures to exalt his office. From 949 through 961, he enjoyed a period of relative peace.98

2.3 Monastic Competition at Ghent

Arnulf I’s program was successful during his lifetime but lacked the legitimacy that long tradition could have given it. This was probably the reason that he associated his son, Baldwin III, in the comital office by giving him the Boulonnais and Ternois to administer after 933. Arnulf needed to smooth the succession since the position of territorial prince was his own innovation. In January of 962, however, Arnulf’s plans suffered a major blow when Baldwin suddenly took sick and died leaving only an infant son, Arnulf II the Young

(r. 965-88), as his heir. During Arnulf II’s minority, the weaknesses of his grandfather’s program became apparent with striking effects on Flemish hagiographic production.

Acting to ward off impending disaster, in 962, Arnulf I (by now called “the Old” or “the Lame”) negotiated a deal with Lothar IV, king of West Francia (r. 954-86). He ceded control over the lands he had acquired in the south – the Artois, Arras, Ostrevant, Ponthieu, and his portion of the Vermandois – to Lothar during his grandson’s minority (see Map 5). In return, the king promised to accept Arnulf II’s control of Flanders when he reached his majority. At the same time, Lothar also negotiated an end to a feud between Arnulf I and Arnulf of Boulogne, Adalolf’s son whom Arnulf I had deprived of his inheritance. Arnulf of Boulogne renounced any claims to act as guardian for Arnulf II and recovered the Boulonnais along with most of the Ternois in fief to the Flemish counts. Finally, Arnulf I designated Baldwin Baldzo (d. 973) as Arnulf II’s chief guardian under the king’s supervision. (Baldwin Baldzo was either Arnulf of Boulogne’s illegitimate half-brother or Arnulf I’s cousin.) Arnulf I died in 965 when his grandson was only four-years-old.99

---

99 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 42-3; Ganshof, La Flandre, pp. 28-9; Dhondt, Les origines, pp. 49-50.
During Arnulf II’s long minority (965-76), several lords, including the young count’s guardians, Baldwin Baldzo and Count Theodoric II of Frisia/Holland (r. 940-88), obtained effective control over large areas of Flanders. At first, the most powerful lord to intervene was King Lothar IV who marched into Flanders immediately after Arnulf I’s death in order to secure the succession and the southern territories. Lothar then seems to have turned Ponthieu over to his ally, Hugh Capet, while his mother, Gerberga, and his younger brother, Charles, administered the Artois.  

The west Frankish king’s presence in southern Flanders, however, prompted the German emperor Otto II (r. 973-83) to secure the border which ran along the Scheldt between Flanders and imperial Lotharingia. After 973, Otto II organized a series of marches in the region between the Scheldt and Dender to ward off potential attacks by Lothar. Fortresses at Valenciennes, Ename and Antwerp formed the backbone of the new imperial defense. (See Map 5.)

Count Theodoric II, noted above as one of Arnulf II’s guardians, began to assume a more prominent role within Flanders as imperial activity along the border increased. Theodoric came from a family that had achieved much of its success by exploiting the fluidity of Lotharingian politics. Since the reign of

---


Louis the Pious his family had been active in Lotharingia, shifting its loyalties between the east and west Frankish kings for advancement. For example, in 936, Theodoric II’s father, Theodoric I, supported Otto I’s (r. 936-73) accession to the German throne. In 939, however, Theodoric I joined an unsuccessful rebellion against the emperor by a group of Lotharingian nobles allied with the west Frankish king Louis IV (r. 936-54), Lothar IV’s father. Theodoric I then moved into the orbit of the west Frankish kings and concluded an alliance with Arnulf I of Flanders as well. Arnulf and Theodoric probably cemented their relationship by arranging the marriage of Arnulf’s daughter, Hildegard, to Theodoric’s son, Theodoric II.

In addition to serving as one of Arnulf II’s guardians, Theodoric II obtained the administration of the county of Ghent and the Land of Waas during the Flemish count’s minority. This is important because Otto II’s organization of the imperial marches along the Flemish border seems to have pulled Theodoric II back into the emperor’s camp. As a result, imperial influence in eastern Flanders increased significantly, especially at the town of Ghent. In the 970s, Otto II asserted a claim to the abbey and village of Saint-Bavon which lay east of the Scheldt (in the Empire). The emperor also had a canal – the Ottogracht – dug from the center of town to the Scheldt, which became part of a new border.

102 My thanks to Professor Thomas Head for providing me with some of his unpublished research on Theoderic II and his family.
between Flanders and Lotharingia. It is difficult to imagine that he did this without Theodoric II's support since the latter was in control of Ghent and had probably seized the lay abbacy of Saint-Bavon as well. In return, by 976, Otto II had made Theodoric's younger son, Egbert, imperial chancellor. Egbert became Otto's trusted advisor and in 977, the emperor appointed Egbert as archbishop of Trier (977-93).

The emperors also trampled on the Flemish count's role as chief patron of the Church in Flanders. One of the advantages of this strategy was that it gave the emperor an opportunity to extend his influence beyond his own territory. Between 974 and 987 – virtually Arnulf II's entire adult life (976-88) – the emperors favored both monastic communities at Ghent with their patronage on almost a yearly basis. In 974, Otto II restored some of Saint-Bavon's properties in the Empire. In 975, the imperial archbishop of Reims Adalbéron (969-88) attended the dedication of a new church at Saint-Pierre, a clear sign of imperial favor. In 976, Otto II donated two additional imperial properties to Saint-Bavon. In 977, Theodoric II and Archbishop Egbert interceded with Otto to obtain a diploma exempting both Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon from tolls within


104 Dunbabin, “Arnulf II,” p. 59; Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, p. 44.

105 Berlière, Monasticon Belge, VII, p. 32.

the Empire. In 977 or 978, Egbert installed Gautier, a monk of Saint-Pierre, as abbot of St. Eucharius at Trier in order to reform it. In 979, Egbert consecrated the west tower of the new church at Saint-Pierre.\textsuperscript{107} Then, although imperial attention tapered off near the end of Otto II’s life (d. 983), it revived again under his son, Otto III (r. 983-1002). In 983, Otto III received hospitality at Saint-Bavon.\textsuperscript{108} In 987, the new emperor confirmed Saint-Pierre’s exemption from tolls in the Empire and the following year – the year that Arnulf II died – he restored additional imperial properties to Saint-Bavon.\textsuperscript{109} Thus, continuing imperial attention challenged Arnulf II’s role as patron of the Church in Flanders at the most important religious center in the east of the county, the center containing the ecclesiastical institution – Saint-Pierre – most closely associated with the comital dynasty.

Imperial patronage changed the institutional dynamic at Ghent. As noted above, until the Viking invasions Saint-Bavon had been the more prestigious community there.\textsuperscript{110} When the monks of Saint-Bavon fled with their patron saints, however, they ceded this position to Saint-Pierre, a situation that continued after the monks of Saint-Bavon returned sometime between 911 and 107

\textsuperscript{107} Berlière, \textit{Monasticon Belge}, VII, pp. 33, 102.


\textsuperscript{109} Berlière, \textit{Monasticon Belge}, VII, pp. 103, 34.

\textsuperscript{110} Berlière, \textit{Monasticon Belge}, VII, pp. 29-30, 98.
937. Although Arnulf I did not neglect the monks of Saint-Bavon, he paid more attention to Saint-Pierre. For example, Arnulf housed the relics of Saint-Bavon’s patron saints, Bavon and Pharaïlde, in his chapel at Ghent while he rebuilt the abbey.\textsuperscript{111} But when he appointed Gérard de Brogne to reform both abbeys, the count placed Saint-Bavon under the authority of Saint-Pierre.\textsuperscript{112} In 981, Saint-Bavon regained its independence, probably as a result of Otto II’s generosity.\textsuperscript{113} This led the monks to challenge their inferior status \textit{vis-à-vis} Saint-Pierre.\textsuperscript{114} A long dispute ensued over which of the two monasteries was more prestigious.\textsuperscript{115}

Saint-Bavon conducted the dispute mostly through hagiography, treating its patron saints as its proxies. It fired the opening salvo with the \textit{Vita secunda metrica Bavonis Gandensis} [BHL 1050], and two works on Landoald’s (d. c. 668) translation to Saint-Bavon, the \textit{Vita, translationes et miracula Landoaldi, Landradae et sociorum} [BHL 4700-4706] and the \textit{Adventus Landoaldi in castro Gandavo anno 980 et elevatio anno 982} [BHL 4707]. By 1000, the community had also produced the \textit{Miracula s. Bavonis} [BHL1054]. These works served several purposes. First, they

\textsuperscript{111} Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” p. 278.

\textsuperscript{112} Berlière, \textit{Monasticon Belge}, VII, p. 31.


\textsuperscript{114} Van’t Spijker, “Gallia du Nord,” pp. 263-79.

\textsuperscript{115} Dunbabin, “Arnulf II,” p. 59; Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 44.
confirmed that the community was in possession of its chief patron saint.

Second, they reconnected the community with its institutional heritage. Finally, they began negotiations over Saint-Bavon’s prestige in an environment where the community found itself subordinate to its junior sibling. Only one other work of Flemish hagiography is extant from the period between c. 965 and c. 1000. This was the *Vita s. Folcuini Morinensis* [BHL 3079] written by Folcuin, the abbot of Lobbes about Folcuin, the bishop of Thérouanne (817-55), and dedicated to Abbot Walter of Saint-Bertin (970-84).

In the next century, Saint-Pierre began to respond with its own hagiographic productions, and the two monasteries at Ghent conducted a virtual war with hagiographic.

Baldwin III’s untimely death in 962 had upset the balance of power in his father’s principality. Although external powers took advantage of Arnulf II’s minority to challenge the young territorial prince, particularly in his role as patron of the Church, the principality itself held together. The struggles that took place were mainly internal, like the dispute that erupted between Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon. While Arnulf II’s son, Baldwin IV, (and perhaps Arnulf himself) later regained political control, the competition among the county’s chief monastic institutions expanded to shape the cult of the saints in Flanders throughout the eleventh century.

---

116 *Index Scriptorum*, I, p. 137.
2.4 The Principality Reformed

Under Baldwin IV the Bearded (r. 988-1035) and Baldwin V the Pious (r. 1030/35-67) the developments discussed in the last two sections merged to create the context within which hagiographers wrote for Saint-Winnoc. First, the counts asserted their power as territorial princes again. In particular, they vigorously intervened in ecclesiastical affairs again. Second, although the counts regained their virtual monopoly on church patronage, hagiography continued to be a competitive enterprise. Both the power of the counts and the role of hagiography in monastic competition are evident in eleventh-century Flemish hagiographic texts.

Arnulf II applied the same exalted formulas to himself that his grandfather had. As has been noted above, however, his minority had emptied these formulas of much of their content. When Arnulf died in 988 at the age of twenty-eight, his son, Baldwin IV, was only eleven. Fortunately for the comital dynasty, Baldwin’s minority was shorter and not as damaging as his father’s had been. He was soon able to regain the ground that the counts had lost after Baldwin III’s death. First, Hugh Capet, the new king of France (r. 987-96), immediately recognized Baldwin’s control of Flanders, including the lands

---

117 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, p. 44; Ganshof, La Flandre, p. 30; Dhondt, Les origines, p. 53.
Lothar IV had obtained in the succession settlement.118 Then, in 993, Count Arnulf of Frisia, Theodoric II’s older son, died in battle leaving an infant son as his heir. This allowed Baldwin to chase the family out of Ghent and Waas. At about the same time, Elbodon, Baldwin Baldzo’s successor as count of Courtrai, submitted to the Flemish count. In addition, Arnulf of Boulogne’s line in the Ternois failed and Baldwin recovered areas around Sithiu and Aire. In order to consolidate his power further he reorganized the internal administration of the county. Beginning in 993, he created a series of large comitatus that later became the castellaries of Courtrai, Bruges, Saint-Omer, and Ghent, with the Land of Waas subordinate to Ghent (see Map 6). He placed a castellan in each who held his office, but not the castellany, in fief to the count.119

Sandwiched between the Capetians and Ottonians, Baldwin IV concentrated most of his attention on his border with the Empire, but could not ignore France completely. In 989, good relations between Flanders and France led to a marriage between Arnulf II’s widow, Rozela, and Hugh Capet’s son, Robert II the Pious (r. 987/96-1031). In 991, however, Robert repudiated his older bride (who had changed her name to Susanna), and Baldwin then joined an

118 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 45-6; Ganshof, La Flandre, pp. 30-1; Dhondt, Les origines, pp. 53-4.

119 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 46-7; Ganshof, La Flandre, pp. 31-3, 35-6; Dhondt, Les origines, pp. 55-6, 60.
unsuccessful rebellion of nobles against Hugh, losing Ponthieu in the process.\textsuperscript{120} In 1019, Robert the Pious used a conflict over the succession in the Ternois as a reason to besiege Sithiu. The action convinced Baldwin that he needed to improve relations with the Capetians because he was increasingly occupied in more serious conflicts with the emperors on his eastern border. Around 1020, he betrothed his son, Baldwin V, to Robert’s one-year-old daughter, Adela, and agreed to raise the girl in Flanders.\textsuperscript{121}

Baldwin IV spent the majority of his time attempting to expand into Lotharingia or at least weaken the imperial marches there. In 995, he tried to install Azelinus, the bastard son of Baldwin III, as bishop of the diocese of Cambrai, which included the imperial march of Valenciennes as well as Flemish Arras.\textsuperscript{122} Unsuccessful at Cambrai, Baldwin then fought a series of wars with the emperor Henry II (r. 1002-24). Eventually, he concluded an agreement with Henry and received imperial territories at the mouth of the Scheldt – the islands

\textsuperscript{120} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, pp. 45-6; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 30-1; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, pp. 53-4.

\textsuperscript{121} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 46; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, p. 36; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, p. 60.

\textsuperscript{122} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 46; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 33-5; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, pp. 57-60.
of Walcheren and Zeeland, and the *Vier Ambachten* (Four Offices) - in fief to the emperor. Later, he acquired the march of Valenciennes in fief as well.\(^{123}\)

Baldwin IV thoroughly merged ecclesiastical and secular affairs in Flanders. In the early part of his tenure, the count seemed to prefer a strictly pragmatic approach to ecclesiastical affairs. He tended to treat ecclesiastical lords just as he would secular lords, frequently intervening in episcopal elections to advance his own interests. He also demonstrated a willingness to use almost any means to undermine ecclesiastical leaders who opposed him.

Baldwin IV’s dispute with the bishop of Cambrai is a good example of his ecclesiastical policy. After his attempt to install Azelinus at Cambrai failed, Baldwin worked to undermine the new bishop, Erluin (995-1012). In particular, he supported Walter I (d. 1012), castellan of Cambrai and lord of Lens, who frequently invaded episcopal properties in the Cambrésis. In 1012, Walter I died while Erluin lay on his deathbed. The bishop refused to confirm Walter’s son, Walter II, as castellan (the emperor had granted Erluin comital power over Cambrai in order to defend it against Baldwin IV). When Walter II claimed the castellany anyway, the bishop threatened him with excommunication. In response, Walter II seized the episcopal mansion and looted the clerics’ quarters. At the bishop’s funeral, Walter and his men rushed into the church with swords.

drawn and seized the body to prevent its burial. He also distributed episcopal 
benefices to his kinsmen. It was a rather ham-fisted bid to seize both the comital 
and episcopal powers of Cambrai. The dispute ended when the Lotharingian 
monastic reformer Richard of Saint-Vanne (d. 1046) convinced Baldwin IV, the 
overlord of Lens, to support Emperor Henry II’s episcopal appointee to the see of 
Cambrai, Gérard I (1012-51). It was as a reward for his cooperation that Baldwin 
first obtained lands in fief to the emperor.124

Baldwin IV’s interest in ecclesiastical affairs grew as he became 
increasingly involved in Richard of Saint-Vanne’s monastic reforms. In order to 
limit other lords’ ability to use lay advocacy as a means to power, the count 
asserted himself as chief advocate of all monasteries in Flanders. This gave him 
the right to intervene whenever he decided that a particular monastery needed 
his protection. Often, however, his interest was less in the welfare of the 
monastery than in his own power, though he sometimes manifested a genuine 
concern for the quality of monastic life.125

124 D.C. Van Meter, "Count Baldwin IV, Richard of Saint-Vanne, and the 
Inception of Monastic Reform in Eleventh-Century Flanders," Revue bénédictine, 
107 (1997), pp. 130-2, 139-41; Hubert Dauphin, O.S.B., Le bienheureux Richard, abbe 
de Saint-Vanne de Verdun (d. 1046), Bibliothèque de la Revue d’histoire 
ecclesiastique, 24 (Louvain: Desclee de Brouwer, 1946), p. 185.

125 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, pp. 45, 48; Monier, Les Institutions, pp. 16-7.
Baldwin’s intervention at Saint-Vaast at Arras, a powerful monastery in the south that had numerous properties and could field its own army, is a good example of his intervention in monastic affairs. By the early eleventh century, Saint-Vaast was under the control of a particularly worldly abbot, named Fulrade, who had allowed monastic discipline to deteriorate to a frightful state. He lived like a secular lord, recruiting vassals, keeping hunting dogs, and paying for fools to entertain at his meals. He even built his own elevated, fortified dwelling within the monastery. In addition, Fulrade frequently had his troops pillage the surrounding episcopal domains. As a result of these transgressions, Bishop Erluin of Cambrai wanted to reform Saint-Vaast. The abbot, however, produced a forged charter from 680 in which Bishop Vindicien of Cambrai purportedly granted the monastery exemption from episcopal authority. Baldwin initially used the charter as a pretext to support Fulrade in opposition to Erluin, whose conflict with Baldwin has just been discussed. In 1004, however, Baldwin took note of the poor state of monastic discipline at Saint-Vaast and allied with Erluin to rectify the situation. Together, they deposed Fulrade and

---

appointed a monk, named Heribert, to reform the abbey. In 1008, when it was clear that Heribert was unable to accomplish the task, Baldwin reluctantly agreed to allow Richard of Saint-Vanne to reform the monastery.\footnote{Van Meter, "Count Baldwin IV, Richard of Saint-Vanne," pp. 132-34, 137-38; Dauphin, \textit{Le bienheureux Richard}, pp. 175-82.}

The collaboration between the Lotharingian reformer and Baldwin led to warmer relations. Richard was adept at brokering deals favorable to both secular and ecclesiastical interests, making Baldwin amenable to his reforming activities. The count gave several other prominent monasteries in Flanders, including Saint-Bertin (1021) and Saint-Pierre at Ghent (1029), to Richard for reform.\footnote{Van Meter, "Count Baldwin IV, Richard of Saint-Vanne," pp. 139-41; Dauphin, \textit{Le bienheureux Richard}, p. 185; Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, p. 46; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 34-5; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, p. 60.}

In 1028, Baldwin IV’s son, Baldwin V, married Robert the Pious’ daughter, Adela, then rebelled against his father. Baldwin IV took refuge with the Norman duke Robert I (r. 1027-35) and married Robert’s sister, Eleanor, while in Normandy. He then returned to Flanders with Norman aid, which led to Baldwin V’s submission. In 1030, they formally ended the conflict at a meeting at Oudenaarde on the border with the Empire. Baldwin IV and Baldwin V then ruled jointly until the former’s death in 1035.\footnote{Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, pp. 48-9; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, p. 36; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, p. 70.}
Like his father, Baldwin V the Pious (r. 1030/35-67) focused his attention on the Empire. He sent his son, Baldwin VI, to be educated at Henry III’s (r. 1039-56) court, and in 1045, the emperor knighted Baldwin VI giving him the march of Antwerp in fief. Henry probably hoped to use these favors to gain Baldwin V as an ally, but count repeatedly rebelled against the emperor.\textsuperscript{130} By 1050, Baldwin had annexed all of the imperial marches between the Scheldt and the Dender (see Map 7).

The Flemish count also expanded his imperial possessions through family politics. In 1051, he achieved a great coup when he married Baldwin VI to Richilde, the widow of Count Herman of Hainaut (c. 1041-51). At the time of the marriage, the parties secretly excluded Herman’s sons from the succession in their father’s county. This gave the Flemish count power over another large swathe of imperial territory. Around the same time, Baldwin V began building up Lille, a Flemish town near the imperial border with Hainaut, perhaps in order to ensure his control over his new territories. When he died in 1067, he was buried at Lille, and Baldwin I of Hainaut (r. 1051-70) became Baldwin VI of Flanders (r. 1067-70) as well, uniting the two territories.\textsuperscript{131} Baldwin V also married his younger son, Robert I the Frisian (r. 1071-93), to Gertrude, the widow

\textsuperscript{130} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, pp. 49-50; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 36-7; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, pp. 73-6.
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of Count Floris I of Frisia (r. 1049-61). Just before 1066, he married his daughter, Matilda, to William the Bastard, duke of Normandy (r. 1035-87). In addition, the count also became regent for Philip I, king of France (r. 1060-1108), after Baldwin’s brother-in-law, Henry I of France (r. 1031-60), died in 1060. He continued to serve as regent until his own death in 1067.132

Baldwin V seems to have earned the appellation “the Pious” both by virtue of his connection to his father-in-law, Robert the Pious and through his wholehearted support of ecclesiastical institutions. He and his wife, Adela, were noted monastery builders – the countess eventually retired to her own foundation at Messines after Baldwin died.133 Both Baldwin IV’s and Baldwin V’s most important intervention as patrons of the Church in Flanders occurred, however, in the cult of the saints, which they co-opted to promote the idea that they had the support of the saints of Flanders.

The introduction of the Peace of God in northern France afforded the Flemish counts new opportunities to strengthen the connection between secular and ecclesiastical power in dramatic ways. In 1024, Baldwin IV convoked a Peace council in a field near Douai, which was in the Flemish part of the diocese of Cambrai. Although it was not unknown for secular rulers to call such

---

132 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, p. 51; Ganshof, La Flandre, p. 38; Dhondt, Les origines, pp. 76-8.
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councils, it was more common for bishops to do so. By calling the council at Douai, Baldwin was asserting both secular and ecclesiastical authority in the diocese where Bishop Erluin had recently been instrumental in hindering Flemish expansion into Lotharingia. In 1030, Baldwin IV and Baldwin V met at Oudenaarde to reconcile after the latter’s rebellion. The meeting blended secular and ecclesiastical policy. At Oudenaarde, the counts not only reconciled but also declared the Peace over the entire county, pressuring the Flemish warrior caste to end its destructive feuding. The peace oaths the counts forced on the warriors brought their efforts to promote unity within the county under the aegis of both comital and ecclesiastical authority. The meeting also served as the prelude to the counts’ next major attempt to expand their power. Oudenaarde lay directly across the border from the imperial fortress of Ename. In 1034, the Flemish devastated the fortress then fortified Oudenaarde. The Peace subsequently became a regular feature of comital policy in Flanders: Baldwin V declared it again in 1042, Arnulf III in 1070, and Baldwin VII in 1111.134

The Peace councils also offered the counts opportunities to forge closer bonds between themselves and the saints of Flanders. A new policy began when Baldwin IV called the council at Douai in 1024, he had Bishop Gérard I of Cambrai (1012-51) gather the saints of the diocese to witness the oaths taken

there.  This was a common practice in the Peace movement because the prospect of gaining access to divine intercession generated tremendous interest from the *populus*. (Head and Landes have defined *populus* as a “rather anonymous Latin term [that] refers to all those free laypeople of relatively low social status whom we might call commoners, that is, to wealthy merchants and impoverished peasants alike.”) In fact, getting non-elites to the councils was crucial: the success of the Peace depended on confronting the warrior elite with an alliance of the clergy and general populace in order to pressure the warriors to control their violence.

After the Douai meeting, Baldwin IV and Baldwin V quickly learned how to promote their authority with popular interest in relics. They fostered the idea that the saints whose relics were located within Flanders were the patron saints of the counts of Flanders. According to the annals of Saint-Pierre:

> All of the relics of the bodies of the saints of Flanders having been gathered at Oudenaarde so that the Peace might be sworn to, that is to say [the relics] of St. Gerulf the martyr, Wandrille, Bavon, Amand, Vaast,

---


Bertin, [and] Winnoc, along with the relics of innumerable other saints, Count Baldwin [IV] the Bearded was asked which of the relics should be preferred and placed over the others in the order of the procession. That same Count Baldwin, in the presence of Hugh, the bishop of Noyon [1030-44], with many other bishops and abbots, the magnates of the entire realm having been gathered there as well, ordered the relics of St. Gerulf the martyr, having originated from his own [Baldwin’s] homeland, to be carried honorably before the others and set down in splendor.

Omnibus reliquiis sanctorum corporum Flandrie Aldenardis adunatis pro pace coniuranda, scilicet sancti Gerulfi martyris, Wandregisili, Bavonis, Amandi, Vedasti, Bertini, Winnoci, cum innumerabilis aliorum sanctorum reliquiis, comes Baldwinus Barbatus, interrogatus, cuius reliquie in ordine processionis essent ceteris preferende vel deponende, constituit ipse comes Baldwinus, presente Hugone Noviomense episcopo cum aliis plurimis episcopis et abbatibus, congregatis totius regni sui primatibus, reliquias sancti Gerulfi martyris, sue patrie indigene, ante omnes honorabiliter asportari et magnificenter preponi.138

Gerulf was a Flemish nobleman who had been murdered in 746. By granting this saint the place of honor, Baldwin emphasized the saint’s connection to the territory over which the count ruled.

The counts called on the same saints to support regional cohesion on other occasions as well. In 1065, Baldwin V gathered the relics from the Oudenaarde council once again for the consecration of the church of Saint-Pierre he had constructed at Lille. His son, Baldwin VI, did the same in 1070 for the restoration of the church at Hasnon. The relics of at least twenty-six major saints from across the principality were brought to these gatherings. On this last occasion, Pope Alexander II (1061-73), King Phillip I of France (r. 1060-1108) and three bishops were also present to lend their prestige to the ritual.139

The Peace fueled competitiveness among Flemish monasteries. Pierre-André Sigal has noted that the Peace councils brought unusually large numbers of saints into close proximity, “where the tents and pavilions sheltering the relics of the saints were arranged side-by-side like stands at a fair.”140 Such close conditions prompted disputes over which saint deserved credit for the miracles performed at the gatherings. As the principal caretakers of the relics, monastic communities became the chief advocates for their patron saints in these disputes.141 Recognition was a critical issue for a monastic community, because it increased the prestige of the institution connected to the saint.142 This seems to

---
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have been especially true for Flanders, since comital policy favored not just one, but several, patron saints for the comital dynasty. During the eleventh century, competition among Flemish monasteries increased, resulting in a burst of hagiographic production.

The competition was most evident at Ghent where the dispute between Saint-Bavon and Saint-Pierre intensified. Each abbey challenged the authenticity of relics claimed by the other and each produced hagiographic forgeries to bolster its own position. For example, both abbeys claimed to possess the relics of Florbert, the first abbot of Saint-Bavon.143 The monks of Saint-Bavon also created a fictional saint, named Liévin (Livinus), based on the story of an eighth-century Irish missionary bishop to Frisia, named Lebuin. Saint-Pierre quickly challenged the authenticity of its competitor’s saint.144 Hagiographic output at the two abbeys was impressive. Saint-Bavon produced the following texts:

1) *Miracula s. Bavonis saeculum XI* [BHL 1059]

2) *Carmen de s. Bavone* [BHL 1053]

3) *Miracula prima s. Bavonis Gandensis* [BHL 1054]

4) *Translatio prima s. Bavonis Gandensis* [BHL 1055-1056]

5) *Vita prima s. Macarii Antiocheni* [BHL 5100]

---


144 Ganshof, *La Flandre*, p. 89.
6) Versus de s. Bavone Gandensi [no BHL listed]

7) Vita / Passio s. Livini Flandrensis [BHL 4960]

8) Translatio secunda s. Bavonis Gandensis [BHL 1057]

9) Translatio s. Livini Flandrensis [BHL 4962]

10) Miracula secunda s. Bavonis Gandensis [BHL 1059]

11) Vita secunda s. Macarii Antiocheni [BHL 5101]

12) Vita tertia s. Bavonis Gandensis [BHL 1051]

Saint-Pierre responded with these texts:

1) Vita s. Dunstani Cantuarensis [BHL 2343]

2) Translatio s. Amalbergae virginis [BHL 324]

3) Vita s. Amalbergae virginis [BHL 323]

4) Vita s. Bertulfi Rentiacensis [BHL 1316]

5) Vita s. Bertulfi Rentiacensis, epitome [BHL 1317a]

6) Translatio s. Florberti Gandensis [BHL 3030]

7) Sermo de adventu sanctorum Wandregisili, Ansberti, et Wulframni in Blandinium [BHL 8810]

In the middle of the eleventh century, Bovo, the abbot of Saint-Bertin (1042-65), ignited a similar dispute between Saint-Bertin and Saint-Omer at the town of Saint-Omer. (At some point before 1042, Sithiu had become known as Saint-Omer.)

Saint-Bertin had experienced mixed fortunes in the early

---

eleventh century. The abbey reached a high point in the early part of Baldwin IV’s rule. Under Abbot Odbert (990-1007), it was one of two great centers of manuscript illumination in Flanders. (The other was Saint-Vaast at Arras.) After Odbert died, however, the community’s fortunes declined. In 1033, a fire ravaged the abbey, and severe flooding afflicted the west of Flanders at about the same time (c. 1014-40). In 1021, Baldwin IV turned the abbey over to Richard of Saint-Vanne, who then appointed his disciple, Roderic of Saint-Vaast, as its abbot (1021-43).

Between 1042 and 1065, Abbot Bovo worked to return Saint-Bertin to its former prestige as a literary center and rebuilt its church which was consecrated in 1052. During the construction, the workmen discovered relics that ecclesiastical authorities later decided were the true remains of Bertin. Rumor quickly spread that the relics the monks of Saint-Bertin had previously venerated

---


as Bertin’s were actually those of Omer, challenging the authenticity of the relics the canons of Saint-Omer possessed. The situation increased the existing tension between the two institutions and continued for centuries.148

The tension also resulted in a number of hagiographic works, mainly from Saint-Bertin, which had a stronger literary tradition. The following four texts appeared at Saint-Bertin: 1) the *Miraculum s. Bertini* [BHL 1295], 2) the *Vita tertia s. Bertini* [BHL 1293], 3) the *Vita quarta s. Bertini* [BHL 1297], and 4) the *Inventio et Elevatio s. Bertini* [BHL 1296]. In the last quarter of the eleventh century, Saint-Omer responded to previous claims by Saint-Bertin that Bertin, not Omer, had received the original donation of land at Sithiu in the *Vita tertia s. Audomari* [BHL 768], an expensive work especially notable for its cycle of illustrations depicting Omer’s burial in the church of Saint-Omer and Adroald’s donation of land at Sithiu to Omer.149

When added together, the disputes at Ghent and Saint-Omer produced a total of twenty-eight texts. Excluding the texts in Saint-Winnoc’s corpus, only a handful of others appeared in the county during the eleventh century. The texts


from Ghent and Saint-Omer reveal the highly competitive nature of hagiography in eleventh-century Flanders. They also shed light on the texts produced for Saint-Winnoc.

2.5 Saint-Winnoc

Although Saint-Winnoc was actually founded by Baldwin IV in 1022, Winnoc as its chief patron saint gave the community roots stretching back much earlier in the Flemish past. According to the *Vitae s. Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, the earliest text to mention Winnoc, the saint arrived in Flanders in the 660s along with three companions, Ss. Quadanoc, Ingenoc and Madoc. All four became monks at Sithiu during Bertin’s abbacy. In 695, a landowner, named Heremar, donated property at the village of Wormhout to Bertin. The abbot of Sithiu subsequently charged his Breton disciples with founding a small monastic community and building a church dedicated to St. Martin at Wormhout. Bertin eventually appointed Winnoc as the community’s head after the death of his

---

companions. He was buried there after his own death in 717. In 846, the monks of Wormhout translated Winnoc’s relics to Sithiu to guard them against the Vikings, who sacked Wormhout about 861.  

On 30 Dec., 899, much to the dismay of the populace of Sithiu and the monks of Saint-Bertin, Baldwin II (r. 879-918) arranged for the removal of Winnoc’s relics from Sithiu. The count did not, however, return the relics to Wormhout. Instead, he had them taken to a church dedicated to Ss. Martin and Winnoc that he had constructed near the Groeneberg (Bergues) to the north of Wormhout. (See Map 1.) Baldwin also installed a chapter of canons to look after the church and Winnoc’s relics. About this time, the Groeneberg became known as the Winomontium or Winoksbergen in honor of its new resident. (Later, the town there became Bergues-Saint-Winnoc or simply Bergues – modern French Flanders.)

Shortly before 1022, Baldwin IV (r. 988-1035) built a new church dedicated to Winnoc on the Winomontium in the upper part of Bergues. He then had Winnoc’s corporal relics translated from the collegiate church of Saint-Martin-et-Saint-Winnoc, which was situated in the lower part of Bergues, to the new church of Saint-Winnoc. At first, he gave the church of Saint-Winnoc to the same

---


152 Pruvost, Chronique et cartulaire, pp. 21-5; Harrau, Histoire, pp. 17, 22-5.
chapter of canons that had tended the saint’s relics at the old church since 900. Soon, however, expelled the canons from both churches and replaced them with a community of Benedictine monks drawn from Saint-Bertin. He also installed Roderic of Saint-Vaast, the reformist abbot of Saint-Bertin (1021-43), as the abbot of the new community of Saint-Winnoc. Roderic kept the office for five years, then appointed Germaine, a monk from Saint-Bertin, as its abbot (1027-31).  

Saint-Winnoc seems to have maintained good relations with its mother abbey in the first decades after its founding. A later cartulary from Saint-Bertin describes the relationship between the two monasteries:

Therefore, after this beautiful monastery [of Saint-Bertin] was strengthened in discipline [by Roderic of Saint-Vaast’s reform], according to its custom, the sowing of the divine seed extended itself all the way to the sea, and [also] on the mount, which formerly was called the mount of Baal, that is at the coenobium of Saint Winnoc… Which church [of Saint-Winnoc], changed some time ago from secular canons to monks [drawn] from this monastery [of Saint-Bertin] at Sithiu in the time of Abbot Roderic and shared the monastic life. From which time these two

churches were bound together in the friendship of mutual love, to such a degree that it should be that one corrects the other.

Hoc ergo monasterio pulcre, juxta suum modulum, in disciplina confirmato, divine sationis usque ad mare se extendit propagatio, et in monte, qui antiquitus dicebatur mons Baal, in sancti scilicet Vinnoci cenobio… Quae ecclesia, de canonicis secularibus in monacos pridem mutata, ab hoc Sithiensi cenobio, tempore Roderici abbatis, et monachicam mutuavit religionem. A quo tempore tanta confederabantur mutuae dilectionis familiaritate hae duae ecclesiae, ut par esset, unam corrigi ab altera.\textsuperscript{154}

This description may be idealized but it indicates a close relationship between mother and daughter abbeys.

Sometime around mid-century, this relationship began to change. In 1050, the monks at Bergues must have been alarmed by the discovery of Bertin’s “new” relics during the reconstruction of the church at Saint-Bertin. If people could find believable the rumor that the “old” body was Omer’s, then the monks of Saint-Winnoc can be forgiven for thinking that their chief patron saint was vulnerable as well. Winnoc would have been a desirable acquisition. By the early eleventh century, he had become one of the most important saints of Flanders. In 1030, he claimed a preeminent place along with Gerulf, Wandrille, Bavon, Amand, Vaast, and Bertin at the Peace council at Oudenaarde. In 1042,

1065, and 1070, the monks of Saint-Winnoc also brought his relics to other gatherings convened by the counts.\textsuperscript{155} Despite its patron saint’s prestige, however, Saint-Winnoc itself was a relatively minor institution in comparison to Saint-Bertin. It possessed the corporal relics of Winnoc, but only “secondary” relics of its other patron saint, Oswald of Northumbria – perhaps slivers of wood from the stakes on which the saint’s head and hands had been hung after he was martyred.\textsuperscript{156} Since medieval people generally did not consider the connections between heaven and earth forged by secondary relics to be as powerful as those forged by the actual bones of a saint, Saint-Winnoc’s relic collection would have seemed poor in comparison to those of the great Flemish abbeys, especially Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon.

The vulnerability of Winnoc’s relics seems to have prompted the community of Saint-Winnoc under its longtime abbot Rumold (1031-68) to conduct a campaign to raise its prestige. Beginning around 1052, the community rebuilt its church, probably to accommodate pilgrims attracted to Winnoc’s shrine; constructed a new reliquary for Winnoc; acquired the corporal relics of the Anglo-Saxon saint Lewinna (d. 664-73) – perhaps a fortuitous, rather than planned acquisition – and took her relics on a tour (\textit{delatio}) of Flanders. It also

\begin{footnotes}
\item[155] Bozóky, “La politique des reliques,” pp. 281-82.
\end{footnotes}
produced or commissioned eight hagiographic texts on its patron saints, Oswald, Lewinna and Winnoc. In 1067, while the abbot of Saint-Bertin was at Auxerre on business, Count Baldwin V (r. 1030/35-67) issued a charter in which he confirmed Saint-Winnoc’s rights and privileges. The charter evidently strengthened Saint-Winnoc’s position vis-à-vis its mother abbey, because when Rumold died in the following year Saint-Winnoc elected its first abbot free from Saint-Bertin’s supervision. Soon thereafter, the monastic community at Bergues received a final hagiographic text on Winnoc’s miracles.  

Saint-Winnoc’s actions bear signs of the influence of the general historical context discussed above. First, it appears that the abbey made a special effort to court Baldwin V’s intervention as patron of the Church in Flanders. The abbey enjoyed a close relationship with Baldwin and his wife, Adela. The comital court was traditionally itinerant and Bergues was one of several fortified sites throughout the county, including Saint-Omer, Ghent, Lille, and Cassel where the counts frequently stopped as they carried out the business of their office. Several sources report occasions when either the count or the countess was staying at Bergues. (Although Bruges had been the most favored comital residence since the time of Baldwin I, Baldwin V favored Lille over Bruges.) Baldwin and Adela also took part on a regular basis in the annual procession of Winnoc’s relics from

Bergues to Wormhout at Pentecost. It was, in fact, on Pentecost in 1067 that the count issued the charter strengthening Saint-Winnoc’s position, with Drogo, the bishop of Thérouanne (1030-78), acting as witness.¹⁵⁸

Baldwin V’s charter strongly suggests that Saint-Winnoc gained its independence as a result of comital intervention. It presents the history of the abbey as a list of actions the counts took on behalf of religious life at Bergues. It specifies that Baldwin II founded the original church of Martin and Winnoc and established canons (canonicī) there. Then, it describes how, many years later, Baldwin IV built a new church, moved Winnoc’s relics into it, and replaced the canons with the Benedictine community under Roderic of Saint-Vaast. Finally, Baldwin V confirmed Saint-Winnoc’s possession of a wide range of properties, rights and privileges. These included a number of properties that Baldwin IV had donated in recompense for properties with which he had allowed the canons to depart, and the abbots’ right to administer public justice in specific areas. Though biased to present the counts in a good light, the charter reveals a long history of comital intervention at Bergues.¹⁵⁹


Two pieces of additional information bolster the conclusion that Baldwin V played a decisive role in Saint-Winnoc’s development. First, a later source from Saint-Bertin states that its abbot, Heribert (1065-80), returned from a long trip to Auxerre to find that Saint-Bertin had been “robbed of control of the monastery of St. Winnoc” (a regimine cenobiali sancti Winnoci spoliatur). Second, Gerbodon, the lay advocate of Saint-Bertin, appears as one of the prominent signatories to Baldwin V’s charter in 1067, while Abbot Heribert does not. Heribert’s absence is explained by his trip to Auxerre but Gerbodon’s presence suggests that the count was acting without the abbot’s consent. Saint-Bertin and its lay advocate were not on the best of terms, since the abbey had been forced to defend its interests against him in the 1050s.  

In addition, while Saint-Winnoc’s efforts did not initiate an outright dispute with Saint-Bertin, the hagiographic texts on the abbey’s patron saints fit

160 “The mark of the glorious count Baldwin [V]; of the countess, Adela; of his sons, Baldwin [VI] and Robert [I]; of the count of Boulogne, Eustacius; of Roger of Saint-Paul; of Anselm of Husden; of John of Arras; of Hugh of Havet; of Gerbodon, advocate of Saint-Bertin; of Reingot of Ghent; of Baldwin of Ghent; of Alardus Emes; of Conon, his son; of Erembald, castellan of Bruges; and of Erkenbert, the count’s agent, as well as [the marks] of many others, as many clerics as laymen which it would take long to enumerate (Signum Balduini gloriosi Comitis; S. Adelæ comitissæ; S. Balduini atque Roberti, Filiorum ejus; S. Eustachii Comitis Boloniaæ; S. Rogerii de S. Paulo; S. Anselmi de Husden; S. Joannis Atrebatensis; S. Hugonis Anet; S. Getbodonis Advocati de S. Bertino; S. Raingoti de Gant; S. Balduini de Gant; S. Alardi Emes; S. Cononis Filii ejus; S. Erembaldi Castellani de Brugis; S. Erkenberti Praepositi et aliorum multorum tam Clericorum quam Laicorum quos longum esset numerare) (Miræus, Opera, p. 513); Regarding the problems between Gerbodon and Saint-Bertin, see Guérard, Cartulaire, pp. 183-7.
within the general competitive framework of Flemish hagiography. Like the works that appeared at Saint-Pierre, Saint-Bavon, Saint-Bertin and Saint-Omer, they attempted to elevate Saint-Winnoc’s prestige. Unlike these other abbeys, however, Saint-Winnoc was not competing for primacy over a sibling, but for independence from its mother abbey.

2.6 Drogo of Saint-Winnoc

Unfortunately, for the same reasons that most medieval hagiographers remain anonymous, we are often ignorant of their lives and literary careers. Though hagiographers played an important role in remembering the past, they rarely provided much information by which they themselves might be remembered. This is generally true of the four authors who wrote for Saint-Winnoc in the middle of the eleventh century. But for one of these authors, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc, we can at least construct a vague outline of his life and works. The outline also serves as another glimpse of the development of the community of Saint-Winnoc.

The chief source of information on Drogo is his hagiographic corpus, yet even this has been a matter of some uncertainty. At various times, scholars have attributed as many as nine texts to Drogo: 1) the *Vita s. Oswaldis regis ac martyris* [BHL 6362], 2) the *Sermo primus de s. Oswaldo* [BHL 6363], 3) the *Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo* [BHL 6364], 4) the *Historia translationis s. Lewinnae virginis et martiris*
[BHL 4902], 5) the *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* [BHL 8956], 6) the *Vita s. Godelevae martyris Ghistellae* [BHL 3591t], 7) the *Vita secunda s. Winnoci* [BHL 8954, 8955], 8) a liturgical office for use on Oswald’s feast, and 9) a collection of liturgical materials for use on Winnoc’s feast. All but the *Vita Godelevae* appear in a twelfth-century manuscript, once owned by Saint-Winnoc and now preserved in the municipal library at Bergues (Bergues, bibliothèque municipale, ms. 19).

Both Maurice Coens and Nicholas Huyghebaert have treated the attribution of these works.\(^{161}\) Through the use of textual and historical analyses, they have convincingly argued that Drogo composed the *Vita Oswaldi*, the *Historia translationis*, the *Liber miraculorum*, the *Sermo primus*, the *Sermo secundus*, and the *Vita Godelevae*.\(^{162}\) Using the same methods, Huyghebaert has successfully made the case that the *Vita secunda Winnoci* was not the work of Drogo but of a contemporary monk from Saint-Pierre at Ghent, the same monk who composed the *Vita s. Bertulfi Rentiacensis* [BHL 1316].\(^{163}\) In addition, Peter Clemoes has successfully challenged the attribution of the office for Oswald. Based on metrical and textual analyses, he has concluded that it is unlikely the piece was

---

\(^{161}\) For a general account of the scholarship on Drogo see Nicholas N. Huyghebaert, O.S.B., "Un moine hagiographe: Drogon de Bergues," *Sacris Erudiri*, 20 (1971), pp. 191-256.


composed before 1150, more than sixty years after Drogo died.\textsuperscript{164} The material for Winnoc’s office, like most liturgical material, is highly formulaic and lacks attribution in the manuscript making it difficult to determine authorship without liturgical analysis that is beyond my expertise. It appears, however, in the same manuscript context as the offices for Oswald, suggesting that it shares similar origins. Therefore, the following chapters treat only the prose works.

In sum, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc was almost certainly the author of the following six works:

1) \textit{Vita s. Oswaldi regis ac martyris} [BHL 6362]
2) \textit{Sermo primus de s. Oswaldo} [BHL 6363]
3) \textit{Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo} [BHL 6364]
4) \textit{Historia translationis s. Lewinnae virginis et martiris} [BHL 4902]
5) \textit{Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci} [BHL 8956]
6) \textit{Vita s. Godelevae martyris Ghistellae} [BHL 3591t]

The information about Drogo’s life and the dates he composed his works are more tentative. The \textit{Historia translationis s. Lewinnae} contains the most explicit information. In its report on the arrival of Lewinna’s relics at Bergues, the \textit{Historia} states:

---

\textsuperscript{164} Peter Clemoes, \textit{The Cult of St. Oswald on the Continent}, The Jarrow Lectures (Jarrow: St. Paul’s House, 1983), pp. 6-7.
This translation was accomplished indeed in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1058, in the third indiction, on the sixth Sunday, with King Henry holding the royal scepter of the kingdom of the Franks, with, moreover, the exalted count Baldwin governing Flanders, and Drogo, the bishop of Thérouanne, living, and indeed the venerable abbot, Rumold, governing the coenobium at Bergues.”

Acta siquidem est hæc translatio anno Incarnationis Domini nostri millesimo, quinquagesimo octavo, indictione tertia, sexta feria, regente Henrico rege sceptrum regni Francorum, optimo autem comite Balduino gubernante Flandriam, vivente etiam Drogone episcopo Taruanense, administrante vero Bergense cœnobium Rumoldo venerando abbate. ¹⁶⁵

This makes 1058 the terminus post quem for the Historia. Drogo’s dedication of the work to Rumold, abbot of Saint-Winnoc (1031-68), who died on 22 February, 1068, provides a terminus ante quem.¹⁶⁶ The Historia also contains another important piece of chronological information. In the dedication, Drogo referred to himself as “Drogo, priest and monk” (Drogo presbyter et monachus). According to canon law, the minimum age for priestly ordination was thirty. Since Drogo wrote the Historia no later than 1068, he was born no later than 1038.

¹⁶⁵ HT, i.IV.39 (col. 620C).

¹⁶⁶ “To the lord and venerable abbot Rumold, the sinner Drogo priest and monk…” (Domino ac venerabili abbati Rumoldo peccator Drogo presbyter & monachus…) (HT, Epistola (col. 613A)); For the date of Rumold’s death, see Pruvost, Chronique et cartulaire, p. 64.
A chance remark in the Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci casts additional light on the date of Drogo’s birth. In this work, the hagiographer revealed that he had been given as a child oblate to Saint-Winnoc. He wrote that Winnoc cured a blind girl, named Malguera, “not many years before I came to the place of holy monastic life as a very small boy” (ante non multis annis quam puer parvulus ad propitium sanctae religionis venissem). The earliest that Drogo’s parents could have given him to Saint-Winnoc was 1022, when the community was founded. This suggests that Drogo could not have been born much before 1020 and still have been a puer parvulus (small child) at his oblation. Thus, he must have been born sometime between about 1020 and 1038.

Other inferences suggest refinements to this picture. First, there is a strong probability that Drogo began the Historia translationis closer to 1060 than 1068. The work reports that a monk from Saint-Winnoc stole Lewinna’s relics on Easter in 1058. The relics arrived at Saint-Winnoc and “were placed in the library with the books temporarily for some days, until a reliquary… might be built” (in Bibliotheca cum libris pro tempore aliquantis diebus locantur, quoad… eis loculus componeretur). Since Drogo’s abbey employed gold- and silversmiths to

---


168 HT, ii.II.71-72 (coll. 627B-F); See also Huyghebaert, “Un moine,” p. 199.

169 HT, i.I.11 (coll. 615B-C).

170 HT, i.IV.36 (col. 619F).
mint coins, it would not have taken long to fabricate a reliquary, which Drogo described as decorated with gold and silver. Since Easter fell on the 19th of April in 1058, there would have been ample time before the end of the traveling season to complete the short “tour” (delatio) through Flanders that the Historia translationis reports the monks conducted with the saint’s relics. The Historia translationis also includes a few miracles that Lewinna performed at Bergues after her return. As Pierre-André Sigal has pointed out in his study of medieval miracle accounts, most miracles seem to have occurred within three months of a major event such as a delatio. Thus, the events reported in the Historia translationis were probably completed by 1059. In addition, there would have been great interest at Saint-Winnoc in producing an account as quickly as possible given the abbey’s ongoing efforts to raise its status. Together, these considerations make it likely that Drogo wrote the Historia translationis by the end of 1060 or soon thereafter.

Drogo seems to have written his texts on Oswald of Northumbria – the Vita Oswaldi, Sermo primus, and Sermo secundus – before the Historia translationis. In the prologue to the Vita Oswaldi, Drogo wrote:

Indeed, pondering your request and desire, and giving it satisfaction, brothers, I combined the life and martyrdom of holy Oswald the king, as

---

171 Pruvost, Chronique et cartulaire, p. 63; HT, i.IV.36 (coll. 619F-20A).

172 Sigal, L’homme, p. 190.
well as the wondrous deeds of that same one in one work, and I sent the composition to you, so that you might be able to imitate the life and the good of the achievements of that same one, whose relics with pious devotion you cherish… Therefore, receive the requested gift of your son, nay of your servant…

Id etiam perpendens, vestræque petitioni voluntatique, fratres, satisfaciens, vitam martyriumque sancti Oswaldi regis, seu miracula ejusdem in uno opere conjunxi, vobisque descripta misi, ut, cujus reliquias pio amore amplectimini, ejusdem vitam & actuum bona valeatis imitari… Ergo munus vestri filii, immo vestri servi, a nobis expostulatum suscipite…¹⁷³

Not only is there no indication that he had received ordination as a priest yet, but he also describes himself to his fellow monks as “your son” (vester filius) and “your servant” (vester servus), signaling relative youth and inferiority. In addition, neither the Vita Oswaldi, nor Drogo’s two sermons on the saint demonstrate the literary sophistication of the text on Lewinna. While the Historia translationis contains references to both classical and Christian authors, the references in the texts on Oswald are limited to the scriptures and Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum.

The passage from the Vita Oswaldi also gives the impression that Drogo was away from Saint-Winnoc for an extended period while composing the text:

¹⁷³ VO, Prologus.2 (col. 94C).
he wrote that he “sent” (misit) the work to his brothers. A good explanation for this extended absence at such a young age would have been the pursuit of his education. Later works reveal that Drogo was familiar with the works of several classical authors, including Vergil, Terence, Plautus, Sallust, and Cicero, as well as with the works of the Church Fathers, particularly Jerome, Gregory the Great and Bede.¹⁷⁴ While the monks of Saint-Winnoc would have been capable of teaching Drogo the psalter and the rest of the scriptures, the most likely place for a monk of Saint-Winnoc to receive advanced education would have been Saint-Bertin. As noted above, Saint-Bertin was located at one of the two great Flemish ecclesiastical centers. It had a long and distinguished literary tradition by the middle of the eleventh century. In addition, when Drogo wrote it still supervised the affairs of Saint-Winnoc.

Drogo’s education may also have been the cause for his absence during the events surrounding the arrival of Lewinna’s relics at Saint-Winnoc in 1058 and 1059. The Historia translationis states that he learned of these events:

from many conversations, not only by repeated testimony to me from our brother [Balger – the monk who stole the relics], by whose service the series of events and conclusion of that same translation of that one were accomplished, but indeed from others who were present…

On other occasions, when Drogo himself witnessed the events he reported, he followed the common practice of writing in the first person. It is difficult to believe that Drogo would have returned to Saint-Winnoc after several years at Saint-Bertin then immediately left again for at least one, if not two, more years. Instead, it seems more likely that the hagiographer spent about five years (1052-59) at the larger abbey, during which time he probably wrote the *Vita Oswaldi* and his two sermons on Oswald. Then, he composed the *Historia translationis* soon after his return to Saint-Winnoc.

The *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* also contains explicit chronological information, indicating that it was the last work Drogo composed for Saint-Winnoc. First, the text mentions Rumold’s death, which occurred on 22 February, 1068, giving a *terminus post quem* in that year. A reference to Drogo, bishop of Thérouanne (1030-78), who died on 21 August, 1078, suggests that the hagiographer completed the *Liber miraculorum* before the bishop’s death. Since

---

175 *HT*, *Epistola*.2 (col. 613C).

176 *LM*, iii.XXI (col. 281F).

the community at Saint-Winnoc seems to have commissioned the *Liber miraculorum* to celebrate Baldwin V’s charter from 1067, Drogo probably wrote it closer to 1068 than 1078.

Other clues point to the dates of both the *Vita Godelevae*’s composition and Drogo’s death. On 30 July, 1084, Bishop Radbod II of Noyon-Tournai (1068-98) performed an *elevatio* (elevation) of the body of a local woman, named Godelieve. (An *elevatio* granted official episcopal recognition to a new saint before the papacy took control of the canonization process in the twelfth century.) Godelieve was a contemporary whose husband had murdered her, perhaps as few as fourteen years earlier. Drogo’s *Vita Godelevae* does not, however, mention the *elevatio*, arguably the most significant development in her cult.178 Instead, as Coens has observed, the purpose of the *Vita Godelevae* seems to have been to promote this very event.179 These clues have led scholars to conclude that Drogo composed the work and was alive shortly before 1084. The fact that he never added an account of the *elevatio*, suggests, however, that he was dead before the event occurred. A *rotulus* (letter-roll) sent out by Abbot Foulques of Corbie (d. 5 Dec., 1097) seems to confirm that he was dead by 1098 at the latest. In that year, the monks of Saint-Winnoc listed a priest by the name of Drogo on the roll.180 If,

179 Coens, "La vie ancienne," p. 113; See also, Huyghebaert, "Un moine," p. 199.
as is probable, this was the Drogo in question, then it means that he was
definitely dead by 1098.

A rough outline of Drogo’s life and career is now possible:

-- c. 1030, Drogo’s birth

-- 1052-59, Drogo’s education at Saint-Bertin and the composition of the
Vita s. Oswaldi [BHL 6362], Sermo primus [BHL 6363], and Sermo secundus
[BHL 6364]

-- c. 1060, Historia translationis s. Lewinnae [BHL 4902]

-- c. 1069, Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci [BHL 8956]

-- 1080-84, Vita s. Godelevae martyris Ghistellae [BHL 3591t]

-- c. 1084, Drogo’s death

A discussion of Drogo’s ethnicity and literary skill round out our
understanding of the hagiographer. In the Liber miraculorum, he wrote:

It happened to me… that I went to Denmark and by chance returned by
way of the city of Hamburg. The provost of this place asked us who we
were and whence we came; for he knew on account of the strangeness of
our speech that we were inhabitants of another land. We responded that
we were Flemish. He inquired also regarding from which place; we

---

180 Huyghebaert, "Un moine," p. 219; “Orate pro nostris fratribus Rumoldo [d. 1068],
Ingelberto [d. 1091-94], Ermengero [d. c. 1096], abbatibus; Sicboldo, Odgero, Alolfo,
Meyzone, Drogone, sacerdotibus; Reyboldo, Bernoldo, Arnoldo, Idesboldo, diaconibus et
ceteris in Christo quiescentibus.” (quoted in Pruvost, Chronique et cartulaire, p. 83).
added, “The place is called Bergues, where the most precious confessor of Christ Winnoc repose.”

Evenit mihi… ut in Danemarcham irem, et casu per Hamaburgense oppidum redirem. Interrogavit nos praepositus eius loci, qui et unde essemus; cognovit enim propter dissonantiam linguæ esse incolas alterius patriæ. Respondimus nos Flandrenses fore. Sciscitatus est aeqe quidem de quo loco; addidimus:

“Bergensis locus dicitur, ubi pretiosissimus Christi confessor Winnocus requiescit.”

As Huyghebaert has pointed out, Drogo typically used the word patria to denote the land in which a person had been born. For example, on a journey home from England, some Flemish sailors encountered “fellow countrymen” (socios conpatriotas) who including some of their relatives. The sailors also referred to a monk from Saint-Winnoc as “our countryman” (nostrum conpatriotam), and when the monk returned to Flanders, he returned to his “homeland” (patria).

Similarly, Winnoc “rose from royal stock, abandoned the glory of this world, his homeland, and his parents,” (regia stirpe ortus, mundi gloriam, patriam, parentes

---

181 LM, iii.XXIII (coll. 282E-F).
183 HT, i.III.27 (col. 618C).
184 HT, i.III.28, 29 (coll. 618C-E).
dimisit) for the life of a religious exile.\textsuperscript{185} Finally, although Godelieve was born in the Boulonnais (\textit{Bononiensis pagus}), a region held in fief to the counts of Flanders, when Godelieve’s Flemish mother-in-law wanted to reprove her son for his choice of a bride, she said, “Were you entirely unable, dear son, to find any crows in your homeland, and thus wanted to bring home a crow from another land?” (\textit{Num in tua patria, care fili, cornices haud poteras reperire, qui cornicem unam ab alia patria domum voluisti deferre?).\textsuperscript{186} It seems safe to say that Drogo was, as he claimed, Flemish, though the area of Flanders from which he came is unknown. Huyghebaert has also stated that it is unlikely that his original home was located near Saint-Winnoc, though his reasons for concluding this are unclear.\textsuperscript{187}

In medieval hagiography, indeed, in most works of medieval literature, it was a common trope for an author to communicate or feign humility by denigrating his own literary skill. In Drogo’s case, however, we should pay heed to his warning, reiterated nine times throughout his works, “Hence, I admonish the wise reader that he should grant indulgence, if [my] uncultivated speech should offend his refined ears” (\textit{Hinc prudentem admoneo lectorem, veniam det, si

\textsuperscript{185} LM, ii.VI (col. 277E).


\textsuperscript{187} Huyghebaert, "Un moine," pp. 211-12.
Despite Saint-Bertin’s reputation as a literary center and the skill Drogo displayed in constructing hagiographic narratives, his prose can be almost impenetrable at times, an aspect of his work that scholars have commented upon. For example, in his analysis of the *Vita Godelevae*, Coens opined that Drogo “was as poor a Latinist as he was a prolix and light-hearted narrator; his style is frequently rough” (*raboteuse*). What Drogo lacked in eloquence was, however, often balanced by his obvious interest in his subjects.

2.7 Conclusion

While the situation at Saint-Winnoc was a bit unusual – it was not competing against a near equal – it is no coincidence that Ghent, Sithiu, and Bergues were the three main centers of hagiographic production in eleventh-century Flanders. All five of the abbeys that produced the bulk of the hagiography in this period sought to raise their status within a regional arena created by the Flemish counts. Saint-Winnoc, however, was more reliant than the others on comital intervention. Both the role that the counts had constructed as patrons of the Church in Flanders and the competitiveness of Flemish

---


hagiography converged at Saint-Winnoc resulting in a burst of hagiographic production. The following chapters examine the abbey’s hagiographic corpus in more detail.
CHAPTER 3
OSWALD

3.1 Introduction

Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s works on the Anglo-Saxon king-saint Oswald of Northumbria (605-42) were not the earliest texts produced at or for his abbey, but they make a good starting point for an examination of Saint-Winnoc’s hagiographic corpus because they highlight the saint’s virtues – the first sense of virtus discussed in Chapter 1. When placed in their eleventh-century Flemish historical context, the Vita sancti Oswaldi, regis ac martyris [BHL 6362], Sermo primus de s. Oswaldo [BHL 6363] and Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo [BHL 6364] all focus on Oswald’s role as an exemplar of Christian virtue rather than on his role as intercessor. In particular, they demonstrate how the virtues associated with a specific saintly typology could change over time.

Although Oswald himself is familiar to many scholars, Drogo’s texts are not. Those scholars who have examined his texts have generally passed over them without much comment.190 One reason for this neglect is that all three

190 Nicholas Huyghebaert, O.S.B., “De twee sermoenen van Drogo van Sint-
seem to resist historical analysis. None states when the hagiographer wrote it, when the monastery of Saint-Winnoc acquired the saint’s relics, how the community acquired the relics, or even which of the saint’s relics the abbey possessed. At the same time, they can also appear closed to literary and typological analyses. The *Vita Oswaldi* consists largely of excerpts from Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*: thirty-eight of the *Vita Oswaldi*’s forty-two passages – about 90% – were exact duplicates of passages in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. (See Appendix B for a comparison of contents.) In addition, the two sermones merely seem to elaborate on traditional topoi from the *Vita Oswaldi* rather than to offer new material on the saint.

Nicholas Huyghebaert has made a good case that Drogo was silent about Oswald’s relics because his abbey did not possess any of the saint’s corporal relics. Drogo used the term reliquiae (relics) in reference to the relics of Oswald that his abbey possessed, while he usually used ossa (bones) or corpus (body) in

---


192 All quotations and translations from Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* come from Bertram Colgrave’s and R.A.B. Mynors’s edition. All translations of Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s texts, when not taken directly from Bede, are my own.
reference to the relics of Lewinna and Winnoc, which he stated were corporal relics. Saint-Winnoc’s relics of Oswald could have been anything from soil taken from the spot where the king-saint died to a splinter from one of the stakes on which his head and hands were impaled after his death, but they do not seem to have been any of his bones. As Chapter 4 discusses, medieval hagiographers claimed that non-corporal relics could induce miracles but did not depict them signifying the actual presence of the saint as did corporal relics.

This does not mean, however, that Drogo’s three texts did not make significant contributions to Oswald’s cult. Not only did Drogo transform Bede’s account in the Historia ecclesiastica into a freestanding piece of hagiography, but he also tailored his presentation to reflect recent developments in the typology of king-saints. Previous assessments of these texts have also ignored how they operated in their historical context. These were not literary curios to be placed on a shelf and forgotten: they provided readings for the liturgy on the saint’s feast day, an occasion when a diverse audience would have been present at the

---

193 See for example HT, Epistola.1 (col. 613B); i.Prologus.5, 7 (coll. 614A, C); i.I.16 (col. 616A); i.II.20 (col. 617A); i.III.28, 31, 32, 34 (coll. 618D, F, 619B, C); i.IV.35-40 (coll. 619E-20C); ii.Exordium alterum.50 (col. 622F); ii.I.56 (col. 624C); ii.II.64 (col. 626A); See also Huyghebaert, "Les deux translations," p. 91.
monastery of Saint-Winnoc. Liturgical material added later to Drogo’s works indicates that they also helped sustain Oswald’s cult at Saint-Winnoc until 1221 when the abbey finally acquired corporal relics of the saint.194

This chapter addresses three main issues regarding the *Vita Oswaldi* and Drogo’s two sermones. First, it examines the changes Drogo made to Bede’s portrait of the king. Second, it discusses the innovations and unique contributions the hagiographer introduced to the typology of martyr-kings. Third, it places the texts in their historical context to understand what impact the presentation of a seventh-century king-saint might have had in eleventh-century Flemish society.

### 3.2 Bede’s Oswald

Several early sources give basic accounts of Oswald of Northumbria. Most of these originated at the monastery of Iona in the Irish kingdom of Dál Riada, where Oswald was raised as a child and converted to Christianity. For example, around sixty years after Oswald’s death Adomnán, the ninth abbot of Iona, wrote the *Vita s. Columbae* (c. 700) in which he portrayed Oswald as holy in the tradition of the Old Testament kings of Israel.195 Despite the early sources

---


from Iona, Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* has been the most important source of information on the king.\(^{196}\)

According to Bede, Oswald was born about 605 into a dynasty that had ruled Bernicia, the northernmost Anglo-Saxon kingdom, since the middle of the sixth century.\(^ {197}\) (See Map 8.) Oswald’s father, Æthelfrith (r. 592-616), was a pagan king who greatly expanded Bernician power at the expense of the neighboring British Christians and the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Deira which he annexed. Oswald’s mother, Acha, was the daughter of the deposed Deiran king. The union of Bernicia and Deira created the kingdom of Northumbria, so-called because it comprised the Anglo-Saxon lands north of the Humber river. In 616, Edwin, Acha’s brother and the heir to the Deiran throne, obtained his revenge by killing Æthelfrith. Oswald and his brothers then fled Northumbria for the Irish kingdom of Dál Riada located in western Scotland.\(^ {198}\)

Oswald spent seventeen years in exile there, during which time the Irish converted him to Christianity. Then, in 633, the British king Cædwalla killed Edwin, paving the way for Oswald’s return. In 634, Oswald defeated Cædwalla

---

\(^{196}\) Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy'," pp. 34 and 51.


\(^{198}\) HE, i.34, ii.2, ii.5, ii.12, iii.1-9; Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy’," p. 33.
at the battle of Denisesburn – more commonly known as Heavenfield (Caelestis campus) – and assumed control of Northumbria. He ruled the kingdom for eight years, resuming his father's expansionist program. He also established Christianity in Northumbria with the help of Aidan, an Irish bishop to whom he gave the monastery of Lindisfarne. Finally, in 642, Oswald died defending his kingdom against Penda, the pagan king of Mercia, and his British allies at the battle of Maserfelth.199

The Northumbrian royal family encouraged the veneration of Oswald’s relics. In accord with pagan custom, the victorious Penda had hacked Oswald apart and impaled his head and arms on stakes planted on the battlefield. Penda’s action ultimately allowed the royal family to disperse the king’s relics – an unusual practice at the time. A year after the battle, Oswald’s brother Oswiu, who had succeeded him on the throne, recovered some of the grisly battlefield remnants. He took Oswald’s arms to the royal city of Bamburgh, where the right arm was said to remain uncorrupted, and the head to Lindisfarne.200

199 HE, iii.1-9; Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy'," p. 33.

200 HE, iii.11; See also Alan Thacker, "Membra Disjecta: the Division of the Body and the Diffusion of the Cult," in Oswald: Northumbrian King to European Saint, ed. Clare Stancliffe and Eric Cambridge (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995), pp. 100-06.
Between 679 and 697, Osthryth, Oswiu’s daughter and the wife of King Æthelred of Mercia, somehow recovered the rest of her uncle’s body and interred it at Bardney, a monastery in Lindsey that she and her husband had founded. The *Historia ecclesiastica* reports that the monks of Bardney initially refused to receive the bones of the king who had conquered them and Oswald’s relics spent a night outside in a tent. During the night, however, a column of light stretched between the tent and heaven, convincing the monks to receive the saint the following day. Later, Bishop Wilfrid of York (634-709) founded a church near Heavenfield at Hexham. Both Oswald’s relics and the sites connected to the saint performed miraculous cures.201

The *Historia ecclesiastica*’s account of Oswald has touched off a debate about how Bede intended to represent the king as a saint. Until quite recently, scholars have argued that the account presents a traditional martyr-king. For example, Bertram Colgrave has paired Oswald with his predecessor, Edwin, as an English king who died fighting for his faith and became a martyr.202 Robert Folz has placed Oswald under the heading “Le Roi martyr de la foi,” and

---

201 *HE*, iii.11-13, iv.14; See also Thacker, "Membra Disjecta," pp. 100-06.

according to Susan Ridyard he “attained sanctity by martyrdom.”\textsuperscript{203} Other scholars, especially Victoria Gunn, have, however, emphasized that Bede never explicitly called Oswald a martyr and did not include the king in the martyrology he composed a few years before the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica}.\textsuperscript{204} Instead, they have suggested that Bede, who was the first author to use the title \textit{miles Christi} (soldier of Christ) with reference to a medieval ruler, was proposing a new model of king-saint in which the king attained sanctity as a king.\textsuperscript{205}

The debate over Oswald’s status reflects a fundamental dichotomy that appeared early in the cult of the saints. Throughout most of the first millennium, Christians considered the exercise of secular power as inherently opposed to sanctity. Early Christians had suffered the persecutions of Rome and recognized as the first saints those Christians – the martyrs – whom Rome had executed for their faith. The belief that the exercise of secular power and the ideal Christian life were fundamentally opposed became deeply ingrained in Christian tradition.

After the Roman persecutions ended, the opposition between secular and


\textsuperscript{205} \textit{HE}, iv.14; Klaniczay, \textit{Holy Rulers}, p. 83.
sanctified assumed a different form in a new class of saints, called the confessors. Confessors were Christians who had suffered a metaphorical death for their faith by renouncing the secular world, a world that was corrupt and prevented them from living sanctified lives.

The idea of a conflict between things pertaining to this world and those of the next persisted through the Early Middle Ages. As a result, early medieval saints tended to come from the clergy (bishops, hermits, priests, monks and nuns) rather than the royalty (kings, queens, princes and princesses). This was especially true on the continent, where only one king-saint, two prince-saints and five queen-saints appeared before the tenth century. Moreover, these royal saints had achieved sanctity in ways that reflected the perceived conflict. They had either never exercised secular power, as in the case of royal women, or had

---


207 The king-saint was Sigismund, king of Burgundy (d. 523). The prince-saints were Chlodovald, third son of the Merovingian king Chlodomer, who lived at the end of the sixth century, and Hermangild, a Visigothic prince (Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, pp. 67-8). The queen-saints were Chrodechilde, Ultrogotha, Radegunde, Mathilde, Balthilde (Graus, *Volk*, pp. 406-15).
renounced their positions. Some abdicated to enter a monastery or embark on a pilgrimage, while others sacrificed their lives in martyrdom. In other words, most early medieval royal saints achieved recognition despite their rank.²⁰⁸

Not surprisingly, the conflict between secular position and sainthood was most acute in cases where the person had actually ruled as a king. As a result, martyrdom was the dominant typology for the few early medieval king-saints because a king’s willingness to die for his faith excused whatever secular actions, such as executing criminals or killing enemies in battle, detracted from his sanctity. Martyrs’ deaths, not their lives, made them holy. The first martyr-king, Sigismund of Burgundy (d. 523), is exemplary. In 523, the Merovingian king Chlodomer (d. 524), the son of Clovis I, conquered Burgundy and had Sigismund beheaded along with his wife and children, then he had the bodies thrown down a well. Soon thereafter, the abbot of Sigismund’s foundation, the abbey of Saint-Maurice-d’Agaune (modern Switzerland), began to claim that the king had been martyred. This seems to have been the only way that the abbot could encourage veneration for the king who was not known for his Christian virtues – in 522,

Sigismund had executed his own son, Sigeric, on suspicion of treason. The
king’s only qualifications for sainthood seem to have been founding a monastery
and getting himself killed.\textsuperscript{209}

While several more martyr-kings, including three Merovingians, were
recognized on the continent in the tenth and eleventh centuries, the tradition was
most popular in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. David Rollason has compiled a list
of twelve English kings or their heirs who met their ends at the hands of
Christian assassins and subsequently achieved recognition as martyrs. In
addition to these, Edwin and Oswald, who were eventually recognized as
martyr-kings, can also be added to the total.\textsuperscript{210} Rollason has suggested four
reasons for the relatively intense popularity of the typology in England. First,
royal families might have encouraged veneration in order to gain prestige over
rivals by associating themselves with holy figures. (Rollason also might have
noted that England differed from the continent in having more royal families
competing for power.) Second, in some cases, royal families sponsored the
veneration of foes whom they had assassinated in order to pay a weargild to God,
the protector and avenger of slain kings. Third, the greatest concentration of

\textsuperscript{209} Klaniczay, \textit{Holy Rulers}, pp. 67-8; André Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood in the Later Middle
\textit{Anglo-Saxon England}, ed. Peter Clemoes, 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University

\textsuperscript{210} Rollason, “Murdered Royal Saints,” pp. 2-11.
interest in martyred royal saints occurred in the late eighth and early ninth centuries, just after 786 when papal legates in a meeting at Cloveshoe strongly condemned royal murders in England. Finally, families with murdered kinsmen may have begun cults to focus opposition against the killers.\footnote{Klaniczay, \textit{Holy Rulers}, p. 69; Rollason, “Murdered Royal Saints,” pp. 12-18.} In other words, the veneration of specific saints was intimately connected to the political situation where those saints were venerated, a point that scholars have made in studying continental hagiography as well.\footnote{Klaniczay, \textit{Holy Rulers}, pp. 14-18.}

The debate about whether or not Bede followed this tradition or departed from it is, however, misleading. Bede finished the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} about four years before his death in 735. By that time, he was already a skilled hagiographer who had great familiarity with hagiographic \textit{topoi}. He had written a prose adaptation [BHL 2873] of Paulinus of Nola’s verse \textit{Vita s. Felicis} [BHL 2871], an improved Latin translation of the Greek \textit{Passio s. Anastasii}, and both verse and prose versions of the \textit{Vita s. Cuthberti} [BHL 2020, 2021].\footnote{Walter Goffart, \textit{The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550-800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon} (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 246.} On the one hand, if he intended to present Oswald as a martyr then he exhibited great clumsiness in failing to take the obvious and expected step of explicitly designating him as such. On the other hand, if Bede wanted to present Oswald
as a new type of king-saint, then his presentation was surprisingly weak for an experienced hagiographer. In the end, if we are to accept either side’s argument, then we must conclude that Bede somehow lost his skills as a hagiographer before composing the Historia ecclesiastica, an unlikely conclusion. What is misleading about this debate is the assumption that Bede was writing hagiography at all.

Bede’s account of Oswald was part of a larger history of the English Church, not an independent hagiography of the saint. While it would be wrong to posit a rigid dichotomy between medieval history and hagiography, the presentation of Oswald in the Historia ecclesiastica differs significantly from the way that Bede would have presented the saint in a passio or vita. (Although the term does not carry the same meaning then as it does today, Bede wrote in the Historia ecclesiastica that he was striving to be a “truthful historian” (verax historicus), not the author of a work about saints.)\(^\text{214}\) His treatment of St. Cuthbert is instructive in this regard. The author’s prose and verse versions of the Vita s. Cuthberti focus on Cuthbert’s virtues as a saint, while the Histora ecclesiastica concentrates on the institutional contributions the saint made as abbot of Lindisfarne.\(^\text{215}\)

\(^{214}\) HE, iii.17.

\(^{215}\) HE, iv.27-32.
The differing treatments of Cuthbert point to two even more critical distinctions Bede made between his roles as historian and hagiographer. First, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Bede chose to produce a unified work about the development of the English Church, not a series of biographies about important figures in English ecclesiastical history. He focused on the institution and its growth, not its individual members. To phrase it differently, Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* had more in common with Gregory of Tours’ *Historiae Francorum* than it did with Gregory’s *Liber vitae Patrum*. In fact, the *Historiae Francorum* was probably one of three models for Bede’s history, the other two being Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* (via Rufinus’ Latin translation and adaptation) and the Old Testament.\(^{216}\) A related but even more important difference between the *Historia ecclesiastica* and hagiography was the method by which Bede invested his subject with meaning. An overarching narrative structure shaped the interpretation of each element in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The Old Testament was particularly influential as a literary model in this regard. As Walter Goffart has pointed out, “biblical commentary, not history, was the privileged focus of Bede’s scholarship, and presumably he would have gone to his grave without regrets” had he never produced the *Historia ecclesiastica*.\(^ {217}\) Steeped in years of biblical study, Bede presented the development of the English Church (or, the

\(^{216}\) Colgrave, Introduction, pp. xxx, xxxvi.

\(^{217}\) Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 238.
Northumbrian part of the English Church) in terms of a providential narrative: the English, like the Israelites of the Old Testament, had a special relationship with God in which they prospered when they obeyed God’s laws and suffered when they did not. Although scholars disagree on the greater purpose of Bede’s text, most agree that he couched it in such terms.\textsuperscript{218} While hagiographers gave meaning to their subjects by subordinating individuals to typologies, Bede subordinated individuals to his providential narrative. What mattered was not each individual’s virtue, but the role he or she had played in God’s plan.

The treatment of Oswald’s father, Æthelfrith, in the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} provides a particularly illuminating example of this construction. Æthelfrith was an unlikely candidate for Bede’s praise. A pagan warrior-king, he expanded his power at the expense of both pagan Anglo-Saxons and Christian Britons. The Britons, commenting negatively on his character, called him \textit{Flesaur} – “The Twister” or ”The Artful Dodger.”\textsuperscript{219} Nor was Bede under any illusions about the Æthelfrith’s virtues. He related a story about a battle at Chester between the pagan king and some British Christians. According to the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica},

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{219} Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy'," p. 61.
\end{flushright}
before the fighting began, Æthelfrith noticed Christian priests from the monastery of Bangor praying for a British victory. Outraged, he ordered 1,200 of them put to death.\textsuperscript{220}

What interested Bede was not Æthelfrith’s personal virtues or lack of them, but his place in the developing relationship between God and the English Church. The text states that Æthelfrith was:

> a very brave king and most eager for glory… He might indeed be compared with Saul who was once king of Israel, but with this exception, that Æthelfrith was ignorant of the divine religion.

*rex fortissimus et gloriae cupidissimus… ita ut Sauli quondam regi Israheliticae gentis comparandus videretur, excepto dumtaxat hoc, quod divinae erat religionis ignarus.*\textsuperscript{221}

Thus, by reducing the power of British Christians, Æthelfrith had fought against the enemies of the (eventually) Christian Anglo-Saxons, God’s chosen people. To emphasize the comparison between Æthelfrith and Saul, Bede quoted Jacob’s blessing to Benjamin (Saul was from the tribe of Benjamin): "Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf; in the morning he shall devour the prey and at night shall divide the spoil" (Benjamin lupus rapax; mane comedet praedam et vespere dividet spolia).\textsuperscript{222} Both

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{220} \textit{HE}, ii.2.
\textsuperscript{221} \textit{HE}, i.34.
\textsuperscript{222} David M. Gunn, "Saul," \textit{The Oxford Companion to the Bible}, ed. Michael D. 121
Saul and Æthelfrith were warrior kings who ravaged the enemies of God’s people like wolves. Each was also inferior to his successor in the eyes of God; David succeeded Saul after Saul’s rejection by God, and Edwin, a convert to Christianity, succeeded the pagan Æthelfrith. According to Bede, even Æthelfrith’s slaughter of Christian priests was part of God’s plan for the English:

> It is said that Augustine [of Canterbury], the man of God, warned [the Britons] with threats that, if they refused to accept peace from their brethren, they would have to accept war from their enemies; and if they would not preach the way of life to the English nation, they would one day suffer the vengeance of death at their hands. This, through the workings of divine judgment, came to pass in every particular as he had foretold.

> For later on, that very powerful king of the English, Æthelfrith… collected a great army… and made a great slaughter of that wicked race [the Britons].

*Quibus vir Domini Augustinus fertur minitans praedixisse quia, si pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent, bellum ab hostibus forent accepturi, et si nationi Anglorum noluissent viam vitae praedicare, per horum manus ultionem essent mortis passuri. Quod ita per omnia, ut praedixerat, divino agente iudicio*

Coogan and Bruce M. Metzger (Oxford: Oxford University, 1993), p. 679; *HE*, i.34; Genesis 49:27.

According to Colgrave, Bede found British Christians problematic for several reasons, not the least of which was their refusal to accept Rome’s authority. Although Æthelfrith had killed Christians, they were not "true" Christians in Bede’s eyes.

Oswald claimed a more prominent spot in Bede’s providential narrative than his father. Clare Stancliffe has argued convincingly that in Bede’s narrative the kings Edwin and Oswald represented two stages in the conversion of Northumbria. Edwin accepted Christianity with hesitation while Oswald embraced the faith wholeheartedly. Edwin established the foundations of the English Church and Oswald completed its structure. Bede used a concrete example to emphasize this point:

[Edwin] was baptized at York on Easter Day, 12 April, in the church of St. Peter the Apostle, which he had hastily built of wood while he was a catechumen... Very soon after his baptism, he set about building a greater and more magnificent church of stone... The foundations were laid and

---

224 HE, ii.2.

225 Colgrave, Introduction, p. xxx; Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy'," p. 37.

226 Stancliffe, "Oswald, 'Most Holy'," p. 62.
he began to build his square church surrounding the former chapel. But before the walls were raised to their full height, the king was slain by a cruel death and the work left for his successor Oswald to finish.

In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Oswald reunified Northumbria after Edwin’s death and reestablished Christianity after the successes of a previous missionary effort proved ephemeral. Thus, he built on the foundations laid by Edwin.

Bede left Oswald’s saintly typology undetermined. While it is clear that he regarded the king as a saint – he reported several miracles attributed to the king – he did not clarify what type of saint he thought Oswald was. Instead, Bede concentrated on two major aspects of Oswald’s story, his reunification of Northumbria and his role in its conversion to Christianity. What connected Oswald’s sanctity to these aspects was the idea that the king’s success depended on

\[227\] HE, ii.14.

\[228\] Thacker, “*Membra Disjecta*,” pp. 111-12.
upon his personal virtues: the kingdom prospered because its ruler upheld the English covenant with God. For this reason, Bede called Oswald the “most Christian king” (\textit{rex Christianissimus}) of Northumbria, lingered over his personal virtues and attributed posthumous miracles to him validating his actions.\footnote{HE, ii.5}

Discussing the king’s sanctity might actually have worked against the narrative. Had Bede written a hagiographic account, he would have found it difficult not to acknowledge Oswald as a martyr, and the palm of martyrdom had a way of overshadowing and deemphasizing everything else in a saint’s life.

In contrast to the typology of martyrdom dominant in the eighth century, Bede placed the accomplishments of the king’s life on par with the events surrounding his death. Both Heavenfield, where Oswald’s reign as king began in battle, and \textit{Maserfelth}, where it ended in battle, were places where miracles occurred. Wood from the cross Oswald raised at Heavenfield worked miracles, as did wood from the stakes erected at \textit{Maserfelth}. Bede also placed accounts of posthumous miracles – the cures performed at Heavenfield, for example – in the body of the text on Oswald’s life. Since it was traditional in hagiography to narrate the saint’s virtues first, then to include a subsequent account of his or her posthumous miracles, Bede was calling attention to the events that surrounded the miracle accounts in the text. He was using miracles to emphasize and
validate Oswald’s actions as a living king, not to prove his *virtus* after death. As Benedicta Ward has noted, for Bede, the awe inspired by *miracula* was always secondary to their value as *signa* of God’s beneficence.230

Bede presented a compelling account of the king’s life, but his passages on Oswald could not stand alone as a hagiographic account. When Drogo removed these passages from the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he also removed them from the providential narrative that had given them meaning. Without this narrative, Bede’s focus on the king’s contributions to the development of the English Church evaporated and the account became little more than a series of biographical episodes. Only the reports of Oswald’s miracles would have had independent hagiographic significance.

### 3.3 Drogo’s Oswald

Drogo had to alter Bede’s historical material in order to transform it into a hagiographic *vita* and two *sermones*. In the prologue to the *Vita Oswaldi*, he made reference to the need for changes:

> Indeed, pondering your request and desire, brothers, then giving it satisfaction, I combined in one work the life and martyrdom of holy

---

Oswald the king, as well as his wondrous deeds, and I sent to you the composition… But, lest anyone should think that the compositions which I combined are my own, I must apologize, on the contrary, they are from the illuminating composition of the blessed priest Bede. But we rearranged the order of Bede’s writings to place them in the [proper] order, because the series of events were out of order; things that were placed first are now placed last, things that were placed last are now placed first… Then, moreover, where so much history urged Bede to shorten the story, we expounded a little, adding things from our own [knowledge] – things which he may perhaps have said in the same way, if the brevity of the composition or material had allowed.

Id etiam perpendens, vestraeque petitioni voluntatique, fratres, satisfaciens, vitam martyrionque sancti Oswaldi regis, seu miracula ejusdem in uno opere conjunxi, vobisque descripta misi… Verum, ne quis existimet, mea fore, quae conjunxi, excusatum venio, sed esse beati Bedae presbyteri dilucidata stylo. At nos ejus ipsius ordinata scripta, versa serie, in ordinem taxavimus; modo praeposita postponentes, modo postposita praeponentes… Tum autem ubi tanta historia adegit virum abbreviare orationem, nos paululum dilucidavimus, addentes de nostro, quae idem fortassis diceret, si brevitas sententiarum vel materiei sineret.231

231 VO, Prologus.2 (col. 94C).
Drogo could not, however, alter his source material at will. His monastic contemporaries to whom he addressed the texts would have been familiar with the *Historia ecclesiastica*, a popular work on the continent, and we can assume that they would have expected the Flemish author to incorporate its material into his texts. Thus, Drogo’s changes appeared more in interpretation than narration.

One of the most important changes that Drogo made to Bede’s presentation was to identify Oswald as a martyr-king. This identification appeared in all three of Drogo’s works on the saint. In the prologue to the *Vita Oswaldi*, he casually referred to the “martyrdom of holy Oswald the king” (*martyrium sancti Oswaldi regis*).\(^{232}\) It was therefore apparent to the audience from the beginning of the work that they ought to consider the saint a martyr-king. Later in the *Vita*, Drogo reiterated the identification when he moved from a discussion of Oswald’s virtues to his death, stating that he would hasten his narrative “to [Oswald’s] martyrdom, which he accepted for the sake of his faith, and the salvation of his people,” (*ad illius martyrium, quod pro fide sua, suaeque gentis salute suscepit*).\(^{233}\) He also identified the saint as a martyr in both sermons, noting in the first sermon, for example, that Oswald “acquired the palm [of martyrdom]” (*palma potitur*).\(^{234}\)

---

\(^{232}\) *VO*, *Prologus*.2 (col. 94C).

\(^{233}\) *VO*, III.25 (col. 99B).

\(^{234}\) *S1*, 1, lines 10-11, p. 105.
The eleventh-century typology of a martyr-king was much different than the one Bede had known. Over the centuries, the perception of a conflict between secular power and sanctity had gradually diminished. In fact, Drogo wrote only twenty-five years or so before hagiographers overcame the crucial barrier between secular rule and sainthood. In 1083, King Stephen of Hungary (r. 997-1038), who had coincidentally been named for the protomartyr Stephen, became the first confessor-king, the first king to achieve sainthood without being martyred or renouncing his throne. One of his successors as king of Hungary, Ladislas (r. 1077-95), had Stephen proclaimed a saint in order to cast an aura of religious legitimacy over his own kingship, which was under attack from Gregorian reformers bent on desacralizing the institution of kingship.235 His action inaugurated “le siècle des saints rois” in which seven of the nine kings canonized were confessors.236

Although Drogo wrote on the threshold of the shift to the confessor-king typology, he had in mind an earlier, intermediate typology between martyr- and confessor-king. In the last decades of the tenth century, two hagiographic works presented martyr-kings who lived holy lives as kings, then confirmed their faith by suffering death as martyrs. The first was the Vita s. Vencezlavi martiris [BHL


236 Folz, Les saints rois, p. 113.
that Gumpold, bishop of Mantua (d. 985), composed around 980 about Wenceslaus, the king of Bohemia (d. 929). The second was the \textit{Vita s. Eadmundi} [BHL 2392] written by Abbo of Fleury (d. 1004) around 987 about Edmund, the king of East Anglia (r. 855-70). In Gábor Klaniczay’s words:

What we have here is a new hagiographic type: the ruler who wields the power of his office reluctantly, is renowned for his exemplary charity, his support of the Church and his missionary zeal, and who finally dies a martyr’s death at the hands of the enemies of the faith.\footnote{Klaniczay, \textit{Holy Rulers}, p. 62.}

These two works were innovative because they combined the virtues of the \textit{rex iustus} (just king) depicted in Carolingian mirrors for princes with the traditional martyr-king. They depicted kings who exhibited great faith as ideal Christian rulers, then confirmed their faith by exchanging the sacred office of king for the sanctified status of martyr.\footnote{Folz, \textit{Les saints rois}, pp. 55-64.} Drogo’s presentation of Oswald both demonstrates the influence of the tenth-century typology and develops it further.

\subsection*{3.4 The Road to Zion}

In the \textit{Vita Oswaldi}, Drogo’s longest and most detailed work on Oswald, the hagiographer rearranged Bede’s passages so that the narrative followed the pattern of a traditional \textit{vita} – lineage, birth, youth, deeds, death, and posthumous
miracles. He tied these elements together by portraying Oswald’s life as a trajectory rising from innate goodness to sanctification through the cultivation of virtue. During his life, the king was a rex iustus who exhibited great faith that he then confirmed in his martyrdom. In this respect, the Vita Oswaldi resembles the Vita Vencezlavi and Vita Eadmundi. But rather than presenting the role of martyr superseding the role of rex iustus, the Vita Oswaldi blurs the distinction between the two by hinting that the king was already a saint when he suffered martyrdom. The result was that the Vita Oswaldi tended to emphasize the saint’s life at the expense of his martyrdom.

Drogo began by diminishing the importance of lineage in favor of virtue. He introduced the idea of two types of excellence – excellence of blood and excellence of deeds – a common trope in medieval hagiography. Bede had mentioned it numerous times in the Historia ecclesiastica, though never specifically with reference to Oswald. Drogo stated that wealth and high

239 See Appendix B for a comparison of the contents of the HE versus the contents of the VO.

240 Mellitus, bishop of London, “was noble by birth, but nobler still in loftiness of spirit” (Erat carnis origine nobilis, sed culmine mentis nobilior) (HE, ii.7); Rædwald, a Wuffing king of East Anglia, “was noble by birth though ignoble in his deeds” (natu nobilis, quamlibet actu ignobilis) (HE, ii.15); Anna, another king of East Anglia, “was a man of very noble Irish race, but still nobler in spirit than by birth” (erat autem vir iste de nobilissimo genere Scotorum, sed longe animo quam carne nobilior) (HE, iii.19); A nun of Barking monastery was “of noble family in this world and nobler still in her love for the world to come” (ad saeculi huius dignitatem nobilis et in amore futuri saeculi nobilior) (HE, iv.9).
status are admirable but inferior to the rewards that come from embracing
“humility, patience, the love of God and his neighbors, and the other kinds of
virtues,” (humilitatem, patientiam, dilectionem Dei ac proximi, caeterasque virtutum
artes).\textsuperscript{241} He emphasized this point by providing a biblical reference, stating that
“For there is no respect of persons with God” (non est acceptio personarum apud
Deum), as Paul wrote to the Christians at Rome.\textsuperscript{242} When Paul was writing, the
eyearly Christians were engaged in an argument about the relative status of the
Jews and Gentiles who followed Jesus. The apostle stated that actions, not the
privilege of belonging to a certain group, would determine how God would treat
each person:

\begin{quote}
Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil: of the
Jew first, and also of the Greek. But glory and honour and peace to every
one that worketh good: to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For there is
no respect of persons with God.
\end{quote}

\textit{Tribulatio et angustia in omnem animam hominis operantis malum, Judaei
primum et Graeci, gloria autem, et honor et pax omni operanti bonum Judaeo
primum et Graeco, non enim est acceptio personarum apud Deum.}\textsuperscript{243}

According to Paul, it is not birth, but deeds that God considers. The use of

\textsuperscript{241} VO, Prologus.3 (col. 94D).

\textsuperscript{242} Romans 2:11.

\textsuperscript{243} Romans 2:9-11.
intertextuality through biblical references was one of Drogo’s most powerful tools. At critical points, such references allowed him to gloss events in Oswald’s life with only a few words.

The reason Drogo deemphasized lineage soon becomes clear. The *Vita Oswaldi* then shifts to discussing Oswald’s pagan roots. For this section, Drogo culled pieces of information from various places in Bede’s account to construct a description of the saint’s genealogy. He described Oswald as being from an “exalted and ancient line of kings” (*alto et longo sanguine regum*) on his father’s side, then stated that “[Oswald’s] mother was from no less regal a lineage” (*mater vero ejus non minus regali stirpe*).244 Drogo also excerpted the passage from the *Historia ecclesiastica* discussed above in which Bede noted that Æthelfrith was like Saul except “that he was ignorant of the divine religion” (*quod divinae erat religionis ignarus*).245 Since he could not integrate this lineage into the account of the king’s virtues as Bede had integrated it into his account of the English Church, Drogo distanced Oswald from his blood by writing that the king was a “rose from thorns” (*rosa de spinis*) – another common trope.246

---

244 *VO*, I.4 (col. 94F).
245 *VO*, I.4 (col. 94F).
246 *VO*, I.4-5 (coll. 94F-95B).
Drogo then moved quickly to a description of the king’s conversion by the Irish, emphasizing that Oswald was virtuous during his youth:

And, indeed, there [in exile] the boy of a naturally good disposition was introduced to the teaching of the Irish, to follow the true religion, to love God according to the instruction of the gospel writing, to have compassion for his neighbor, to give aid to one oppressed by injustice, to give generously to one deprived of necessities, [to give] clothing to the naked man, to feed the hungering man.

*Ibi denique institutus est bonae indolis puer ad doctrinam Scotorum, sequi veram religionem, Deum diligere juxta evangelici scripti praeceptum, cui proximo compati, subvenire oppresso calumnia, large inopi necessaria indulgere, nudo vestem alere esurientem.*

This was the beginning of an upward trajectory in the king’s virtue that stretched throughout his life. The *Vita Oswaldi* goes on to state that Oswald “passed out of adolescence: and, in addition to this, in his adulthood he did not neglect to do the same things, nay even greater things [my emphasis]” (*evasit in adolescentiam:*)

---

247 VO, I.4 (col. 94F).
Moreover, “always he advanced to the better, and passed from strength to strength” (*semper in melius proficiebat, de virtute in virtutem ibat*).\(^{249}\)

The trajectory was like a road with a clear destination. According to the text, the saint advanced in virtue “so that he should merit to attain what follows: The God of gods will be seen on Zion” (*ut mereretur assequi quod sequitur: Videbitur Deus deorum in Sion*).\(^{250}\) This quotation is from the psalm of a pilgrim on the road to Jerusalem. In the psalm, the pilgrim states that “my soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord” (*concupiscit, et defect anima mea in atria Domini*), and exclaims “Blessed is the man whose help is from thee: in his heart he hath disposed to ascend by steps [to Zion]” (*Beatus vir, cujus est auxilium abs Te; ascensiones in corde suo disposuit*).\(^{251}\) Such people “shall go from virtue to virtue: the God of gods shall be seen on Sion” (*ibunt de virtute in virtutem; videbitur Deus deorum in Sion*).\(^{252}\)

Drogo was suggesting that Oswald’s life had

---

\(^{248}\) *VO*, I.5 (col. 95A-B).

\(^{249}\) *VO*, III.25 (coll. 99A-B).

\(^{250}\) *VO*, III.25 (coll. 99A-B).

\(^{251}\) Psalm 83:3, 6 (Psalm 84 in most modern editions).

\(^{252}\) Psalm 83:8.
been a pilgrimage of deepening faith that bound the events of his life together in a single narrative. The destination of this journey was Zion, a common term for both the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem.253

Drogo’s intense focus on the trajectory of Oswald’s life overshadows the saint’s martyrdom just as it does in the Historia ecclesiastica. In reporting the king’s death, the Vita Oswaldi provides only a cursory note excerpted from Bede’s text:

Which circuit of years having been completed, [Oswald] was killed, a great battle having been engaged, by the same pagan people, and pagan king of the Mercians, Penda by whom his predecessor, Edwin, was cut off, in the place which in the tongue of the Angles is called Maserfeld, in the thirty-eighth year of his age, on the fifth of the month of August.

Quo completo annorum curriculo, occisus est, commisso gravi prælio, ab eadem pagana gente, paganoque rege Merciorum Penda (a quo & prædecessor ejus Eadwinus peremptus fuerat) in loco qui lingua Anglorum nuncupatur Maserfeld, anno ætatis suæ trigesimo octavo, die quinto mensis Augusti.254

The brevity of this account contrasts markedly with Abbo of Fleury’s treatment of Edmund’s death in the Vita Eadmundi. As Thomas Head has noted, Abbo’s decision to treat Edmund as a martyr led him to focus almost exclusively on the


254 VO, III.26 (col. 99C).
king’s death and the subsequent fate of his relics.\textsuperscript{255} The contrast is particularly notable since both Drogo and Abbo lived under the nominal rule of the Capetians and were separated by less than seventy years and 550km/342mi. when they wrote their texts.

The next passage in the 	extit{Vita Oswaldi} hints at why Drogo blurred the line between the Oswald’s life and martyrdom. God deprived the king of life at a young age so that his perfected virtue would not be corrupted:

But, indeed, it is clear and manifest about [Oswald], what is read in Solomon, "He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul." For he was taken away while young, not even scarcely of middle age, so that he might be crowned by God, he who continuously both as a boy and as a youth demonstrated that he was a servant of God.

\textit{Verumenimvero claret, manifestumque habetur de illo, quod in Salomone legitur: Raptum esse hunc, ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus, aut ne fictio deciperet animam ejus. Raptus enim juvenis est, ut talis necdumque vix etiam mediae aetatis, a Deo coronaretur, qui continuum et puer et juvenis famulatum ipsi exhibuit.}\textsuperscript{256}


\textsuperscript{256} VO, III.26 (col. 99C).
The biblical passage from which Drogo took the quotation deals with the early death of a just man (the one who was “taken away”).\textsuperscript{257} It states that the just man “being made perfect in a short space, he fulfilled [reached the maturity of] a long time; For his soul pleased God: therefore he hastened to bring him out of the midst of iniquities [my emphasis]” (Consummatus in brevi, explevit tempora mutta; placita enim erat Deo anima illius; propter hoc properavit aducere illum de medio iniquitatum).\textsuperscript{258} Thus, the Vita Oswaldi hints that Oswald reached perfection prior to his martyrdom, not because of it. In terms of his sanctity, the king’s death seems ancillary or supplementary to his life.

3.5 Rex iustus

In the process of describing Oswald’s deepening virtue, the Vita Oswaldi paints a detailed picture of the king as a rex iustus, and the Sermo primus elaborates on this image, highlighting the king’s generosity. The texts also give further indications that Drogo’s understanding of the topos was different from Abbo’s or Gumpold’s. While the two tenth-century authors had reconciled the exercise of royal power with sanctity, Drogo displayed a willingness to consider the exercise of royal power as an element of the king’s sanctity.

\textsuperscript{257} Wisdom 4:11.

\textsuperscript{258} Wisdom 4:13-14.
Parts of Drogo’s presentation of Oswald as a *rex iustus* in the *Vita Oswaldi* are entirely traditional. For example, the text attributes to the king the qualities traditionally associated with the type, which included piety, justice, and generosity to the poor.\(^{259}\) According to the text, the “King was marked with virtues, and was a noble champion of Christ, with the Holy Spirit ruling all of his actions” (*Rex insignis virtutibus, Christique praeclarus athleta, Spiritu Sancto regente omnes actus ipsius*). He “embraced the four [cardinal] virtues, prudence, justice, fortitude, [and] temperance” (*quatuor virtutes, prudentiam, justitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam amplexabatur*). He “was regarded as good, pious, and accustomed to good deeds” (*bonus, pius, mansuetus bonis habeatur*).\(^{260}\) Upon assuming power, Oswald:

began to attend to the care of his kingdom, to guard its borders from the incursions of enemies, to provide for his own and his subjects’ salvation: and although he was frequently occupied with the business of the kingdom, indeed, he was urged by an earnest intention so that the holy religion would always be his concern.

*Coepit igitur curam regni sui gerere, tutari fines suos ab inimicorum incursibus, providere suae suorumque saluti: et cum persaepe negotiis regni occuparetur,*

\(^{259}\) Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p.165.

\(^{260}\) *VO*, III.25 (col. 99B).
mente sedula id quidem agitare; ut sancta religio semper foret sibi sollicitudinii.261

The *Vita Oswaldi* presents Oswald as a king who watched over all aspects of his kingdom’s welfare, both secular and ecclesiastical.

Traditional elements also appear in the *Sermo primus*, where Drogo wrote that Oswald prayed both night and day, so that “long periods of prayer and supplication made calluses on his knees” (*callos in genibus longus precum orationumque fecerat usus*).262 More importantly, the *Sermo primus* amplifies the description of Oswald’s charity by embellishing a story told in the *Historia ecclesiastica* and repeated in the *Vita Oswaldi*.263 The *Sermo primus* relates that the king once sat down to eat and was presented with numerous sumptuous dishes laid out on a large silver platter. The king had his steward summon the paupers begging outside his door, then distributed the food and even pieces of the platter itself to the beggars. Drogo broke out in praise for this act of generosity, exclaiming “O good deed. O sweet, o ought to be imitated, o pious mind of the king” (*O pium factum. O dulce, o imitandum, o pium animum regis*).264 Bishop Aidan, who was also present at the time, was deeply impressed by the king’s generosity. He pronounced a blessing on Oswald, saying "May those hands live"

261 *VO*, I.5 (col. 95A).

262 *S2*, 1, lines 87-88, p. 107.

263 *HE*, iii.6; *VO*, III.21 (coll. 98D-E).

264 *S1*, 4, line 36, p. 106.
(Vivant ipsæ manus).\textsuperscript{265} According to the Sermo primus, the blessing resulted in the king’s right arm remaining uncorrupted after his death.\textsuperscript{266} This story of Oswald’s generosity was well-known in the Central and Late Middle Ages. In fact, it became part of the saint’s iconography in the form of a silver dish or covered cup that he often bore in visual presentations.\textsuperscript{267} In addition, the king was frequently pictured receiving Bishop Aidan’s blessing with the dish in hand. (Aidan was the Irish missionary bishop whom the king had invited to Northumbria to convert his subjects.) For Drogo, however, this was more than a popular story. It was the most famous example of Oswald’s generosity, a central trait of the rex iustus.

Drogo’s presentation sometimes contains strikingly original imagery. The most prominent example is a comparison between Oswald and the Hebrew king David. First, the Vita Oswaldi reproduces a passage from Bede in which Oswald serves as translator for Aidan, who was not fluent in English:

\begin{quote}
And thus, the King humbly and freely giving attention to the words and admonitions of this bishop in all matters, took care to diligently build up and expand the Church of Christ in his kingdom: where it frequently happened by a most beautiful spectacle, that when the bishop, who did
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{265} S1, 5, line 46, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{266} HE, iii.11; See also Thacker, "Membra Disjecta," pp. 100-06.
\textsuperscript{267} Stancliffe, Introduction, pp. 5-6.
\end{flushright}
not know the tongue of the Angles perfectly, was preaching, that same
King would act as interpreter to his nobles and ministers for the heavenly
word, since without doubt during the long time of his exile he had fully
learned the tongue of the Irish.

Hujus itaque verbis atque admonitionibus humiliter ac libenter Rex in omnibus
auscultans, Ecclesiam Christi in regno suo multum diligenter ædificare, ac
dilatare curavit: ubi pulcherrimo sæpe spectaculo contigit, ut euangelizante
antistite, qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat, ipse Rex suis ducibus, ac
ministris, interpres verbi existeret cælestis, quia nimirum tam longo exilii sui
tempore linguam Scotorum jam plene didicerat.²⁶⁸

Immediately after the excerpt from Bede’s text, Drogo inserted some lines of his
own composition:

O illustrious King, who, in all of his deeds, ought to be praised,
proclaimed, and imitated! Hither, hither let David, the citharist of heaven,
come, hither let the excellent King hasten. For this one [David] plucked
the harp before the Ark of the Lord, leapt, made merry in the nude, and
walked upside down; but the other [Oswald] taking up the word of the
Lord from the mouth of the bishop, ministered to the people. Truly, each
to the other ought to be compared, although they are held to be of
different merit.

²⁶⁸ VO, II.14 (col. 96F); HE, iii.3.
O celebrem Regem, in omnibus suis actis laudandum, praedicandum, imitandum!

Huc, huc David coelestis cytharista veniat, huc Rex egregius properet. hic namque ante arcam Domini cytharam percutit, saltat, nudus jocatur, inversum obambulat; alter vero ab ore episcopi verbum Domini suscipiens, plebi ministrat. Uterque vero in utroque comparandus est quanquam quidem diversi meritii habeantur. 269

The passage is arresting and suggests that Drogo wanted to highlight the comparison between the two kings in a way that his audience would be sure to remember.

Although David was the traditional type for the rex iustus, the hagiographer’s reference is somewhat cryptic until its biblical context is considered. The description of David cavorting before the Ark of the Covenant appears twice in the Bible. 270 2 Samuel 6:1-23, the fuller of the two accounts, reports that the Israelites took the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem and that “David danced with all his might before the Lord” (David saltabat totis viribus ante Dominum). 271 The king’s whirling before the Ark seems to have exposed his genitals, because upon his return, his wife Michal, who had seen David from a window, confronted him saying “How glorious was the king of Israel today,

269 VO, II.14 (col. 96F).


271 2 Kings 6:14.
uncovering himself before the handmaids of his servants, and was naked, as if one of the buffoons should be naked” (Quam gloriosus fuit hodie rex Israel discooperiens se ante ancillas servorum suorum, et nudatus est, quasi si nudetur unus de scurris).\textsuperscript{272} David immediately replied to Michal (who was Saul’s daughter) with a stinging rebuke:

Before the Lord, who chose me rather than thy father, and than all his house, and commanded me to be ruler over the people of the Lord in Israel, I will both play and make myself meaner than I have done: and I will be little in my own eyes: and with the handmaids of whom thou speakest, I shall appear more glorious.

Ante Dominum, qui elegit me potius quam patrem tuum, et quam omnem domum eius, et praecepit mihi ut essem dux super populum Domini in Israel, et Iudam, et vilior fiam plus quam factus sum: et ero humilis in oculis meis: et cum ancillis, de quibus locuta es, gloriosior apparebo.\textsuperscript{273}

Drogo apparently wanted to compare Oswald’s translating to David’s dancing. Each of the kings had placed himself in a position of humility, perhaps even contempt. Yet, neither king’s prestige was injured because each, in his own way, had acted in the service of God.

\textsuperscript{272} 2 Kings 6:20.

\textsuperscript{273} 2 Kings 6:20-23.
This comparison was a critical part of Drogo’s presentation. For medieval authors, David was the model of the rex iustus. Authors used David’s example to praise, excuse and condemn all manner of behavior by their own monarchs. For example, David and his son Solomon were favorite royal models in Carolingian mirrors for princes. In addition, as part of the Carolingians’ effort to legitimize their kingship, they promoted comparisons between their own power and that of the Old Testament kings of Israel. Not only were they anointed after the fashion of biblical kings, but they also encouraged explicit literary comparisons between themselves and David; Alcuin bestowed the nickname David on Charlemagne, and comparisons between Louis the Pious and David were even more frequent.

While Carolingian authors exalted the virtues of their kings with comparisons to David’s virtues, medieval authors also excused the flaws of other kings by comparing them to David. In his Epitoma vitae regis Rotberti pii about Robert II the Pious (r. 987/96-1031), Helgaud of Fleury pointed to David’s adulterous affair with Bathsheba and his subsequent murder of her husband as an example of one of his moral failings that was excused by his subsequent public repentance. According to Robert-Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory,


Helgaud considered David’s repentance a model for future kings; in any event, the author believed that King Robert’s incestuous marriage paled in comparison to David’s murderous lust.276

The particular image of David dancing and exposing himself before the Ark of the Covenant that Drogo cited was rare but not obscure in the Middle Ages. Hugo Steger has documented at least three representations of the biblical story in medieval manuscript illuminations.277 The first appeared in a manuscript originating from the school of Tours between 846 and 851.278 The second, dated between 1050 and 1075, was produced at either the Benedictine abbey of Waulsort at Dinant (modern Belgium) or somewhere in the vicinity.279 These images show David standing with his lyre in his hands, a traditional representation. The king, however, is clearly naked underneath a cloak-like garment that billows around his body, covering parts of it. A third manuscript from twelfth-century Bavaria was produced under the influence of artists at


278 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Lat. 1, f. 215v (Steger, David, pp. 166-68).

279 München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM. 13067, folio 18 (Steger, David, pp. 190-91).
either Salzburg or Regensburg. It depicts the entire story in a series of five scenes that include David, clothed in only a cape and loincloth, dancing before the Ark with his lyre and Michal looking down on him from a window. The images reveal that this story about David, although uncommon in visual presentations, was widely known in northern Europe both chronologically and geographically. The second illumination, in particular, demonstrates that at least one of Drogo’s immediate contemporaries – separated from Bergues by only about 200km/130mi. – also used the *topos*. Collectively, they suggest that the Drogo could expect literate contemporaries to understand the reference.

Drogo’s presentation of Oswald in the *Vita Oswaldi* and *Sermo primus* also displays evidence that the martyr-king typology was evolving. Abbo and Gumpold described king-saints as extremely hesitant about exercising their power. For example, Abbo wrote that:

[Edmund] was courteous with pleasant speech for all, with the grace of excellent humility, and the lord lived among his contemporaries with admirable kindness, and without any of the contempt of pride.

*Erat omnibus blando eloquio affabilis, humilitatis gratia precluis, et inter suos coaeuos mirabili mansuetudine residebat dominus absque ullo fastu superbiae.*

---


In addition, “he always held in his view the saying of the wise man: ‘Have they made you a prince? Do not be exalted, but be among them as if one of them’” (semper habens prae oculis dictum illius sapientis, “Principem te constituerunt? Noli extoli, sed esto in illis quasi unus ex illis”).\(^{282}\)

According to Drogo, however, Oswald felt no compunctions about ruling. The *Vita Oswaldi* states that the king was:

a fierce, nay, a harsh man, and seemed overbearing to the impious, so that he produced goodness for the good, and harshness for the impious, as was evident. Truly, indeed, he regarded it a rule of justice that… the unjust ought to be deterred by harsh reproach.

ferus vero asper, et velut arrogans impiis videbatur, ut bonitas illius bonis, et asperitas, uti videbatur, impiis prodesset. Verum id quidem norma justitiae tenet, ut… injusti quoque deterreantur aspera invectione.\(^{283}\)

On this count, Oswald seemed to share more in common with the first confessor-king, Stephen of Hungary, as portrayed around 1112 by Hartvic’s *Vita s. Stephani primi* [BHL 7921]. At one point, the *Vita Stephani* reports that a party of Stephen’s soldiers slaughtered some foreigners – Pechenegs with whom the Hungarians had often fought – who had been traveling to seek Stephen’s advice. When the king learned of the killing, he summoned the soldiers then:

\(^{282}\) Abbo, *Vita s. Eadmundi*, 4 (p. 71).

\(^{283}\) VO, III.25 (col. 99B).
spoke to them saying: ‘Why, transgressing the law of the precepts of God, did you not choose mercy, and why did you condemn innocent men? Just as you have done, let the Lord do to you today in front of me. For the transgressors of the law must be killed.’ The decision having been received, they were led away, and throughout the entire kingdom, at the entrances of roads, hanged two-by-two, they perished.

Cur, inquit, legem præceptorum Dei transgredientes, non intellexistis misericordiam, & viros innocentiae condemnastis? Sicut fecistis, ita faciet Dominus vobis coram me hodie: transgressores enim legis feriendi sunt. Accepta sententia, educti sunt, & per omnem regni ingressum duo & duo suspendio perierunt.284

Compared to Edmund, both Oswald and Stephen lacked any squeamishness about the performance of royal duties. As reges iusti, they displayed no doubts about the propriety of their actions. Nor did Drogo or Hartvic feel any need to excuse or explain away their behavior.

3.6 Rex et sacerdos

The rex iustus was still, however, a problematic figure for Drogo. While Hartvic could depict a successful king who died peacefully in his old age, Drogo

284 Hartvic, Vita s. Stephani primi Hungarorum regis, IV.25 (AASS, Sep. 1, col. 570F); See also Nora Berend, “Hartvic, Life of King Stephen of Hungary,” in Head, Medieval Anthology, p. 390.
had to explain why Oswald lost his life to a pagan at the relatively early age of thirty-two. In Drogo’s case, the very typology that had allowed previous hagiographers to overcome the perception of conflict between the exercise of secular power and the achievement of sanctity proved something of a barrier. Drogo dealt with the issue at length in the *Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldode*.

Near the beginning of the *Sermo secundus*, Drogo returned to the image of Oswald serving as translator for Aidan. He wrote:

O the king’s fame ought to be spread far-and-wide, [the king] whom even those priests desired to imitate. Indeed, he distilled the seed of the divine word from his mouth into others, what is for the priest to administer, that is, the word of God, sometimes he expertly claimed for himself.

*O praedicandum regem, quem etiam ipsi desiderabant imitari sacerdotes.*

*Siquidem semen divini verbi ab ore eius in alios stillabat, quodque est sacerdotis amministrare, verbum Dei scilicet, nonnumquam solers sibi vindicabat.*

Rather than using the episode to compare Oswald to David as he had in the *Vita Oswaldide*, however, this time Drogo added the duties of a priest to royal duties.

The *Sermo* then refers to Melchizedek, the Old Testament type for the *rex et sacerdos*. It continues:

He even imitated that Melchizedek in the action of his moral life, which excellent king administered his seat (rule) on the outside and poured out

---

an offering to the heavenly king for the victory of Abraham. Thus, without doubt, thus the noble king provided for his kingdom, thus he sowed the eternal seed. Truly, the good seed, by the dispersal of which minds are refreshed, regain health, are restored, and are fed.

_Illum etiam Melchisedech actu moralis vitae imitabatur, qui exterius sedem rex praepotens amministrabat, et excelsa regi oblationem pro Abrahæ victoria libabat._

_Sic nimirum, sic nobilis rex suo regno providebat, sic semen perhenne serebat._

_Bonum vero semen, quo iacto mentes reficiuntur, convalescunt, vivificantur, pascuntur._

It is not easy to decipher Drogo’s purpose here. Genesis 14:17-20 presents Melchizedek as both the king of Salem and the priest of God Most High. The passage discusses Melchizedek meeting Abraham when the latter was returning victorious from a battle. The _rex et sacerdos_ gives the patriarch bread and wine, then blesses him. Was Drogo trying to suggest that Oswald held both secular and ecclesiastical authority?

Suggesting that the king held both types of authority would have been a radical statement to make, even before the Gregorian reform. When medieval authors compared kings to Melchizedek, it was usually only to praise them, not to attribute sacerdotal power to them. For example, Venantius Fortunatus (d. c. 600) wrote that the Merovingian king Childebert II (d. 596) was “our

---

286 S2, 1-2, lines 96-102, pp. 107-08.
Melchizedek, in merit both king and priest / a layman perfected the work of
religion” (Melchisedek noster merito rex atque sacerdos / conplevit laicus religionis
opus).²⁸⁷ Fortunatus was careful to specify that Childebert was a layman (laicus)
and a priest only “in merit” (merito).²⁸⁸ More serious suggestions that kings held
sacred power came with regard to royal unction. Some authors claimed that
unction was a sacrament that raised kings above lay status. (The statue of
Melchizedek that stood in the cathedral of Reims where the coronation of French
kings took place is suggestive in this regard.) They did not, however, argue that
being vested with sacred authority transformed anointed kings into priests.²⁸⁹

Drogo did write that by preaching (translating really) the word of God,
Oswald was claiming “what is for the priest to administer” (quodque est sacerdotis
amministrare), but if he wanted a type for a rex iustus who claimed sacerdotal
power better kings than Melchizedek were available.²⁹⁰ Several biblical passages
suggest that both David and Solomon had occasionally adopted priestly
authority by offering sacrifices and blessing their people.²⁹¹ For example, the
biblical passage cited in the Vita Oswaldi in which David dances before the Ark

---
²⁸⁷ Carmina, II, no. 10, “De ecclesia Parisiaca” (Myers, Medieval Kingship, p. 138).
²⁸⁸ Myers, Medieval Kingship, p. 138.
²⁹⁰ S2, 2, lines 89-96, p. 107.
²⁹¹ 2 Kings 6:13, 17; 3 Kings 3:3-4 (2 Samuel 6:13; 1 Kings 3:3-4).
states that “David danced with all his might before the Lord: and David was girded with a linen ephod” (David saltabat totis viribus ante Dominum: porro David erat accinctus ephod lineo).292 The king was wearing the ephod, a garment worn specifically by ancient priests, because he had just offered a sacrifice in honor of the Ark’s return to Jerusalem.293 One of the psalms attributed to David even depicts the king justifying his appropriations of the priestly office by citing Melchizedek. The psalm states “The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech.”294 While the Bible never describes Melchizedek as a warrior, the same psalm also describes David as a fierce conqueror. In it, God promises David that He will “make thy enemies thy footstool,” and commands the king “rule thou in the midst of thy enemies,” because God “shall fill ruins: He shall crush the heads in the land of many.”295 This passage may seem obscure to a modern reader, but Drogo and


his fellow monks would have known it by heart from their memorization of the psalter. Why then did the hagiographer choose Melchizedek over David in the _Sermo secundus_?

An interpolation points to the answer. The _Sermo secundus_ states that Melchizedek ruled his kingdom and “poured out an offering for the victory of Abraham” (oblationem pro Abrahae victoria libabat). This libation was Drogo’s own invention: Genesis states only that Melchizedek offered Abraham bread and wine, then blessed him but does not specify how. The _Sermo_ continues:

O what a beneficent king, how essential to his homeland, and to the welfare of his kingdom. It was not enough to administer the need of the body to that kingdom, unless he also conferred the dish of the divine sacrifice. He introduced the plow, and separated out the useless sprout of the tare, of the thistle, and of the weeds with the divine hoe. Cultivate the vine of Christ, so that afterwards you might become the pure wine of the cup, squeezed by the press in an outpouring of blood [my emphasis].

_O quam utilis rex, quam necessarius suæ patriæ suique regni auspicio. Haud satis habebatur illi amministrare necessitudinem corporis, nisi etiam conferret ferculum divinæ dapis. Aratrum admittebat, et inutile germen lolii, cardui, zizaniorumque sarculo diuino auferebat. Vineam Christi excole, ut postea fias_

---

296 S2, 2, lines 93-4, p. 107.
The *Sermo secundus* compares Melchizedek pouring wine on the ground to Oswald spilling his blood on the ground.

In medieval literature, Melchizedek’s priestly attributes usually overshadowed his royal ones. In medieval Christian theology, the letter to the Hebrews provided the dominant interpretation of the priest-king. The letter characterizes Jesus as “a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek” (*sacerdos in aeternum, secundum ordinem Melchisedech*). This became the most common way to refer to the consecration of priests. More specifically, by offering Abraham bread and wine, Melchizedek served as a type for Christ at the Last Supper and consequently the eucharistic offerings of priests as well. The offering became one of the three most common representations of the *rex et sacerdos* in medieval iconography. Sometimes Melchizedek even appeared alone, holding the bread and wine before an altar like a priest.

---

297 S2, 2, lines 89-102, pp. 107-08.


299 Dohi, “Melchisedech,” p. 78; This interpretation was significantly influenced by Ambrose’s (c. 340-97) systematic interpretation of the typology of Melchizedek’s offering, its connection with the Last Supper, and its meaning as a sacrament in his *De Sacramentis* (Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 129-31).

The offering provides the key to Drogo’s comparison between Oswald and Melchizedek. By interpolating the libation, Drogo connected Melchizedek’s offering of the bread and wine as a type for the Last Supper with Oswald’s martyrdom through a series of associations. First, all of the Gospels associate the Last Supper with the Jewish celebration of the Passover. Second, the breaking of the bread and drinking of the wine, which the Gospels say Jesus called his body and blood at the Last Supper, imply the sacrificing of the Passover lamb. Third, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb alludes to Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross as the “lamb of God.”

Fourth, although Jesus was the type for all of the saints, he was especially the type for martyrs because of the manner of his death. Thus, the meaning of Drogo’s comparison becomes clear: like Jesus, Oswald “became the pure wine of the [eucharistic] cup, squeezed by the press [of martyrdom] in an outpouring of blood” (ut postea fias uinum merum calicis, pressus prælo in effusione cruoris).

To my knowledge, this connection between martyrdom, a martyr-king and Melchizedek is unique.

Drogo’s construction is contorted but deals with a vital issue in the relationship between a rex iustus and martyrdom – the manner of the king’s death. A rex iustus going meekly to his slaughter seems out of character.


\[302\] S2, 3, lines 97-102, pp. 107-08.
glance at the martyrdom accounts of the protomartyr Stephen and the martyr-king Edmund of East Anglia in comparison to Drogo’s description of Oswald’s martyrdom helps to clarify the issue.

In hagiographic tradition, the early martyrs had fully imitated Jesus’ example in their willingness to be executed for their faith. The Acts of the Apostles make this connection explicit when its relates the story of the first saint, the protomartyr Stephen. Stephen was one of Jesus’ followers who, like Jesus himself, was charged with blasphemy and brought before the Sanhedrin. His preaching enraged the crowd that gathered to hear his trial, and the crowd:

casting him forth without the city, they stoned him... And they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And falling on his knees, he cried with a loud voice, saying: Lord, lay not his sin to their charge: And when he had said this, he fell asleep in the Lord.304

Stephen’s death imitated Jesus’ death both in being an execution and in the prayer Stephen said for his executioners. (In his gospel, Luke, the author of Acts, states that Jesus prayed for his enemies on the cross, saying “Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.”)305 In the subsequent era of persecutions, Stephen’s meek surrender to execution for his faith became the


model for Christians condemned to death by the Roman state. As was mentioned above, this experience led to the perception that there was an inherent conflict between secular power and sanctity that gradually diminished with time.

Abbo’s *Vita Eadmundi* indicates, however, that a new conflict developed after the original had abated. Specifically, the image of a vigorous king did not reconcile easily with the image of a martyr going willingly to his or her death. The *Vita Eadmundi* reconciles the two images by describing Edmund as exchanging the role of king for that of martyr. The text states that the Danes suddenly invaded Edmund’s kingdom, raped its women, pillaged its towns, and decimated its population. Among those killed were the king’s closest friends and family, causing him to lose the will to live. When the Danes drew near, a servant suggested that Edmund flee his kingdom. The king, however, refused, stating that he had never fled the field of battle. But neither did he resist the Danes. Moved to despair by his failure to protect his kingdom, he surrendered to the invaders. Still, although he had been defeated, Edmund did not dishonor his royal office by collaborating with the Danes as their leader suggested. Instead, he preferred to die, saying “having followed the example of my Christ, I do not wish to stain my pure hands, he who for his name, if it should happen, I am prepared to die voluntarily by your weapons” (*Christi mei exemplum secutus, nolo puras commaculare manus, qui pro eius nomine, si ita contigerit, libenter paratus*)
Forced to abandon his role as *rex iustus*, Edmund took up the role of martyr. The Danes then used him as a target for archery practice, finally beheading him.  

Oswald presented an even greater problem for Drogo. Bede’s account clearly says that the king fell in battle. By comparing Oswald to Melchizedek, Drogo changed martyrdom from a passive to an active fate. Rather than awaiting death as a captive, the Christian king went out to greet it as a *rex iustus*.

The *Sermo secundus* reports:

Oswald, the most victorious king, approached with his soldiers [and] a great battle was joined. The Christians were strewn about by the great slaughter. In the middle of the butchery of his soldiers, the celebrated king viewed the men falling around him with steadfast piety, [then] prayed, grieved, [and] yet still hoped. He hurled lightning from his sword and poured out prayers to heaven… He mowed down whatever was nearby, then said [these] words in prayer, "Jesus Christ, most glorious of kings, have mercy on the souls of the dead." Most excellent king [Oswald], making a worthy triumph of your fall, and without anxiety for your light, fearing for others, fight for the kingdom, pious one, cut apart the army with your dagger… On the chance that, perhaps, some of his

---

306 Abbo, *Vita s. Eadmundi*, 9 (p. 76).

307 Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of the Saints*, pp. 240-44.
enemies were of the Christian religion, [Oswald] prayed for his enemies at the same time, so that he might be an imitator of the Lord [Jesus] and a witness of his protomartyr, Stephen.... He prayed and, in the midst of his soldiers pierced by the spear of his adversaries, he died. Thus, battling and fighting for his homeland and the Christian religion, he merited to be crowned by the Omnipotent, merited to obtain the palm of victory and of the heavenly triumph through martyrdom.

Affuit Oswaldus rex victoriosissimus cum suis, grave proelium committitur, christiani gravi caede sternuntur. In media strage suorum rex praeculn pietate persta, aspicit in circuitu cadentes, precatur, tristatur, tamen sperat. Fulminat ense suo, funditque precamina caelo.... Proxima quaeque metit, tunc verba precantia dicit: “Ihesu Christe, regum gloriosissime, animabus defunctorum miserere.” Optime rex, dignum peragens in caede triumphum, securusque tuae lucis, metuens alienae, pro regno pugna, pius agmen dissice sica.... Si fortasse nam forent christianae religionis, hac eadem hora pro inimicis orasset, ut imitator Domini testisque eius prothomartiris Stephani existeret.... Oravit et in medio suorum confossus telis adversoriorum cecidit. Igitur decertans pro patria pugnansque pro religione christianana, ab Omnipotente meruit coronari, meruit palma victoriae triumphique caelestis per martyrium potiri.308

308 S2, 5, lines 112-31, p. 108.
Unable to cast Oswald as a lamb, the hagiographer did not shrink from describing a lion. Drogo’s description allows Oswald to remain a king through the moment of his martyrdom, erasing the line between *rex iustus* and martyr.

Drogo cast even Oswald’s struggle against sin as a metaphorical battle. For example, the *Sermo primus* begins by describing how the devil lies in wait for the opportunity to corrupt a person’s soul through the weakness of the body. In the text, the devil and the body were the invisible and visible enemies of the soul respectively. The *sermo* then discusses Oswald’s resistance to these enemies in martial language:

King Oswald detected the missiles and the snares of these enemies on both sides, in close combat the victor prevailed over the attacking foe, conquering he indeed trampled the conquered with his feet.

*Horum hostium rex Oswaldus tela, insidias utroque dispiciebat, victor comminus super aggredientem superabat, uincens quidem uictum pedibus conculcabat.*

Just as the king fought a battle against pagans, he also fought a battle against sin. Although such martial language was not necessarily uncommon in describing saints’ opposition to evil, in the presentation of an aggressive king-saint, it calls attention to his military abilities.

---

309 S1, 3, lines 20-22, p. 105.
Drogo seemed cognizant that his presentation of Oswald stretches the martyr *topos* to its limits. This is perhaps most evident in the way he modified an anecdote from Bede, who had written that:

It is also a tradition, which has become proverbial, that [Oswald] died with a prayer on his lips. When he was beset by the weapons of his enemies and saw that he was about to perish, he prayed for the souls of his army. So the proverb runs, “May God have mercy on their souls, Oswald said when he fell to the earth.”

*Vulgatum est autem, et in consuetudinem proverbii versum, quod etiam inter verba orationis vitam finierit; namque cum armis et hostibus circumseptus iamiamque videret se esse perimendum, oravit pro animabus exercitus sui. Unde dicunt in proverbio: “Deus miserere animabus, dixit Osuald cadens in terram.”*310

In Bede’s anecdote, Oswald’s prayer for his soldiers, although similar in form and timing – just before his death – to those of Stephen and Christ, did not have the same symbolism since he did not offer it for his killers. Seeing that the king’s prayer did not quite fit the *topos*, Drogo added a vague statement about the king praying for his enemies “on the chance that, perhaps, some of his enemies were of the Christian religion” (*si fortasse nam forent christianae religionis*). Still, even by Abbo of Fleury’s standards, Drogo’s presentation threatens to turn Oswald into a typological caricature.

---

310 *HE*, iii.12; *VO*, V.39 (col. 101E).
3.7 In Defense of Flanders

The key to understanding Drogo’s presentation of Oswald and how it would have been received by contemporaries lies in the specific uses of violence he characterized as legitimate. Drogo lived in an age when the emergence of the idea of holy war was changing attitudes about the legitimacy of violence. From French sorties into Muslim Spain in the 1030s through Urban II’s call for the first crusade in 1095, warfare was increasingly identified as a Christian enterprise. These changing attitudes allowed hagiographers to argue that kings who had committed violence as part of their royal duties could also be saints. In fact, the commission of violence in the interests of Christianity could actually become part of their sanctity. Drogo’s presentation, however, derived from a different source than the concept of offensive holy war, concentrating on defensive, rather than offensive, war. This emphasis is evident in the evolution of Oswald’s memoria.

First, the Historia ecclesiastica reports that Pope Honorius I (625-38) sent Bishop Birinus to evangelize the pagans in England, and that the bishop succeeded in converting Cynegisl, the king of the West Saxons (r. 611-42). Since Oswald happened to be visiting his ally, Cynegisl, at the time of the latter’s conversion, the Northumbrian king served as godfather at Cynegisl’s baptism.

---

311 For a concise overview that is rich in citations, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, The First Crusaders, 1095-1131 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 23-52. The classic account is Carl Erdmann, Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935).
Later, Oswald married Cynegisl’s daughter. The two kings also jointly gave Birinus the town of Dorchester as his episcopal see.\textsuperscript{312} In Bede’s text, the emphasis is on the connection between the English Church and Rome (in contrast to British adherence to a flawed tradition). The story also records the institutional foundation of the see of Dorchester.

The \textit{Vita Oswaldi} treats the same story, but depicts it as an example of Oswald’s missionary zeal. The text gives credit for Cynegisl’s conversion to Oswald rather than the Birinus, stating that:

Not only, moreover, was the most glorious king Oswald anxious for his own people, but also for other peoples which were placed under the oppressive rule of [their] kings. He wished to lead all to the worship of the one true God, and to the path of the true religion. On account of which, he sent missionaries to kings allied to him, calling them to the light of his faith; he zealously tried to attract the minds of those both with letters, and with royal gifts. Not a few times, he urged them himself and through his own presence, so that they might embrace his religion with pious intention indeed, and submit their necks [bow their heads] to the omnipotent God; that by this they might gloriously become conquerors of the enemy; [Oswald] affirmed that to hope in [God] or to lean upon [Him] was always a victory.

\textsuperscript{312} Bede \textit{HE}, iii.7 (pp. 232-33).
Non solum autem Oswaldus rex gloriosissimus suæ gentis sollicitus fuit; verum etiam aliarum gentium, quæ sub extero jure regum erant constitutæ, volens omnes ad cultum unius veri Dei, veraeque religionis tramitem adducere, quapropter suos ecclesiasticos nuntios ad amicissimos sibi reges mittebat, ad fidei suæ lumen provocans; tum vero litteris, tum autem regis xeniis animos eorum sedulo alliciebat. Nonnumquam per se, suique præsentiam eos monebat, uti religionem suam pio quidem animo amplecterentur, Deoque omnipotenti colla submitterent; eo victores hostium gloriose existerent; in quo sperare, sive inniti, veram semper victoriam esse affirmabat.\[313\]

It is important to note that although the *Vita Oswaldi* describes conversion in language with martial overtones – as a victory over the enemy (the devil) – it depicts Oswald using peaceful means to accomplish the victory.

The *Vita Oswaldi*’s treatment contrasts with a post-crusade version of the story in which Oswald becomes a crusading missionary, one who uses violence to expand Christianity. In the second half of the twelfth century, an author at Regensburg in Bavaria wrote a series of five Middle High German *Spielmannsepike* (minstrel tales), one of which – the *Münchener Oswald* – is loosely based on the story of Cynegisl’s conversion. In the poem, a talking raven acts as a messenger between Oswald and a pagan princess from a faraway land. The king embarks on a bride-quest to find the princess (as do all the heroes in the five

\[313\] VO, III.23-24 (coll. 98F-99A).
poems), eventually elopes with her, then battles her father, Aron. The Christian king defeats his father-in-law, which leads to Aron’s conversion to Christianity. As Annemiek Jansen has observed, by using the sword to bring Christianity to a distant pagan land, Oswald becomes the prototypical crusader. The poem even states that the saint had his men put crosses on their clothing, just as the crusaders did.\(^{314}\)

In Drogo’s texts, although Oswald expanded his rule by conquest the focus is on violence as a means to defend, not expand, Christianity. As pointed out above, the *Vita Oswaldi* presents a king who took care “to attend to the care of his kingdom, to guard its borders from the incursions of enemies, to provide for his own and his subjects’ salvation [my emphasis]” (*curam regni sui gerere, tutari fines suos ab inimicorum incursibus, providere suae suorumque saluti*).\(^ {315}\) In addition, according to the *Sermo secundus*, Oswald died “battling and fighting for his homeland and the Christian religion [my emphasis]” (*d certans pro patria pugnansque pro religione christiana*).\(^ {316}\)


\(^{315}\) VO, I.5 (col. 95A).

\(^{316}\) S2, 5, lines 112-31, p. 108.
Drogo’s idealized depiction of Oswald as a defender is puzzling since it conflicts so strongly with his own society’s experiences with kings. By the time that he wrote, it had been two hundred and fifty years since any monarch had been able to exercise regular authority within Flanders. Although King Lothar IV of West Francia (r. 954-86) had briefly controlled the south during Arnulf II’s minority (965-76), the later Carolingian, early Capetian, and Ottonian kings exercised little real power within the county. (See Map 5.) This was especially true under Baldwin IV (r. 988-1035) and Baldwin V (r. 1030/35-67), who ruled Flanders during Drogo’s life before he wrote about Oswald. More often than not, kings were actually the invaders rather than the defenders of Flanders. For example, in 1007, the emperor Henry II (r. 1002-24), recaptured the imperial fortress of Valenciennes taken by Baldwin IV a year earlier, then marched through Flanders, ravaging as he went. He captured Baldwin’s fortress at Ghent and threatened to carry away the relics of the town’s patron saints. In 1019, Robert II the Pious (r. 987/96-1031), the Capetian king of France and titular sovereign of Flanders, invaded the county and laid siege to Sithiu in an attempt to assert his power over the Ternois. In 1047, Baldwin V joined a rebellion against the emperor Henry III (r. 1039-56). In response, in 1049, Henry attacked

---

Flanders while King Edward the Confessor of England (r. 1042-66) and King Svein II of Denmark (r. 1047-74) blockaded the Flemish coast. Since Flemish power continued to increase along the imperial border, Henry III attacked Flanders again in 1054, causing extensive damage.

Drogo’s texts on the king-saint Oswald were not, however, exercises in nostalgia for a golden age when kings actually defended Flanders. Nor were they meant to encourage the Capetians or Ottonians to adopt the Northumbrian king-saint as a model. Drogo had no access to a royal court. Instead, they reflect and perhaps furthered the Flemish counts’ efforts to increase the power of their office. According to Geoffrey Koziol, French monarchs and their clerical propagandists used ritual and written presentations to depict the Capetian kings as guardians of their people and patrons of the Church. Koziol has also argued that the great territorial princes of northern France acquiesced to these royal pretensions because they stood to gain even more than they lost from royal claims. The princes claimed that in the traditional political order magnates like themselves shared in the king’s divine commission to provide justice, defend the kingdom and protect the Church. By making these claims, they hoped to separate themselves from lesser lords who ruled by military force alone. While


the kings gained relatively little real power from their efforts, the princes were able to make substantial gains. The counts of Flanders were particularly successful at using comparisons to royal authority to increase the status of their office. Chapter 2 describes how the Flemish counts adopted a Carolingian model of rulership within their territory. It was the counts who administered Flanders, defended it from attack, and acted as the chief patrons of its Church. Both Drogo and his audience would have compared Oswald to their counts, not their kings.

The first piece of the Flemish program, which dates primarily to Arnulf I (r. 918-65), was the adoption of increasingly exalted titles. For example, in a diploma granting donations to Saint-Pierre at Ghent in 941, Arnulf I referred to himself as a *markysus*. Usually translated as “marquis,” *markysus* or *marchio* was a term that originally denoted the royal official who guarded a frontier region called a march. By Arnulf’s time, however, it was merely a distinction given to powerful men as a sign of royal affection. The count’s use of the term is noteworthy because he applied it to himself regularly and as part of a larger program. In order to increase the effect, Arnulf encouraged the use of

---


322 Dunbabin, *France*, p. 47.
prestigious adjectives to modify his title. The *Vita s. Bertulphi Renticae*, for example, calls Arnulf the “renowned Marquis” (*inclytus Marchio*) and the “glorious Marquis” (*gloriosus Marquis*), as well as “the noblest man among the noblest men” (*in viris clarissimis clarissimus est*).\(^{323}\) The count’s success in associating the title with his office is evident from its continued use by his successors. In his charters, Arnulf II (r. 965-88) called himself “Arnulf the younger, glorious marquis” (*Arnulfus gloriosus marchysus iunior*) and “the renowned marquis” (*inclytus marquisus*); Baldwin IV was “Marquis Baldwin” (*marchio Balduinus*); Baldwin V was “the Marquis of Flanders” (*marchio Flandrensium*) and “most noble marquis of Flanders” (*clarissimus Flandrensium marchysus*).\(^{324}\)

A second element was the use of the formula “by the grace of God” (*gratia Dei*). Although Carolingian counts had used the formula on occasion, Arnulf adopted it with greater frequency to emphasize that he had received his office neither from royal delegation nor from *de facto* military power, but from God alone.\(^{325}\) He called himself “count by the grace of God” (*gratia Dei comes*), “count by the grace of Christ” (*gratia Xristi comes*), and “marquis by the supporting


mercy of the heavenly king” (amminiculante superni regis clementia markysus). Later counts also adopted the formula. For example, in 1047, Baldwin V called himself “marquis by the grace of God” (gratia Dei marchysus).

While titles and formulas raised the prestige of the comital office, marriages mixed the counts’ blood with that of kings, clouding the line between the counts of Flanders and their royal sovereigns. (See Appendix A for a genealogy of the counts of Flanders.) As Chapter 2 points out, Baldwin I married Judith, a Carolingian princess, who had already been the bride of two kings. In addition, one of Judith’s previous marriages also made Alfred the Great, king of Wessex (r. 871-99), Judith’s stepson. This familial connection resulted in another: about 883, Judith’s son, Baldwin II, married Alfred’s daughter, Æthelfryth (Elftrude). Thus, Arnulf I, only the third Flemish count, received royal blood from both of his parents. Unions with royal lines continued in later generations. In 976, Arnulf II, married Rozela, the daughter of King Berenger of Italy, and gave his family the most distinguished lineage of any non-royal house in Europe. In 1028, Baldwin V, married Adela, the daughter of the Capetian king of France Robert the Pious. By the 1050s when Drogo wrote about Oswald, the Flemish dynasty was linked to both the Carolingian and Capetian rulers of France and to

326 Gysseling, Diplomata belgica, no. 57, p. 150; no. 59, p. 154; no. 63, p. 143.
327 Gysseling, Diplomata belgica, no. 96, pp. 201-02.
328 Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, p. 20.
several Anglo-Saxon lines. (Later, Baldwin V’s daughter, Matilda, would also marry William the Bastard who later became King William the Conqueror of England.)

Like other members of the new western nobility, the Flemish counts called attention to their royal blood in order to increase their prestige. The *Genealogia Arnulfi comitis* was a notable expression of this emphasis. Between 951 and 959, the priest Witger, working at Saint-Bertin, produced a genealogy of the comital family for Arnulf I. It begins with the Carolingian Arnulf of Metz’s grandfather, Ansbert, and traces fourteen generations of the Carolingian family in several of its branches. It also carefully notes Baldwin’s wife, Judith’s, place in the Carolingian line. A heading then follows the note on Judith, “Here begins the holy bloodline of the most glorious count, Lord Arnulf [I], and his son, Baldwin [III], whom the Lord deems worthy to protect in this world” (*Hic incipit sancta prosapia Domni Arnulfi comitis gloriosissimi filiique eius Balduini quos Dominus in hoc secolo dignetur protegere*). The text slides smoothly from the Carolingian to the Flemish dynasty. The first line of the next section reads, “Which Judith most wise and beautiful the most brave count Baldwin [I] united with himself in the

---


bond of matrimony” (Quam Iudith prudentissimam ac spetiosam sociavit sibi
Balduinus comes fortissimus in matrimonii coniugium). Reaching Baldwin II, who
married Alfred the Great’s daughter, the Genealogia notes that “Baldwin accepted
a wife from a most noble race of kings from across the sea” (Balduinus accepta
uxore de nobilissima progenie regum ultramarinorum). Although it was common
for territorial princes to display their connections to royalty, especially to the
Carolingian kings, Arnulf began the practice earlier than his peers and was not
forced to fabricate relationships as were others.

Other works followed the Genealogia in a chain of histories and
genealogies that stretched down to the sixteenth century. Both the counts and
the authors who sang their praises evinced pride in the comital dynasty’s royal
connections, as well as the fact that the comital office descended in the male line
from Baldwin I (r. 863-79) until the death of Baldwin VII (r. 1111-19).)
According to Koziol, “by the late eleventh century, extolling the [Flemish]
counts’ ancestry had become a standard technique for praising them.” For

333 Witger, Genealogia Arnulfi, p. 303.
334 Witger, Genealogia Arnulfi, p. 303.
335 Raoul C. Van Caenegem, “The Sources of Flemish History in the Liber
Floridus,” Liber Floridus Colloquium: Papers read at the international meeting held in
the university library Ghent on 3-5 September 1967, ed. Albert Derolez (Gand, 1973),
p. 72-3.
337 Koziol, Begging Pardon, p. 241.
example, the author of the *Vita Bertulfi* (c. 1073) described Arnulf I’s genealogy this way:

Thus, [Arnulf] proceeded from the blood of great kings, [Arnulf] whom Elstrudis, daughter of Edgher, king of the English, bore to Baldwin [II] the Bald; not less of noble blood from his father than from his mother; since from his father’s side he drew his great-grandfather, Charles the Bald, the king of the Franks, [and] from his mother’s side, as was said, he drew his grandfather, Edgher, the king of the English.

Processit itaque hic a sanguine magnorum regum, quem Balduino Calvo peperit Elstrudis, filia Edgheri regis Anglorum; non minus ingenui sanguinis a patre, quam a matre; quia a patre regem Francorum Carolum Calvum proavum, a matre, ut dictum est, Edgerum regem Anglorum traxit avum.\(^{338}\)

The author of the *Sermo de adventu s. Wandregesili* made even more extravagant claims. After repeating Arnulf I’s descent, he claimed:

Therefore, [Arnulf I] drew from St. Arnulf [of Metz], that is, the grandfather of the most holy father Wandrille, both a name and a descent from the blood of the Romans, who were formerly [from the blood] of the Trojans.\(^{339}\)

\(^{338}\) *Vita Bertulfi*, vi.26 (col. 682B-C).

\(^{339}\) The *Vita altera s. Wandregisili*, produced in 870, linked St. Wandrille and his father to the Carolingian line; See Nicholas N. Huyghebaert, O.S.B., *Une translation de reliques à Gand en 944: Le Sermo de Adventu Sanctorum Wandregisili*, 174
Hic igitur a sancto Arnulfo, avo scilicet sanctissimi patris Vuandregisili, et nomen traxit et genus a sanguine Romanorum, qui et olim Trojanorum.\textsuperscript{340} Although this work dates to the early twelfth century, it probably revises an earlier work from the middle of the tenth century which may also have contained this claim.\textsuperscript{341} Finally, in 1127, Galbert of Bruges neatly summarized Count Charles I the Good’s (r. 1119-27) heritage this way:

His ancestors were among the best and most powerful rulers who from the beginning of the Holy Church had flourished in France, Flanders, Denmark, and under the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{342}

\textit{Meliores et potentiores, qui a principio sanctae ecclesiae, sive in Francia, sive in Flandria, sive in Datia, sive tandem sub Romano imperio floruissent, progenitores ejus fuerunt.}\textsuperscript{343}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{340} \textit{Sermo de adventu}, ch. 21 (Huyghebaert, \textit{Une translation}, pp. 23-4).

\textsuperscript{341} Nicholas N. Huyghebaert, O.S.B., Introduction, \textit{Une translation de reliques à Gand en 944: Le Sermo de Adventu Sanctorum Wandregisili, Ansberti et Vulframni in Blandinium} (Bruxelles: Académie royale de Belgique, 1978), pp. LXXV-LXXXVIII.

\textsuperscript{342} Charles I was the son of Adela of Flanders and Cnut IV, king of Denmark (r. 1081-86).

The convergence of title, formula and lineage in Flemish ideology is most apparent in expressions characterizing Flanders as a principality. In these expressions, the term *monarchia* that was used for the county of Flanders demonstrates that the territory was something more than a Carolingian *pagus* or *comitatus* – a term that denoted a castellany in the eleventh century. For example, Baldwin V’s charter from 1047, mentioned above, includes the phrase, “with the glorious marquis, Baldwin, ruling the principality of Flanders,” (*Flandrensium monarchiam moderante Balduino glorioso marchys*).\(^\text{344}\) The counts also promoted the notion that, like kings, they ruled this principality by hereditary succession. The *Vita secunda s. Winnoci* (c. 1064) states that Baldwin II “received the principality of Flanders from his ancestors” (*a progenitoribus Flandriae monarchiam sortitus*).\(^\text{345}\) Similarly, the *Vita Bertulphi* (c. 1073), states that “By the grace of God, [Baldwin IV] now succeeded to the rule of the principality of Flanders according to hereditary succession” (*qui ex successione hæreditaria in principatu monarchiæ Flandrensis, gratia Dei, iam convalverat*).\(^\text{346}\)

The counts also staged ceremonies of *adventus* (approach) and *occursus* (arrival) as they traveled through Flanders. These ceremonies traditionally honored the arrival of kings and relics at towns, but the great princes adopted

\(^\text{344}\) Gysseling, *Diplomata belgica*, no. 96, pp. 201-02.

\(^\text{345}\) VS, XVI (col. 272E).

\(^\text{346}\) *Vita Bertulphi*, ix.37 (col. 685E).
them for their own use in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Usually, the populace would advance to meet the counts some distance outside the town, carrying crosses, candles and incense. The crowd would sing hymns of praise as it processed. Such honors reinforced the lofty position the counts claimed for themselves.347

In addition to their other efforts to bring the status of their office closer to that of kings, the counts also claimed for themselves the role of chief patron of the Church in Flanders. They began by casting themselves as the guardians of piety at ecclesiastical foundations. Both Baldwin II and Arnulf I acquired the lay abbacy of several monasteries, including the two greatest Flemish abbeys, Saint-Pierre at Ghent and Saint-Bertin at Sithiu. In addition, both usurped many monastic properties. In 941, however, Arnulf, urged by Bishop Transmar of Tournai (937-51), invited the Lotharingian monastic reformer Gérard de Brogne (d. 959) to reform Saint-Pierre.348 Gérard converted the chapter of canons there to a community of Benedictine monks and instituted strict observance of Benedict’s Rule, while Arnulf restored its properties and buildings.349

347 Koziol, Begging Pardon, p. 134 and 134 n. 85.


The success of the reforms at Saint-Pierre led Arnulf to compare himself to Judas Maccabeus, the Hebrew king of Judah:

Arnulf, marquis by the supporting mercy of the heavenly king, [to] the faithful soldiers of the holy church wherever they are placed in rank by the universal God. It is read in the divinely written books of the Maccabees that the temple of God at Jerusalem was destroyed by the most wicked king, Antiochus, which temple Judas Maccabeus rebuilt after many difficult triumphs in battle, and that he adorned it with gold and silver which he took from the spoils of the enemy, indeed on account of this deed he believed that the assistance of the king of the heavens had been granted to him from heaven. Encouraged by the desire to imitate the example of that man, I, the most humble Arnulf, rejoicing at the thought of what was to be done, made myself a companion of those, who, maintaining the precepts of the Lord, transform earthly patrimonies into heavenly treasures…

Arnulfus amminiculante superni regis clementia markysus, sanctae ecclesiae fidelibus quocumque passim ordine Deo catholice militantibus. Legitur in Machabeorum libris divitus exaratis destructum Hierosolimis templum Dei ab Antiocho regum nefandissimo, quod post multos gravissimosque bellorum triumphos Iuda Machabeus restruxerit, ac auro atque argento quae de hostium spoliis adquirebat decoraverit, quo scilicet facto credebat sibi affore auxilium e
caelo regis polorum. Huius igitur exempli aviditate incitatus, ego humillimus Arnulfus, toto mentis conamine illorum gestiens particeps effici, qui praecepta servantes dominica terrena caelestes ad thesauros transtulerunt patrimonia…

The image of the count as patron of the Flemish Church became part of the regular presentation of comital authority. For example, the Genealogia Arnulfi comitis states:

Indeed, Lord Arnulf, most venerable count and most beloved to the Lord Jesus Christ, exceptional in wisdom, excelling in counsel, dazzling with all goodness, most perfect restorer of the churches of God, most pious comforter of widows, orphans, and wards, most merciful dispensor to all in need seeking help from him. What more? If anyone should have a hundred mouths and tongues, he would never be able to enumerate the gifts of his benefits.

Domnus vero Arnulfus comes venerabilissimus atque domino Iesu Christo amantissimus, prudentia eximius, consilio pollens, omni bonitate fulgens, ecclesiarum Dei perfectissimus reparator, viduarum orfanorum ac pupillorum piissimus consolator, omnibus in necessitate auxilium ab eo petentibus clementissimus dispensator. Quid amplius? si centum ora linguasque quis haberet, eius benefitiorum dona nequaquam enarrare valeret.  

---

350 Gysseling, Diplomata belgica, no. 63, pp. 143-6.

351 Witger, Genealogia Arnulfi, p. 303.
Arnulf continued to donate funds and relics to the abbeys of Flanders throughout his life, and he gave several more monasteries, including Saint-Bertin, to Gérard de Brogne for reform.

Baldwin IV and Baldwin V also adopted the role of chief patron of the Church in Flanders during Drogo’s lifetime. They supported their own Lotharingian monastic reformer, Richard of Saint-Vanne, and continued to donate to monastic communities. Baldwin V was especially noted as a builder of monasteries and churches. Even more importantly, however, Baldwin IV and Baldwin V made special efforts to increase their authority by supporting the Peace of God. In 1024, Baldwin IV took advantage of a council at Douai to promote an image of himself as the protector of the Cambrésis. Douai lay in the Flemish part of the Cambrésis, a region that Baldwin had been trying to wrest from the control of Bishops Erluin (995-1012) and Gérard I (1012-51) of Cambrai.352 In 1030, Baldwin himself called a council at Oudenaarde where he and Baldwin V reconciled after the latter’s rebellion. By calling the council, the two counts (Baldwin V shared in the administration of the county after the reconciliation) hoped to promote the restoration of order in their territory. They also hoped to foster an aura of sacrality around their office. Baldwin IV summoned the relics of saints from the principal comital foundations and had the nobles swear their oaths on these relics. As Koziol has described it, “the

assembly of saints must have looked not a little like a gathering of the count’s supernatural patrons, called out like oathhelpers to show his favor in heaven.”

Winnoc, the chief patron saint of Drogo’s abbey, was among the saints at this gathering. The assembly of relics also would have highlighted comital patronage of the most powerful monasteries in Flanders. As Chapter 2 notes, Baldwin V and later counts gathered the same group of relics for other councils as well.

The Flemish counts’ patronage of Drogo’s abbey suggests that the hagiographer may have been deliberately invoking an image of the counts in his texts on Oswald. Baldwin V’s charter from 1067, which confirmed Saint-Winnoc’s rights and privileges, provides detailed evidence of comital intervention at Drogo’s abbey. The charter describes the counts as the guardians of religious life within the community. First, it specifies that Baldwin II “founded a church in honor of the holy confessors, Martin and Winnoc, and established canons there [at Bergues] who should serve God day and night,” (in honore Sanctorum Confessorum Martini & Winnoci Ecclesiam fundavit, & Canonicos, qui diu noctuque Deo servirent, ibidem instituit). Then, it states that many years later, Baldwin IV built a new church dedicated to Winnoc and moved the saint’s relics there, along with the canons. The arrangement was not to last:

353 Koziol, Begging Pardon and Favor, pp. 136.

since pleasure accompanied affluence, and forgetfulness of the commandments of God accompanied pleasure, the aforementioned canons, led astray by their own desires, were found not very much devoted, nay nearly ignorant, regarding the matters which concern God.

\textit{quoniam rerum affluentiam delitiæ, delitias autem comitatur Dei mandatorum oblivio, præfati Canonici, propriis voluptatibus inescati, circa ea, quæ Dei sunt, non nimis devoti, imo penitus ignavi reperti sunt.}\footnote{Miræus, \textit{Opera diplomatica}, p. 512.}

According to the charter, when Baldwin IV discovered this laxity, “he eradicated the root of sins entirely lest it should spring forth again,” (\textit{radicem vitiorum, ne amplius pulularet, funditus exstirpavit}). The count expelled the canons and founded a Benedictine community under the Lotharingian reformer Richard of Saint-Vanne’s disciple, Roderic of Saint-Vaast.

A cartulary from the abbey of Saint-Winnoc dating before the second half of the sixteenth century, paints an even more colorful picture:

And indeed, Baldwin with the handsome beard, count of Flanders, a man strong in virtue, defender of the church of God, friend of monks, on a certain night wishing to experience the religious rite and diligent conversation of the canons of Saint-Martin of Bergues – for by strong rumor and report he had heard much that was bad regarding these canons – when the custodian opened the church at the sounding of matins, [the
count] entered in disguise (in changed clothing) as though he would pray…

Etenim Balduinus pulchra barba, Flandriæ comes, vir virtute potens, ecclesiæ Dei defensor, monachorumque amator, nocte quadam experiri volens religiosum ritum ac conversationem diligentem canonicorum sancti Martini Bergensis – multa namque sinistra de iis firma fama et relatione intellexerat – dum custos ad pulsandam matutinam synaxim ecclesiam aperiret, habitu mutato, quasi oraturus intravit…

Finding that none of the canons arrived to celebrate matins and that they were not accustomed to keeping the vigils, the count decided to expel them and reform the community. Both Baldwin V’s charter and the later source depict the counts with the authority to pass judgment on ecclesiastical matters.

Drogo’s presentation of Oswald supports a perception of continuity between the sacrality of the role of rex iustus and the sanctity of martyrdom. In fulfilling the duties of the rex iustus, Oswald became a martyr and a saint. The image of the rex iustus in the Vita Oswaldi, Sermo primus de s. Oswaldo and Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo closely parallels the image of royal authority promoted by the French kings. Thus, the texts cast an additional aura of divine sanction over the royal office. Since the counts of Flanders claimed to share in ruling along

---

with the kings, Drogo’s presentation implies divine sanction for comital authority as well. Certainly, the counts acted like *reges iusti* within their own territory.

Although Drogo addressed only his monastic brothers in the prologue to the *Vita Oswaldi*, and although he wrote the sermons in Latin, the audiences for these texts are not clear.\(^{357}\) In the manuscript Bergues 19 from Saint-Winnoc, the *Vita Oswaldi* appears with *lectio* markings, indicating that parts of the text may have been read during the liturgy on certain occasions. Both the genre and brevity of the sermons suggest that they too may have been read aloud on liturgical occasions. In both instances, the texts would have meshed with the counts’ broader ideological program. It is also possible that the texts were translated for delivery in the vernacular on these occasions. Since the comital court of Flanders was itinerant and often stayed at the *castrum* in Bergues, it is likely that the counts were present for at least some of these deliveries. At the very least, Drogo’s presentation demonstrates the influence of the counts’ ideological program on his political thinking.

\(^{357}\) *VO, Prologus.2* (col. 94C).
3.8 Conclusion

Drogo’s texts on Oswald demonstrate how the virtues of a long-dead saint could have relevance for contemporary society. Subtle modifications could indicate major developments in saintly typologies. In this case, Drogo’s alterations to Bede’s presentation of Oswald indicate changes in how people perceived the relationship both between the exercise of secular authority and sanctity and between the authority of kings and counts.
4.1 Introduction

Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s fourth work, the *Historia translationis sanctae Lewinnae, virginis et martiris* [BHL 4902], which he composed around 1060, highlights the intercessory power – the second use of *virtus* – of its subject, Lewinna. According to the *Historia translationis*, in 1058, the monastery of Saint-Winnoc obtained the relics of another seventh-century, Anglo-Saxon saint, named Lewinna (O.E. *Leofwynn*). The text also states that she was a virgin martyr killed by pagan Saxons, perhaps during the reign of King Ecgberht of Kent (r. 664-73)\(^{358}\). According to the text, a monk from Drogo’s community, named Balger, performed a *translatio* (transfer or translation, to use the more common cognate) of the saint’s bones from England to Flanders. The monk had acquired the bones by stealing them from St. Andrew’s minster at a place, called *Seuordt*, in southern England. A short time after Balger’s return, the abbey constructed a reliquary adorned with silver and gold, then used it to take the

\(^{358}\) *HT*, i.IV.38 (col. 620B); See John Blair [Forthcoming] for the historical context.
saint on a delatio (tour) through Flanders during which she performed several miracles. The text also reports four miracles that the saint performed from her shrine at Saint-Winnoc.

This chapter analyzes the Historia translationis from two perspectives. First, it analyzes the process of transferring a saint from one community to another and explores the relationships between members of a community in the temporal world and a patron saint in the eternal world. It demonstrates that, as scholars have observed, the relationship was personal, not physical or spatial. People sought the aid of a living person when they petitioned a saint. This perception of a saint’s nature required that both the ecclesiastical community that cared for the saint’s shrine and the lay community that provided the most direct support for the shrine accept the saint as a member of their communities. This process was both complex and difficult.

Second, an important part of the process of establishing a saint’s cult in a new shrine was the composition of a written memoria for the saint that articulated his or her place in the new community. In this respect, it may be more accurate to say that Drogo, not Balger, translated Lewinna to Flanders. Just as when an idea is translated from a word in one language to a word in another it loses some of its original associations and gains new ones, so too did Lewinna lose some of her former associations and gain new ones in the process of becoming a patron saint.
saint in Flanders. This chapter will consider both what Drogo memorialized in writing and what he might have deliberately forgotten—what he might have decided to leave “lost in translation.”

4.2 Lewinna’s Cult

It was primarily Drogo’s responsibility to craft the “official” (the version approved by his institution) guide to how Lewinna would be remembered in writing. Although the Historia translationis ostensibly belongs to the translatio genre, the work actually played a larger role in Lewinna’s cult than the title would suggest. It contains the only version of the saint’s written memoria. Considering that Lewinna had only recently arrived in Flanders when Drogo wrote, the Historia translationis is remarkably diverse and comprehensive. This section will consider the function of the text in Lewinna’s cult and its importance as a source for the process of introducing a saint to a new community.

Martin Heinzelmann has traced the development of the translatio genre from Late Antiquity through the thirteenth century. According to Heinzelmann, its origins lie in the fourth century, when Christians conducted the first translationes and wrote sermons about them. Scholars have suggested various literary influences on these early accounts, including the Roman practice of giving a speech at a funeral (laudatio funebris), the panegyrics addressed to rulers at their ceremonial entrances (adventus) into cities, and early Christian letter
writing. Patrick Geary has also cited the account of the discovery (inventio) of the True Cross, which describes the Cross’s translation by Empress Helena, as an important early influence. Until the eighth century, translatio accounts usually formed sections of vitae or passiones, not independent works.

The key period – what Heinzelmann has dubbed the “classical period” – in the development of the translatio genre fell between the eighth and the eleventh centuries. Numerous translationes occurred during this period, first as a result of better ties with Rome from which many relics came and later as a result of the dislocations caused by invasions. In addition, the translatio account first emerged as an independent hagiographic genre during this period. Einhard’s *Translatio ss. Marcellini et Petri* [BHL 5230-33], composed between 828 and 834, was particularly influential: Heinzelmann has described it as the closest thing the genre had to a prototype. Although Einhard’s account comprised four books, most translatio accounts were transmitted in shorter formats intended for use as liturgical readings on the feast of the saint or the anniversary of the translatio. As

---


a result, the development of the genre broadly paralleled its use in the liturgy. After the eleventh century, ecclesiastical institutions performed fewer and fewer *translationes* and the genre declined in popularity.\(^{362}\)

Heinzelmann has also noted that despite significant variations most *translatio* accounts address certain basic issues. First, they report on the origins of newly-acquired relics. This includes *inventiones* of previously forgotten or neglected saints’ tombs, relic thefts, and the miracles performed during these acquisitions. The accounts also describe the transportation of relics to new shrines – trips that could require a month or more. Finally, they report on the arrival and reception of the relics along with some of the miracles performed in the new community.\(^{363}\)

Drogo’s *Historia translationis* contains two books, whose contents he described in the prologue to Book I:

But, [regarding] how her most holy bones were carried from the land of the Angles to Flanders and were honorably deposited in that place which is called Bergues, by no means will we be silent, because we know this was done by the providence of the Lord and her own will. The first book indeed will contain this, but the second will describe the miracles, which on account of her merits, the omnipotent Lord saw fit to do.

\(^{362}\) Heinzelmann, *Translationsberichte*, pp. 43, 89-92.

Verum qualiter ab Anglorum terra Flandriam delata sint eius sanctissima ossa, & in loco qui Bergas dicitur honorabiliter recollocata; haud tacebimus, quod quia prouidentia domini suaque uoluntate actum sit cognovimus. Id siquidem primus libellus continebit, secundus uero miracula quæ propter eius merita facere dignatus est omnipotens dominus declarabit.364

Thus, Drogo himself placed his text’s contents in at least two different hagiographic genres. He described the first book as a *translatio* account and the second as a *liber miraculorum*. Although in the eleventh and twelfth centuries it was most common to find a *liber miraculorum* attached to a *vita*, examples of *libri miraculorum* attached to *translatio* accounts do exist.365

The classification of the *Historia translationis* is even more complicated than Drogo’s description suggests. The hagiographer covered all of the topics mentioned in Heinzelmann’s *translatio* outline in the first two thirds of Book I. Then, a section that mixes the *vita* and *passio* genres completes the last third of the book. Book II begins by describing the *delatio* that the monks of Saint-Winnoc conducted with Lewinna’s relics. The *delatio* account could be classified as a second *translatio* account, but it is less about the journey itself than the miracles
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364 *HT, Prologus primus*.7 (col. 614C-D).

the saint performed. As a result, it is more easily classified as part of the *liber miraculorum* Drogo mentioned in his prologue. The final section of Book II adds four miracles that Lewinna performed from her shrine at Bergues.

A table of contents might represent the text this way:

Dedicatory Epistle (§§1-3)

Prologus primus (§§4-7)

Book I (§§8-47)

*Translatio* (§§8-40)

*Vita et Passio* (§§41-47)

Prologus secundus (§48)

Book II (§§49-72)

*Exordium alterum* (§§49-50)

*Liber miraculorum* (§§51-72)

*Delatio* (§§51-65)

Bergues miracles (§§66-72)

Given the fluidity of the *translatio* genre, however, it seems unproductive to try to make a definitive judgment about the genres to which the *Historia translationis* or its constituent parts belong. Instead, it is more fruitful to consider the work’s place in Lewinna’s cult.
By the time Drogo wrote, it had become traditional for a saint’s dossier – the collection of documents that transmitted the written version of his or her memoria – to include three elements. First, there was usually some form of “biography,” either a vita for a confessor, a passio for a martyr or a mixture of the two that discussed the saint’s virtues. Second, if the saint’s relics had been moved, either from a crypt to a shrine in the sanctuary or from one shrine to another, the dossier would include a translatio account. Third, a section on the saint’s posthumous miracles updated the dossier with the saint’s posthumous vita, particularly in the case of early medieval saints whose cults were still active in the Central Middle Ages. Essentially, the dossier contained documents that affirmed the sanctity of its subject, authenticated the relics and urged people to visit a certain shrine to access the saint’s intercessory power. A glance at the contents of the Historia translationis reveals that it contains all of these elements. The text provides Lewinna’s entire dossier.

Because the Historia translationis contains Lewinna’s full dossier, written no more than two or three years after her arrival in Flanders, it provides an unusually comprehensive look at the creation of a local saint’s cult. Although the text presents Drogo’s hagiographic reconstruction of the process, the fact that its audience included the people who had witnessed Lewinna’s arrival suggests that the community of Saint-Winnoc would not have preserved the text unless
there was broad agreement that it represented a true version of the events it reports. Drogo’s construction of the past probably expressed the perceptions of those who lived it (who included Drogo himself).

4.3 Rites of Passage

It is clear that Drogo thought of Lewinna’s corporal relics as the saint herself. In the dedicatory epistle that precedes Book I, the text states that Drogo “was made anxious by a certain interval of time [passing], lest the arrival of the virgin arranged by the highest Craftsman should be consigned to oblivion” (aliqua intercapedine temporis michi timebam, ne oblivioni traderetur adventus uirginis a summo opifice dispositus).³⁶⁶ It was not a dead body but Lewinna herself who arrived at Saint-Winnoc. Drogo’s perception was not unique. Patrick Geary has noted that most, if not all, hagiographers wrote about saints this way, and because hagiographic literature was so important in the Middle Ages, it is likely that many of their contemporaries shared this view.³⁶⁷ A collection of medieval practices concerning corporal relics lends support to this conclusion. First, dead saints had legal rights, including the right to own the monasteries and churches where their tombs were located. Second, saints, represented by their corporal relics, stood as witnesses to legal oaths of various sorts, the rough equivalent of
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³⁶⁶ HT, Epistola.2 (col. 613C).

³⁶⁷ Geary, Furta Sacra, p. 124.
placing one’s hand on a bible in court to swear to give true testimony. Third, people offered gifts to the saints even though the gifts were eventually used by the institutions that housed their shrines.\footnote{Geary, Furta Sacra, p. 124.} Fourth, religious communities could subject relics to ritual “humiliations” and “clamors” in which they degraded, scourged, or supplicated corporal relics just as though they were dealing with living people.\footnote{Patrick Geary, “Humiliation of saints,” in Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 123-40.} Finally, hagiographers and liturgists referred to the day of a saint’s death as his or her \textit{dies natalis} (birthday) into eternal life.

The claim that corporal relics were living beings opens up analytical possibilities for how we can approach \textit{translatio} accounts. In particular, Geary has argued that we can use Arnold van Gennep’s anthropological model of “rites of passage” to understand the process of incorporating a saint into a new community.\footnote{Patrick Geary, \textit{Furta Sacra}, pp. 126-28.} In \textit{Les rites de passage}, van Gennep has written that humans experience transitions between different states of existence and that these transitions are accompanied by rites that govern them – rites of passage from adolescence into manhood or womanhood are good examples. He has suggested a three-stage outline for such transitions: first, a person experiences “separation” from his or her previous state, second, he or she enters a marginal state called

\footnote{\textit{Les rites de passage}, pp. 126-28.}
“transition,” finally the process is completed by a third stage, “incorporation” or “aggregation” into a new state of being. Van Gennep has also offered the terms, “preliminal,” “liminal,” and “postliminal,” as alternative terms for these stages. Among these, liminality has become the most commonly used term for the middle stage. In addition, Victor Turner, in writing about pilgrimage, has expanded the concept of liminality to include “all phases of decisive cultural change in which previous orderings of thought and behavior are subject to revision and criticism.” According to Turner, people in liminal states exist in an ambiguous zone of potential outcomes. Separation places them outside of or on the margins of society, and their state upon incorporation is not predetermined. Liminality is a state of possibility rather than predictability.

Geary has described the passage recorded in translatio accounts as having stages that broadly parallel Heinzelmann’s outline of the typical translatio account. First, separation occurs when the relics of the saint are removed from their original resting place. During this phase, the narrative confirms the saint’s power in association with his or her relics: the saint often performs miracles during the translation and can even refuse to allow the removal of his or her

---


373 Turner, Image and pilgrimage, pp. 2-3.
relics until convinced by entreaties. The subsequent journey between old and new shrines marks the liminal stage. Here, the relics can encounter significant dangers, including loss, destruction, denial of their authenticity and even denial of the saint’s sanctity if being moved to a new community. Finally, the relics’ placement in the new shrine, marked by an adventus, a depositio and similar rites, marks incorporation. Usually, the saint performs some sort of miracle after incorporation as well. This outline describes the basic narrative of Lewinna’s theft as told in the Historia translationis. It is, however, only an outline. The actual process of creating a connection to heaven at Saint-Winnoc was more complex and more difficult than the outline suggests.

4.4 Translatio: From England to Flanders

Drogo’s first task was to record how Lewinna’s relics reached Saint-Winnoc. After reading his account, most modern readers would probably be surprised that Drogo and his community chose to record their acquisition of Lewinna at all, or rather, that the monks did not suppress the fact that they had obtained the relics by theft: at first blush, thievery seems a fundamentally immoral act. Where corporal relics are concerned, this appears to be mostly a modern prejudice inspired by a heightened concern for property rights. In the Middle Ages, a furtum sacrum (sacred theft) was an accepted and even laudable
means of acquiring corporal relics. Geary has raised this issue directly in his groundbreaking monograph on *furta sacra*. It states:

From the reign of Charles the Great until the age of the crusades, we have nearly one hundred relic theft accounts... These stories are, at first reading, bizarre... But even more bizarre for modern readers is the almost universal approval of contemporaries who heard of these thefts. Far from condemning them as aberrations or as sins against the fellow Christians from whom the saints were stolen, most people apparently praised them as true works of Christian virtue, and communities... boasted of their successful thefts.\(^{374}\)

As frequently happens, medieval attitudes defy modern expectations.

Hagiographic accounts indicate a hierarchy of preference concerning the means used to acquire relics. Generally, the most desirable way to obtain relics seems to have been to draw them from within a community. One of its members could be recognized as a saint or the *inventio* of a previously unknown or forgotten saint’s relics could occur. Absent these situations, communities looked to thefts, gifts and purchases. Hagiographic sources indicate a preference for theft over both gift-giving and what most modern people would regard as “fair” commercial transactions.

\(^{374}\) Geary, *Furta Sacra*, p. xii.
Both gift-giving and selling could result in problems for communities that acquired relics through these means. In a society in which a gift-exchange economy was prominent, gifts could create unwanted relationships. Specifically, they could subordinate the receiver to the giver or make the receiver beholden in some way. For example, giving relics became a way for the papacy to advance its primacy over the West by obligating the recipients to Rome.\textsuperscript{375} Buying relics was also problematic. Written accounts suggest that before the late twelfth century, many people had deep reservations about the profit-motive. They apparently considered selling to a friend dishonorable and trading with one’s enemies cowardly.\textsuperscript{376} It was also difficult enough to convince people that anonymous bits of bone and flesh were the authentic relics of a saint without the need to overcome suspicions of commercial fraud. In addition, the ecclesiastical hierarchy was wary of relic purchases because they could place access to the sacred outside its authority.\textsuperscript{377} Finally, both gifts and purchases could generate questions about a saint’s power: why would anyone willingly part with the relics of a powerful patron saint?

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{376} Geary, “Commodities,” p. 173.
\textsuperscript{377} Geary, “Commodities,” p. 185.
\end{flushright}
*Furta sacra* appear to have avoided many of these problems. They created no relationships with the original community. They testified to the value of the saint as a patron because the relics were taken without consent. Since many of the reported thieves were members of religious communities, they also kept relics in ecclesiastical hands. Thus, there were strong incentives to record the acquisition of new relics as the result of a *furtum sacrum*, even when the situation was quite otherwise.\(^{378}\)

In addition, relic thefts were not ordinary thefts, because corporal relics were not ordinary objects. Hagiographic texts register approval for *furta sacra* because they claim that relics could not be taken without the consent of the saints to whom they belonged. The saints were just too powerful. Often, hagiographic texts state that saints miraculously prevented thefts or prevented them for a time by making reliquaries too heavy to carry. If thieves solved this problem, it was usually by begging and pleading for a saint’s permission to take the relics. The thieves solicited consent for the translation by offering the saint better treatment in a new community. For this reason, Geary has suggested that *furta sacra* paralleled the early medieval:

> custom of ritual “kidnappings” of brides by their prospective husbands,

> the theft of relics was at once a kidnapping and a seduction; overcome by
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the force of the thief’s ardor and devotion, the saint allowed himself to be swept away to a new life in a new family.\textsuperscript{379}

Again, beliefs about the nature of corporal relics as living beings dictated how their removals and acquisitions were perceived.

Book I of the \textit{Historia translationis} devotes considerable attention to narrating Lewinna’s movement from England to Flanders, describing in some detail the theft of her relics perpetrated by Balger, a monk from Saint-Winnoc. The account begins by stating that although Balger wanted to sail to Dover (\textit{Douere}) on some unspecified business for his abbey, he boarded a ship whose crew intended to sell goods at another, unnamed English port. An unfavorable wind, however, blew the ship westward past both Dover and the sailors’ destination as well as several more ports on the southern coast of England. After three days, the master of the ship, an experienced navigator, guided them to a harbor at a place that the account calls \textit{Seuordt}.\textsuperscript{380}

The next day, Balger spied a church from the harbor, and since it was Easter, he and another monk walked toward the church to celebrate Mass. Along the way, they met an old man whom they questioned about the church. He informed them that they were walking toward the minster of St. Andrew (\textit{monasterium sancti Andreae}) – medieval sources referred to minsters as \textit{monasteria}\textsuperscript{379 geometric, \textit{Furta Sacra}, p. 133.\textsuperscript{380} \textit{HT}, i.I.8-10 (coll. 614E-15B).
or mynstru. The old man also mentioned that it contained the bones of St. Lewinna, who was so holy “that the heavenly power displays itself through her each day,” (celestis uirtus per eam omni die ostendit).

The two Flemish monks reached the church, celebrated Mass, and then examined the interior of the church. Discovering Lewinna’s reliquary (loculus), Balger asked a priest there about pieces of parchment (scedas membranarum) with English writing on them affixed to the walls around Lewinna’s shrine. The priest stated that they recorded the miraculous cures the saint had performed and then provided a synopsis. This prompted Balger to try to buy or barter for some of the virgin martyr’s relics. The priest, however, rebuffed him with horror:

Then, disturbed by [Balger’s] insolence, [the priest] responded, “Father! Do you not know what you say? Is it proper that a servant of God wishes this, fitting that he utters it, suitable that he does this? Although some fool might wish to commit this crime, you being prudent, you being wise, you a servant of God ought to prevent it!

Tunc commotus animo huius insolentia, respondit, Pape, scisne quæ loqueris? An decet seruum dei id uelle, conuenit dicere, oportet facere? Quanquam quis


382 HT, i.I.12 (col. 615D).

383 HT, i.I.13-14 (coll. 615D-F).
The priest went on to question Balger’s character, causing the monk to explain away his request as a mere joke. Although this exchange casts Balger in a somewhat unfavorable light, Drogo seems to have included it in order to affirm the saint’s value to her original community and to refute potential accusations that the relics were purchased.  

Undeterred, Balger spent the rest of the day praying before Lewinna’s reliquary, examining it and testing it for a way to gain access to its contents. He prayed that God and Lewinna might grant him an opportunity to bear her bones “to a better place… where her honor would be greater, and she would be held in worthy veneration, as she seemed to be neglected by all in that place,” (ad meliorem locum… ubi suus maior honor foret, dignæque haberetur uenerationi, quæ eodem in loco uti uidebatur ab omnibus esset neglectui). Not only does this passage begin Balger’s attempt to woo the saint, but it also indicts the English community’s treatment of her. Geary has noted that hagiographers frequently cited neglect as part of the justification for a furtum sacrum.
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384 *HT*, i.I.15 (col. 615F).


386 *HT*, i.I.16 (col. 616A).

The monk of Saint-Winnoc kept vigil in front of the reliquary that night and all the next day. He also seems to have begun chanting the psalter in its entirety. When the church’s custodian (aeditus) wanted to leave for a time, Balger convinced the man to allow him to remain alone with the relics. He then approached the reliquary and tried to lift it, “but it stuck fast as if rooted to the earth, it was not able to be moved, nor to be lifted, nor to be turned on its side in any direction,” (sed aeci terrae radicitus hæreret moveri non potuit, non eleuari, non aliquorsum in latera flecti). He retreated, prayed, then tried again but failed to move it. Finally:

he picked up a leather strap, tied it around his neck and placed its end over the reliquary of the saint of God, and he said, "Take me, my venerable virgin, as your servant in perpetuity; only allow yourself to be moved, allow yourself to be led away, allow yourself to be carried to a better height and veneration of your station and to be borne to the devotion of a greater service." Trembling at these words, and kneeling in submission he placed his hand on it, and immediately lifted the reliquary.

Corrigiam unam sumit, collo suo circumligat summitatesque eius super loculum sanctae dei ponit. Suscipe ait mi venerabilis uirgo me perpetuo seruum, tantum sine te moueri, sine abduci, sine ad melioris altitudinem ac venerationem tui

---

388 HT, i.1.17 (col. 616B).
Balger’s action had profound personal implications. Placing a rope around one’s neck was part of the legal procedure for becoming a serf. It symbolized the creation of servile status. Balger’s action forged a personal bond of service between himself and the saint.

Fearful, Balger then replaced the reliquary and continued reciting the psalms. In the middle of reciting the one-hundred-fiftieth psalm – the last – Balger fell asleep and Lewinna appeared to him in a vision. She spoke to him, “’Wake up,’ she said, ‘take me, I say, have me as a companion of your journey’,” (Surge ait me me accipito, me inquam comitem tui itineris habeto). Balger picked up the relics, which were wrapped in a pall (pallium), and “certain smaller bones” (quædam minoraossa) fell through a hole to the ground. The monk replaced the bones, but they fell out again when he picked up the pall a second time. He repeated this process a third time, before concluding that the saint wanted the bones to fall:
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389 *HT*, i.II.18 (col. 616E).


391 *HT*, i.II.19 (col. 616F).
so that it might be clearly indicated how many of the relics of her body she wished to remain in that place, the place in which she ended her life with the palm of a martyr, where her body was committed to the earth.

*ut patenter indicaretur quid sui corporis reliquiarum uidelicet ibidem uellet haberi, quo in loco martirii [p]alma finiuit uitam, ubi corpusculum terræ mandatum est.*

Balger placed the rest of the relics in a new cloth and gave them to his companion to take to their ship while he remained in the minster’s guesthouse (*hospitium*) to ward off suspicion.

The saint’s decision to leave (mostly) her old shrine at *Seuordt* was momentous. It produced violent disturbances in the natural world:

*sed nullomodo elementa mundi quiescunt. Nam subito fragore insonat æther impulsus uentis, fragorem cadentes siluæ dant, maria eolica [Æolica] rabie*  

---

392 *HT*, i.II.20 (col. 617A).

393 *HT*, i.II.19-21 (coll. 616E-17B).
While Balger spent the night in fitful sleep, the sailors grew anxious for their welfare. Some of them began to believe that the package containing the relics, the contents of which they did not know, was the cause of their unhappiness. “One of them, a rude peasant,” (Unus eorum rusticus rudis) even suggested they throw it overboard. “Another of sounder mind indeed” (Alter quidem sanioris mentis), however, dissuaded them by urging that they place their trust in divine aid. In the meantime, Balger had awakened and attempted to allay his fear of being caught by praying to the saint. After he fell asleep again, she spoke to him, reassuring him that she desired to go with him. Soon, the storm abated, another sign of her willingness to leave.395

The monks in Drogo’s audience probably knew the psalter by heart. Lewinna’s control over the elements would have reminded them of Psalm 106, which states that “[the Lord] turned the storm into a breeze: and its waves were still.”396 His audience may also have recalled the gospel story where Jesus and his disciples were buffeted by a storm while sailing. In the story, Jesus calmed the winds and the sea, and his disciples asked incredulously “What manner of

394 HT, i.II.21 (coll. 617B).
395 HT, i.II.22-4 (coll. 617B-E).
396 Psalm 106:29 (Psalm 107:29).
man is this, for even the winds and the sea obey him?" In addition, the sailors’ discussion about whether or not to throw Lewinna overboard is reminiscent of the story of Jonah, in which a storm threatens the boat carrying the recalcitrant prophet to Nineveh. The sailors soon discover that God is angry with Jonah and reluctantly toss him overboard, where he is swallowed by the whale. In Lewinna’s case, however, the sailors place their trust in God and are not disappointed. As I will point out shortly, Drogo liked to make allusions to other stories similar in outline but reversed in their outcomes. The story of the storm emphasizes both the saint’s power and her willingness to go with Balger. It also demonstrates that the separation of a saint from his or her community was not a matter to be undertaken lightly.

Drogo strove to demonstrate that God also approved of the theft. He wrote that, in part, “the providence of God, which provides and arranges all things” (providentia dei quæ omnia prouidet ac disponit), had inspired Balger to embark on the journey to England. When the ship was caught in the storm on the way to England, the sailors “moved by fear, prayed to God” (timore impulsi deum orant) and then sailed on safely. Balger also prayed repeatedly

---

397 Matthew 8:23-7; Mark 4:35-40; Luke 8:22-5.
398 Jonas 1:4-15.
399 HT, i.I.8 (col. 614E).
400 HT, i.I.9 (col. 614F).
throughout the night he spent in the church of St. Andrew “so that if God might permit it to him and it should be her wish whose bones were venerated there” (ut si deus sibi permitteret, & eius cuius ossa ibidem venerabantur uelle esset) they might grant him an opportunity to steal the relics.\textsuperscript{401}

Balger’s personal troubles did not end with the calming of the storm. On the return journey, the sailors sent the monk ashore to buy provisions. While he was doing this, the wind blew the ship out to sea and left the monk standing on the shore forlornly bemoaning his fate. When the sailors reached port, they left Lewinna’s relics in the keeping of the wife of a captain whom they knew. Eventually, Balger arrived on a different ship and recovered them.\textsuperscript{402}

Upon nearing Bergues, Balger halted to await the arrival of a delegation from Saint-Winnoc led by its prior. The prior examined the relics to verify their authenticity and found three seals (\textit{sigilli}) attached to the bones. (According to Heinzelmann, it had been common since the Early Middle Ages for bishops to affix seals to relics as a means of authentication.)\textsuperscript{403} Convinced that the relics were genuine, the monks brought Lewinna’s bones to the gate of the monastery, where the prior displayed the relics and their seals to Abbot Rumold. There, “the abbot of [Saint-Winnoc] was made glad over these things, and the entire

\textsuperscript{401} HT, i.I.16 (col. 616A).

\textsuperscript{402} HT, i.II.25-III.34 (coll. 617E-19C).

\textsuperscript{403} Heinzelmann, \textit{Translationsberichte}, p. 86.
congregation – every boy, youth, and elder – rejoiced in spiritual exultation”

(Super his lætatur abbas eiusdem loci, & omnis congregatio, omnis puer, iuuenis, senex exultant spirituali tripudio).404

The monks prepared a wooden reliquary (loculus) ornamented with silver and gold. When the reliquary was ready, they exhibited Lewinna’s bones and placed them inside in a solemn liturgical deposition (depositio). The account also reports that “a certain bishop from the East, named Bovo, was staying at Bergues at the time” (quidam episcopus ab oriente tunc temporis Bergis morabatur nomine Bouo). Bovo performed the ceremony since it required episcopal authority.405 Presumably, this is the same Bovo mentioned in the Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci as “a certain bishop named Bovo from Saxony,” (quidam Episcopus nomine Bovo a Saxonia).406 His place of origin is important because the text states that he was able to read from a certificate (cartula) in English that Balger had stolen along with the relics. The certificate stated:

Here is the body of the excellent virgin Lewinna, who flourished adorned with many virtues under the king of the Angles called Tubert [perhaps, Ecgberht of Kent (r. 664-73)]. Which one afterwards and during the time of the rule of that same king ended her life in martyrdom, during the lifetime

404 HT, i.IV.36 (col. 619F).
405 HT, i.IV.37 (col. 620A).
406 LM, XXII (col. 282B).
of the archbishop Theodore [of Canterbury (669-90)]. Whence after the passing of much time, with God revealing [it], her body was raised from the earth by the bishop Edelmo [probably Eadhelm of Selsey (956/63-979/80)], a great multitude of people being present, and thus with worthy honor was brought inside the minster.

Hic est corpus preclare uirginis leuunne que multis decorata uirtutibus floruit sub rege anglorum Tuberto nuncupato; que postmodum sub eiusdem regis tempore martirio uitam finiuit, archypresule uiuente nomine theodoro. Unde post multorum curricula temporum deo revelante corpus eius ab Edelmo antistite a terra est leuatum magna populorum astante multitudine, sicque cum digno honore intra monasterium est collocatum.407

Later, a man from Saint-Winnoc’s monastic familia (ex familia eius loci) found that the wine used to wash Lewinna’s bones in preparation for the ceremony cured fevers.408 According to Heinzelmann’s outline, this miracle is the last element in the traditional translatio account.

Drogo’s narrative, however, contains a deeper layer of meaning. First, Huyghebaert and Geary have noted that his exceptional interest in the sights,
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407 HT, i.IV.38 (col. 620B); See Blair [Forthcoming] for the historical context.

408 HT, i.IV.36-39 (coll. 619F-20C).
sounds and activity of sailing makes his account stand out within the tradition.\textsuperscript{409}

For example, the text describes Balger’s departure from England in some detail:

But, the night having been traversed, and now with lucifer [the dawn-star] beating back the darkness, the bright face of the heavens appeared, the wind held its course with a favorable breeze, which repeatedly invited the sailors to the sea, and continued to press out into the vast expanse of the sea.

And thus, his companion having been summoned, the oft-mentioned monk [Balger] now returned to the sea. Who, approaching all those [sailors who were] prepared for [yet] delaying that voyage for so long now, discovered them awaiting his arrival. The sails were given to the winds. Then the keel was carried by the waves, oars were extended on the right and on the left equally, the ship was also steered imperiously by its rudder. Now the sailors sang loudly, now they rejoiced by other means, now a game of words was played, now a friendly insult thrown.

\textit{At transeunte nocte, iamque lucifero pellente tenebras, suda poli facies apparuit, prospera aura tenorem sui flatus habuit, quod persepe nautas ad æquor inuitat, & longa maris spacia penetrare factitat.}

Accito itaque comite suo monachus iam sæpe memoratus, mare repedauit.

Qui ueniens, omnes paratos navigatum iam diu ipsum operientes, & aduentum ipsius expectantes inuenit. Ventis uela dantur. Tum carina undis fertur, dextra levaque æque tenduntur rudentes, nais etiam clauo suo imperiose deducitur.

Modo etiam celeuma canunt nautæ, nunc aliquibus modis exultant, nunc ludus uerbis agitur, nunc carum conuicium obicitur.410

Drogo may have been embellishing his account with colorful details from his own travels (Huyghebaert’s observation), but these details are not superfluous.411 They are conscious allusions to Vergil’s Aeneid.

It is likely that the sea voyage in the Historia translationis – perhaps any sea voyage – would have reminded Drogo’s literate audience of Vergil’s text. For Drogo and his ecclesiastical contemporaries, the Aeneid was one of the best-known classical Latin texts. It was widely available in the eleventh century, particularly in monastic schools where it was the primary text for teaching Latin grammar.412 In addition to the Aeneid itself, most monks also studied Servius’ extensive commentary on it.413 This means that some in Drogo’s ecclesiastical

410 HT, i.II.24-25 (coll. 617D-F).


413 Comparetti, Vergil, pp. 55-60; See also Servius Maurus Honoratus Grammaticus, Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii, ed. Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, I-III (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1961).
audience would have been intimately familiar with both the *Aeneid*’s narrative and its idioms. For example, between 1058 and 1063, the monk Onulphus wrote in the *Vita s. Popponis Stabulensis* [BHL 6898] that a novice monk, named Gozo, who was being educated at the monastery of Stavelot (modern Belgium), contracted a grave illness. While the boy lay in bed:

> he suddenly exclaimed that a phalanx of demons imitated the faces of Aeneas and Turnus and other men from Vergil, and that his spirit was assailed by them, who were intimately familiar to him in his education.

> exclamauit subito dæmonum phalangem, Æneæ & Turni aliorumque ex Virgilio virorum vultus imitari, seque ab eis, qui sibi in discendo plurimum vsui fuerant, vsque ad animam infestari.\(^{414}\)

Drogo’s text displays a similar, though less traumatic, familiarity with the *Aeneid*.

Vergilian idioms permeate the *translatio* account, especially where it discusses ships on the sea. The following gives a small sampling:

1) *lucifer* (the archaizing name for the dawn-star)\(^{415}\)

2) *æquor* (for the more common *mare*, meaning the sea)\(^{416}\)

---

\(^{414}\) *Vita s. Popponis Stabulensis* [BHL 6898], XV.66 (AASS, Jan. 25, p. 651).

3) *puppis* (for the more common *navis*, meaning ships)\textsuperscript{417}

4) *velivolare* (to fly with the sails)\textsuperscript{418}

5) *Vela ventis dare* (to give the sails to the winds)\textsuperscript{419}

Drogo’s use of Vergil’s text also went beyond idioms and short phrases to the more noticeable borrowing of a longer passage in which Vergil described the Libyan harbor where Aeneas first made landfall near Carthage. Drogo used it to describe the English harbor at *Seuordt*. The *Historia translationis* states:

Indeed, this same port is called Sevordt… Truly, the etymology of the name is fitting: for Sevordt is spoken in Teutonic, in Latin speech it means the ford of the sea. And it is truly a ford: for it was a ford desired by those coming to the shore. Since I speak to ones unfamiliar, this same port was entered through such narrow straits that scarcely two keels joined side-by-side would be able to enter this same port. On either side, double peaks are raised up against the sky, a ridge descends steeply upon which each wave is broken, while in the turbulent straits Aeolus’ wrath is raised.

There, no anchor holds the ships, no cord restrains the bobbing vessels, for

\textsuperscript{416} HT, i.II.24 (col. 617E); Vergil, *Aeneid*, i.67 (pp. 244-45); Servius, *Commentarii*, I, p. 39; Cordier, *Études*, p. 134.

\textsuperscript{417} HT, i.III.26 (col. 618B); Vergil, *Aeneid*, ii.256 (pp. 310-11); Servius, *Commentarii*, I, p. 262; Cordier, *Études*, p. 135.

\textsuperscript{418} HT, i.I.9 (col. 614F); Vergil, *Aeneid*, i.224 (pp. 256-57); Servius, *Commentarii*, I, p. 85; Cordier, *Études*, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{419} HT, i.III.25 (col. 617E); Vergil, *Aeneid*, iv.546 (pp. 432-33).
they stand still by themselves, they do not fear at all the East Wind, nor the North Wind, nor the Southwest Wind. Here, the sailors tired of their duties rest their bodies, and the jubilant men rejoice that they have evaded so many and such great perils. But after feasts of such joys, night rushes in, and heaven envelopes the lands and seas together. One goes to sleep. Then sleep occupies the tired limbs of all.

Uocatur uero idem portus Sevordt... Verum digna nominis æthymologia.

Seuordt enim Teutonice dictum; latino æloquio maris uadum dicitur. Et re uera uadum. Nam uadum fuit uenientibus ad litus optatum. Ut nescientibus loquar; isdem portus tam arti [arcti] introitus est, ut uix binæ carinæ hunc ipsum iuncto latere ualeant intrare. Hinc atque hinc bini scopuli uersus cælum erecti; decliue iugum demittunt, quis [quibus] omnis unda frangitur, cum eolica [Æolica] rabies turbato freto tollitur. Ibi non anchora puppes alligat, non funis nutantes retentat, uerum per se solæ contentæ stare; minime quidem timent Eurum, non Aquilonem, non Affricum. Hic nautæ fessi rerum corpora recreant, & tot tantaque discrimina læti euasisse exultant. Verum post tanti gaudii epulas nox ruit, ac cælum, terras, maria una inuoluit. Itur dormitum. Tum sopor fessos omnium artus occupat.420

The Aeneid describes the Libyan harbor this way:

420 HT, i.10-11 (coll. 615A-C).
There in a deep inlet lies a spot, where an island forms a harbor with the barrier of its sides, on which every wave from the main is broken, then parts into receding ripples. On either side loom heavenward huge cliffs and twin peaks, beneath whose crest far and wide is the stillness of sheltered water… Here no fetters imprison weary ships, no anchor holds them fast with hooked bite. Here, with seven ships mustered from all his fleet, Aeneas takes shelter; and disembarking with earnest longing for the land, the Trojans gain the welcome beach and stretch their brine-drenched limbs upon the shore.

Although Drogo did not excerpt the entire passage directly, the description of the harbor at Seuordt owes a great deal to Vergil’s text. It is possible to see these uses of the Aeneid as merely decorative, the result of Drogo’s attempts to produce eloquent literature. A further example, however, suggests that the hagiographer was inviting his audience to make connections

---

421 Vergil, Aeneid, i.159-173 (pp. 251-53); Servius, Commentarii, I, pp. 65-9.
between the *translatio* account and the *Aeneid*. After Balger had been left on the shore in England, the sailors continued their voyage back to Flanders with Lewinna’s relics. One night, the sea grew extremely calm and “sleep from heaven entered all,” (*cælitus somnus omnes inuadit*), including the helmsman.\(^{422}\) The *Historia translationis* reports that in this situation when the ship was in grave danger of veering off course and running aground, Lewinna “held the rudder, ruled the ship, steered the oars, and was there filling all the offices of the ship.” (*clauum teneat, nauim regat, amministret rudentes, omnibus carinæ officiis assit præsens*).\(^{423}\) She steered the ship safely throughout the night until its master (*magister nauis*) awoke the next morning. According to Drogo, “the right course through the sea was well-known to her, and equally [well-known] to her was the port of our homeland,” (*Sibi optime notus habetur rectus per æquor cursus, sibi æque nostræ patriæ portus*).\(^{424}\) This is an obvious allusion to an episode in the *Aeneid*, in which the sea grew calm at night and the god Somnus visited Aeneas’ helmsman, Palinurus. Despite his best efforts to resist the god’s powers, Palinurus fell asleep and pitched headlong into the sea, eventually meeting his doom. Aeneas then awoke and steered the ship for the rest of the night, “sighing often and his mind stricken by his friend’s misfortune,” (*multa gemens casuque*

\(^{422}\) *HT*, i.III.31 (col. 618F).

\(^{423}\) *HT*, i.III.31 (col. 618F).

\(^{424}\) *HT*, i.III.31 (col. 618F).
Drogo’s allusion simultaneously contrasts the Christian saint’s beneficial actions to the harm done by the pagan god Somnus and compares Lewinna to Aeneas in guiding the ship through the night. Again, Drogo’s delight in allusions that contain both comparisons and contrasts is evident.

This allusion also points toward a broader comparison between Lewinna and Aeneas. After the end of the *translatio* account, the language of the *Historia translationis* shifts to a much simpler style. In the prologue to Book II, Drogo offered an explanation:

At length, the series of events of the translation of the blessed virgin Lewinna having been completed, we come to the miracles, which the mercy of the Omnipotent deemed worthy to do by the merits of that one. Which are regarded as so numerous and so many, that [even] if the learned eloquence of Maro [Vergil] or Homer should be present it would perhaps succumb, overcome by the manifold task of the telling, and by the great weight of encompassing the things heard and seen.

---


426 Vergil was himself echoing Homer’s epic, the *Odyssey*. In the *Odyssey*, one of Odysseus’ men, Elpenor, walked off the roof of Circe’s palace in a drunken haze and broke his neck. Both Odysseus and Aeneas met the shades of their respective companions when they sailed to the underworld (Homer, *Odyssey*, x.550-60, xi.51-83; Vergil, *Aeneid*, vi.337-83 (pp. 528-33); Servius, *Commentarii*, II, pp. 57-8).
Tandem decursa serie translationis beatæ leuuinnæ uirginis; uentum est ad
miracula, quæ illius meritis dignata est operari omnipotentis clementia. Quæ
tam numerosa tamque multa habentur, ut si Maronis vel Homeri docta facundia
afforet, fortassis uicta multiplici taxatione narrandi moleue tenendi auditæ uel
uisa succumberet.\textsuperscript{427}

This is a common late antique and medieval trope, found in numerous works on
saints and ecclesiastical leaders. For example, in the twelfth-century \textit{Vita et
miracula s. Bernardi poenitentis Audomaropoli} [BHL 1203], the author, John
(Ioannus) of Saint-Bertin, stated that “neither Maro, nor Socrates, nor the learned
hand of Cicero would be able to write odes worthy of Bernard” (\textit{non Maro, non
Socrates, non docta manus Ciceronis, Digne Bernardi scribere posset odas}).\textsuperscript{428} In the
\textit{Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopo}, another author, Balderic, wrote:

for who is able to equal in words the mighty deeds of this man, Albero [of
Montreuil, archbishop of Trier (1131-52)]…? This material would be equal
to the skill of Homer, if only Homer were equal to the material… either I
will succumb to the burden… or else I will be found not inferior to Virgil,
Statius, Titus Livius and Iosephus.

\textit{Quis enim dictis equare possit fortia facta huius viri Alberonis…? Haec viribus
Homeri sufficiens estset materia, si tamen ipse materiae sufficeret… aut oneri…}

\textsuperscript{427} \textit{HT, Prologus secundus} 48 (coll. 622A-B).

\textsuperscript{428} \textit{Vita et miracula s. Bernardi poenitentis Audomaropoli} [BHL 1203], i.II.23 (AASS,
Apr. 19, col. 679B).
succumberem, aut non impar Virgilio vel Stacio, Tito Livio vel Iosepho invenirer.429

(The excellence of Albero’s accomplishments did not, however, deter Balderic, master of the cathedral school at Trier during its heyday (1147-57), from ornamenting his work with phrases from Horace and Ovid.) 430

This trope reflects a long-standing tradition in Christian literature. In the classical Latin rhetoric employed by Cicero and Quintilian, orators chose from a hierarchy of styles based on the gravity of their subjects: sublime speech (*sermo sublimis*) to discuss subjects important to men’s welfare and to arouse the emotions that move men to act, intermediate speech (*sermo temperatus*) for praise, blame, admonition and discussion, and low speech (*sermo humilis*) for instruction, exegesis, and when speaking of mundane subjects in forensic oratory. (Augustine referred to them as *res magna, modica* and *parva*, respectively.) Late antique Christian authors, however, noted that when discussing spiritual matters and the gospels, *every* subject was important to a person’s welfare. Yet, they also believed that they should make even the most sublime Christian mysteries accessible to common people. As a result, they

---

maintained the traditional distinctions of form for the sake of variety but employed the *sermo humilis* for their weightiest subjects – the Bible, which had itself been scorned for its low style, and later, the miracles of the saints.\(^{431}\)

Einhard, for example, chose different styles for different subjects. In composing the *Vita Caroli*, a tribute to Charlemagne who was neither a saint nor an ecclesiastic, Einhard adopted the classical style of Suetonius’ *De vita Caesarum*. This choice simultaneously placed the *Vita Caroli* in a tradition of imperial biography and invited its educated readers to compare Charlemagne to the Roman emperors, particularly Augustus. In the *Translatio ss. Marcellini et Petri* [BHL 5230-33], however, Einhard used the style of the *sermo humilis*, finding it more appropriate to the miraculous deeds of the saints.\(^ {432}\)

Drogo apparently disregarded the example set by Einhard’s *translatio* account, noted above as the closest the *translatio* genre had to a prototype. Instead, he deliberately chose a classical style for his account of Lewinna’s *translatio*. Just as Einhard’s use of the *De vita Caesarum* encouraged his audience to compare Charlemagne to Augustus, Drogo’s use of the *Aeneid* invited his educated contemporaries to compare Lewinna to Aeneas. Just as Aeneas’
departure from his Trojan homeland for a new one had been permanent, so too Lewinna’s departure from her English homeland for Flanders was permanent. This literary strategy confirms the permanence of the saint’s *translatio*.

Drogo’s literary strategy also raises questions about his veracity. How much of the *translatio* account did he fabricate to produce these parallels? In the prologue to Book I, Drogo wrote that he wanted to preserve a record of events related to him by Balger and other eye-witnesses. But given the incentives to disguise the purchase or gift-giving of relics, did he describe a *furtum sacrum* that never took place? Unfortunately, since the *Historia translationis* is the only source on Lewinna of which we are aware, it is impossible to answer these questions definitively. Speculation on the issue does, however, illuminate the social context within which Drogo anticipated his strategies would operate.

First, Drogo could not have expected an entirely fabricated account to avoid detection by his contemporaries. Numerous people in Flanders had both motive and opportunity to expose a false report. Saint-Winnoc’s monastic competitors would not have hesitated to challenge the relics’ authenticity or the manner of their acquisition. Saint-Pierre at Ghent, for example, quickly disputed the existence of St. Lebuin, whom the monks of Saint-Bavon invented almost completely.

---

433 *HT*, i.1.2 (coll. 613B-C).
whole-cloth. In addition, as Richard Landes has pointed out with regard to the alleged apostolicity of St. Martial promoted by Ademar of Chabannes, local populations could be receptive to such challenges. The populace of Limoges made Ademar the laughingstock of the region for claiming that Martial had been an apostle. In fact, as I will discuss below, the Historia translationis itself contains an episode in which the members of a community near Bergues challenged Lewinna’s sanctity, saying that they had never heard of her.

Nor would it have required a heroic effort to check the veracity of the Historia translationis. Many of the lands in which other furta sacra took place were distant and largely unknown to the people who received stolen relics, making it difficult for them to verify theft accounts. Although Drogo claimed that he described the English port into which Balger’s ship sailed “since he spoke to ones unfamiliar” (ut nescientibus loquatur), he probably meant only that they were unfamiliar with that specific port. Modern scholars have demonstrated that for hundreds of years before the rise of the wool trade in the twelfth century, the

---


436 HT, i.I.10 (col. 615B).
Flemish maintained intimate economic, political and religious connections with the English too numerous to cite here.\textsuperscript{437} The Flemish sailors’ knowledge of English ports and their trading activity depicted in the \textit{Historia translationis} support the view of regular cross-Channel interactions in Drogo’s time. Also, the \textit{Historia translationis} describes Balger as “known there [in England] to the king, queen and equally to several princes of the land,” (\textit{ibi esset notus regi, reginæ, æque nonnullis principibus patriæ}).\textsuperscript{438} This too indicates close relations. In order to ensure acceptance of Lewinna’s authenticity, Drogo had to construct an account that people familiar with southern England would have found at least plausible, if not verifiable.

Nevertheless, modern scholars have experienced difficulties in identifying Lewinna’s original community. Based on Drogo’s description, several have linked the \textit{Seuordt} of the \textit{Historia translationis} to the region around Seaford head on the coast of East Sussex. The coastline has, however, changed considerably since the eleventh century, making it difficult to match Drogo’s description to any one combination of harbors and churches in the area. As a result, the exact


\textsuperscript{438} \textit{HT}, i.I.8 (col. 614E).
location of the church of St. Andrew from which Balger ran off with Lewinna has been the subject of a long-standing debate. Scholars have identified churches at Lewes, Alfriston, Seaford, and Jevington as viable candidates.

John Blair has also advanced a strong argument in favor of the church of St. Andrew at Bishopstone, located near the mouth of the Ouse river. (See Map 9.) Drogo’s account mentions that Balger could see the church that contained Lewinna’s relics from his ship as it stood in the harbor. Set back about a mile from the shoreline that curves between Seaford head and Newhaven head, Bishopstone’s church may have been visible from a ship anchored just offshore. Blair has suggested that the current shingle beach stretching between the two headlands was once a shingle bar that has moved inland since 1058 as the result of a natural process, called “longshore-drift.” It may once have spanned the distance between the two headlands farther out to sea, providing a ford that gave the place its name. An artificial cut in this shingle bar would have created the narrow straits that Drogo’s account describes. In addition, archaeological excavations in the modern churchyard at Bishopstone have uncovered what may be the remains of a settlement associated with an Anglo-Saxon minster. The original phase of the present church dates to around the beginning of the tenth century.

---


440 HT, i.I.10 (col. 615B).
century, making it possible that this was the *monasterium* Drogo’s text
mentions.\(^{441}\) No evidence has been uncovered, however, that would allow a
definitive conclusion, and neighboring Alfriston also has some claim to being the
minster described in the account.

Whether or not Bishopstone was Lewinna’s original resting place, the
topography of the area demonstrates that Drogo composed an account that his
contemporaries would have found plausible. Although Seaford head has
suffered much erosion since the eleventh century, it and the headlands on either
side – Newhaven head to the west and the “Seven Sisters” to the east – dominate
the coast. All three are chalk formations that present sheer white cliffs (like the
famed “white cliffs of Dover”) to the Channel surf. On clear days such as the one
that reportedly greeted Balger’s ship, the towering cliffs shine in the sun like
beacons. They must have made a deep impression on the monk, Balger, as he
sailed into Newhaven harbor (from which Bishopstone is visible) to the west of
Seaford head or into Cuckmere Haven (from which Alfriston may have been
visible) to its east. It is not difficult to imagine that as Balger described these
shining headlands and the harbor between them to Drogo, the hagiographer
recalled the Libyan harbor where “on either side, loom heavenward huge cliffs
and twin peaks, beneath whose crest far and wide is the stillness of sheltered
water” (*hinc atque hinc vastæ rupes geminæque minantur in cælum scopuli, quorum*
\(^{441}\) *HT*, i.I.12 (col. 615D).
The appearance of the harbor as described by Balger inspired the use of a specific passage from Vergil’s work, but Drogo described the actual topography of the English harbor. He adapted the _Aeneid_ to his account rather than _vice versa_.

The fact that Andrew is one of only two saints other than Lewinna mentioned in the entire _Historia translationis_ only reinforces the conclusion about Drogo’s intention to create a plausible account. Although the monks of Saint-Winnoc took Lewinna’s relics on a tour through Flanders visiting eight churches, each presumably dedicated to at least one saint, Drogo omitted their names. For example, the church they visited at Bruges was dedicated to St. Donatian though the text never mentions him. The omissions include the other patron saints of Saint-Winnoc as well, whom he mentioned collectively as “the saints of the monastery of Bergues” (sancti Bergensis monasterii). St. Peter is the only other saint mentioned, and then only in connection to a pilgrim who travels to Rome. Therefore, the dedication to Andrew joins Seuordt and Lewinna’s own name as a critical piece of information for Drogo’s contemporaries. Our difficulties in locating the precise church from which Balger stole the relics is related to the loss of Lewinna’s _memoria_ in England, not to any inaccuracies in Drogo’s description.

---

442 Vergil, _Aeneid_, i.162-64 (pp. 252-53).

443 _HT_, ii.II.69 (col. 626F).
His contemporaries would have had no such difficulties, since Balger’s decision to leave a few bones in their original reliquary meant that the saint still had a presence there.

It was important to Drogo, then, that he preserve the memory of Lewinna’s original location. It was important because, in this case, it was not difficult to verify his account. By providing enough information for his contemporaries to find the saint’s original community, he gave the relics a “pedigree,” insulating them against challenges to their authenticity.

4.5 Passage

There is no evidence that either Drogo or his contemporaries thought in terms of rites of passage. Both the Historia translationis’s account of Lewinna’s furtum sacrum and Drogo’s literary strategy become more intelligible, however, after the application of van Gennep’s model. The model helps assess the function of major events in the narrative.

According to the model, Balger initiated Lewinna’s passage from the status of patron saint of the community at Seuordt to patron saint of the community at Bergues. Whether the account of his pleading with the saint and her subsequent permission to remove her relics was part of his own report or
Drogo’s addition, it was an element that the *Historia translationis*’s audience would have expected from a *furtum sacrum*. Broadly speaking, it was a “rite” of separation.

The violent disturbance in the natural world signaled her entrance into the perilous state of liminality. The sailors’ debate over whether or not they should throw the container with her relics into the sea demonstrated her change in state. The sailors would not have dared to suggest such an action had they known that the container held the relics of a saint. In the container in which Balger had hidden her, Lewinna was anonymous, no longer recognized as a patron saint because the monk could not reveal her true status for fear of being discovered. In Drogo’s literary strategy, the journey by sea paralleled Aeneas’ journey to a new homeland. It can also be seen as a metaphor for the saint’s progress through the state of liminality.

In Flanders, the saint was received by a delegation led by the prior, then honored by an *adventus* conducted by Abbot Rumold, then solemnly honored by a *depositio* presided over by the Saxon bishop Bovo. The ecclesiastical authorities who confirmed her status as saint became progressively more prestigious. Each stage was a rite of incorporation, particularly the *adventus* and *depositio*, which were traditional liturgical celebrations to greet the arrival of a new saint.
Lewinna’s transition from patron saint in England to patron saint in Flanders was not, however, completed with the depositio. The application of van Gennep’s model to subsequent sections of Drogo’s text reveals that the process of incorporation was more complicated and involved more effort. Specifically, only one community in Flanders, the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc, had recognized her as a saint. Other segments of Flemish society would have to recognize her and her position would have to be defined more carefully before full incorporation.

4.6 Vita et Passio: Forgetting England

In light of the specific details Drogo included in the translatio, it is interesting that his account of the saint’s life and martyrdom (vita et passio) lacks similar specifics. He began by stating that “we shall speak first regarding [Lewinna’s] life; afterwards we shall speak regarding [her] virtues, [then] ascending to a few things about her martyrdom,” (de uita eius primo dicendum est, post de uirtutibus, deque martirio paulatim ascendentes pauca dicemus). He followed this tripartite structure but although he extolled her virtues at some length, he offered virtually no historical context for her life or death. For example, she was “from the first years of her dear childhood, full of the spirit of God,” (a primis care pueritie annis plena spiritus dei), but the text does not mention

---

444 HT, i.V.41 (col. 620F).
who her parents were, what her family’s station was or even where she lived. In addition:

While she lived, she lived well, both as a girl and as an adult virgin… She excelled as a lover of humility, as a cultivator of [humility’s] partner patience. She preserved her modesty, by which she attained heaven, dear to God and the angels.

\[
\text{et puella et adulta uirgo dum uixit bene uixit... Amica humilitatis extitit, cultrix eius college patientie. Pudicitiam conservabat qua celum deo & angelis cara attingebat.} \]

The text does not, however, offer any examples of her actual behavior in life. Finally, it states that “this saintly Virgin was pleasing to God, and was found worthy in her martyrdom,” (\textit{hec sancta uirgo deo placuit, [et] martirio digna inuenta est}) but gives no details about how she died or who killed her. This last omission is particularly significant because her status as saint seems to have rested on her martyrdom. The only piece of information specific to Lewinna was the date of her martyrdom – “on the eighth day after the Kalends of August”

\[\text{445 HT, i.V.41 (col. 620F).}\]
\[\text{446 HT, i.V.42 (col. 621A).}\]
\[\text{447 HT, i.V.44 (col. 621E).}\]
(VIII Kalendas Augusti). Of course, Drogo had already provided some specifics about the saint when he reported the contents of the *cartula* Balger had stolen along with the relics. He did not, however, expand or repeat them here.

In the prologue to Book I, Drogo offered an explanation for this lack of detail. He stated that Lewinna was a virgin and a martyr, “regarding whose life and martyrdom little knowledge is held by us in our time, either on account of the negligence of scribes, or because indeed the writing perished,” (*de cuius uita martiriove perparum cognitum nobis nostro habetur in tempore, vel propter incuriam scriptorum, uel quia etiam perit scriptum*). The *cartula* and the pieces of parchment on the walls around the saint’s shrine seem to have been the only written records of her.

The image of an English cult with little written evidence of the saint’s *memoria* fits the description of a typical minster cult in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as described by Blair. He has argued that a concentration of patronage and liturgical activity from the tenth through the twelfth centuries decreased the number of saints venerated in England. Before this period a network of small religious communities nurtured cults that were localized and poorly

---

448 *HT*, i.V.46 (col. 621E).

449 *HT*, i.I.14 (col. 615E).

450 *HT*, Prologus primus.7 (col. 614C).

451 *HT*, i.I.15 (col. 615F).
documented. Many of these cults survived into the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but the better documented cults based at reformed monastic and regular communities have eclipsed their existence in the historiography.\textsuperscript{452}

William of Malmesbury wrote about these smaller cults:

There [at Tavistock] the holy bishop Rumon lies and is venerated, and is endowed with a beautiful shrine, although no written evidence attests to his legend. You will find this not merely there but in many places in England: only the bare names of saints are known, and whatever miracles they may still perform. All evidence for their doings has been obliterated, I believe, by the violence of enemy attacks.\textsuperscript{453}

Drogo’s description of Lewinna’s community suggests that it was a small minster that had mostly failed to preserve her \textit{memoria} in writing. Only the practice of hanging lists of the saint’s miracles around the shrine seems unusual. It has been reported for some late medieval English shrines, but this is apparently the only known pre-Conquest case.\textsuperscript{454}

Drogo condemned those who allowed saints’ \textit{memoriae} to fade. In the dedicatory epistle to Abbot Rumold, he stated that although entreated by his abbot and brothers, he vacillated about whether he was skilled enough to record

\textsuperscript{452} Blair, “Minster,” pp. 455-59.


\textsuperscript{454} Blair, [Forthcoming].
the events connected with Lewinna’s relics. Finally, he convinced himself that if he continued to delay someone else would reap the blessings of composing the account and he himself “would pay the penalty on account of the hidden talent” 
(pro abscondito talento pœnas solverem). The “hidden talent” refers to the parable of the master who gave his three servants sums of one, two and five talents (talenta) according to their abilities, then left home for some time. While their master was away, the latter two servants invested their talents and made more, and the first “hid his talent in the ground” (abscondit talentum suum in terra).

Upon his return, the master condemned the servant who had hidden his talent to be cast “out into the exterior darkness. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” Drogo continued that he did not want to be “held liable for the sin” (arguerer huiusce criminis reus) of consigning Lewinna’s memory to oblivion.

Despite his harsh words, Drogo did not avail himself of two means which could have given a detailed account of Lewinna the appearance of some historicity. First, Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica contains extensive information on Theodore of Tarsus and his activities as archbishop of Canterbury.

---

455 HT, Epistola.2 (col. 613C).
456 Matthew 25:25.
458 HT, Epistola.2 (col. 613C).
459 For example, see HE, iv.1-4, pp. 328-47.
could have used this information to create a historical frame around the list of virtues he ascribed to the saint. Second, he could have excerpted all or part of another virgin martyr’s *vita* or *passio* and substituted Lewinna’s name for the original saint’s, a relatively common practice, especially in cases where the *inventio* of a previously unknown saint occurred. The practice would not have distressed Drogo’s contemporaries, since as his generic list of virtues demonstrates, particular types of saints shared similar virtues. The hagiographer could no more have known Lewinna’s virtues than he could the other particulars of her life and death that the “negligence of the scribes” had lost unless saints fell into these general typologies.  

It is not clear why Drogo did not supplement his description of Lewinna’s virtues with historical material. Perhaps providing details about Lewinna’s life and death would have focused too much attention back on her original community in England. The *vita et passio* section is one of only a few portions of the *Historia translationis* that appears outside of its place in the relative chronological order. This placement was not an accident. By opening the text with an account of how Lewinna’s relics came to Flanders, Drogo focused on his most important task, recording the acquisition of the saint. His next most important task would have been to record the establishment of her cult in

---

Flanders. Historical details about her life – even forged ones – may not have served this purpose because they would have perpetuated her connections to England. In a way, forgetting Lewinna’s memoria in England was also part of the separation process.

In this regard, Drogo was lucky that Lewinna was a virgin martyr because this type of saint “traveled well.” In fact, Lewinna’s saintly typology may have been what made Balger so keen to possess her in the first place. Blair has written that four categories account for most of the classifiable saints from the seventh through the ninth centuries in England: lay founders, heads or members of religious communities, bishops and hermits.\textsuperscript{461} The majority fell into the former two categories, both of which entailed intimate ties to English institutions. Had Lewinna been a saint by virtue of having been founder or abbess of a religious community at Seuordt, Drogo would have found it difficult to discuss her virtues without describing a strong bond with her original community. A virgin martyr’s recognition, however, did not depend upon such ties.

Lewinna’s generic \emph{vita et passio} is a reminder that hagiography is not modern biography. Drogo’s focus was Lewinna’s eternal, not mortal, life. He seems to have concluded that historical details would not advance his purpose and could be forgotten without danger of condemning him to being thrown “into the exterior darkness, [where] there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

\textsuperscript{461} Blair, “Minster,” p. 459.
4.7 Delatio: Through Flanders

Drogo’s *translatio* account ends with the joyful reception of Lewinna’s relics at Saint-Winnoc and the report of the cures wrought by the wine in which her bones had been washed. According to Geary’s outline, this ought to mark the saint’s incorporation into her new community. But in reading the account, the limited nature of her incorporation leaps out. It states that “the entire congregation – every boy, youth, and elder – rejoiced” (*omnis congregatio, omnis puer, iuuenis, senex exultant*).\(^{462}\) No mention is made of the lay population of Bergues or the surrounding region. They do not seem to have participated in the *adventus*. Later, when the community conducted the *depositio*, the account notes only that “the brothers stood by as witnesses” (*testimonii astant fratres*).\(^{463}\) Again, there is no mention of the local lay populace. It also seems unusual that a foreign bishop presided over the *depositio*, rather than Bishop Drogo of Thérouanne (1030-78), given the importance that contemporaries placed on obtaining the ecclesiastical hierarchy’s approval of a new cult.\(^{464}\) The *delatio* account demonstrates that the establishment of Lewinna’s cult required more than the transportation of her relics to Flanders and the official approval of an ecclesiastical community. It also required her acceptance by the lay community.

\(^{462}\) *HT*, i.IV.36 (col. 619F).

\(^{463}\) *HT*, i.IV.37 (col. 620B).

in the surrounding region, confounding modern notions of a “top-down” or elite-controlled religious structure in the Middle Ages. In van Gennep’s terms, Lewinna was still a liminal figure.

The monks of Saint-Winnoc soon took measures to secure their new saint’s recognition by the laity. Just before he described Lewinna’s depositio, Drogo reported that the monks of Saint-Winnoc placed the saint’s relics “in the library with the books temporarily for some days” (in Bibliotheca cum libris pro tempore aliquantis diebus). In the meantime, “a reliquary was assembled to the honor of the saintly virgin, first with planks of wood, then it was adorned with silver and gold, which were regarded more worthy of her cult” (componitur honori sanctæ uirginis loculus, primo ligneis tabulatis, donec argento aurove comeretur, qui dignior eius religioni haberetur). Understandably, the monks took care that “the planks of the casket were fastened on all sides with nails, lest by some fraud one might be able to remove it and be able to remove some of the relics from within” (clauis undique tabule loculi configuntur, ne qua fraude posset adiri, nec inde aliquid reliquiarum tolli).

---

465 HT, i.IV.36 (col. 619F).
466 HT, i.IV.36 (col. 619F).
467 HT, i.IV.39 (col. 620C).
According to the *Historia translationis*, not long after the *depositio*, the monks decided to tour Flanders with their new relics. This was a serious undertaking. Away from their shrines, relics were subject to increased danger of theft, damage, and loss.  

Various factors could prompt monastic communities to expose their relics to such risks, but Huyghebaert has suggested that in this case, the motive was financial. At the time of the *delatio*, the monks of Saint-Winnoc may have already begun or were contemplating the construction of a new abbey church. As Huyghebaert has noted, Drogo’s *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* (1068-78) recounts miracles in which Winnoc healed craftsmen and monks injured while working on the church of Saint-Winnoc.  

From this perspective, the *delatio* was a “fundraising tour” undertaken to solicit donations for the construction, a frequent practice in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

---


470 Geary, *Furta Sacra*, pp. 63-5; Sigal, “Les voyages,” p. 77; See also Heinzelmann, *Translationsberichte*, p. 83, for financial considerations as the chief reason for the exhibition of relics.
Although financial considerations may have inspired the *delatio*, Drogo’s account never mentions such a purpose. The text claims that the monks made the trip “so that the relics of such a holy virgin might become known, and [so that] during the procession the omnipotent Lord might declare to whose merit it was” (*ut et note fierent tantæ uirginis reliquæ, et inter eundo omnipotens dominus cuius foret meriti declararet*).\footnote{HT, ii.I.51 (col. 623B).} Although Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn have observed that “though the narrator who recorded a miracle clearly knew the actual purpose of the procession during which it took place, that purpose was often of little interest to him,” there is no reason to suggest that Saint-Winnoc’s financial interests and the recognition of Lewinna as a saint were in opposition.\footnote{Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn, “Sainte Foy on the Loose, Or, The Possibilities of Procession,” in *Moving Subjects: Processional Performance in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Kathleen Ashley and Wim Hüsken (Atlanta: Rodopi, 2001), pp. 58-9.} Nor is there any reason to assume that Drogo’s statement masks the chief motive of the *delatio*. The monks hoped to benefit from the saint’s *patrocinium* in the form of donations inspired by her miracles. Clearly, a precondition for the donations was Lewinna’s recognition as a saint.

The monks had good reason to be concerned about whether or not the lay population would venerate Lewinna as a saint. When the procession carrying her relics arrived at the village of Leffinge (*Letfingas*), the second stop on the
outbound leg of the delatio (see Map 10), “[Lewinna] was brought to the church, where she was neither received nor honored by the inhabitants, since her name before this had not indeed, as they said, been heard there” (Uenitur ad ecclesiam ubi ab incolis nec suscipitur nec honoratur, quippe cuius nomen ante hac nequidem uti dicebant illic audiebatur).473 Despite their misgivings, the inhabitants of Leffinge placed Lewinna on the altar and awaited a sign. While they waited, one of the monks of Saint-Winnoc prostrated himself before the reliquary, alternately flattering and berating the saint to induce her to display her power – a good example of the belief that the living saint was present in his or her relics. Finally, the monk threatened Lewinna:

                Unless you do this [perform a miracle], you will be returned to the monastery as soon as possible, you will be replaced in your position, and henceforth you will be regarded diminished in your honor and merit.

Quod nisi feceris, ad monasterium quamprimum reportaberis, tuo in loco reponere [reponeris] et amodo tuo honore merito[que] minor habebere.474

Then, “in that same hour… the holy cross, sign of our redemption, which was in this place, emitted from itself a sweat of water, and for some while it remained

473 HT, ii.I.52 (col. 623C).

474 HT, ii.I.52 (coll. 623D-E).
thus sweating” (eadem hora contigit... sancta crux nostræ redemptionis signum, quod eo in loco est, aquæ sudorem ex se emisit, et aliquandiu ita sudans permansit).\textsuperscript{475} Shortly thereafter, Lewinna healed a paralyzed man from the village.

The saint’s initial rejection by the inhabitants of Leffinge reveals the limited spread of Lewinna’s cult at the time of the delatio. In an impressive statistical analysis of miracle collections from central medieval France, Sigal has reported that at the end of two or three weeks the news of a saint’s recent miracles had usually spread the distance of two or three days travel – thirty to sixty kilometers. Beyond this radius, the distances became too great for people to visit the shrine, especially for the sick who often traveled on foot or were carried on litters. Beyond this radius, shrines also began to infringe on other shrines’ zones of attraction.\textsuperscript{476} About forty kilometers separate Bergues and Leffinge, placing the latter well within Bergues’ range of influence, yet Lewinna’s reputation had not spread even that far.

The monks continued with the delatio, and their route is interesting because it reveals how important the status of the ecclesiastical community that housed a saint was in establishing the status of the saint. Although the monks of Saint-Winnoc wanted to spread the news of Lewinna’s presence in Flanders, they avoided the two great religious centers of the county, the town of Saint-Omer,

\textsuperscript{475} HT, ii.I.53 (col. 623E).

\textsuperscript{476} Sigal, L’homme, p. 191.
where the chapter of Saint-Omer and the abbey of Saint-Bertin were located, and Ghent, where the monasteries of Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon were located. They also avoided Thérouanne, the episcopal see of the diocese in which Saint-Winnoc was located.

Despite the institutional resources of these centers, there were several reasons for the monks of Drogo’s abbey to fear visiting them with their new patron saint. First, Saint-Bertin was Saint-Winnoc’s mother abbey. By visiting the town where the abbey was located, the monks would have risked setting back their abbey’s bid to become independent. Saint-Bertin could have orchestrated Lewinna’s reception to subordinate her to its authority. Geoffrey Koziol has called attention to the skill medieval monks exhibited in crafting ritual environments. Rather than contributing to their abbey’s efforts to raise its prestige, the monks of Saint-Winnoc might have unintentionally reinforced its subordination to Saint-Bertin.

Or, worse, Abbot Bovo of Saint-Bertin (1042-65) could have claimed Lewinna for his abbey. As Pierre-André Sigal has noted, institutions sometimes attempted to keep visiting relics for themselves, and the *Vita tertia Audomari* [BHL 768, 769, 771] illustrates a parallel situation in which another abbot tried to

---

do just that. In 834, Abbot Hugh of Saint-Quentin, one of Charlemagne’s sons, became provost of Saint-Omer (834-44) as well. Nine years later, Hugh tried to translate Omer’s relics to Saint-Quentin. The saint, however, refused to be moved for three days, which allowed Bishop Folcuin of Thérouanne (816-55) to put a stop to the attempt. The relationship between Abbot Hugh and Saint-Omer resembled the relationship between Abbot Bovo and Saint-Winnoc.

The *Vita tertia Audomari* also describes an attempt to turn a *delatio* into a *translatio*. It reports that when the canons and local populace of Saint-Omer brought Omer’s relics to Nijmegen to greet the emperor Otto I (r.936/62-73), the emperor’s brother, Archbishop Bruno I of Cologne (953-65), attempted to take possession of the relics. The saint, however, miraculously foiled his plans. Although the *Vita tertia Audomari* may have been composed after Lewinna’s *delatio*, the monks of Saint-Winnoc were almost certainly aware of both stories discussed above, as well as others like them. Saint-Winnoc was much less powerful than any of the five institutions mentioned above and for this reason, they would have feared to risk the loss of the relics.

---


479 *Vita tertia Audomari* [BHL 0768, 0769, 0771], IV.31-34 (AASS, Sep. 9, coll. 413D-14C); See also Alain Derville, *Histoire de Saint-Omer* (Lille: Presses universitaires de Lille, 1981), p. 20.

480 *Vita tertia Audomari*, IV.36-9 (coll. 414D-15A).
In addition, competition between different religious communities often centered around their patron saints. Christian Lauranson-Rosaz has remarked on the disputes that could develop when one shrine “poached” on another’s territory.\textsuperscript{481} Similarly, Sigal has stated that communities frequently disputed which saint deserved the credit for miracles when different relics were in close proximity to each other, as at Peace councils or during translations.\textsuperscript{482} It should also be recalled that the two religious communities at Ghent had been engaged in a fierce dispute with each other since the late tenth century, and that in 1052, the discovery of Bertin’s relics beneath the altar at Saint-Bertin had raised tensions with Saint-Omer.\textsuperscript{483} Both towns were volatile environments for a visit by the unknown saint of a relatively small abbey.

The route is also interesting because it suggests that the monks directly targeted Bruges. Sigal has estimated that this \textit{delatio} covered about 280 km/ 174 mi., making it relatively short in comparison to other contemporary \textit{delationes} which could reach up to 2000 km/ 1240 mi. For example, a \textit{delatio} the monks of Lobbes conducted with their patron saint Ursmer covered 570 km/ 353 mi.\textsuperscript{484}


\textsuperscript{482} Sigal, \textit{L’homme}, pp. 213-16.


\textsuperscript{484} Sigal, “Les voyages,” pp. 78-81; See also Koziol, "Monks," pp. 241-42.
Although Drogo claimed in the prologue to Book II that he “passed over many things, lest the material becoming excessive should become tedious to the one reading” (*multa pretermittit, ne superhabundans materia legenti fastidio sit*), the villages he mentioned form a plausible list of rest stops for a procession – at least on the outbound leg of the trip.\(^{485}\) Bruges was the only major town that the monks visited.

Drogo’s narrative also focuses on Bruges, which the monks visited even though the powerful collegiate chapter of Saint-Donatian was located there. Rather than greeting the new saint with hostility, however, the text reports that the chapter greeted Lewinna with an *adventus*. It notes that “when the reliquary came to Bruges, it was received with the greatest jubilation of the clergy and the people” (*dum uero feretrum Bruggas uenit, cum maximo tripudio cleri plebisque suscipitur*), and in traditional fashion, “the procession encountered the inhabitants on the road outside the castle” (*processio obuiam eis extra castellum egrederetur*).\(^{486}\) This was the only *adventus* the *delatio* account mentions. In addition, this part of the account reports one of only two miracles Lewinna performed that was not a cure. (The other was the sweating cross at Leffinge.) As the monks entered the church at Bruges – probably that of Saint-Donatian – a strong wind was blowing. Nevertheless, the saint caused the candles carried by

---

\(^{485}\) *HT, Prologus secundus*.48 (col. 622B).

\(^{486}\) *HT*, ii.II.61 (col. 625D).
the procession to flare up so that the wind did not extinguish them.\footnote{HT, ii.II.61 (col. 625E).} This was a minor miracle that probably would not have been reported had it not been connected to the recognition of the saint in the \textit{adventus}.

Why the monks targeted Bruges is not entirely clear. Perhaps, they hoped to solicit donations from the count. Although the comital court was itinerant at this time, Bruges had been the favorite residence of the counts until Baldwin V (r. 1030/35-67) shifted his favor to Lille, which was closer to the imperial border. Bruges was also in a region where the comital family held the majority of its properties.\footnote{Jan Dhondt, \textit{Les origines de la Flandre et de l’Artois} (Arras, France: Centre d’Études Régionales du Pas-de-Calais, 1944), p. 87; Adriaan Verhulst, \textit{The Rise of Cities in North-West Europe} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 101-04.} The account does not, however, report that either Baldwin or his wife, Adela, both of them generous donors to monastic foundations, participated in the \textit{adventus}. It is hard to believe that if the count or countess had been present, Drogo would have failed to note this. Perhaps, the monks hoped to target the growing mercantile population at Bruges instead. In the early eleventh century, the counts rebuilt the fortifications at Bruges and a \textit{portus} (trade port) developed alongside an earlier \textit{vicus} (market).\footnote{David Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders} (London: Longman, 1992), pp. 35-6.} Neither explanation, however, is completely satisfactory.
Although no other communities rejected the saint, Lewinna’s reputation encountered at least one further challenge. On the island of Walcheren, the saint healed a paralyzed and deaf man. Then, a virgin stricken with a grave illness had her parents bring her to the saint on a litter. After a night-long incubation on the reliquary, however, the girl died. In his explanation for Lewinna’s inaction, Drogo revealed a certain amount of embarrassment about the saint’s failure to produce a cure. His text claims that the girl asked not for healing, but whatever was more useful for her own salvation whether it was a cure or a speedy death. The text then states:

It is possible to ask, why was more of a space of life not procured for her by the saintly virgin and given to her? Because the providence of heaven gives consideration to our salvation on both sides, and grants what is better, whatever it judges of necessity for us. For, perhaps, in a return to this world, she might have entangled herself in worldly concerns, and cleaving to these, might have deteriorated by as many days [as she lived].

_Potest moueri, cur non mage sibi spatium uitæ a sancta uirgine fuit impetratum atque sibi adeo donatum. Cælestis enim providentia utrobique saluti nostræ consulit, et quod melius, quodque necessarium nobis esse præuidet concedit. Fortasse enim huic seculo reddita mundialibus se implicaret, hisque adhærescens quot diebus deterior fieret._

---

_HT_, ii.I.60 (coll. 625B-C).
Since he had already stated that his reporting was selective, one wonders why
the hagiographer chose to report this failure at all. He seems to have been trying
to explain a well-known blight on the saint’s reputation and to shield her from
any who would recall this incident in order to detract from her sanctity.

The *Historia translationis* also offers insight into the mechanism that spread
a saint’s reputation, word-of-mouth or *fama* (report/fame) as Drogo called it.

After the near-disaster at Leffinge, the text states that:

the report of the sign done took wing, a crowd gathered at the church, an
old man, a youth, and a boy of each age was there, miraculous to say
[each] saw the sign, and [each] returned a prayer of praises to the Lord
creator and at the same time to the saintly virgin… [God] displayed by
the doing of this sign, of what merit and how great in heaven she was,
who on the earth is celebrated in the praise of few men. And, indeed, it
was done from heaven, so that there would be many witnesses and
supporters of the merits of that same virgin, though at first there might be
only a few, and little by little the honor of that one would grow and would
become greater, which the people ignorant at first, and not knowing of the
truth, afterwards might proclaim [it].

*Tunc denique fama facti signi uolat, fit concursus ad ecclesiam, senex, iuuenis,
onnisque puer adest, mirabile dictu signum aspicit, ac creatori domino simulque
sanctae virgini uota laudum reddit... Huius signi facto ostendit, cuius meriti ac*
In another example, a girl at Oudenburg was stricken with epileptic-like seizures while working on the sabbath. The account states that Lewinna cured her, and she “remains healthy to this day, and announces to all how effective the blessed virgin is to those calling upon her” (quæ hodieque incolumis permanet, ac omnibus prædicat, quantum beata virgo se invocantibus ualeat).\textsuperscript{492}

The mechanism could also include visual as well as oral testimony. At Alverinckehem (Aluerinkehem), the saint cured a lame man, named Bodera, who the account states:

a little while before was carried by his crutches, soon on that same day carried the relics of the blessed virgin without a crutch. And, indeed it was done by the miraculous dispensation of God, and by the merits of the virgin, so that while he rejoiced regarding his health, he carried the benefactress of his health.

\textsuperscript{491} HT, ii.I.55 (coll. 624A-B).

\textsuperscript{492} HT, ii.I.56 (coll. 624C-D).
suis paulo ante portatus erat baculis, mox eodem die sine baculo portavit reliquias beatæ virginis. Et mirabili dispensatione dei id quidem actum est, meritisque virginis, ut dum de sua salute exultaret, sue salutis auxiliatricem portaret.493

Similarly, Boldredus, the paralytic from the reluctant community of Leffinge, sprang up and helped carry the reliquary to the next village after his cure.494

Simply the sight of laymen carrying a reliquary would have been memorable to bystanders. Normally, the members of a religious community arranged themselves in hierarchical order around a reliquary with the most prestigious members following directly after it.495 The laity followed the religious, with only high-ranking laymen usually obtaining places close to the reliquary, let alone the privilege of helping to carry it. King Charles the Bald (r. 840-77) played a critical role in shaping this tradition by personally carrying relics at Soissons (841) and Auxerre (859). After his innovation, it became standard to ask rulers to help carry reliquaries while otherwise restricting the opportunity.496 Although the Historia translationis does not state the rank of the two men mentioned above, the lack of any indication suggests that they were not

493 HT, ii.I.51 (col. 623C).
495 Ashley and Sheingorn, “Sainte Foy on the Loose,” p. 54; Sigal, L’homme, p. 159.
of elite status since Drogo usually made note of high secular or ecclesiastical rank. For example, when he wrote about a miracle that occurred later at Bergues, he identified the man whose daughter was healed as “not at all humble… for he was influential from the lineage of his blood passed on from his fathers, and he abounded in a great many riches” (haud infimus… nam sanguinis serie ducta a patribus pollebat, & substantia quam plurimum habundabat). Formerly disabled laymen carrying Lewinna’s reliquary would have provided dramatic testaments to her virtus. Those who knew the men and saw them walking in contact with the relics would not soon have forgotten what they saw. Both the spectacle of the reliquary procession itself and the sight of men they had known as disabled in perfect health would have impressed themselves on people’s memories.

The risk that a community would not display the respect due Lewinna’s status, the danger that the relics would be claimed by another institution, the embarrassment of a supplicant’s death, all of these point to the saint’s liminality during the delatio. Thus, the Historia translationis records how the saint gained gradual recognition as a saint in Flanders. The miracles she performed served as the rites of incorporation into the community of Flemish saints. The adventus at Bruges represents the highlight of the delatio because it was an official recognition of her status not conducted by the monks of Saint-Winnoc. The text

497 HT, ii.II.72 (coll. 627C-D).
reinforces the point by demonstrating that Lewinna’s status changed after the \textit{adventus}. At Dodesela, the first village the relics visited after Bruges, the local “dignitaries” (\textit{officiales}) turned out to gather around the saint in the church.\footnote{HT, ii.II.62 (col. 625E).}

Drogo ended his account of the \textit{delatio} rather abruptly. He signaled a break in the narrative by claiming that he left out many other miracles she performed on the journey “lest any squeamish person should look on excessive material with distaste” (\textit{ne quis fastidiosus superhabundanti inuideat materiæ}).\footnote{HT, ii.II.65 (col. 626A).}

The incorporation process, however, continued in the next section of the text.

\section*{4.8 Four Miracles at Bergues}

Although the end of the \textit{delatio} brought the saint’s relics to rest at Saint-Winnoc, Lewinna had not quite achieved her full status as patron saint. As Benedicta Ward has pointed out, members of the lay population who lived near a saint’s shrine claimed a special right to the saint’s intercession.\footnote{Benedicta Ward, \textit{Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record, and Event, 1000-1215} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), p. 35} In the final section of the text, the emphasis is on establishing the proper relationship between Lewinna as patron saint and the mortals over whom she extended her \textit{patrocinium}. The \textit{Historia translationis} shows Lewinna claiming the residents of
Bergues and the surrounding area rather than the laity’s hesitancy challenging the saint to act. The saint makes these claims by unusually frequent projections of her power across space.

The last section of the text begins with the story of a girl from Bergues who was unable to travel to the saint’s shrine because of her infirmities. The girl, who was ten years old, had been disfigured from birth and was unable to move on her own. On Good Friday, her parents went to Mass while she and her nine-year-old brother remained at home sleeping. The children awoke and decided to ask Lewinna to cure the girl. The boy dragged his sister into the family’s garden, and the pair “prayed in the direction of God’s temple and Saint Lewinna” (uersus templum deum sanctamque leuuinam adorant). The girl was healed, and her parents were suitably amazed when they returned from Mass. While the town celebrated the miracle, report of it reached the countess of Flanders Adela who seems to have been staying at Bergues at the time since she summoned the mother and children to her. Drogo added that he was greatly honored by being commissioned to record the miracle at that time. He does not, however, specify who asked him to write about the cure, though the text gives the impression that he was present when the villagers appeared before the countess.

501 HT, ii.II.67 (col. 626C).
502 HT, ii.II.66-8 (coll. 626A-E).
The next miracle story states that a group of the inhabitants “of the territory of Bergues” (*Bergensis pagi*) made a pilgrimage to Rome. While there, one of the female pilgrims fell seriously ill. She prayed to St. Peter and to the saints of Bergues, though apparently not to Lewinna because, according to the account, she was unaware of the saint’s recent arrival from England. (Drogo wrote that the saint’s reliquary had not yet been constructed.) Lewinna appeared to the woman in a vision, identified herself and reported the arrival of her relics at Saint-Winnoc. Then, she healed the woman. When the pilgrim told her companions of the vision, they confirmed the report of Lewinna’s arrival at Saint-Winnoc.\(^{503}\)

A third story, contains elements of both earlier stories. It reports that, like the girl in the first miracle, a woman “from the territory of Bergues” (*de territorio Bergensi*) was unable to reach the saint’s shrine due to illness. Like the pilgrim to Rome, the saint appeared to her in a vision and healed her.\(^{504}\)

In the final miracle performed from Bergues, a rich and influential man “from the territory of Bergues” (*de territorio Bergensi*) had a daughter, deaf and mute from birth. Lewinna appeared in a vision to the man’s neighbor, a pious but poor widow whom villagers suspected of taking unnecessary alms for herself. The widow went to the girl’s mother as the saint commanded and told

\(^{503}\) *HT*, ii.II.69-70 (coll. 626E-27B).

\(^{504}\) *HT*, ii.II.71 (coll. 627B-C).
the woman that Lewinna wanted the mother to take her daughter to Saint-Winnoc. The girl’s father, however, suspected the widow’s motives and forbade his wife and daughter to go. Disobeying her husband, the girl’s mother surreptitiously readied two horses and rode toward the abbey with her daughter:

When they approached the monastery, the evening service was being called… In the same hour before they reached the monastery, the girl hearing the bell spoke to her mother, "My dear mother, tell me, what might it be that I hear?" In that place then she heard and spoke for the first time.

*Dum appropinquarent monasterio, uespertina sinaxis pulsabatur… Eadem hora antequam accederent ad monasterium, puella audiens campanam locuta est matri.*

*Mi pia mater dic mihi, quid siet [sit] quod audio. Eo in loco tunc primum auduit locuta est.*

These four cures are interesting in part because they were all performed at a distance from Lewinna’s relics. Sigal has described the thaumaturgic power of the saints he studied as spreading across the landscape in concentric circles: from a distance that allowed one to see the sanctuary, from the cemetery of the church, from the threshold of the church, from a distance that allowed one to see relics themselves, etc. Although a major saint’s zone of influence could be vast, saints’ powers were usually most concentrated in the presence of their relics. The

---

505 *HT*, ii.II.72 (coll. 627C-F).
farther one traveled from a shrine, the less likely it was that a saint would act. Often, the only reason the saint did act was that the beneficiary was too incapacitated to travel to the shrine. Of the 2,050 miraculous cures Sigal studied, only 396, or 20%, occurred outside the presence of relics. It is striking that despite the relative infrequency of cures from a distance, all four of the miracles involving inhabitants of Bergues or the surrounding region were performed some distance from Lewinna’s shrine. The miracles suggest that the saint knew no physical bounds to how far she could project her power. Aside from their incapacities, the crucial factor in these cures seems to have been the fact that the beneficiaries all lived near the town of Bergues. This is most apparent with the woman who made a pilgrimage to Rome. Lewinna’s *patrocinium* extended over *people* not a territory. There is no indication that Drogo consciously meant to make this claim in recording these particular miracles. Instead, the impression comes from his perception that the connection between mortals and the saints was personal, not physical.

At the same time that Drogo remembered Lewinna projecting her power outward, he also described the saint attracting the beneficiaries to her. The brother and sister prayed “in the direction of God’s temple and Saint Lewinna”

---

uersus templum deum sanctamque leuuinam).507 The brother and sister were orienting themselves toward the saint’s shrine, emphasizing her attraction.

In the story of the pilgrim whom Lewinna healed at Rome, Drogo was consciously attempting to discourage people from neglecting Saint-Winnoc by reproducing a *topos* found in other hagiographic works about local shrines. The *topos* suggests that local shrines could match or surpass famous holy places far away. In the ninth century, for example, the monastery of Redon in southeastern Brittany claimed that its saints were more powerful than both Rome’s and Jerusalem’s.508 Similarly, Lewinna’s miracle suggests that for the inhabitants of Bergues, long pilgrimages to Rome were unnecessary. Bergues had its own epicenter of Christianity, its own pilgrimage destination.

The third miracle story contains an explicit instruction to visit Lewinna’s shrine at Saint-Winnoc. It relates that Lewinna commanded the woman she healed to visit her shrine and acknowledge her benefactress. “On that same day,

---

507 *HT*, ii.II.67 (col. 626C).

she filled the order of the young virgin commanding that she visit her, [and] she
told to those present [at the shrine] the vision” (*Eodem die præceptum uirginis
iubentis uti se uisitaret implet, narrat præsentibus uisionem*).509

The details of these miracle accounts were prescriptive as well as
descriptive. They offered models for how the community of the *territorium
Bergense* should relate to the new patron saint. In this regard, they resemble
other prescriptions in the *Historia translationis*, as well as in other hagiographic
texts of the period. These texts describe two obligations that beneficiaries
incurred as a result of a saint’s intercession. First, they had to publicize their
good fortune by, at a minimum, reporting it to the custodians of the saint’s
shrine, usually by visiting the shrine in person. Second, some sort of offering of
thanks was customary. The men who carried Lewinna’s reliquary during the
delatio are a good example of the former. Regarding the latter, Drogo’s work
notes that the man cured at Alverinckehem offered “a candle of his own length”
(*suae longitudinis candelam*) in thanks to the saint.510 The woman from the
Bergues community whose story followed that of the pilgrim also offered a
candle, while the man from Leffinge brought the monks eleven sheep.511 The
text notes other offerings as well. Hagiographers sometimes recorded a saint’s

509 *HT*, ii.II.71 (col. 627C).


511 *HT*, ii.II.69 (coll. 626E-F); *HT*, ii.I.55 (coll. 624A-B).
anger when a beneficiary left a shrine without making known the miracle or offering thanks to the saint. Other hagiographers even recorded instances of saints revoking cures or punishing beneficiaries who failed to fulfill these obligations. Both obligations would have been critical to a monastery trying to increase its status within Flanders.

4.9 Patron Saint

By analyzing the Historia translationis s. Lewinnae with the modern anthropological model of rites of passage, it becomes clear that it was much harder to create new ties between a saint and a community than to destroy old ones. To use Geary’s analogy to the ritual kidnapping of brides, it was much easier for Balger to elope with Lewinna than it was for him to have his family and community accept her. Removal of the saint’s relics from her old community put her status at risk. Even if her relics survived the journey, there was no guarantee that she would be treated better or even similarly in Flanders.

Much of the uncertainty and difficulty in this process was the result of complex negotiations over the recognition of Lewinna’s status. First, the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc subjected the relics to a three-part test: 1) the prior examined the relics before they reached Bergues, 2) Abbot Rumold examined the relics again and accorded the saint recognition with an adventus.

---

512 Sigal, L’homme, p. 185.
and 3) Bishop Bovo examined the relics and the accompanying cartula and conducted the depositio. In response, the saint performed a cure through the wine used to wash her relics. Second, the general lay population challenged her and received more miracles in response. The miracles expanded her reputation and led to the adventus at Bruges. Finally, the saint’s position within the local community surrounding Bergues needed further definition. Miracles again accomplished this task.

The process of establishing Lewinna’s shrine at Bergues was arduous for the monks of Saint-Winnoc. They also placed their communal prestige at some risk. By conducting the delatio, they were taking a chance that the unknown saint might not produce miracles in proof of her status. Should Lewinna have failed to perform miracles, the monastic community’s reputation would have suffered a blow along with the saint’s. Her inaction at Leffinge, only the second village the procession had visited, must have caused great consternation among the monks for this reason. The composition of a hagiographic dossier like that contained in the Historia translationis was also a significant investment of time and energy for the hagiographer who undertook the task.

It is unlikely that many of Drogo’s contemporaries would have read the Historia translationis in its entirety or in the order it has come down to us. Instead, most would have heard only portions of it read on Lewinna’s feast day. The manuscript Bergues 19 from Saint-Winnoc bears witness to this fact. As in
the other prose texts in the manuscript, lectio markings appear in the margins of the Historia translationis. The scribe made the first of eight lectio marks next to the part relating the miracle involving the wine used to wash the saint’s bones. The last mark appears next to the part relating her passio.513 In addition, Book II has headings in rubricated letters to indicate the beginning of individual miracle accounts. Any of these readings could be excerpted to fit an occasion. For example, the report of the miracle performed at Rome could be read if the frequency of pilgrimages to other shrines increased among the residents of the territorium Bergense. A section on Lewinna’s virtues as a virgin could be read in a sermon designed to encourage these virtues among the monks or even the laity of Bergues.

The sophisticated style, subtle allusions to classical literature, and lack of either lectio markings or headings in the translatio account indicate that it was a special-purpose section. It was probably read silently, for the most part, by Drogo’s fellow monks. It may also have been read aloud on special occasions in order to refute challenges to the authenticity of the relics. Its basic narrative could also be summarized without doing damage to the listeners’ enjoyment of an exciting tale.

513 HT, i.IV-V.40-46 (coll. 620C-621E); Bergues 19, ff. 138r-140v.
Finally, it is easy for a modern reader presented with only one source on Lewinna to forget that Drogo’s version of her *memoria* was probably not the only one available to his contemporaries. Almost certainly, memories of the saint’s actions were passed on orally among the laity as well as among the monks. People who had been cured by the saint or to whom she had refused a cure had their own stories to tell. In addition, if there was any material Drogo chose not to use in his text, it may have been available for the construction of additional *lectiones* or alternate versions. Drogo’s role in shaping Lewinna’s *memoria* was powerful since he crafted the “official” version for his abbey, but he was probably not alone. Over time, however, as other stories were lost, his voice would have become more powerful. Having seen the long-term effects of the Viking invasions, Drogo was surely aware of this.
CHAPTER 5
WINNOC AT WORMHOUT

5.1 Introduction

Of the three patron saints of the abbey of Saint-Winnoc, Winnoc, its chief patron saint, had the oldest and most diverse cult in Flanders. He first arrived in the region in the latter half of the seventh century and became the prior of a small monastic cell at Wormhout, a town located about 9 km/5.6 mi. to the south of Bergues. (See Map 11.) The monks of Winnoc’s community at Wormhout probably recognized him as a confessor-saint soon after his death in 717. In the period between 717 and 1078, hagiographers added seven texts to his dossier – four vitae and three libri miraculorum. Since the last text in the saint’s dossier, the Vita tertia s. Winnoci [BHL 8955b] (AASS, Nov. 6, coll. 285A-89D), appeared between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, it falls outside the chronological limits of this dissertation. For more on the text, see De s. Winnoco: Commentarius Praevious, 11 (AASS, Nov. 6, coll. 256B-C).
handful of major saints located in Flanders. During the same period, his relics were translated three times and his shrine was located at two different Flemish towns — Wormhout and Bergues. Forty-one miracles are attributed to him.

Winnoc’s dossier provides a good opportunity to examine the interrelationship among all three senses of the term *virtus* — virtue, intercessory power and miraculous deeds. This chapter analyzes both his role as exemplar and his role as patron saint at the monastic community of Wormhout and the chapter of canons at Bergues, the communities that housed his relics before the foundation of the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc in 1022. It focuses on two aspects of Winnoc’s cult. First, it examines how changes in the temporal world affected the hagiographic presentation of Winnoc. Second, it argues that wrenching political changes in the Carolingian empire resulted in a bifurcation of Winnoc’s cult. With the foundation of the chapter of canons, the institutional base of the saint’s cult moved to the town of Bergues, while the sacred base, the saint’s shrine, remained at the town of Wormhout.

5.2 The Monastic Cell at Wormhout

The first community to venerate Winnoc as a saint was the monastic cell (*cella*) that he helped found in the seventh century at the town of Wormhout. Because of his role in its origins, his *vita* formed part of what Amy Remensnyder would call the cell’s “foundation legend,” its account of its origins.
Remensnyder, who has studied the foundation legends that southern French
monastic communities composed about their origins, has argued that such
accounts were constructions of the past that had paradigmatic authority for the
present. These constructions stated the principles that monks believed ought to
govern their communities. When communities felt threatened by discontinuity
or destruction, foundation legends provided guides for reforming them. In
other words, for the monks of Wormhout, Winnoc was not just an exemplar, he
was their exemplar. His life modeled the virtues that the monks from his
community should practice. In addition, his holiness legitimized their
community’s organization and existence because it gave divine sanction to the
principles around which their life was organized. At the same time, Winnoc’s vita
was more than the monastic community’s foundation legend. Along with
later texts, it also defined the patrocinium Winnoc extended to the monastic
community at Wormhout. In other words, the saint helped maintain as well as
create the community. As a result, the concerns that emerge from an analysis of
his roles as exemplar and patron saint provide a silhouette of the community’s
development.

515 Amy G. Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in
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5.2.1 The Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci

The earliest hagiographic work that treats Winnoc is a composite text that Wilhelm Levison has titled the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci because it joins Winnoc’s vita to those of Omer (Audomarus) and Bertin (Bertinus).\(^{516}\) Little is known about the composition of the text, but given its unified narrative and the consistent vocabulary used throughout, it is almost certainly the work of a single author. In addition, based on the great deal of attention it devotes to the monastic community founded at the town of Sithiu by Omer (d. 668) and Bertin (d. 698), the community there probably commissioned the work (see Map 11 for the location of Sithiu). It is not clear, however, whether or not the author was himself a member of this community – the text regularly uses phrases, such as “the aforesaid monastery” (*praedictum monasterium*), rather than more familiar ones, such as “our monastery” (*nostrum monasterium*).\(^{517}\) Finally, the Vitae probably dates between c. 750 and c. 800. One chapter reports a miracle that the text says Winnoc performed “after a long time had passed” (*longo temporis spatio*

---

\(^{516}\) Although the composite text has been divided and published along with later miracles for each saint in the AASS, I have chosen instead to use Wilhelm Levison’s edition, which appears as Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SSRM, V (Hanover, 1910), pp. 753-75. As will presently become clear, Levison’s edition and terminology allow for greater precision in discussing Winnoc’s dossier.

\(^{517}\) Wilhelm Levison, “Commentary,” MGH SSRM, V (Hanover, 1910), pp. 739-41.
transacto) after his death in 717. The phrase provides a rough terminus post quem of 750. For the terminus ante quem, it is important to note that the text calls Omer and Bertin “most beloved brothers” (fratres carissimi), betraying none of the discord that often marked relations between the chapter of Saint-Omer and the monastery of Saint-Bertin, the two communities that were created when the original monastic community at Sithiu was divided in the 830s. These characteristics suggest that the author wrote for the original unified community. Furthermore, it seems possible to date the text somewhat earlier, to the period before the council of Aachen in 816. “Iro-Frankish” monastic ideals that predate the imposition of Benedict’s Rule at this council mark the Vitae, indicating a date closer to 800. The complete text of the Vitae survives in eight medieval manuscripts.

518 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 6 (p. 774).


520 1) St. Petersburg, Public Library, Fol. I, 12, ff. 98r-106r (9th-century); 2) Brussels, Bibliothèque royale Albert I, MSS. 3202 (formerly 8518-20), ff. 67r-83v (10th-century); 3) Ghent, Centrale Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS. 00244, ff. 69r-69v (11th-century); 4) Brussels, Museum Bollandianum, MS. 005, ff. 51r-52r (12th-century); 5) Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, MS. 1269 (T.1.4), ff. 295r-298r (13th-century); 6) Arras, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS. 0014 (23), ff. 53r-54v (13th-century); 7) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS. lat. 11759, ff. 187v-189v (14th-century); 8) Saint-Omer, Bibliotheque municipale, MS. 724, ff. 174r-176r (14th-century).
The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* is an apt title for this text because it expresses its dual nature. On the one hand, the text weaves the stories of three saints together into a single foundation legend. As a result, a single title suffices for the entire text. On the other hand, the text presents the *vitae* of three different patron saints, including each saint’s virtues, deeds and miracles. As a result, the plural *vitae* seems more appropriate than the singular *vita* used by Gregory of Tours for the *Vita patrum*. The hagiographer himself signaled this duality by providing only one prologue for the entire text while ending each *vita* with its own doxology.\footnote{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, Prologus, 17, 21, 28 (pp. 753-54, 764, 769, 775).}

**Co-Founders**

The text describes each saint contributing one element to the foundation of the original monastic community at Sithiu in the chronological order of their arrival in the Ternois – the region around Thérouanne, Sithiu, Wormhout and Bergues (see Map 11). Thus, Omer appears first, then Bertin, then Winnoc. The saints’ appearances in the text are not, however, mutually exclusive. Each appears in his predecessor’s *vita*, creating a single, overarching foundation narrative. Since the stages of this narrative are not coterminous with the saints’ *vitae*, the text signals the beginning and end of each foundation stage through repetition of both content and language. For example, the strategic placement of
distinctive phrases, such as “a small space of time having passed after these things” (parvo post haec temporis spatio transacto), marks key points in the narrative.\textsuperscript{522}

This type of interconnected structure is rare in medieval hagiography and strikingly similar to the structure of Jonas of Bobbio’s Vitae s. Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius [BHL 1898]. The Vitae Columbani, which Jonas composed around 640, describes the life of the Irish ascetic Columbanus (c. 543-615) along with the lives of two generations of his successors at his various monastic foundations – chiefly the monasteries of Bobbio and Luxeuil, and the nunnery of Faremoutiers.\textsuperscript{523} Rather than presenting a succession of separate vitae, Jonas’s text also intertwines the lives of its subjects. For example, Abbot Eustasius (d. 629), Columbanus’s successor at Luxeuil, appears in chapters of his predecessor’s vita on three separate occasions.\textsuperscript{524}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[522] Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 10 (p. 759).
\item[524] Jonas, Vitae Columbani, i.20, 27, 30 (pp. 196, 215, 222-23).
\end{footnotes}
The contents of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* are also similar to the contents of the *Vitae Columbani*. Both address primarily monastic audiences.\textsuperscript{525} Both stress obedience and humility as important monastic virtues.\textsuperscript{526} In addition, some of the miracles in the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* parallel miracles found in the *Vitae Columbani*. For example, both Columbanus and Bertin traveled in boats propelled and steered by God.\textsuperscript{527} In another example, one of Columbanus’s monastic brothers developed a fever and saw a vision of a man clothed in light. The man then announced that he had come to take the sick monk to heaven.\textsuperscript{528} (Such deathbed visions are, in fact, a prominent feature of the *Vitae Columbani*.)\textsuperscript{529} At the end of his life, Omer too developed a fever and saw angels surrounding his deathbed.\textsuperscript{530} Finally, the two texts sometimes use similar phrases or expressions. The most notable concerns the spirit of brotherhood that developed among monks who emigrated together. Jonas’s text describes Columbanus and the monastic companions who departed Iona with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{526} On obedience and humility in the *Vitae Columbani*, see Wood, “The *Vita Columbani*,” pp. 66-7.
\textsuperscript{527} Jonas, *Vitae Columbani*, i.22 (pp. 200-01); *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 11 (pp. 760-61).
\textsuperscript{528} Jonas, *Vitae Columbani*, i.17 (pp. 183-85).
\textsuperscript{529} Wood, “The *Vita Columbani*,” p. 67.
\textsuperscript{530} *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 14 (p. 762).
\end{flushright}
him as being so pious “that it happened that they assented as one and denied as one” (ut unum velle, unum esset nolle).\textsuperscript{531} Similarly, the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} describes Bertin and the monastic companions who came with him as “three men with one mind” (tres una cum mente viri), and Winnoc and the monks who traveled with him as “having one heart and one spirit according to the apostolic example” (cor unum et animam unam apostolico habentes exemplo).\textsuperscript{532}

These similarities are more than just coincidence. First, the monastery at Sithiu’s links to Columbanus gave it access to the \textit{Vitae Columbani}. Both Omer and Bertin entered monastic life at Columbanus’s foundation at Luxeuil – Omer under Columbanus’s successor, Eustasius (610-29), and Bertin under either Eustasius or his successor, Waldebert (629-70).\textsuperscript{533} They also may have known the author of the \textit{Vitae Columbani}, Jonas of Bobbio (c. 600-c. 665). As Jonas wrote in his text, he knew Abbots Eustasius and Waldebert personally, making it possible

\textsuperscript{531} Jonas, \textit{Vitae Columbani}, i.5 (p. 161). The reference is to Acts 4:32, \textit{Multitudinis autem credentium erat cor unum et anima una}…

\textsuperscript{532} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 9, 23 (pp. 759, 770-71).

\textsuperscript{533} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 2 (p. 755); \textit{De s. Bertino: Commentarius Praevius}, 34-5 (coll. 557A-D).
that he had visited Luxeuil while Omer and/or Bertin were still monks there.\textsuperscript{534}

In addition, Jonas spent time in Flanders with the missionary bishop St. Amand (c. 584-675).\textsuperscript{535}

Second, the monks of Sithiu also had good reason to ask the author of the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} to use the \textit{Vitae Columbani} as a model. Their foundation was one of a family of so-called “Iro-Frankish” institutions founded by Columbanus or one of his successors. If the monks of Sithiu obtained a copy of the \textit{Vitae Columbani} from Luxeuil as is likely, they would have been aware of its utility as a monastic “genealogy.” The Iro-Frankish monastic communities that copied Jonas’s text frequently omitted his material dealing with other foundations in order to focus on their own communities.\textsuperscript{536} The \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} clearly provides such a genealogy for the monks of Sithiu.

Third, until the ninth-century Carolingian monastic reforms, the community at Sithiu adhered to a version of the so-called “mixed rule” (\textit{regula mixta}) in use at Columbanus’s foundations soon after his death.\textsuperscript{537} As Ian Wood

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{534} Jonas, \textit{Vitae Columbani, Epistola} (p. 145).


\end{footnotes}
has noted, this rule was less a document than a pattern of life created by
combining precepts from four sources: Columbanus’s rigorous Rule for Monks
(Regula monachorum), Rule for the Monastery (Regula coenobialis) and Penitential
(Paenitentiale), along with Benedict of Nursia’s more moderate Rule.\textsuperscript{538} Since
ambiguities could result from this arrangement, the \textit{Vitae Columbani} became an
authoritative guide to life at Iro-Frankish monasteries. Its numerous miracle
accounts provide \textit{exempla} designed to illustrate specific monastic virtues.\textsuperscript{539} The
\textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} suggests that the community at Sithiu’s ideals
were somewhat different from those found in the \textit{Vitae Columbani} and that the
monks of Sithiu may have wanted an expression of their own monastic ideals. In
particular, the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} eschews the fierce asceticism and
miracles involving animals that form such prominent parts of the \textit{Vitae
Columbani}.\textsuperscript{540} The \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} also pays a great deal more

more descriptive formulations than \textit{regula mixta}, such as stating that a
community lived “according to the rule of Benedict and of the lord Columbanus”
(\textit{secundum regulam Benedicti vel domni Columbani}) (From the abbey of
Montierender; quoted in Prinz, \textit{Frühes Mönchtum}, p. 280). For a discussion of


attention to its subjects as institutional founders than it does as exemplars.\textsuperscript{541} For all these reasons, the \textit{Vitae Columbani} probably influenced the structure and content of the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}.

The \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} begins with a presentation of Omer as the apostolic founder of Christianity in the Boulonnais (\textit{pagus Boloniensis}) and Ternois (\textit{pagus Terwanensis}). In the prologue, the text describes how Jesus sent out the original twelve apostles and later, another seventy-two, in order to spread Christianity throughout the world. It also reports that other apostles followed these two groups and lists Omer among them. It declares that “the omnipotent God gave… to the peoples located in the western parts of the world… the apostolic teacher, Omer,” (\textit{Deus omnipotens… populis in occidentalibus mundi partibus positis… Audomarum apostolicum donavit doctorem}).\textsuperscript{542}

The first chapter opens with Omer’s life before his mission. It states that he was born near Coutances in western France and that after his mother died, he and his father, Friulf, entered the monastic life at Luxeuil in Burgundy. It says

\textsuperscript{541} On foundation accounts in the \textit{Vitae Columbani}, see Wood, “The \textit{Vita Columbani},” p. 80.

\textsuperscript{542} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, Prologus} (p. 754).
that he gained such a great reputation for holiness that eventually, the Merovingian king Dagobert I (r. 628-39) asked the saint to become the first bishop of Thérouanne (c. 637–c. 668).\textsuperscript{543}

The text continues with an account of how Omer arrived at Thérouanne and found that although the pagan inhabitants of the region had been converted by two earlier missions – one by the third-century martyrs Fuscian (\textit{Fussianus}) and Victoricus (\textit{Victoricus}), the other by the fourth-century martyr Quentin (\textit{Quintinus}) of Vermandois – the people had reverted to idolatry. Omer, however, was successful in permanently converting the inhabitants, thus it is he whom the text memorializes as the founder of Christianity in his diocese (see Map 12). Omer’s missionary efforts also led to the conversion of Adroald, who donated the town of Sithiu (649) to the bishop, making Omer the provider of both the sacred and secular bases on which the monastery at Sithiu was eventually built.\textsuperscript{544}

Rather than continuing to Omer’s miracles and death (he performed miracles while he was alive), however, the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} introduces Bertin. According to the text, three monks from Omer’s old community at Luxeuil, named Mummolin (\textit{Mummolinus}), Bertramn (\textit{Ebertrannus}) and Bertin, traveled to Thérouanne to assist his mission. A short

\textsuperscript{543} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 1-4 (pp. 753-56).

\textsuperscript{544} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 5-7 (pp. 756-57).
time after their arrival, he allowed them to found a monastic community on land to the north of Sithiu. After a few years at the “Old Monastery” (*Vetus Monasterium*), the same three monks set out to found a new community at the town of Sithiu itself. At first, Omer placed the community under Mummolin, but Mummolin soon departed to become bishop of Noyon (c. 661-86) and was accompanied by Bertramn. (One manuscript adds that Bertramn became abbot of Mummolin’s monastic foundation, Saint-Quentin.) At Omer’s command, Bertin succeeded his friend as abbot of the community at Sithiu. The text then reports that Omer kept his eyes on heaven as he became blind in his old age and finally died. It also takes care to note that Bertin buried Omer according to his wishes in the church of Notre-Dame at Sithiu (which later became the church of Saint-Omer). A report of his posthumous miracles concludes Omer’s role in the narrative. The text continues with chapters on Bertin’s activities as abbot, his death and several miracles – both those he performed during his life and posthumously. It also notes that Bertin was buried in a church at Sithiu but

---

545 The *Vetus Monasterium* later became known as Saint-Momelin (*Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, p. 760, n. 2).

546 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 12 (p. 761).
implies that this was not the same church in which Omer was buried. Thus, Bertin seems to have been buried in the church of Saint-Pierre (which later became the church of Saint-Bertin). 547

Just as the text identifies Omer as the founder of Christianity in the Ternois despite earlier missions, it remembers Bertin as the founder of the monastic community at Sithiu despite his companions’ contributions. The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* holds Bertin, not Mummolin, up as Sithiu’s ideal abbot. For example, it states that:

the holy shepherd [Bertin] guarded the crowd of monks entrusted to him by the Lord under the strict yoke of the rule with an anxious mind, knowing what was written, “to whom more is given, more is required from him.”

_turbam monachorum a Domino sibi creditam sub districto sacrae regulae iugo mente sollicita agius custodiebat pastor, sciens, quod scriptum est, “Cui plus committitur, plus ab eo exigitur.”_ 548

The quotation in this passage is particularly significant because it comes from Chapter 2 of Benedict’s *Rule*, “What the Abbot Should Be Like” (*Qualis debeat esse abbas*), which, in turn, paraphrases a biblical passage, “to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more” (*cui commendaverunt*

---

547 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 11-21 (pp. 760-69).

548 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 18 (p. 765).
multum, plus petent ab eo). Had the author of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* simply wanted to express this sentiment, he could have quoted the biblical passage directly. Instead, his source was the *Rule*’s chapter on the ideal abbot. In addition, the text also states that Bertin fulfilled the scriptural injunction, “Thus, let your light shine before men, so that they may see your good works and glorify your father” (*Sic luceat lux vestra coram hominibus, ut videant bona opera vestra & glorificent Patrem vestrum*). Bertin’s behavior fulfills the *Rule*’s requirement that “he therefore who assumes the name of ‘abbot,’ must lead his disciples with a twofold teaching; that is to say: let him show what is good and holy by deeds rather than by words” (*ergo, cum aliquis suscipit nomen abbatis, duplici debet doctrina suis praeesse discipulis, id est omnia bona et sancta factis amplius quam verbis ostendat*). Although Mummolin was Sithiu’s *first* abbot, the text presents Bertin as its *founding* abbot.

Following its report on Bertin, the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* shifts its attention to Winnoc. It describes how he and three companions, Quadanoc (*Quadanocus*), Ingenoc (*Ingenocus*), and Madoc (*Madocus*), arrived in the Ternois

---


550 Matthew 5:16; *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 18 (p. 765).

551 *Regula Benedicti*, 2.11-2 (pp. 49 and 52).
“from the very distant land of the Britons” (ex longe remota Brittonum terra). The four newcomers submitted to Bertin’s authority, and some years later (c. 695), he sent them to found a monastic cell at Wormhout on land donated by a local rich man, named Heremar. After the death of Quadanoc, Ingenoc, and Madoc, Bertin appointed Winnoc to govern the community at Wormhout. Since the text never gives Winnoc a title – it says that “the blessed Bertin… granted that holy Winnoc should govern [the cell]” (beatus Bertinus… sanctum praeses concessit Winnocum) – he was probably appointed prior, not abbot. The text concludes with Winnoc’s virtues as head of the community, three miracles he performed while alive, and three he performed posthumously.

The text’s description of Winnoc at his monastic cell parallels its description of Bertin at Sithiu. Like Bertin’s companions, Winnoc’s companions helped him build the cell at Wormhout and lived there together with him. But, as the text explains, they predeceased him because he “was unequal in age” (aetate dispar fuit) to them. As a result, Winnoc had more time to influence the development of his community, leading to his identification as its founder.

552 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 22 (p. 770). It is unclear whether the text intends Brittany or Britain.

553 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 24 (p. 771).

554 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 24 (p. 771); See De s. Winnoco: Commentarius Praevius, IV.26 (coll. 259C-D).

555 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 23 (p. 770).
In addition to associating the three saints with each other, the foundation narrative also establishes a rough hierarchy among them. The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* lavishes the most praise on Omer. First, the prologue prays for divine assistance “through the glorious patronage of this same bishop” (*per gloriosa eiusdem pontificis patrocinia*), but not through Bertin or Winnoc. Second, the text also reports on Omer’s childhood, but not Bertin’s or Winnoc’s. For example, it states that while Omer was still a young monk at Luxeuil under Abbot Eustasius (*Austasius*), he was “filled with spiritual grace, a youth in age, strong in faith, [and] made submissive to the strict rigor of the rule” (*spiritali gratia plenus, aetate tener, fide robustus, destricto regulae rigore subditus*).556 Third, it states that Omer achieved such a reputation for sanctity while living at Luxeuil that “report of blessed Omer was spread through many places until it came to the notice of Dagobert [I], king of the Franks” (*beati Audomari fama per multa loca vulgata usque ad Dagoberti Francorum regis notitiam pervenit*), resulting in Omer’s appointment as bishop.557 According to the text, Bertin’s reputation attracted monks “from many and diverse parts” (*ex multis undique partibus*), but it never mentions his fame reaching the ears of a supraregional authority, and Winnoc’s reputation was even more tightly circumscribed.558 Thus, the relatively extensive

556 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 3 (p. 755).


558 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 22 (pp. 769-70).
treatment of Omer in the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci roughly parallels the treatment of Columbanus in Jonas’s text. In the Vitae Columbani, the Irish ascetic garners far more praise and far more chapters than his successors. In addition, the Vitae Columbani relates Columbanus’s childhood, but not those of the other abbots it mentions. These differences suggest that Omer is the most important saint in the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci.

The Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci also lauds Bertin’s virtues before becoming abbot, though it does not dwell on him as much as it does on Omer. When Bertin and his companions arrive in the Ternois, Omer accepts them as his assistants (adiutores), not his disciples. It states that they were already “perfect in the catholic faith and in religious discipline, and learned in the divine scriptures” (in fide perfecti catholica et in ecclesiasticis disciplinis atque in divina scriptura eruditi). On account of their many virtues, Omer gives them permission to build a monastery at Sithiu. In addition, as noted above, the text also calls Omer and Bertin “most beloved brothers” (fratres carissimi). This description is

---

559 Jonas, Vitae Columbani, i.2 (pp. 152-55).

560 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 9 (p. 759).

561 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 11 (p. 760).

562 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 20 (p. 767).
not only a reference to their shared background as monks of Luxeuil, but also a statement of their status as co-founders of Sithiu. It implies a rough parity between the two.

The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* states that after Winnoc and his companions had lived at Sithiu for a time, Bertin perceived that they “were wise followers of the holy rule likewise replete in perfect charity and true humility” (*sagaces sacrae regulae sectatores fuisse necnon perfecta caritate et vera refertos humilitate*), and sent them to found a small monastic community at Wormhout.\(^563\)

Although Winnoc’s virtues were similar to Bertin’s, his position as a monk under Bertin’s supervision and the smaller amount of space the text expends on his praises suggest that both Bertin and Omer were more prestigious than Winnoc.

Despite the hierarchy established within this group of saints, the community at Sithiu later venerated all three jointly. The initial description of the men as the founding saints of the community at Sithiu continued to be influential even after Abbot Fridegis (820-34) split the community into the chapter of Saint-Omer and the monastery of Saint-Bertin. A donation made in the 830s reports that, moved by the destruction of his abbey’s library at some unspecified date, Guntbert, a monk of Saint-Bertin, donated numerous books: among which were two antiphonaries, which he copied with his own hand. And, he gave one to St. Omer and the other to St. Winnoc. And he

\(^563\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 23 (p. 770).
copied a third, which he illuminated with more brilliant work, whose beginning and in the song of the greater liturgies he decorated wondrously with gold letters, which, since he saw that it was more elegant, he gave to St. Bertin.

ex quibus duo sunt antiphonarii, quos ipse propria manu conscripsit; et alterum sancto Audomaro, alterum vero sancto Winnoco concessit. Scripsit et tertium, quem lucidiori opere elucidavit, cuius initium, et in carmine maiorum sollemnitatum, aureis litteris mirifice decoravit; quem, quia eligantiorem vidit, sancto Bertino contradidit.564

Although Bertin received the most elegant manuscript, even after the division of the original community the three saints were still honored together, which attests to foundation legends’ ability to shape perceptions.

Part of the reason such legends were powerful is that monks chose certain people as founders over others as a way to define their communities.565 For example, the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci notes that both Omer and Bertin were monks at Luxeuil, linking the community they founded to a family of Iro-Frankish monastic foundations that stretched from Lérins in southern Provence to Cologne in the Rhineland, and from Weltenberg in Bavaria to Le Mans in

565 Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past, pp. 92-9.
western Neustria. In addition, the text’s depiction of the men performing missionary work also reflects an important strain in the Iro-Frankish tradition. Not only have scholars often described Columbanus himself as a missionary saint, but Eustasius also attempted his own mission to the Bavarians. In addition, as noted above, Jonas of Bobbio, the author of the *Vitae Columbani*, participated in Amand’s missionary work in northeastern *Francia*. The allusions to the community of Sithiu’s origins as an Iro-Frankish foundation seem especially pointed, because during the period that the monks of Sithiu commissioned the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, the Carolingian reforms were beginning to remake Frankish monasticism in an exclusively Benedictine image. In many ways, the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*’s placement of Omer, Bertin and Winnoc in the Iro-Frankish tradition seems an attempt to place the monastery of Sithiu in that tradition in the face of the reforms.

Omer is also important for the apostolic authority the text presents him wielding. The authority a community attributed to its founders was often a statement about how it wished to construct its relationship with other institutions. Remensnyder has noted that apostolic saints, such as Omer, were a

---


popular feature of ninth-century monastic foundation legends in southern France. By identifying an apostolic saint as one of its founders, she has argued, an abbey could hope to accomplish three things. First, this type of founder provided a direct connection to the primordial layer of Christianity in a region, making the foundation of the abbey coterminous with the foundation of the faith on which it rested. Second, the abbey became a center from which Christianity emanated, giving it the overtones of apostolic authority. Third, an apostolic founder connected the community to the premier successors of the apostles, the popes, sometimes bypassing the authority of the local bishop. According to Remensnyder, “a monastery founded by and upon a saint who was himself an apostle possessed intrinsically (although not necessarily effectively) apostolic liberty.”

Since the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* takes care to describe Omer as both an apostle and the first bishop of Thérouanne, the monastery of Sithiu may have hoped to outflank the authority of the local bishops of Thérouanne on two counts.

Bertin’s status as founder is more obviously an expression of the monastic identity of the community at Sithiu. While Omer had begun his ecclesiastical career as a monk, he had left that calling to become a bishop. Bertin, however, spent most of his life as a monk and abbot, despite a short stint as a missionary. His life embodied the community’s monastic values.

---

Winnoc’s authority is more difficult to explain. At the time of Wormhout’s origins, the text states that Bertin governed a “multitude of monks at the monastery at Sithiu” (*in Sithiu monasterio multitudo monachorum*). By contrast, Winnoc governed only a “little congregation of the servants of God” (*conventiculum servorum Dei*) at a monastic “cell” (*cella*). This presentation of the community at Wormhout raises questions about why and how it obtained its own founder. Since the text was probably commissioned by the monks of Sithiu, who chose Winnoc as a founder? Why did a dependent cell even merit a separate founder? What made Winnoc preferable to the more prestigious Bertin? It was, after all, Bertin who had received the original donation of land at Wormhout.

Based on evidence from charters, the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*’s descriptions of the monastic foundations at Sithiu and Wormhout are accurate representations of the two communities, both at the time that the community at Wormhout was founded and at the time that the hagiographer wrote. In the mid-tenth century, Folcuin, a monk at Saint-Bertin, began work on a cartulary for his abbey. With later additions, the cartulary records the ownership of Saint-Bertin’s properties from the foundation of the original monastic community at Sithiu in the mid-seventh century through the death early in 1187 of the monk

---

569 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 22 (p. 769).

570 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 24 (p. 771).
Simon, the last author to contribute to the cartulary.\footnote{Guérard, Cartulaire, pp. I-III.} For the period between 649, when Adroald donated the town of Sithiu to Omer, and 717, when Winnoc died, the cartulary demonstrates that Sithiu owned at least 32 villae (not including Wormhout or Sithiu itself).\footnote{Guérard, Cartulaire, pp. 18-40.} For the period between 649 and 830, the cartulary shows that Sithiu owned at least 49 villae, and in 831, the abbey received a major donation of 30 new villae.\footnote{Guérard, Cartulaire, pp. 49-73, 79-81, 156-67.} Thus, by 831, the monastery at Sithiu owned at least 79 villae. But these were only the properties that a monk at the monastery of Saint-Bertin chose to record. They probably do not include the properties from the original monastic community at Sithiu that the canons of Saint-Omer received when Abbot Fridégis split the original community. Alain Derville has stated that in the Carolingian period, major abbeys, such as Saint-Amand, Saint-Vaast, and Sithiu – he specifically cites these institutions – could easily possess over 100 villae. He has estimated the area of such holdings at about 100,000 ha/247,105 acres.\footnote{Alain Derville, L’Agriculture du Nord au Moyen Age: Artois, Cambrésis, Flandre wallonne (Arras, France: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1999), p. 26.} Extensive properties were necessary because, as Folcuin notes, there were 130 monks at Sithiu even before the large donation in 831.\footnote{Guérard, Cartulaire, p. 74.} By contrast, the extant sources indicate that during Winnoc’s lifetime,
his community possessed only the *villa* of Wormhout and that after his death, it acquired only three more.\(^{576}\) It is possible that the cell owned more properties, but if so, they are unknown to us since no cartulary for the community has been discovered. The foundation at Sithiu was obviously much larger than the foundation at Wormhout and to a great extent property was an indication of prestige. Again, this raises the question of why Winnoc’s community merited a founder.

The geography of the Ternois points to some answers. The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* states that Bertin decided to establish a monastic cell at Wormhout because he wished “to multiply the dwelling places for the servants of God and to prepare a lodging for the poor of Christ [monks], which [institutions] at that time were rare in the aforementioned *pagus* [of Thérouanne]” (*Dei famulis multiplicare habitacula et Christi pauperibus hospitia praeparare, quae eo tempore rara in praedicto fuerunt pago*).\(^{577}\) Essentially, Wormhout was founded as an outpost of the larger community. It functioned as a place from which to spread Christianity in the region and a place where traveling ecclesiastics might lodge for the night. At first glance, it is difficult to see why the community was placed so close to Sithiu—it lies only about 20 km/12 mi.


\(^{577}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 23 (p. 770).
from the larger town. The marshes of the Audomarois, however, lay in between, and while riddled with navigable canals, these marshes made travel slow and difficult. In one of Winnoc’s later miracles, for example, another hagiographer compared crossing the marshes on foot to the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites. The same account also states that “the marsh... is thought to be more than eight miles long” (palus... plus octo miliariis tenditur).\(^{578}\) As a result, Wormhout would have been an attractive place to site a hostel as well as relatively isolated from Sithiu. The isolation would have led to the development of a communal identity among the monks at Wormhout distinct from that of their mother house at Sithiu.

In addition to the region’s topography, the distribution of Sithiu’s properties also isolated Wormhout. Of the 79 different villae from the original community at Sithiu mentioned in Folcuin’s cartulary, 54 can be associated with locations in modern France and Belgium (see Map 13).\(^{579}\) Plotting these locations on a map shows that the foundation at Sithiu’s holdings were concentrated to its west, in the Boulonnais and western Ternois. This distribution makes sense,

\(^{578}\) Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci, 10 (ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH, SSRM, V (Hanover, 1910), pp. 784-85).

\(^{579}\) The map omits several villae located to the south around Saint-Quentin in Noyon and in Compiègne, as well as property near Coutances in the Cotentin. The identification of the Latin place names in the cartulary is based on those found in Maurits Gysseling, Toponymische Woordenboek van België, Nederland, Luxembourg, Noord-Frankrijk en West-Duitsland (vóór 1226), 2 vols. (Tongeren, Belgium: George Michiels N.V., 1960).
since these regions contained the most fertile land and the major trade routes in 
the Early Middle Ages. (Quentavic – modern Étaples – near the mouth of the 
Canche was one of two major *emporia* on the coast of the North Sea during the 
Merovingian and Carolingian eras. The other, Dorestad, lay far to the northeast 
at the point where the Lek branches off from the Rhine.) Since the cartulary 
either notes the *pagus* in which most of the remaining 25 *villae* were located or 
notes that they were donated in groups with other properties, it seems 
reasonable to conclude that they would show a similar geographic distribution. 
Wormhout was situated on the eastern periphery of the monastery at Sithiu’s 
properties in a relatively less-fertile and less-populated region. With a large 
community and numerous properties to oversee to the west and south, the 
abbots of Sithiu could not have exercised much supervision over the monks at 
Wormhout. The priors of Wormhout must have enjoyed a good degree of local 
autonomy, especially over the day-to-day activities during which the most 
intimate communal bonds would have formed. In addition, the monks at 
Wormhout would have had even less frequent contacts with the mother abbey 
than their priors, fostering an even stronger sense of community among them. 
Thus, it was probably the community of Wormhout itself that recognized 
Winnoc as its founder.
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The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* must therefore represent a compromise between the communities at Sithiu and Wormhout. On the one hand, by memorializing Winnoc as a founder, the text recognizes that Wormhout had developed its own communal identity. On the other hand, it presents him as subordinate to the founders of the community at Sithiu in order to ward off the possibility that a separate identity would lead to independence. The text presents Winnoc as the monks of Wormhout remembered him, but filtered through the community of Sithiu’s lens.

*Patron Saint of Wormhout*

The monks of Sithiu and Wormhout may have attributed sanctity to their founders as a way to cast an aura of sanctity over their communities. Because holy founders were exemplars of Christian virtues to the communities they founded, the monks who imitated them gained a general aura of holiness themselves.\(^{580}\) Patron saints, however, also had other roles that complemented their recognition as founders. Their *patrocinia* sustained their communities. From heaven, the living saint offered divine intercession in support of his or her institution and his or her relics were “pledges” (*pignora*) of that assistance. Every time God performed a miracle through the saint, sacred power revealed itself in the secular world in striking ways, proving the community’s link to the divine.

---

Since the word *pignus* can mean both “pledge” and “hostage,” the practice of “humiliating” relics becomes more understandable. If a saint reneged on his or her pledge to supply divine assistance to the community, the community was then justified in holding the saint’s relics hostage until the aid was supplied.⁵⁸¹ The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* demonstrates how a monastic community’s identity could be expressed in descriptions of the *patrocinium* of a saint who was both founder and patron.

Chapter 24 of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* describes Winnoc’s sanctity, focusing on his charity and humility. After reporting on Winnoc’s promotion to the head of the cell at Wormhout, the chapter states that:

> the Lord bestowed upon him great grace of humility. For he thought that he was more base than all men, fulfilling what was written, “He that is the greatest among you shall be your servant. Because every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled: and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.”

*magnam ei Dominus humilitatis largitus est gratiam. Viliorem enim se omnibus hominibus esse putabat, implens quod scriptum est, “Qui vult inter vos maior

---

fieri sit vester minister: qui enim se exaltat humiliait et qui se humiat exaltabitur.”

Then, near the end of the same chapter, the text reports that God said “Over whom should I repose if not over the humble and peaceful and he who trembles at my speech?” (Super quem alium requiescam nisi super humilem et quietum et trementem sermones meos?). Finally, at the end of the chapter the text states that God saw “the perfect charity and humility of His servant Winnoc, [and] exalted him with glorious powers” (perfectam sui famuli Winnoci caritatem atque humilitatem intuit, gloriosis eum virtutibus exaltavit).

The description of Winnoc’s humility connects him to both the Columbanian and the Benedictine monastic traditions. First, humility was a key virtue in Columbanian monasticism as seen in Jonas’s Vitae Columbani and in Columbanus’s own Regula monachorum. In particular, the quotations from Matthew, Luke and Isaiah above recall the Vitae Columbani’s description of

---


584 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 24 (p. 771).

Columbanus and his Irish companions as they departed Brittany, where they first landed after leaving Iona. His text states:

Therefore, [Columbanus and his companions] left the confines of Brittany and proceeded to Gaul.... So great was the abundance of their humility, that just as men try to find distinctions in the offices of this world, thus conversely, that one competed with his companions regarding the cultivation of humility, one to outstrip the other, mindful of that precept, "He who humbles himself will be exalted," and of the precept of Isaiah, "To whom shall I look, if not to the humble, and peaceful, and he who trembles at my speech?"

A Britannicis ergo finibus progressi, ad Gallias.... Tanta erat humilitatis ubertas, ut versa vice, sicut de honoribus homines saeculi conantur quaerere dignitates, ita iste cum sodalibus suis de humilitatis cultu alter alterum nitebatur praevenire, memores praecepti illius, "Qui se humiliat, exaltabitur." Et illud Isaiae, "Ad quem respiciam, nisi ad humilem, et quietum, et trementem sermones meos?"  

In addition, the quotation from Isaiah also appears in one of Columbanus’s sermons. Chapter 7 in Benedict’s Rule deals with monastic humility as well, and includes the quotation from Luke stating that “Sacred Scripture cries out to us, brothers. It is saying, ‘Everyone who makes himself great will be humbled, 

586 Jonas, Vitae Columbani, i.5 (p. 161). The translation of the biblical quotation is my own.

587 Columbanus, Instructiones, II.3 (Opera, p. 70).
and he who humbles himself will be made great” (omnis qui se exaltat humiliabitur et qui se humiliat exaltabitur). The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* describes Winnoc exhibiting the monastic ideals of the mixed Iro-Frankish tradition that Omer and Bertin absorbed as monks at Luxeuil.

The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* also draws on the Benedictine tradition to describe Winnoc’s progress on the road to sanctity. In Benedict’s *Rule*, the quotation from Luke is an introduction to the twelve rungs of humility in “that ladder which appeared to Jacob in the dream” (illa scala quae in somnio Iacob apparuit). According to the *Rule*, when a monk scales this ladder, he reaches “the summit of highest humility” (summae humilitatis culmen) and “heavenly exaltation” (exaltatio caelestis). By the end of Chapter 24, the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* notes that Winnoc climbed this ladder.

According to the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, the specific form that Winnoc’s humility took was a willingness to perform manual labor. For example, the text notes that Bertin sent Winnoc and his companions to Wormhout, “observing that they devoted themselves to the work of the hands with great zeal for obedience” (cum magna oboedientiae industria animadvertens

---

588 *Regula Benedicti*, 7.1 (pp. 91 and 99).
589 *Regula Benedicti*, 7.6 (pp. 91 and 99).
590 *Regula Benedicti*, 7.5 (pp. 91 and 99).
labori manuum operam dare).\textsuperscript{591} It also states that “Winnoc, keeping this precept of the Savior [that he who humbles himself will be exalted], was accustomed to minister to the brothers subjected to him and to the guests of Christ coming to him” (Winnocus hoc Salvatoris praeceptum conservans, fratribus sibi subiectis Christique hospitibus ad se venientibus ministrare solebat).\textsuperscript{592} In addition, he “completed whatever kind of work seemed hard and heavy to the other brothers living with him... with a serene mind” (qualecumque opus aliis fratribus secum cohabitantibus durum et grave videbatur, ipse... sereno perficiebat animo).\textsuperscript{593} He was willing to do these things because he was mindful of the saying that “he who perseveres right up to the end will be saved” (qui perseveraverit usque in finem, hic salvus erit).\textsuperscript{594} This last quotation also comes from Chapter 7 of the Rule and refers to persisting until the highest rung of Jacob’s ladder.\textsuperscript{595}

In the text, Winnoc’s persistence becomes synonymous with continuing to perform the humbling tasks of manual labor even into old age. The first miracle account begins when the saint’s age threatens to prevent him from working any longer. It stresses Winnoc’s concern over his failing strength:

\textsuperscript{591} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 23 (p. 770).

\textsuperscript{592} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 24 (p. 771).

\textsuperscript{593} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 24 (p. 771).

\textsuperscript{594} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 25 (p. 771).

\textsuperscript{595} Regula Benedicti, 7.36 (pp. 95 and 100).
burdened with venerable old age and deserted by bodily vigor... he pondered with an anxious mind how he might be able to serve God and the brothers subjected to him with the labor of his hands in his old age...

Cum igitur agius Christi confessor Winnocus venerabili senectute fuisset adgravatus, carnali etiam virtute desertus... mente cogitavit sollicita quomodo Deo et fratribus sibi subiectis suarum labore manuum in sua potuisset senectute servire...

Inspired by God, however, the saint enters the mill that his community uses for grinding its grain. Then, standing alone with his arms raised in prayer, he begs for divine assistance. God answers him and turns the millstone without any help from human hands, producing copious amounts of flour.

Winnoc’s first miracle bears a superficial resemblance to several miracles in Jonas’s Vitae Columbani. In one example, Columbanus is living as a hermit in a mountain cave when the young boy assisting him complains that bringing water up the steep mountain path tires his knees. The saint prays and a fountain of water miraculously appears in the back of the cave. In another example, two monks of Bobbio are strengthening the fence around one of the abbey’s vineyards and cut down a tree too heavy for them to budge. They pray and are

---

596 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 25 (p. 771).
597 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 25 (p. 771).
598 Jonas, Vitae Columbani, i.9 (pp. 167-69).
then able to move it. Later, many brothers working together are unable to move the tree again.\(^{599}\) In these and other examples, divine intercession performs manual labor for monks.

Winnoc’s miracle is, however, different. While the miracles in the *Vitae Columbani* involve either the appearance of food or the completion of manual labor, the miracle in the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* involves the completion of manual labor leading to the provision of food. The text stresses such labor as a prerequisite for survival in a biblical quotation placed at the end of the account. It notes that Winnoc bore in mind the apostolic command, “He should not eat who will not labor” (*Non manducet qui non laborat*).\(^{600}\) The quotation comes from the second epistle to the Thessalonians, which remarks that Paul had heard that some of the members of the Christian community at Thessalonica were idle and not supporting themselves. Their behavior, it says, ran counter both to the example of industriousness Paul had set when he was visiting the community and to his instructions that those who were unwilling to work for their bread should not receive any.\(^{601}\) The quotation is significant because it is so emphatic about the need to work.

\(^{599}\) Jonas, *Vitae Columbani*, ii.25 (pp. 293-94).

\(^{600}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 25 (p. 772); The biblical passage is 2 Thessalonians 3:10. The translation is mine.

\(^{601}\) 2 Thessalonians 3: 8-9, 12, 14.
Manual labor’s place in monastic life differed by monastic tradition. In antiquity, labor was often seen as a Christian virtue, while in the Middle Ages, monks with noble backgrounds often found it unpalatable. Some medieval monks probably welcomed the expansion of monastic holdings that frequently led to monks directing, rather than performing, manual labor. In Iro-Frankish monasticism, labor was often necessary but not mandatory. The *Vitae Columbani*, for example, contains miracle stories in which the monks work but it makes no special connection between labor and food. Although Chapter 48 of Benedict’s *Rule* prescribes manual labor along with reading to avoid idleness, it never makes the connection to food so strenuously. Among monastic rules, only the little-known one composed by Bishop Ferreolus of Uzés for his sixth-century foundation, Ferreolac, emphasizes the necessity to work so strenuously. It too quotes the passage from Thessalonians.

Similarities between the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* and one of the few hagiographic texts that cites the passage from Thessalonians, the *Vitae sanctorum martyris Germani abbatis et Randoaldi praepositi* [BHL 3467], indicates

---


603 Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, p. 537.

604 *Regula Benedicti*, 48 (pp. 227-30); See especially lines 7-9 (pp. 227 and 229).

that hagiographers working in the Iro-Frankish tradition considered manual labor an important element of life at monastic “outposts,” such as Wormhout. The *Vitae Germani et Randoaldi* states that Germanus, the first abbot of Granval (618-70), “displayed an example of humility and charity to all” (*exemplum humilitatis & caritatis omnibus exhibebat*), then notes that he too kept Paul’s command in mind.606 The similarities to the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* are important because both texts were part of the Iro-Frankish tradition. According to Friederich Prinz, Abbot Waldebert of Luxeuil (629-70) sent Germanus to found an outpost at Granval near Basle about 629. Bobolenus, who became the third abbot of Columbanus’s foundation at Bobbio around 639, composed the *Vitae Germani et Randoaldi*.607 Finally, Jonas of Bobbio dedicated the *Vitae Columbani* jointly to Waldebert and Bobolenus.608 These connections suggest that the author of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* may have consciously borrowed from the *Vitae Germani et Randoaldi*, or that this was an ideal enforced at such small Iro-Frankish outposts.

---

606 *Vitae s. martyris Germani abbatis et Randoaldi praepositi* [BHL 3467], 6 (AASS, Feb. 21, col. 264D).


The evidence from the monastic community at Wormhout indicates that concerns about manual labor were more than just a hagiographic *topos* or monastic ideal. The small number of the community’s holdings indicates that it had few dependent peasants to perform labor for the monks. In addition, the region to the east of the marshes was not as fertile or populated as the western and southern parts of the Ternois. In fact, larger population centers along the coast, such as Bruges and Ghent, depended upon imported grain to survive, and it was at least partly for this reason that the counts of Flanders would later push southward into the more fertile Artois and Vermandois. As a result, the monks at Wormhout, including their priors, most likely had to perform manual labor in order to survive. A patron saint who strove to work even in old age would have been a powerful exemplar for the monks, many of whom would have been younger sons of the nobility. It also must have been of great comfort to them that Winnoc’s *patrocinium* included the miraculous completion of manual labor to support his *familia*. In his first miracle, Winnoc becomes literally the “breadwinner” for his community.

Maintaining the community also meant that Winnoc occasionally had to exercise his patriarchal authority – both as prior and as patron saint. While discussing Winnoc’s first miracle, the text notes that he prayed “also with the

---

door having been closed according to the precept of the Lord” (*clauso etiam secundum Domini preceptum ostio*). The reference here is to Matthew 6:5-6 in which Jesus commands his disciples to pray in secret to avoid acting like the hypocrites who pray in public so that people will think them pious. The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* attempts to convey Winnoc’s humility in wishing to hide his miracle-working power. According to the second miracle account, however, after the saint had returned to the mill for several days and repeated the miraculous grinding of the grain, the monks began to wonder how the venerable old man was producing so much flour. One of the brothers dared to peer through a small portal in the mill’s wall and saw Winnoc performing the miracle. The millstone immediately stopped and the monk was repaid for his boldness with paralysis and blindness in a miracle of chastisement. Later, Winnoc miraculously restored the man’s health. At once, the account illustrates the chastisement that awaited monks who disobeyed their prior’s commands and the founding principles of their community.

---

610 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 25 (p. 772).

611 “And when ye pray, you shall not be as the hypocrites, that love to stand and pray in the synagogues and corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men: Amen I say to you, they have received their reward. But thou when thou shalt pray, enter into thy chamber, and having shut the door, pray to thy Father in secret, and thy father who seeth in secret will repay thee.”

612 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 25 (pp. 772-73).
Since the curious monk obviously acted in contradiction to Winnoc’s desire to work in secret, his story links this miracle to a series of *exempla* in the first book of the *Vitae Columbani* that illustrate the virtue of obedience. Since these *exempla* far outnumber those of any other type in Jonas’s text, obedience is one of its primary concerns.\(^{613}\) This conclusion is bolstered by the fact that obedience is the first topic in Columbanus’s *Regula monachorum*.\(^{614}\) Although the theme is not nearly as prominent in the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, the Iro-Frankish influence again seems evident.\(^{615}\)

In the last three chapters of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, Winnoc’s status as patron saint becomes even more closely identified with the existence of his community. The fourth miracle account relates that one day, a long time after the saint’s death (*longo temporis spatio transacto*), while the monks were taking an afternoon nap, a fire broke out in a building adjacent the church at Wormhout. Then “suddenly, the rapid force of the flames” (*subito velox flammarum impetus*) entered the church itself “with a great roar” (*cum magno strepitu*). The text continues that “with the flames running through the dry wood, the entire church

---


615 Omer’s *vita* also deals with disobedience in a miracle. A youth at Boulogne whom Omer has expressly forbidden to go sailing disobediently to sail, and is swept out to sea in his little boat. Despite his best efforts, the youth is unable to reach shore until he prays for forgiveness from Omer (*Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 8 (pp. 757-58)).
was burned in the fire’s great fury, and the flames suddenly consumed all the wooden buildings which were around it” (*tota ecclesia, flammis per arida ligna currentibus, immenso ignis furore fuit exusta, cunctaque lignea quae in circitu eius erant aedifica subito consumperat flamma*).\(^{616}\) Fearful that Winnoc’s relics had been lost, the monks ran to his tomb but found it miraculously intact even though the roof above it had burned.

In the fifth miracle account, the brothers carry their patron saint’s body from the ruined building, intending to house it “in a place far from the church” (*in remoto ab ecclesia loco*) until the building could be reconstructed.\(^{617}\) The saint, however, objects. At Winnoc’s behest, God – literally, the divine hand (*divina manus*) – miraculously immobilizes the monks carrying the saint’s body. They discuss the matter, saying “perhaps, it is not granted to us by the Lord that we should carry that body of the blessed man to the place far from the church” (*forsan non est nobis a Domino hoc concessum ut istud beati viri corpus in remotum ab ecclesia portemus locum*).\(^{618}\) They then pray that God will allow them to move the

\(^{616}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 26 (p. 774).

\(^{617}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 27 (p. 774).

\(^{618}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 27 (p. 774).
body to a little garden (hortulum) next to the church, and without delay (sine mora) they are able to do so. Finally, the text reports that “terrified from the aforementioned sign, they did not dare to carry it farther” (ex praedicto enim signo perterriti, non ausi sunt longius illud portare).619

The last chapter reports one other miracle that it says occurred “not a long space of time after these things” (non longo igitur post haec temporis intervallo).620 In the account, Winnoc heals a lame man after the original church at Wormhout has been rebuilt. As the brothers are celebrating nocturns, the man enters the church and watches as two arrows of fire (duas sagittas igneas) streak into his ears. Blood then pours out of the orifices of his head (foramina capitis) – streams of blood and pus were a common feature of miraculous cures – and he runs around the church declaring his good fortune to the crowd that has gathered.621 The cure itself is memorable, but juxtaposed to the account of the fire and the saint’s short translation it emphasizes Winnoc’s continuing presence at Wormhout.

Taken together, these last three chapters amount to an abridged refoundation legend. Such legends treat questions of continuity and discontinuity in monastic communities. Sometimes, they present new foundations as refoundations in order to emphasize the continuity of sacred

619 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 27 (p. 774).
620 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 27 (p. 774).
621 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 28 (p. 775).
space, while at other times, they stress discontinuity in order to take advantage of the chance to reform communities.\textsuperscript{622} In this case, although transmitted through the filter of the mother abbey at Sithiu’s hagiographer, the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} indicates that the monks of Wormhout preserved a story that further distinguished their communal identity from that of the foundation at Sithiu. The destruction of the church at Wormhout could have meant the decline or dissolution of the community attached to it. Given the community’s relative poverty, there was no guarantee that the church would be rebuilt. The reconstruction also had the potential to lead to a similar end by emptying the cell’s treasury. In addition, the destruction of the church at Wormhout threatened to deprive the community there of Winnoc’s relics: the monks were apparently prepared to take the relics to Sithiu – the most likely \textit{locus remotus} to which the text refers – and there is a strong probability that the mother abbey would not have permitted the relics to leave its possession. As the production of the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} itself attests, the mother abbey was not only willing to venerate Winnoc, but also better equipped to foster his cult. It could have claimed the relics from its dependent cell quite easily. Deprived of its patron saint, the community at Wormhout would have had a difficult time maintaining its social cohesion as well as its material fabric. By physically immobilizing his casket at Wormhout, however, Winnoc ensured that

\textsuperscript{622} Remensnyder, \textit{Remembering Kings Past}, pp. 44–50.
his community would be reconstituted. In doing so, he became more completely its founder. The fact that he chose to remain in a garden rather than to be translated also magnifies the implicit separation from the original community at Sithiu. The proper place to house a saint was a church, and a garden paled in comparison to the grand churches of the mother abbey.

The presence of Winnoc’s relics maintained sacred as well as physical continuity at Wormhout. A church – often called the “gate of heaven” (porta caelis) – was usually the most sacred place in a monastic community. Hagiographic texts, however, usually focus more closely on sacred space connected to relics rather than to churches. In the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, this focus shifts attention away from the ruined church. After dwelling on the discovery that the saint’s tomb was intact despite the ferocity of the blaze, the text reports that:

[the monks] gave great thanks to the omnipotent Lord, who not only frees the souls of his servants from the flames of perpetual punishment, but also at the same time preserves their bodies unharmed from the force of the present fire [in this world].

---

623 Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past, p. 35.
immensas omnipotenti Domino referebant gratias, qui non solum animas suorum
famulorum a flammis poenae liberat perpetuae, sed et eorum corpora a praesentis
ignis impetu illaesa simul conservat.\textsuperscript{624}

The relics’ survival demonstrates the permanence and sacredness of the relics. Neither the earthly flames of “the present fire” (\textit{praesens ignis}) nor the “flames of perpetual punishment” (\textit{flammae poenae perpetuae}) can prevail against the divine protection afforded to saints. By remaining at Wormhout, the saint preserved its sanctity, as is evident in the miraculous cure he subsequently performed.

With some qualifications, then, the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}’s presentation of Winnoc closely parallels the actual development of the monastic community at Wormhout. From a supraregional perspective, the text’s borrowing from the \textit{Vitae Columbani} places Winnoc, along with Omer and Bertin, firmly within the Iro-Frankish monastic tradition in \textit{Francia}. From a regional perspective, Winnoc was one of three major saints in the Ternois who contributed to the foundation of a community at Sithiu that included the dependent community at Wormhout. On a local level, Winnoc, the least prestigious of the three saints, still had nearly independent control of his own small community at Wormhout. There, he was a good leader who provided, often by his own manual labor, for the monks under his care, both during his life and after his death. He was their chief patron saint and his \textit{patrocinium} reflected

\textsuperscript{624} \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 26 (p. 774).
the concerns of his community, especially a concern for manual labor. The result is that Winnoc’s personal narrative intertwines with the institutional narrative of the community at Wormhout, blurring the nature of each. In the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, Winnoc’s *vita* parallels aspects of the development of the community at Wormhout.

*Secular Authority*

Despite the close identification between the three saints and their communities in the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, it is clear that the text ignores significant aspects of the communities’ development. Specifically, it ignores secular authorities except where their actions cast the saints in a good light or are important to the foundation narrative. For example, the text mentions a king only once, and then only with reference to Omer’s original commission to become bishop of Thérouanne. It states:

> Then the report of blessed Omer… came to the attention of Dagobert [I], king of the Franks [r. 628-39]… After these things, with many years intervening, [Omer] was called for the purpose of teaching and governing the episcopal populace of the city of Thérouanne, by the aforesaid most pious prince, Dagobert, and by the entire people of the Franks, with St. Acharius, bishop of Noyon [626-38], assisting.
While the text notes the king’s role in Omer’s appointment, it also notes that he was not alone in commissioning the bishop. After these remarks, royal authority gives way to that of the “eternal King” (aeternus Rex).

The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* also mentions local figures of authority, but their positions remain obscure. The text describes the man who donated Sithiu to Omer as:

a certain powerful man, by the name of Adroald, very rich in the empty riches of this world, whom the blessed Omer converted from the error of paganism to the catholic faith, and whom he baptized with his entire familia.

*quidam vir potens Adrowaldus nomine, in divitiis hujus sæculi vanis valde dives, quem beatus Audomarus de errore gentilitatis ad fidem convertit catholicam, quemque cum omni sua baptizavit familia.*

---


626 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 15 (p. 763).

627 *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 10 (p. 759).
It does not, however, clarify what sort of power or position Adroald held. Similarly, the section on Bertin describes a man, named Waldbert, whom Bertin cured in vague terms as “a certain noble man, also an honored count according to the vain dignity of this world” \( \textit{quidam vir nobilis, honorificus etiam comes secundum vanam hujus sæculi dignitatem} \). Since the power of counts could vary widely based on the territories in which they held power, the description of the man is vague and without context. Finally, the section on Winnoc simply calls Heremar, the donor who gave Wormhout to Bertin, “a certain rich man” \( \textit{quidam vir dives Heremarus} \).

The \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}’s perspective contrasts with that of the later cartulary of Saint-Bertin, which suggests frequent royal activity in the Ternois. It records exemptions, privileges and confirmations granted to the abbey by various Merovingian and Carolingian rulers. In the process of recording the abbey’s privileges, it also notes the succession of kings who confirmed those privileges. For example, at one point, it states:

Meanwhile, the aforesaid glorious king of the Franks, Theoderic [III], having died, in the year of the incarnation of the lord 682, which was the seventeenth year of his reign, his son, the boy Clovis [III], was raised with glory in the kingdom of the Franks.

\begin{itemize}
\item[628] \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 15 (p. 763).
\item[629] \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci}, 23 (p. 770).
\end{itemize}
Decedente glorioso interea Francorum rege suprascripto Theoderico, anno incarnationis dominicæ DCLXXXII, qui erat annus regni ipsius XVII, filius ejus Clodoveus puer in regno Francorum gloriose sublevatur.630

In addition, the cartulary describes a variety of other lay authorities, including counts, nobles and various types of warriors (milites, cavallarii) with whom the abbey interacted.631

Scholars have disagreed about the amount of real power that charters and diplomas reveal. Typically, immunities and exemptions have been seen as signs of royal weakness. Barbara Rosenwein has argued, however, that far from indicating royal weakness, such grants were made from a position of power.632

The critical issue in this chapter is, however, how the sources remember the past. Whether royal authority was weak or strong, the cartulary presents kings taking an interest in Saint-Bertin and the community taking an interest in kings. It also presents regular interaction with other powerful lay figures. Even if the cartulary’s interest was somewhat anachronistic (Folcuin began composing it in 962), it at least shows that Saint-Bertin was maintaining the sort of records that would allow an author to discuss secular authorities. The Vitae Audomari, Bertini,

630 Guérard, Cartulaire, p. 34.

631 See, for example, Guérard, Cartulaire, pp. 97-107.

Winnoci, however, largely overlooks these authorities, remembering events from a perspective in which secular position was part of the “vanity” of this world and merited only passing notice. This bias is not necessarily inherent in hagiography. Chapter 6 demonstrates that the monks of Saint-Pierre at Ghent were happy to record the actions of the Flemish counts in hagiographic texts.

5.2.2 The *Vita antiqua s. Winnoci*

In the 830s, Fridegis (Fridegisus), the abbot of Sithiu (820-34), divided the monastic community there and installed a chapter of canons at the church of Notre-Dame, where Omer was buried. He also reduced the size of the remaining monastic community based at the church of Saint-Pierre, where Bertin was buried. Both communities continued to share a single abbot, who was sometimes a monk, sometimes a canon, until Gérard de Brogne reformed Saint-Bertin in 944. Relations between the two communities were often amicable, though they also developed separate hagiographic traditions that could be fiercely polemical toward each other.  

---

633 Authors referred to the town as Sithiu until the 1030s or 1040s, when they began to call it Saint-Omer as well. For a detailed discussion of the division and reform of the community, see Brigitte Meijns, *Aken of Jerusalem: Het ontstaan en de hervorming van de kanonikale instellingen in Vlaanderen tot circa 1155* (Leuven, Belgium: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 2000), pp. 218-33.
At some point in the first half of the ninth century, the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* was also divided. Based on the contents of the independent *vitae* that resulted, both the canons of Saint-Omer and the monks of Saint-Bertin took steps to reshape the presentation of their chief patron saints in order to benefit their own interests. It seems that the structure and the contents of hagiographic texts at Sithiu continued to reflect the development of the communities.

Two versions of Omer’s *vita* appeared just after the split. The first version [BHL 765] omits the prologue, excerpts the first seventeen chapters from the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, and adds three posthumous miracles by Omer. This is the version of Omer’s *vita* that was contained in the *Codex argenteus*, an early eleventh-century manuscript bearing a fourteenth-century silver cover (hence the name) displayed in the collegiate church of Saint-Omer in the sixteenth century. Therefore, it seems likely that this is the version of the saint’s *vita* that was accepted by the canons of Saint-Omer. A second version

---

634 Levison refers to this version as the *Vita I Audomari* (B1) [BHL 765]. It appears in one manuscript – Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS. 855 (formerly 759), ff. 41r-44v (13th-century) – which Levison calls B1a. Another version in the *Codex argenteus*, which Levison calls B2, added an epilogue.

635 The *Codex argenteus* was destroyed by a fire in the archbishop of Bourges’s palace in 1871, but its contents and decoration had been carefully described by Charles de Linas in 1857. (Charles de Linas, “Note sur la reliure d’une vie manuscrite de Saint-Omer,” *Revue de l’art chretien*, I (1857), pp. 62-9; cited in Rosemary Argent Svoboda, "The Illustrations of the Life of St. Omer (Saint-Omer, Bibliotheque Municipale, Ms. 698). (Volumes I and II) (France)," dissertation at University of Minnesota (1983), pp. 14-16, 238, 279). The version in the *Codex argenteus* added an epilogue. Levison refers to this version as B2 [BHL 766].
of Omer’s independent vita also appeared soon after the split. In this version, Omer’s role in founding the monastery at Sithiu is minimized. Its alterations suggest that this text was an attempt by Saint-Bertin to deprive Omer of his status as co-founder of the monastic community at Sithiu.

Only one independent version [BHL 1290] of Bertin’s vita appeared. This text thoroughly revises the chapters on the saint in the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci in order to have Adroald donate Sithiu directly to Bertin and his companions. Its version of Bertin’s vita complements the second version of Omer’s vita discussed above. It also omits any mention of Winnoc and his companions. This last change was not, however, as radical as it may seem. Winnoc’s independent vita still mentions Bertin, and both the community at Wormhout and Saint-Bertin undoubtedly possessed copies of Saint-Bertin’s versions of Omer’s and Bertin’s independent vitae along with the independent version of Winnoc’s vita. Since the revised version of Bertin’s vita does not

---

636 Levison refers to the two copies of this version as the Vita I Audomari (B1b1 and B1b2). It appears in two manuscripts: (B1b1) London, British Library, Cotton MS. Nero E. I, vol. II, ff. 118-121v, (11th-century), and (B1b2) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Fell. 1, ff. 130-36 (12th-century).


638 Levison refers to this version as the Vita II Bertini. The AASS refers to it as the Vita secunda s. Bertini [BHL 1290]. It appears in four medieval manuscripts: 1) Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 764, ff. 91r-96r (10th-century), 2) Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginenses latini, 0598, ff. 105v-112v (10th-century); 3) Boulogne, Bibliothèque municipale, 107, ff. 3v-28v, 33r-45r (11th-century); 4) Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 836, ff. 171v-179r (12th-century).
contain any of the miracles the saint performed during the Viking invasions in 860 and 891 (these were recorded by another author around 900), it probably dates before 860.\textsuperscript{639}

The independent version of Winnoc’s \textit{vita}, which Levison has called the \textit{Vita antiqua s. Winnoci} [BHL 8952], reproduces Chapters 22 through 28 from the \textit{Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci} without revisions or additions.\textsuperscript{640} Since the \textit{Vita antiqua Winnoci} does not note the saint’s translation from Wormhout to Sithiu in 846, it too probably dates before the middle of the century. It appears in five medieval manuscripts.\textsuperscript{641}

As with Drogo’s \textit{Vita s. Oswaldi}, the process of excerpting removed Winnoc’s \textit{vita} from its original literary context as one of three interconnected \textit{vitae}. The most significant effect was that allusions to the \textit{Vitae Columbani} became much less evident, if not invisible, once it was extracted from the joint structure. The distinctive monastic “genealogy” that hinted at connections between the


\textsuperscript{640} This text has been published in the \textit{AASS}, Nov. 3 as chapters 1-10 of the \textit{Vita prima sancti Winnoci abbatis} [BHL 8952].

\textsuperscript{641} 1) Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 764, ff. 91r-96r (10\textsuperscript{th}-century); 2) Boulogne, Bibliothèque municipale, 107, ff. 107v-115r (11\textsuperscript{th}-century); 3) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodleian 354, ff. 29r-31v (12\textsuperscript{th}-century); 4) London, British Library, Arundel 91, ff. 216v-218v (12\textsuperscript{th}-century); 5) Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 716, vol. VIII, ff. 50v-52v (c. 1200) (Levison, “Commentary,” pp. 742-43).
community at Sithiu and other Iro-Frankish institutions was for the most part lost. Along with these connections, Bertin’s and Winnoc’s links to supraregional authorities, such as King Dagobert I, became much weaker.

Many of these developments were probably welcomed by the communities at Sithiu and Wormhout. Fridegis was an Anglo-Saxon monk whom Louis the Pious (r. 814-40) appointed as head of the royal chancellery in 819. His connections to the monarch who pushed for more thorough Benedictine reforms at the council of Aachen in 816 indicates that his reforms were directed, at least in part, toward eliminating the same spirit of Iro-Frankish monasticism that had produced the composite Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci.\footnote{Meijns, Aken of Jerusalem, pp. 218, 221.} The revision of the vitae of Sithiu’s patron saints was probably part of the reform of the community itself, in which one form of supraregional monastic tradition replaced another. In addition, the new canons at Saint-Omer would have been pleased with the elimination of the monastic focus from Omer’s vita and the resulting increased attention to their chief patron saint’s career as a bishop. For the monks of Saint-Bertin and Wormhout, the increased emphasis on the Benedictine character of their communities already present in the composite text
was actually helpful. Since the council of Aachen in 816 had mandated the exclusive use of Benedict’s *Rule* in Carolingian monasteries, obscuring their Columbanian roots would have allowed them to adapt more easily.643

Other, more subtle changes are also evident and will be discussed in subsequent sections where they shed light on how Winnoc’s dossier developed. For now, it is enough to note that independent texts became the vehicles that transmitted each saint’s *memoria* after the first quarter of the ninth century.

5.3 The Canons of Bergues

The fire in the church at Wormhout was fierce, but the Vikings were fiercer still. In 820, the first of many Viking raids hit the Flemish coast. In 836, the raiders struck again at Antwerp. In 846, they ravaged Frisia, including the emporium of Dorestad, and moved up the Scheldt as far as Ghent. The monks of Saint-Bavon responded by fleeing to Sithiu with their relics. That same year, the monks of Wormhout also fled, taking Winnoc’s relics to Sithiu as well.644 What the fire in the church of Wormhout had been unable to accomplish, the invaders seemed to accomplish with ease.

---


Between 879 and 884, the Vikings returned several times, sailing up all the major river valleys and penetrating as far south as the Remois. After 884, however, Count Baldwin II of Flanders (r. 879-918) began constructing a chain of fortifications in his territory that eventually helped repulse the attacks. He placed one of these fortifications at Bergues, where he also had a church constructed in honor of Ss. Martin and Winnoc. On 30 December, 899, Baldwin had Winnoc translated from Sithiu to the new church at Bergues and installed a chapter of canons to care for the relics.

The transfer of Winnoc’s relics to the chapter of canons at Bergues led to a rupture in the saint’s cult. Winnoc’s vita was not connected to the foundation of this new chapter. He had no links to Bergues until the count decided to have his relics translated there. In addition, Winnoc embodied monastic ideals, not those of the ordo canonicorum. The hagiography produced by the canons indicates that they responded by focusing on the one part of the saint’s cult they could influence. Unable to define Winnoc as the founder of or an exemplar for their community, they focused on the saint’s intercessory power through a connection to his original shrine. Even this focus was problematic, however. Their hagiographic texts present the saint performing miracles only at Wormhout and not at Bergues where his relics were housed.

---

645 d’Haenens, Les invasions, pp. 45-61.

The hagiography produced by the chapter of canons suggests that the community was ambivalent about the way that the Flemish counts were reshaping both the political and religious topographies of the region in the tenth century. Unable to justify Baldwin II’s translation of Winnoc to Bergues and not Wormhout, they presented their patron saint continuing to act at his old shrine.

5.3.1 The *Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci*

The canons’ first addition to Winnoc’s dossier was a brief *liber miraculorum* [BHL 8953], called the *Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci* in Levison’s edition.647 It contains four miracle accounts and appears in two medieval manuscripts.648 The critical issue in understanding this text is its date of composition. It opens with two miracles that appear to date to the early ninth century when Winnoc’s relics were still in the possession of the monks of Wormhout. The third miracle, however, appears to date to the tenth century when the relics were at Bergues. Scholars have expressed different opinions concerning the dating of the text.
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647 *Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci* (ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH, SSRM, V (Hanover, 1910), pp. 780-82). The AASS joins this text to the *Vita antiqua* and calls the combined text the *Vita primas s. Winnoci* [BHL 8952, 8953] (AASS, Nov. 6, coll. 263B-67A).

Levison, for example, has dated it to the ninth century, while Huyghebaert has placed it in the tenth. Since the institutional context for Winnoc’s cult changed between the ninth and tenth centuries, the issue demands consideration.

The *Miracula antiquiora* begins with a miracle set just after the fire at Wormhout. It reports that during the reconstruction of the church, a servant fell from the top of one of its walls, but after he lay on the ground for an hour, the saint miraculously restored him to health. The second account relates that sometime later, Count Gerard (*Gerhardus comes*) – the man who financed the reconstruction of the church at Wormhout – also built a church in honor of Winnoc on his property at Éperlecques (*Spirliacus*). He then invited “brothers of good character from the monastery of the holy man” (*fratres boni testimonii ex monasterio sancti viri*) to serve at the new foundation. One Sunday, a glass vessel used for consecrating the eucharist at Éperlecques cracked. When one of the brothers washed it in water, however, Winnoc miraculously restored it. The third account describes an annual Rogation procession conducted with Winnoc’s relics, some of which were encased in a staff (*cambutta*) decorated with gold (perhaps Winnoc’s own abbatial staff?). The procession was late in setting out,
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650 *Miracula antiquiora*, 1 (p. 780).

651 *Miracula antiquiora*, 2 (p. 781).
forcing the return journey to be made in haste and with less care than usual; no one noticed when the relics fell out of the staff with pieces of gold from the decoration. The text reports that the next day, a search was conducted until the sacristan miraculously found that the relics had fallen “into the hood of his cowl, which, at the time, we canons also used” (*in capitium cucullae suae, qua tunc etiam canonici utebamus*). The final account reports that Winnoc miraculously preserved an oil lamp from breaking or spilling its fuel when it fell from where it hung before his tomb (it does not specify where his tomb was at the time).

The chronological indicators in the text contradict each other. Three clues suggest that these miracles took place before the translation in 846. First, the miracles involving the servant’s fall and the chalice at Éperlecques took place around the time of the reconstruction of the buildings at Wormhout. Since Folcuin, the bishop of Thérouanne (816-55), stayed there in 843, during one of his tours of the diocese, the reconstruction probably took place before this date. Second, various scholars have identified Count Gerard with a count from the Ternois of the same name who is mentioned in a capitulary of Charles the Bald in

---


653 *Miracula antiquiora*, 4, (pp. 781-82).

Third, the *Miracula antiquiora* does not mention the translation of Winnoc’s relics either from Wormhout to Sithiu or from Sithiu to Bergues. Since both events would have been important developments in the saint’s cult, their absence suggests a date before the middle of the ninth century. Another reference, however, contradicts this dating. The text explicitly uses the term canons (*canonici*) to designate the ecclesiastics who conducted the Rogation procession. Thus, it seems to indicate that the miracle took place after the foundation of the chapter of canons at Bergues in 900.

The key to resolving the contradictions lies, like the relics, in the sacristan’s cowl (*cuculla*). The council of Aachen (816) that reformed monasticism in the Carolingian realm also dealt with canons. It standardized the regulations for the *ordo canonicorum* in the *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis* just as it did the regulations for the *ordo monasticus* with Benedict’s *Rule*. In addition to standardization, one of the chief goals of the council was to draw clear distinctions between canons and monks. The differences had not always been clear. Monks had sometimes had far more contact with the secular world than seemed appropriate to some reformers, and canons sometimes lived communally like monks. Therefore, the council introduced a series of bans
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designed to distinguish between the two orders. One of the bans prohibited canons from wearing cowls (*cucullae*), which became the exclusive clothing of monks.⁶⁵⁶ There is no way to know how closely the canons of Bergues observed the *Institutio* in the tenth century, but the fact that the author felt the need to explain the use of the cowl and that the note is in the past tense – *utebamur* – suggests that they observed at least this one restriction when the author wrote.

The phrasing leaves three interpretations of the use of the term. The first interpretation is that the community at Wormhout was originally founded as a small chapter of canons. This was apparently Levison’s conclusion: he has discussed a canon at the cell of Wormhout writing the *Miracula antiquiora*.⁶⁵⁷ There is some justification for this interpretation. From the Merovingian period until about 800, it was often difficult to distinguish canons from monks because much cross-pollination occurred, especially in communities that followed the *regula mixta*.⁶⁵⁸ In addition, hagiographic texts were rarely as precise as charters in defining the exact nature of an ecclesiastical community. Although royal and ecclesiastical authorities gradually took steps toward reform in the decades leading up to the council of Aachen, both Merovingian and Carolingian hagiographers usually referred to canons as *fratres* – the same term they used for
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⁶⁵⁶ Meijns, *Aken of Jerusalem*, pp. 170-86, see especially p. 176 for the prohibition of cowls.

⁶⁵⁷ Levison, “Commentary,” p. 750.

monks – and could also refer to chapters of canons as monasteria.\textsuperscript{659} Despite fluid
definitions and ambiguous terminology for ecclesiastical communities in the
seventh and eighth centuries, however, Levison’s conclusion seems untenable.
The evidence in the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci strongly suggests a self-
consciously monastic community. The text clearly states that Bertin governed “a
multitude of monks” (multitudo monachorum), and that the abbot “associated
[Winnoc and his companions]... in the multitude of holy monks” (eos...
monachorum... sociavit multitudini).\textsuperscript{660} The Vitae seems to be as exact as was then
possible about the monastic nature of the community Winnoc and his
companions joined. Furthermore, it says that Bertin sent the men “with others of
their brothers” (cum aliis fratribus eorum) from Sithiu to found the cell.\textsuperscript{661} It is
unlikely that they would have abandoned their monastic life to become canons.

A second possibility is that Fridegis converted Wormhout to a chapter of
canons along with Saint-Omer. This would mean that a canon at Wormhout
could have written the entire Miracula antiquiora in the second quarter of the
ninth century. There is, however, no evidence of such a reform at Wormhout.
Certainly, Folcuin who condemned Fridegis as “the first destroyer of the regular
life” (regularis vitae primus destructor) in his cartulary would have mentioned if

\textsuperscript{659} Meijns, Aken of Jerusalem, pp. 155-57; XXII-XXIII, 59-61, 148.

\textsuperscript{660} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 22 (p. 770).

\textsuperscript{661} Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 23 (p. 770).
the abbot had committed the additional outrage of converting Wormhout.\footnote{Guérard, Cartulaire, p. 74.}

This second possibility seems even less likely than the first.

The final possibility is that some or all of the miracles took place and were originally recorded in the ninth century, but were copied and altered in the tenth by a canon of Bergues. This is the possibility most supported by the evidence. The canon either found or substituted the terms \textit{fratres} for the monks and \textit{ecclesiae} for the sacred buildings in the text. Because the cowl was integral to the narrative of the third miracle, however, he could not expunge it and instead had to insert the note “which, at the time, we canons also used” (\textit{qua tunc etiam canonici utebamur}) to explain away its use.\footnote{Miracula antiquiora, 3 (p. 781).} There is only a slim chance that the canons of Bergues did actually conduct the procession mentioned in the account. According to J.F.A.M. van Waesberghe, a canon could wear a cowl-like outer garment in bad weather – he notes one text in which a canon requests a cowl to keep his head warm. His argument, however, is complicated by the fact that it also cites the same account of Winnoc’s miracle in question here as evidence for his point.\footnote{J.F.A.M. van Waesberghe, \textit{De Akense regels voor canonici en canonicae uit 816} (Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1967), pp. 284-85.} In addition, it seems unlikely that the exception he notes applied in this case. Rogation processions were performed either on 25 April or the three days before the Ascension (the fortieth day after Easter Sunday). If the canons
were wearing cowls to ward off the cold, the springtime weather would have to have been particularly cold for them to wear “monastic” garb during such an important public event – the text reports that the brothers processed “with the people” (*cum populo*).\textsuperscript{665} The text, however, does not note unusually cold weather. These factors make the copying of a ninth-century text by a tenth-century canon the best fit with the available evidence.

Seen as a product of the monastic community at Wormhout, the *Miracula antiquiora* essentially strengthens the same themes of renewal and refoundation found in the last three miracles of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*. In each of the new miracles, Winnoc either restores or preserves something belonging to the community at Wormhout, including himself. At the same time, the miracle at Éperlecques records the community’s acquisition of the church there by extending Winnoc’s *patrocinium* over it.

By copying the text for the chapter at Bergues, however, the canon transferred it to a new institutional context in which the same themes operated differently. For example, the text does not even mention the new shrine at Bergues. Instead, it explicitly associates Winnoc with his former shrine and a property owned by the monastic cell.

\textsuperscript{665} *Miracula antiquiora*, 3 (p. 781).
At first glance, this seems a strange text for the canons to transmit. There is, however, good reason to believe that the chapter at Bergues had connections to both Wormhout and Éperlecques in the tenth century. Baldwin V’s charter (1067) confirming the rights and privileges of Saint-Winnoc reports that when Baldwin IV expelled the canons from Bergues in 1022, he provided for their continued support by granting them some of the chapter’s properties, “since they were from noble stock” (quia de nobili erant prosapia). According to the sixteenth-century Catalogus reverendorum abbatum monasterii s. Winnoci, the count granted one of the canons a property at Éperlecques (Sperliacense). Although the list in the Catalogus does not include a property at Wormhout, Baldwin V’s charter also states that the abbey of Saint-Winnoc should receive the tithe at Wormhout, which suggests that the canons at Bergues may have received the tithe before the count gave it to the monks. The Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci, the next text in the saint’s dossier, supports this conclusion. According to this later text, the canons performed an annual procession to Wormhout on the feast of
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667 Pruvost, Chronique et cartulaire, p. 31; According to the commentary in AASS, the Catalogus is late but should not therefore be dismissed. It contains much valuable and accurate – where it can be checked – information (De s. Winnoco, Commentarius Praveius, 12 (AASS, Nov. 6, coll. 256C-E)).
John the Baptist (24 June), spending the night and conducting the daily liturgical offices in the church there. Miracle accounts associating the chapter with Wormhout and Éperlecques would not have been problematic.

This is not to say that they would have caused no problems. Brigitte Meijns has observed that Baldwin II (r. 879-918) may have usurped the property at Wormhout from Saint-Bertin. In 900, Baldwin II had Folcuin, the archbishop of Reims (883-900), assassinated for successfully blocking his attempts to gain the lay abbacy of Saint-Bertin. Meijns has suggested that Baldwin deprived Saint-Bertin of its property at Wormhout at this time and gave it or its tithe to the canons. If true, the count may also have done the same with Éperlecques. The count’s actions suggest that the canons would have been eager to legitimize their connections to these places with Winnoc’s authority.

It is likely, however, that even if the canons at Bergues did not hold any usurped properties, they still would have been defensive about their community’s origins. By the tenth century the canons must have perceived Winnoc as a thoroughly monastic saint, based on the description of his virtues in the *Vita antiqua Winnoci* as well as the saint’s connections to the monastery of

---

668 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).

Saint-Bertin. In addition, the canons were located at Bergues not Wormhout, which the saint himself had chosen as his resting place. Any usurpations by Baldwin II would only have added to their defensiveness.

Copying the miracles in the *Miracula antiquiora* seems to have been an attempt to strengthen the chapter’s claims to Winnoc as their patron saint and to his past. The miracle accounts reminded people of the associations among the saint, the community that possessed his relics, and the places where he performed the miracles. The miraculous recovery of the saint’s relics after they had been lost during the Rogation procession would have been particularly important to the canons. Any time a community’s possession of its relics was threatened, whether by theft, destruction or loss, there was an opportunity for the saint to demonstrate his or her wishes. For example, Lewinna at first refused to go with Balger by immobilizing her reliquary. Winnoc signaled his desire to remain at Wormhout by a similar action. By explicitly referring to canons, the miracle account implies that Winnoc wanted the canons to find his relics, legitimizing the chapter’s identity as the community under his *patrocinium*. 
5.3.2 The *Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci*

The next text in Winnoc’s dossier – called the *Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci* [No BHL] in Levison’s edition – elaborates on the main themes of the *Miracula antiquiora*. It contains a chapter on the saint’s translation from Wormhout to Sithiu, then a chapter on his translation from Sithiu to Bergues, followed by four more posthumous miracle accounts.\(^{670}\) It appears in one medieval manuscript.\(^{671}\)

Like the previous text, the *Miracula recentiora* also has a double institutional context. First, Huyghebaert has convincingly argued that the miracles it contains occurred while the chapter of canons at Bergues possessed Winnoc’s relics. The last miracle involves “a certain man, by the name of Adalhard, from the *familia* of the holy confessor Winnoc” (*quidam ex familia sancti confessoris Winnoci nomine Adalhardus*) who owned property at a village, called Zwevezele (*Suuivesele*).\(^{672}\) As Huyghebaert has demonstrated, this village was never part of the monastery of Saint-Winnoc’s holdings. One of the canons at Bergues usurped it when Baldwin IV dissolved the chapter in 1022.\(^{673}\) Therefore,

---

\(^{670}\) *Miracula recentiora*, 9-11 (pp. 782-85).


\(^{672}\) *Miracula recentiora*, 10 (pp. 784-85).

these miracles must have occurred before the dissolution of the chapter in order for someone from Zwevezele to have been a part of the saint’s familia. As Huyghebaert has also argued, however, two factors indicate that a monk of Saint-Winnoc copied the miracles into the present version and modified as he copied what the canons must have recorded, especially the translation accounts. First, the influences of the Miracula s. Wandregisili [BHL 8808] and the Miracula s. Bertini [BHL 1291] – both produced at Saint-Bertin – are evident in the Miracula recentiora’s translation accounts, suggesting a monastic author. A phrase – recti tramitis – found in Gregory the Great’s discussion of Benedict of Nursia in the Liber dialogorum also suggests a monastic author. Second, the description of the administrative district around Furnes (Veurnes) as the territorium Furnensi in the account of the second miracle indicates that the author probably wrote after 1035. Territorium is the term that was applied to each of a series of small castellanies carved out along the North Sea coast in the eleventh century. This term replaced the earlier pagus that referred to these administrative districts when they were still part of the larger castellany of Saint-Omer (see Map 17). Although these territoria may have appeared under Baldwin IV (r. 988-1035), they more likely date to Baldwin V’s (r. 1030/35-67) time. Huyghebaert’s opinion was
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that the text dates to around 1050.\textsuperscript{675} This section will consider what the miracle accounts reveal about the chapter of canons at Bergues, while Chapter 6 will consider the translation accounts in light of developments at the monastery of Saint-Winnoc where they were copied.

It would be interesting to discover what the canons thought of their patron saint’s \textit{vita}. Given their identity as a chapter of canons rather than a community of monks, it is likely that they would have desired major revisions. It is therefore curious that in the 122 years of the chapter’s existence there is no evidence that they attempted to produce a revised text. It is also unfortunate that the canons’ account of the translation to Bergues has not survived. (Presumably, they had some record of the translations that the monk from Bergues later rewrote in the \textit{Miracula recentiora}.) The account would contain the most direct evidence of their perspective on Winnoc’s presence at Bergues. The current text is, however, so thoroughly permeated by the monastic author’s influence that it is impossible to discern what sort of information the canons transmitted. We have only the miracle accounts, which seem to be mostly unrevised.

An important shift in the nature of Winnoc’s \textit{patrocinium} is immediately evident in the miracle accounts. Most notably, the identity of the beneficiaries changes. Whether they depicted Winnoc performing miracles in the

Columbanian tradition of exempla, providing food for his community, chastising a disobedient monk or supporting the material fabric of his monastery, Winnoc’s earlier miracles primarily benefited the monastic community that housed his relics. In the Miracula recentiora, however, the laity are the primary beneficiaries of the saint’s patrocinium – all four beneficiaries are laypeople. Behind this change in beneficiaries is an even greater change in the way that the saint related to the ecclesiastical community that housed him. In the first two miracle accounts, Winnoc cures blind people, and in the second two, he frees captives. Miracles such as these were generally used to publicize a shrine and spur donations, not to maintain the religious life of an ecclesiastical community. In these miracles, the transition from the church to the saint’s relics as the communal focal point that began with the fire at Wormhout is completed. The canons implicitly adopt a role as custodians of Winnoc’s shrine.

What is surprising about this last development is that the Miracula recentiora identifies Wormhout, not Bergues, as the location of Winnoc’s shrine. The text makes the reason for this identification abundantly clear: it was the place in which the saint had lived, died and immobilized his body. For example, the first miracle account describes Wormhout as “the place of his own rest, in which place he commended his earthly body to the ground and his spirit ascended to the heavenly heights, whence also he had previously been borne away [to Sithiu]” (locus proprie quieritionis, quo terrena terris commendavit et celestia
spiritus celsa conscendit, unde quoque prius asportatus fuerat). In addition, the third account identifies it as the place where “the oft-named coenobium of Wormhout” (saepe dictum Woromholt cenobium) was located, and the fourth calls it the location of “the monastery of the confessor of Christ” (monasterium Christi confessoris).

Moreover, at least once a year, Winnoc’s relics were actually physically present at Wormhout. The first account, which follows the two chapters reporting the saint’s translations, states that “it was decreed by the religious men serving God, that each year on the feast of St. John the Baptist the body of the blessed man... be carried [to Wormhout]” (statutum est a religiosis et Deo famulantibus viris, singulis annis in sancti Iohannis Baptiste festivitate beati viri corpus... afferri). The text describes the procession as a dramatic event. It reports that “with the people greatly rejoicing, every year, with much preparation and great celebration, [the canons] did not delay in doing that thing” (populus valde coniubilans, omni anno cum modo apparatu et immenso tripudio illud peragere non distulerunt). The account also calls it “a time, at which it is pleasing to the omnipotent Lord to consecrate this most salutary translation not

676 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).

677 Miracula recentiora, 9, 10 (pp. 784, 785).

678 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).

679 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).
only with indescribable joy, but also with the proofs of signs [miracles]” (tempus, quo placuit omnipotenti Domino hanc saluberrimam translationem non solum gaudio ineffabili, verum etiam signorum indiciis dedicare). Finally, it was a time during which the saint himself was present at Wormhout. The text emphasizes this by reporting that one year, while both the canons from Bergues and the suppliants were performing the nightly vigils, a youth who had been born blind and lived that way for sixteen years fell asleep and “saw standing next to him an old man ornamented with beautiful white hair and embellished with a splendid garment, carrying a staff in his hand” (sibi adstare senem caniciei decore ornatum et amictu splendido comptum, baculum manu gestantem). The old man, whom the text identifies as Winnoc, rebuked the youth for falling asleep, then tapped him gently on the eyelids, curing him.

The relics did not, however, have to be present at Wormhout for Winnoc’s patrocinium to be effective there. The second account reports that a woman who had been blind for three years sought help from doctors, but found no relief. She then traveled to numerous shrines seeking a cure, but was unsuccessful. Finally, she arrived at Wormhout and was healed. Even though his relics were elsewhere, Winnoc had left his mark on the landscape at Wormhout.

680 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).
681 Miracula recentiora, 7 (p. 783).
682 Miracula recentiora, 8 (p. 783).
Even when a miracle occurred far away, the *Miracula recentiora* urges beneficiaries to travel to Wormhout to complete the intercession. In the last account, the lord Adalhard from Zwevezele pursues some runaway serfs to Boulogne. When he gets there, he discovers that a slavetrader, named Mirolf has captured them, intending to sell them to “merchants from across the sea” (*mercatores ultramarini*). When Adalhard demands his serfs back, the unscrupulous slavetrader – the account compares the trader to the Egyptian pharaoh who enslaved the Israelites – takes Adalhard captive as well. Winnoc then appears to Adalhard at night in the same guise that he had appeared to the blind youth at Wormhout. Winnoc breaks the man’s chains and opens his cell door. Fleeing, Adalhard:

quickly approached that marshy area, which is, I believe, thought to be a little more than 8 miles [long], in which water his footprint did not sink, with that One [God] doing these things, as we believe, through His generous servant Winnoc, [that One] who led the aforesaid Israelite people with dry feet, and with Pharoah following [them], through the break [in the sea] after the sea was divided.

*protinus spaciosam illam aggreditur paludem, que pene et, ut credo, plus octo miliaris tenditur, in qua nec vestigium pedis aqua intinxerat, illo, ut credimus, per servum suum alnum Winnocum hec agente, qui prefatam plebem*
The miraculous crossing of the marsh emphasizes that the man was not out of danger until he reached Wormhout. Immediately thereafter, he went directly to the church and announced the miracle.

Finally, it is possible that the canons maintained some sort of permanent presence at Wormhout. The second miracle account notes that a blind woman was cured after the office of vespers was completed. It does not, however, say that the canons from Bergues were there for the annual procession. In addition, the text refers to Wormhout as a *coenobium* and a *monasterium*, possibly indicating some kind of permanent community of clerics, however small.

It is surprising that the *Miracula recentiora* would focus so closely on Wormhout. It is especially unusual to report beneficiaries traveling to a place other than the permanent home of a saint’s relics to give thanks. As Pierre-André Sigal has pointed out, miracles that occurred at a distance from a shrine must have often gone unreported, since beneficiaries might not have made the effort to visit the shrine after the fact. In order to bring people to the shrine, most accounts involving such miracles were careful to note that beneficiaries went to the shrine afterwards to make the saint’s power known and to give thanks. In some cases, the saint revoked the miracle or punished the beneficiary when he or
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683 *Miracula recentiora*, 10 (pp. 784-85).
she did not follow such prescriptions. In the Miracula recentiora, however, there is no suggestion that the beneficiaries hesitated to visit the saint’s former shrine at Wormhout, rather than his current resting place at Bergues.

Like the Miracula antiquiora, the Miracula recentiora reveals that the canons were anxious about their claim to Winnoc’s patrocinium. Even after the saint’s relics had been relocated to Bergues, the canons still depicted Wormhout, rather than Bergues, as his shrine. Two factors seem to have been at work here. First, although pressing dangers, such as the Viking invasions, could justify relic translations, by usurping properties from Saint-Bertin and by translating Winnoc’s relics to Bergues, Baldwin II may have stretched his comital prerogative to the limit.

The text carefully notes that ecclesiastical authorities approved the annual procession with the saint’s relics. It is not clear that the translations had such approval. Second, the people of the region still remembered Winnoc’s association with his former institution. There must have been a strong expectation that his relics would be restored to Wormhout.

Local memory probably limited the degree to which the canons of Bergues could alter Winnoc’s memoria. Only fifty-four years – two generations – elapsed between the saint’s two translations, and Winnoc’s relics did not travel far. In
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685 Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past, p. 48.
addition, the chapter’s institutional structure was largely restricted to the area
where the saint’s original monastic community was located. According to the
Catalogus reverendorum, Baldwin IV granted the canons ten properties when he
dissolved the chapter at Bergues. These properties were concentrated in the area
around Bergues and Wormhout (see Map 14).\footnote{Sperliacensem [Éperlecques], Tetingem [Téteghem], Sciocham alias Sox [Socx],
Bieren [Bierne], Stenas [Steene], Killem [Killem], Bissinghelam [Bissezeele], Crochtas
[Crochte], Houtkerkam [Houtkerque], Warhem [Warhem] (Pruvost, Chronique et
cartulaire, p. 31).} The chapter’s sphere of
religious influence was roughly coterminous with the eastern Ternois, the area
where the saint had been located before his translation.

The Viking invasions and the subsequent emergence of the counts of
Flanders had reorganized the political landscape of the region. Ecclesiastical
reorganization followed political reorganization. Baldwin II seems to have
placed Winnoc’s relics at Bergues, one of the towns along the coast that he had
recently fortified, in order to complement the material fortifications he had
constructed for the region with the saint’s spiritual defenses. The strategy also
linked the patrocinia of the region’s saints to his own authority as count. He and
the saints were responsible for protecting Flanders. Later, his son Arnulf I would
develop the strategy even further by translating the saints of Fontanelle from
Boulogne to Saint-Pierre at Ghent and Ss. Riquier and Valéry from Montreuil to
Saint-Bertin. Baldwin, however, engineered Winnoc’s translation despite the
objections of the residents of the town of Sithiu, and the canons of the chapter at Bergues seem to have been defensive about the manner in which they had acquired the relics of their patron saint. In order to strengthen their own claims to legitimacy, they connected themselves to Winnoc’s cult as it had existed at Wormhout before his original translation. The miracles demonstrate that the saint’s physical location may have changed, but the structure of his memoria survived. While new forces shaped the political and ecclesiastical structure of the Ternois, the structure of Winnoc’s memoria displayed a remarkable durability.

5.3.3 Secular Authority

Significant changes were occurring in the political topography of Flanders, but one would scarcely know it from reading the miracle accounts in the Miracula antiquiora and Miracula recentiora. Like the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, the texts pay scant heed to who had power and how much power they held. The only secular figure of any discernible authority who appears in the Miracula antiquiora is the nobleman who donated the funds to rebuild Wormhout after the fire. The text describes him simply as “the venerable man Count Gerard” (vir venerabilis Gerhardus comes).687 The Miracula recentiora does contain some tantalizing hints about the structure of secular power, but is still remarkably vague. In the third miracle it reports that a man, named Hartfrid

687 Miracula antiquiora, 2 (p. 780).
(Harthfridus) was apprehended for a crime and taken before the “ruler” (princeps).\textsuperscript{688} Who this princeps was and what sort of power he held, the text does not say, though it is interesting that at least one later text calls Flanders a “principality” (principatus).\textsuperscript{689} The account involving Adalhard, the man from Zwevezele who goes to Boulogne to recover his runaway serfs, is even more interesting. Adalhard demands his serfs back “according to his right under the laws” (secundum ius legum). But, as with the earlier account involving Hartfrid, the Miracula recentiora is vague about the rights to which it refers and who granted the rights.

5.4 Conclusion

The texts added to Winnoc’s dossier between the eighth and the tenth centuries demonstrate that although hagiography played an important role in defining communal identities, major changes in communal structures could sometimes result in only subtle changes to hagiographic presentations. For example, in the late eighth century, the monastic community at Sithiu had a three-tiered perspective that included supraregional, regional and local levels.

\textsuperscript{688} Miracula recentiora, 9 (p. 784).

\textsuperscript{689} “By the grace of God, [Baldwin IV] now succeeded to the rule of the principality of Flanders according to hereditary succession” (qui ex successione hæreditaria in principatu monarchiæ Flandrensis, gratia Dei, iam convalverat) (Vita s. Bertulfi Rentiacensis, ix.37 (AASS, Feb. 1, col. 685E)).
The *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* although vague, does mention a king and the “entire people of the Franks” (*omnis populus Francorum*).\(^{690}\) It also depicts Omer, Bertin and Winnoc as a trio of monastic founders in the Ternois. Finally, each saint plays a role in defining a local monastic community. The Carolingian monastic reforms broke the connection to a supraregional monastic family, but replaced it with an empire-wide, standardized reform movement, based on Benedict’s *Rule*. More importantly, the reforms may have led to the fragmentation of the monastic community at Sithiu. The hagiographic texts, however, only imply that these changes took place through the division of the composite text and the disappearance of the emphasis on the two-fold Iro-Frankish tradition. Had the composite *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* not survived, the division of the original text might be undetectable.

Similarly, the texts produced by the canons at Bergues superficially continue the themes of earlier hagiographic texts about Winnoc, particularly the focus on the shrine at Wormhout. But, since the saint’s relics were normally kept at Bergues, the texts reveal, again by implication, a tension in the development of the cult. The physical location of the relics had changed, but the change had not yet registered in the saint’s *memoria*. It would not be until about 1050 that the monks of Saint-Winnoc would begin to update the hagiographic presentation of Winnoc’s cult.

\(^{690}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 4 (p. 755-56).
CHAPTER 6
WINNOC AT BERGUES

6.1 Introduction

Chapters 1 and 2 describe how the counts of Flanders, chiefly Arnulf I (r. 918-65), used elements of the past to remake their office after a Carolingian model of rulership. They highlighted a distinguished genealogy that tied them to the Carolingians as well as to other royal families. They adopted and adapted what had been royal titles and formulas. They depicted themselves as the chief protectors of the Church in Flanders, and they intervened in the cult of the saints to bolster their own authority as territorial princes. In short, they defined themselves by arguing that their legitimacy was rooted in the Carolingian past, even though they had participated in dismantling that past.

The monks of Saint-Winnoc at Bergues found that it was more difficult to adapt the past to their needs. On the one hand, in 1022 when Count Baldwin IV founded Saint-Winnoc, the presence of Winnoc’s relics at the abbey bequeathed it a memoria that stretched back in the past almost to the foundation of Christianity in the Ternois. On the other hand, only the community’s possession
of Winnoc’s relics explicitly connected it to that *memoria*. The monks of Saint-Winnoc subsequently crafted an identity that presented themselves as the inheritors not only of Winnoc’s relics but also of his Benedictine vocation as well. In addition, they transferred the saint’s shrine from Wormhout to Bergues by interpolating a seventh-century connection between the saint and the town. In many ways, they reversed the rites of passage discussed with regard to Lewinna. Rather than incorporating Winnoc’s *memoria* into their community, they incorporated their community into Winnoc’s *memoria*.

The monks’ chief ally in the transfer of the shrine turned out to be the saint himself. By casting the founding of Saint-Winnoc in the familiar *topos* of a decline and reform – a decline in the piety of the chapter of canons and the chapter’s reform into a monastic community – the monks were able to rearrange the religious topography and claim Bergues as the site of Winnoc’s shrine. The belief that Winnoc could act in the present through his relics allowed the monks to sanctify these innovations. They could prove that the saint had moved his shrine from Wormhout to Bergues because he performed miracles at Bergues.
6.2 The Monastery of Saint-Winnoc

In the first quarter of the eleventh century, the Lotharingian monastic reformer Richard of Saint-Vanne (d. 1046) convinced Baldwin IV to initiate monastic reform in the principality of Flanders. In 1021, Baldwin placed the monastery of Saint-Bertin under the reformer’s authority, and Richard sent one of his disciples, Roderic of Saint-Vaast (1021-43), to carry out the reform as Saint-Bertin’s abbot. A year later, the count translated Winnoc’s relics from the church of Saint-Martin-et-Saint-Winnoc in the lower part of Bergues to the new church of Saint-Winnoc in the upper part of the town. Shortly thereafter, he dissolved the chapter of canons and expelled its members from Bergues, giving them properties from the chapter’s former holdings to support themselves. Baldwin handed supervision of the new foundation of Saint-Winnoc over to Roderic of Saint-Vaast, who populated it with monks drawn from Saint-Bertin. Although Roderic soon appointed a monk from Saint-Bertin, named Germaine,


348
as abbot (1027-31) of the new community, it remained subordinate to the abbots of Saint-Bertin until 1068. When Germaine died, Roderic appointed another monk from Saint-Bertin, named Rumold (1031-68), to succeed him.  

By 1030, the abbey of Saint-Winnoc had already become an important part of the Flemish ecclesiastical structure, especially in the Ternois. Its chief patron saint, Winnoc, was one of the most prestigious saints in the county along with Ss. Gerulf, Wandrille, Bavon, Amand, Vaast, Donatian, Bertin, and Omer. Although the abbey of Saint-Winnoc itself was far less powerful than great abbeys like Saint-Bertin, it was the dominant ecclesiastical center in the eastern Ternois, where it received the full tithes or parts of the tithes of twenty-two churches (see Map 15).

---


695 *Videlicet totam decimam de Wormhout* [Wormhout], *totam de Iptra* [Quaëdypre], *totam de Warheem* [Warrem], *totam de Hoymilla* [Hooimille], *totam de Ghinelda* [Ghyvelde], *totam de Oxhem* [Uxem], *totam de Dunkercka* [Dunkerque], *totam de Coudekercka* [Koudekerke], *totam de Sintonis* [Sinten], *totam de Spicois*, *totam de Capella Erembaldi* [Armboutskappel], & *duas partes totius decimæ de Chocas* [Chocques], *duas de Brieten*, *duas de Bissingesela* [Bissezele], *duas de Crochte* [Krochte], *duas de Stermis* [Stene], *duas de Tetingeem* [Tetegem], *duas de Kilheem* [Killem], *duas de Oudegesela* [Oudezele], *duas de Houtkercka* [Houtkerke], *duas de Snellegerikercja* [Snaaskerke] (Aubertus Miræus [Aubert Le Mire], *Opera*
While there is no evidence that the monks of Saint-Winnoc produced any hagiographic texts between 1022 and c. 1050, shortly after this period, a burst of hagiographic and cultic activity occurred at the monastery that continued until 1078. First, around 1052, a monk from Saint-Winnoc produced the *Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci*, which revised the accounts of Winnoc’s translations and miracles originally produced by the chapter of canons at Bergues. Around 1055, Saint-Winnoc commissioned Drogo of Saint-Winnoc to write at least the *Vita s. Oswaldi* and perhaps his *sermones* on the king-saint as well. In 1058, the community acquired Lewinna’s relics and soon conducted a *delatio* with them. Around 1060, Abbot Rumold asked Drogo to create a dossier for the newly-acquired saint. The result was the *Historia translationis s. Lewinnae*. In roughly the same year, Abbot Rumold revised the *Vita antiqua s. Winnoci* and *Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci*, and composed a *sermo* in rhyming prose narrating what appears to be the first miracle Winnoc performed after the founding of the abbey at Bergues. About 1064, the monks at Bergues commissioned a hagiographer from the abbey of Saint-Pierre at Ghent to revise these works again. The result was the *Vita secunda s. Winnoci*. In 1030, 1042, 1065, and 1070, Winnoc’s relics claimed a prominent place at peace councils and other ecclesiastical gatherings.

---


696 *HT*, Epistola.1 (col. 613B).

697 *VS*, Prologus (col. 267C).
convened by the counts. During this same period, the community of Saint-Winnoc had a new reliquary constructed for Winnoc. In addition, between roughly 1055 and 1067, the abbey was also reconstructing its church. In 1067, Count Baldwin V confirmed the abbey’s rights and privileges. In 1068, the monks of Saint-Winnoc elected their first abbot from their own community and free of Saint-Bertin’s supervision. Finally, sometime between 1068 and 1078, Drogo added the *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* to Winnoc’s dossier, probably at his community’s request. The activity suggests a major campaign to win Saint-Winnoc’s independence from its mother abbey and at the same time raise its status within Flanders. Twenty years after Rumold became abbot, the community suddenly seems to have awakened.

Certain internal developments may have helped prepare the community to take these measures. By about 1050, a separate communal identity must have been developing at Saint-Winnoc. The original generation of monks from Saint-Bertin would have begun to die out, and there would have been ample time to recruit new monks like Drogo of Saint-Winnoc directly into the community. (In the *Liber miraculorum Winnoci*, Drogo wrote that he entered the community as a *puer parvulus* or “very small boy.”) Although these other monks may have

---


699 The dating for the texts mentioned here is discussed in the following sections.

been educated at Saint-Bertin as Drogo probably was, they still would have
developed a separate communal identity. Despite these internal developments,
however, the major causes of the activity seem to have been external.
Specifically, they seem to have come from Saint-Bertin.

Between 1042 and 1050, a monk of Saint-Bertin, named Folcard, revised
Bertin’s vita. Folcard dedicated the text to his abbot, Bovo (1042-65), providing
the terminus post quem, but did not mention important events that took place in
Bertin’s cult around 1050, giving the terminus ante quem. Folcard fabricated
much of the revised vita and his reasons for doing so seem clear: he wanted to
raise Bertin’s status vis-à-vis Omer. Most significantly, he presented Bertin as
Omer’s equal. For example, Folcard’s text provides a report on Bertin’s
childhood, which had been lacking from the saint’s vita since the appearance of
the Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci in the early ninth century. The text claims
that Bertin came from Konstanz (Constantia) in modern Germany near St. Gall.
Its geographic descriptions are, however, inaccurate, casting suspicion on its
sources. Folcard also stated that Bertin entered the monastic life at Luxeuil

---

701 Levison calls this version the Vita quarta s. Bertini, while the AASS titles it the
Vita tertia s. Bertini [BHL 1293] (Wilhelm Levison, “Commentary,” MGH SSRM,
V (Hanover, 1910), p. 749; AASS, Sept. 5, coll. 604B-13E). It is extant in four

702 Vita tertia Bertini, Dedicatio.1-3 (coll. 604B-E); Levison, “Commentary,” p. 749.

703 Vita tertia Bertini, I.7 (coll. 605C-D).
under Abbot Eustasius (610-29) but he obviously took the passage from Omer’s *vita* rather than an independent source.\(^{704}\) He even went so far as to state that Omer was Bertin’s relative (*consanguineus*).\(^{705}\)

More importantly for Saint-Winnoc, however, Folcard’s text restores the accounts of Heremar’s donation of Wormhout to Bertin and of Winnoc’s appointment as prior there.\(^{706}\) It makes conscious attempts to amplify the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*’s presentation of Winnoc as subordinate to Bertin. For example, the revised text states that Winnoc “was instructed in discipline [at Sithiu] from his boyhood” (*a puero sua disciplina instructus*).\(^{707}\) Folcard also revealed his intentions when he stated that “In this manner, therefore, blessed Bertin stood out as the creator and father of all of the monasteries of the territory of Thérouanne, and by such a sprout he bore fruit to the growth of the Church of Christ” (*Taliter ergo beatus Bertinus omnium cœnobiorum Teruanensis territorii auctor & pater extitit, tantoque germine in proventus Ecclesiæ Christi fructificavit*).\(^{708}\) These revisions could not have been welcome at Bergues, but soon an even greater shock to the monks of Saint-Winnoc would happen.

\(^{704}\) *Vita tertia Bertini*, I.8 (col. 605D).

\(^{705}\) *Vita tertia Bertini*, I.9 (col. 605E).

\(^{706}\) *Vita tertia Bertini*, II.18-9 (coll. 607D-F).

\(^{707}\) *Vita tertia Bertini*, II.19 (col. 607E).

\(^{708}\) *Vita tertia Bertini*, II.19 (col. 607F).
In 1033, a fire destroyed the main church at Saint-Bertin. The church was soon rebuilt, but in 1046, Abbot Bovo of Saint-Bertin (1042-65) began another reconstruction, claiming that the first had been poorly done. According to the abbot’s own account, the *Inventio et elevatio s. Bertini* [BHL1296], workmen were digging under the main altar in 1050 and discovered a reliquary.\(^{709}\) The monks gathered around the reliquary and opened it. Inside, they found a body and a cross inscribed with Bertin’s name (*Sanctus Bertinus Abbas*).\(^{710}\) Abbot Bovo then consulted various written accounts, including the *Vita s. Folquini episcopi Morinensis* [No BHL], and learned that Folcuin, bishop of Thérouanne (816-55), had ordered the relics of several saints, including Bertin, buried in the 840s to protect them from the Vikings.\(^{711}\) The abbot was, however, unable to determine whether or not Bertin’s relics had ever been recovered. He kept the discovery of

---


\(^{711}\) *Vita s. Folquini episcopi Morinensis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH SS*, XV, part 1 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 423-30, see especially 6-7 (p. 428).
the body secret while he consulted Bishop Drogo of Thérouanne (1030-78), Archbishop Wido (Guy) of Reims and Pope Leo IX (1049-54). These three prelates decided that the new bones were Bertin’s true relics and designated a place for them next to the relics of the unknown saint (sanctus incertus) whom the monks had previously venerated as Bertin. In 1052, Archbishop Wido performed the elevatio (elevation – the liturgical ceremony granting episcopal recognition) of the new relics with numerous dignitaries, including Abbot Rumold of Saint-Winnoc, in attendance.712

The next day, the canons of Saint-Omer had Archbishop Wido conduct an ostensio (exhibition) of Omer’s relics to prove that they still possessed him. Apparently, rumors had spread that the sanctus incertus was actually Omer. According to Rosemary Svoboda, the canons also produced written records, including the vitae of Omer and Folcuin, to support their claims. Despite these measures, the identity of the sanctus incertus was a matter of dispute between Saint-Omer and Saint-Bertin for centuries afterward. On several occasions, the monks of Saint-Bertin claimed to possess all or part of Omer.713


Winnoc’s relics were, if anything, more vulnerable than Omer’s. Not only had he been translated to Sithiu in 846, but in 1052, his community at Bergues was also under Abbot Bovo of Saint-Bertin’s supervision. The sanctus incertus at Saint-Bertin could easily have become sanctus Winnocus. This vulnerability must have been readily apparent at Saint-Winnoc. The monks at Bergues would have immediately made certain that they possessed a record of Winnoc’s translations in order to strengthen their claim to possess his relics. As Svoboda has pointed out, both Abbot Bovo and the canons of Saint-Omer consulted written sources concerning the fate of their patron saints’ relics.\textsuperscript{714} The hagiographic texts added to Winnoc’s dossier after 1052, especially the Miracula recentiora which contains accounts of Winnoc’s translations from Wormhout to Sithiu, and from Sithiu to Bergues, probably owe their existence to anxiety about Winnoc’s status.

Much of the hagiographic activity in Winnoc’s dossier would be hidden from us were it not for a thirteenth-century legendary from the Cistercian abbey of Clairmarais near the town of Saint-Omer.\textsuperscript{715} The eighth volume of this extensive legendary contains the only extant copies of the revised \textit{Vita antiqua s. Winnoci} and \textit{Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci}, along with the only extant copies of the \textit{Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci} and \textit{Sermo de s. Winnoco}. The \textit{Vita secunda s.}

\textsuperscript{714} Svoboda, “The Illustrations,” p. 247, 249.

\textsuperscript{715} Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 716, vol. VIII (c. 1200) (Levison, “Commentary,” p. 743).
Winnoci and Drogo’s Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci also appear in the manuscript. Apparently, the monk of Clairmarais who copied these texts into the legendary had a now-lost codex before him that contained the texts in the chronological order of their composition. At Saint-Winnoc itself, the abbey’s lectionary, Bergues 19, contains only the Vita secunda and the Liber miraculorum. The monks at Bergues seem to have concluded that the Vita secunda superseded the texts it revised. This chapter discusses each of these texts in the chronological order of their production to develop a sense of how Winnoc’s cult evolved under the monks of Saint-Winnoc.

6.3 The Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci

The Miracula recentiora s. Winnoci [No BHL], like the Miracula antiquiora s. Winnoci [BHL 8953], provides evidence for how two different communities – the chapter of canons at Bergues and the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc – related to Winnoc as their chief patron saint. In relationship to the monastic community, the content of the text is not as interesting as the fact of its production. More specifically, as Chapter 5 notes, Nicholas Huyghebaert has argued that the use of the term territorium Furnense in the text indicates that a
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716 Levison’s commentary lists the contents of the manuscript as: 1) Vita antiqua Winnoci, ff. 50v-52v, 2) Miracula antiquiora, Miracula recentiora [and sermo], ff. 52v-55r, 3) Vita secunda s. Winnoci, ff. 55r-60r, 4) Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci a Drogone, ff. 60r-66v (Levison, “Commentary,” p. 743).
monk revised the text sometime soon after 1050. The Miracula recentiora with its two translation accounts appears to be Saint-Winnoc’s effort to secure its claim to possess the relics of its chief patron saint.

The translation accounts themselves are mostly unremarkable. The first account reports Winnoc’s translation from Wormhout to Sithiu. The Miracula recentiora does not state who initiated the translation, but it excuses the presumption of moving the saint from the place he himself had chosen by citing the ferocity of the Viking attacks. It also borrows sections from the Miracula s. Wandregisili [BHL 8808] and the Miracula s. Bertini [BHL 1291] to bolster the authority of its depiction. The Miracula recentiora describes the invaders as “the savage race of the Danes, pirates sailing through the deep seas, thirsting for blood in the manner of a wolf, they devastated and burned the coast next to the ocean and all that was nearby” (seva Danorum gens pyratis per alta maria velivolantes, lupino more sanguine sitibundi, iuxta occeani litus circumquaque omnia devastabant atque incendebant). Interestingly, however, the text reports that Winnoc’s body “was carried to the monastery of St. Omer at Sithiu” (in Sithiu


719 Miracula recentiora, 5 (ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SSRM, V (Hanover, 1910), p. 782). The grammatical errors here seem to stem from borrowing from both the Miracula Wandregisili, II.2 (p. 407) and the Libellus Bertini, 1 (p. 509).
Although the monks of Wormhout might have been expected to take Winnoc to the monastic church of Saint-Bertin, this may be an accurate detail rather than an error. The translation accounts for Omer and Bertin are confusing and Brigitte Meijns has noted that the monks of Saint-Bertin helped the canons of Saint-Omer to fortify their church. Saint-Omer, Saint-Bertin and the monks of Wormhout probably cooperated to defend their patron saints from the invaders. The second chapter of the text matter-of-factly reports that Baldwin II translated the saint to Bergues on 30 December, 899 and acquired a royal privilege from “the king” (the *Vita secunda Winnoci* states that it was Charles III the Simple (r. 893-922) who granted the privilege).

6.4 The *Vita Interpolata*

The legendary of Clairmarais also contains revised versions of the *Vita antiqua Winnoci* and the *Miracula antiquiora Winnoci*. Because the revisions appear as a series of nineteen interpolations, Huyghebaert has referred to the two
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720 *Miracula recentiora*, 5 (p. 782).


722 *Miracula recentiora*, 6 (pp. 782-83).
revised texts in combination as the *Vita interpolata s. Winnoci*. Most of the interpolations range in length from a few words to a sentence or so, but three are substantial paragraphs.

Huyghebaert has persuasively argued that Rumold himself composed the interpolations as well as the *Sermo de s. Winnoco* that follows the *Vita interpolata* in the legendary. Huyghebaert’s argument begins with the dating of the *Vita interpolata*. It demonstrates that the *Vita secunda Winnoci*, which he had already dated to about 1064, borrows from the *Vita interpolata*, showing that the *Vita interpolata* pre-dates the *Vita secunda*. Based on language and style, it is also likely that the same author composed both the interpolations and the *sermo*. Since the author of the *Vita secunda* and Drogo of Saint-Winnoc in his *Liber miraculorum Winnoci* reproduced the miracle story reported in the *sermo* along with various chronological indicators, Huyghebaert’s argument cross-references these indicators to arrive at a date between 1050 and 1064 for the composition of the *sermo* and *Vita interpolata*, but suggests that it was probably closer to 1060.
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723 Huyghebaert, “L’Abbé Rumold,” p. 6. Levison’s edition of the *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci* reproduces the interpolations in the *apparatus criticus* for the chapters on Winnoc, while the AASS edition of the *Vita prima s. Winnoci* reproduces the interpolations in square brackets marked by the *siglum C*.


The final part of Huyghebaert’s argument states that we know of only four authors connected to Saint-Winnoc who could have produced these works. Drogo and the anonymous author of the *Vita secunda* are dismissed based on language and style – Drogo’s style is too rough and the anonymous’s too different. Then, the author of Baldwin V’s charter from 1067 is discussed. During this period, the count allowed ecclesiastical institutions to which he granted rights, privileges or property to draw up their own legal documents. Although Huyghebaert’s argument acknowledges that it is dangerous to compare hagiographic texts to charters, Baldwin’s charter includes a lengthy discussion of the dissolution of the chapter of canons at Bergues and the foundation of the Benedictine community of Saint-Winnoc. The language and style of the charter suggest that its author may have been the author of the *Miracula recentiora*, but not of the interpolations. This leaves Rumold, who is described in various sources as a master of letters, a description that agrees with the eloquence of the *sermo* and interpolations.727

Two successive lines provide Rumold’s most substantive changes to Winnoc’s *memoria*. The lines occur just after Winnoc has healed the curious monk who observed him in the mill at Wormhout. The first states that Winnoc “strived according to the example of the most blessed Benedict to be loved more than to be feared” (*studebat iuxta normam beatissimi Benedicti plus amari quam*)

---

timeri). Here, the text implicitly promotes Winnoc from prior to Benedictine abbot. The norma Winnoc imitated is not a guideline for a monk, but one of the guidelines that Benedict of Nursia – an abbot himself – addressed to future abbots in Chapter 64 of his Rule, “Regarding Appointing the Abbot” (De ordinando abbate). The Rule admonishes “let [the abbot] strive to be loved rather than feared” (studeat plus amari quam timeri). It is not clear whether Rumold consciously intended to elevate the saint’s monastic status or, finding an element of Winnoc’s life – the chastising of a disobedient monk – particularly evocative of his own experience as abbot, simply assumed that Winnoc held the position of abbot at Wormhout. It is also important that the text does not just make an intertextual reference to the Rule, but explicitly identifies the saint as a follower of Benedict. The Benedictine part of the Iro-Frankish tradition finally triumphed, if only unwittingly, in the presentation of the saint.

The next line states that “although he was descended from a royal line, nevertheless he did not give himself precedence over anyone converting from serfdom” (quamvis regia stirpe progenitus foret, non tamen praeponebat se ex servitio convertenti). The line is important for two reasons. First, it is a paraphrase of a

---

728 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 25 (p. 773).
line from Chapter 2 of the Rule, “What the Abbot Should Be Like,” one of only
two chapters specifically devoted to the character of the abbot. The line instructs
the abbot that “He who came from the status of freeman should not have
precedence over the monk who came from the state of slavery” (*Non convertenti
ex servitio praeponatur ingenuus*).\(^731\) Second, this is the first time that any source
describes Winnoc’s lineage as royal. As the section below on the *Vita secunda*
will discuss, the monks of Bergues apparently believed that Winnoc was the
brother of the seventh-century Breton saint Judoc/Josse (*Iudocus*), who was the
brother of King Judicael (*Iudichaelus*) of Brittany. Although the *Vita interpolata*
does not elaborate on its comment, it does provide a tantalizing hint of a major
development in the saint’s *memoria* occurring mostly outside the written record.

6.5 The *Sermo de s. Winnoco*

Rumold’s *sermo* mirrors the interpolations in its focus on piety and
exhortation. It contains three parts: 1) an introduction, 2) the narration of the
miracle and 3) a closing exhortation. Levison has published these sections as
three separate paragraphs.\(^732\)

\(^{731}\) *Regula Benedicti*, 2.18 (pp. 49, 53).

\(^{732}\) Levison has placed the *sermo* directly after the other miracles as *Miracula
The introduction to the *sermo* provides an intimate glimpse of the audience and occasion for the text. It begins:

Since indeed, dearest brothers, on this annual occasion we refer to you the miracles of this most holy confessor Winnoc for the purpose of venerating [him], with only a few from the many [miracles he performed] having been presented in the manner of writers, which miracles on account of his merit the power of the omnipotent God worked, his sacred joints still laboring in this world…

*Quoniam quidem, fratres karissimi, huius sanctissimi confessoris Winnoci miracula, pauca de multis scribentium more prolata, annuo tempore vobis referimus veneranda, que pro eius merito operatur omnipotentis Dei potentia,*

*eius sacris artibus adhuc in mundo laborantibus…*\(^{733}\)

Obviously, the text addresses a monastic audience at an annual event. Later in the *sermo*, it becomes clear that the occasion is an annual procession at Pentecost from Bergues to Wormhout that replaced the canons’ procession on the feast of St. John the Baptist. The introduction then goes on to exhort the monks to piety.

After the introduction, the *sermo* relates a miracle that occurred during the procession one year. It states that crowds of people “flocked to St. Winnoc, the confessor of Christ, who was staying on his fruitful estate, Wormhout” (*ad sanctum convenirent Winnocum Christi confessorem in fructiferam eius hereditatem*).

---

\(^{733}\) *Miracula recentiora*, 11 (p. 785).
Among the crowds was “a small girl, by the name of Maluvera” (*puellula nomine Maluvera*) who had been blind since birth. After much difficulty in breaking through the throng, the girl was able to approach the saint’s relics in the church. She beseeched the saint with loud prayers and was eventually cured. In return, the girl “vowed eternal service in perpetuity to God and St. Winnoc” (*aeternum Deo et sancto Winnoco servitium promisit in perpetuum*). She fulfilled her vow, “living for the space of many years, faithfully she abstained from dishes of meat, stripping herself with respect to her body she never again covered herself with fine linen garments” (*multis vivens annorum spaciis, devota a carnis se abstineret cybariis, et nuda sui corporis de suavis lini vestibus nunquam protexit amplius*) and eventually “she departed to the stars” (*migravit ad sydera*). The text ends by urging the brothers to follow Maluvera’s example of fasting and praying.

The special treatment given this miracle demonstrates its importance to the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc. Given its placement in the legendary after the *Miracula recentiora*, it was probably the first miracle Winnoc performed for the new community at Bergues. It affirms that Saint-Winnoc enjoyed the

---

734 *Miracula recentiora*, 11 (p. 785).
735 *Miracula recentiora*, 11 (p. 786).
736 *Miracula recentiora*, 11 (p. 786).
737 *Miracula recentiora*, 11 (p. 786).
benefits of the saint’s *patrocinium*. Since Maluvera was a *puellula* when the miracle occurred, she could not have been more than ten-years-old.\textsuperscript{738} This, in turn, meant that she could act as a witness to the event for many years afterward, testifying to the saint’s power. The fact that she adopted an almost monastic life demonstrates the Lotharingian reformers’ simultaneous emphasis on monastic virtues and their somewhat paradoxical attempts to reach beyond the cloister.

It is again surprising that for more than a century after Winnoc was translated to Bergues, Wormhout had remained the focal point of the saint’s cult. Although the *sermo* does not memorialize Wormhout as the saint’s resting place, it does suggest that the annual return to the town was a high point in the year.

6.6 The *Vita secunda s. Winnoci*

The next text in Winnoc’s dossier – the *Vita secunda s. Winnoci* [BHL 8954, 8955] – revises the *Vita interpolata*, the *Miracula recentiora* and the *sermo*, and combines them into a single text.\textsuperscript{739} In addition to Saint-Winnoc’s lectionary, Bergues 19, the *Vita secunda* appears in five medieval manuscripts.\textsuperscript{740} The

\textsuperscript{738} Huyghebaert, “L’Abbé Rumold,” pp. 18-23.

\textsuperscript{739} VS.

\textsuperscript{740} 1) Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, 0573 (462), ff. 091v-095v (thirteenth-century); 2) Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale, 07461 (3176), ff. 001-009 (thirteenth-century); 3) Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale, 09120 (3221), ff. 54r-62r (twelfth-century); 4) Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 838, ff. 33r-36r (thirteenth-century); 5) Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 716, ff. 55r-60r (1201-50).
attribution and date of composition for the text have been the subjects of a
detailed analysis by Huyghebaert. He has concluded that new quotations from
the Rule indicate that the author was a monk. The author’s statement that he was
commissioned “by the brothers of St. Winnoc’s coenobium, thanks to whose
charity I have taken rest with not a little pleasure” (fratribus coenobii Sancti
Winnoci, quorum caritate non parum iocunde refrigeratus sum), however,
demonstrates that he was not a monk at Bergues. The author’s apparent
familiarity with the geographic features, but not the political boundaries of
western Flanders also indicates that he was not from the Ternois. In addition,
among other indications, a penchant for lauding the Flemish counts reveals a
connection to Saint-Pierre at Ghent, where such praise was a literary tradition.
Based on a comparison of vocabulary and style, the author was the same monk
from Saint-Pierre who wrote the Vita s. Bertulfi Rentiacensis [BHL 1316]. The
author’s stress on Benedictine ideals and the importance of a virtuous abbot hints
at personal experience. Huyghebaert’s argument suggests that the author may
have been staying at Saint-Winnoc as a result of problems with his own abbot. It
notes that between 1059 and 1064, Everelm, the abbot of Saint-Pierre at Ghent
(1059-69), dispersed a number of monks from his abbey because he had
mismanaged its properties and could not afford to support them. This
connection to Everelm gives a date of about 1064 for the composition of the Vita

741 VS, Prologus (col. 267C).
Finalmente, Huyghebaert argumentó que la evidente admiración del autor por la *peregrinatio pro Christo* (self-exile/wandering for Christ) hace posible que él fuera el monje reformador y predicador viajero, llamado Wéry.\footnote{Huyghebaert, “La ‘Vita secunda s. Winnoci’,” pp. 223-24.}

Además de su parte más especulativa que identifica al autor como Wéry y describe la causa de su estancia en Bergues, puntos que son difíciles de afirmar o refutar, el argumento de Huyghebaert hace un fuerte caso para la identidad del autor. Sin embargo, no aborda el contexto institucional en Saint-Winnoc. En particular, no explica por qué la comunidad necesitó comisionar una nueva *vita* cuando ya poseía la *Vita interpolata*, su propio abad’s obra. Además, no pregunta por qué los monjes de Saint-Winnoc eligieron a un hagiógrafo de fuera de su comunidad en lugar de uno de los tres – Rumold, Drogo o el autor de Baldwin V’s charter – que Huyghebaert ha identificado en su artículo sobre la *Vita interpolata*.

La finalidad de la *Vita interpolata* informa la finalidad de la *Vita secunda*. Huyghebaert ha argumentado que Rumold planeaba que la *Vita interpolata* fuera para un lectura privada. En lugar de ser glosas marginales, notas explicativas o correcciones, las interpolaciones elaboran sobre el significado percibido del texto por sí mismo. El abad también prestó cuidado a su estilo como si estuviera escribiendo un obra literaria. Además, la *Vita interpolata* indica que su autor no deseaba aburrir...
his reader (*lector*) rather than his listener (*auditor*). Huyghebaert’s conclusion is reasonable, but there seems have been another reason for Rumold to produce the *Vita interpolata* and *sermo*. Since Saint-Winnoc was in the process of reinvigorating its chief patron saint’s cult and attempting to raise its own status, the *Vita interpolata*, *sermo* and *Miracula recentiora* seem to have been a “rough draft” of a revised dossier for Winnoc. This would also help explain why Rumold was so concerned about the literary quality of the interpolations. Perhaps the abbot, who died in 1068, originally intended to revise the dossier more thoroughly himself but was diverted by old age or his abbey’s business.

It is less clear why the monks did not commission the author of the *Miracula recentiora* and charter to make the revisions. Perhaps, the monks of Saint-Winnoc judged him too unskilled as a Latin stylist to compose the new text. Expressing the humility trope often found in medieval texts, the prologue of the *Vita secunda* states that the monks of Saint-Winnoc sought “the tongue of Cicero in a rustic mouth” (*Ciceronis linguam in ore rustico*).

Why the monks may have passed over Drogo is more complicated. Although Drogo’s Latin was not as good as that of the *Vita secunda*’s author, his narrative skill more than made up for his stylistic deficiencies. He was the most

---


744 VS, *Prologus* (col. 267C).
prolific hagiographer at the abbey. By 1064, the monks had already requested that Drogo compose texts on Oswald (*Vita Oswaldi*) and Lewinna (*Historia translationis*). In addition, they had also received two more from him on Oswald (*Sermo primus, Sermo secundus*). It is puzzling why they did not commission him to write the *Vita secunda*. There is no evidence to indicate that Drogo had fallen out of favor as a hagiographer. Quite the contrary, the monks of Saint-Winnoc requested that he compose a *liber miraculorum* for Winnoc after 1068. In addition, sometime between 1070 and 1084, Bishop Radbod II of Noyon-Tournai (1068-98) asked him to compose a *vita* for the recently-deceased Godelieve.

Drogo’s *Liber miraculorum* suggests the reason that he is not the author of the *Vita secunda*: he was most likely absent from Bergues when the monks of Saint-Winnoc commissioned the *Vita secunda*. The *Liber miraculorum* describes how the monks of his community removed Winnoc from his old reliquary decorated with silver in order to deposit him in a new one decorated with gold and gems.\(^745\) The account does not state when this was done, but in the next chapter, it describes a miracle that occurred at Hamburg when the Saxon bishop Bovo brought a piece of the old reliquary there on his trip from Bergues to his home.\(^746\) The *Liber miraculorum* continues with Drogo’s account of his own stop at Hamburg on a later trip. While he was at Hamburg, the provost of the church

\(^{745}\) *LM*, iii.XXI (coll. 281F-28A).

\(^{746}\) *LM*, iii.XXIII (coll. 282B-83A).
recounted to Drogo the miracle that the piece of the old reliquary carried by Bishop Bovo had performed – an exorcism of a demoniac.\textsuperscript{747} Since Bishop Bovo is the same bishop who performed Lewinna’s depositio in 1058, and since Drogo composed the Historia translationis around 1060, Drogo’s trip must have occurred after 1060.\textsuperscript{748} This means that he was absent from Saint-Winnoc during the period when the abbey commissioned a revised vita of its chief patron saint, making it impossible for the monks to go to him.

A closer examination of the Vita secunda reveals a complex portrait both of the work and of the community that commissioned it. The Vita secunda’s author navigated among contradictory impulses operating within the community of Saint-Winnoc. First, the community wanted to distance itself from Saint-Bertin. This is probably the reason the monks of Saint-Winnoc commissioned an author from Saint-Pierre at Ghent rather than an author from Saint-Bertin, which was closer and also had a distinguished literary tradition. Second, the monks of Saint-Winnoc were probably reluctant to make too radical a break from their mother house. Finally, the monks also wanted to create stronger links between themselves and Winnoc’s past. The author of the Vita secunda offered a series of revisions and additions designed to shape the saint’s memoria in the service of these sometimes divergent needs.

\textsuperscript{747} LM, iii.XXIII (coll. 282B-83A).

\textsuperscript{748} HT, i.IV.37 (coll. 620A-B).
The *Vita secunda*’s first important alteration is to expand substantially the *Vita interpolata*’s remark about Winnoc’s royal bloodline. After a short prologue, the text provides a genealogy, linking him to the rulers of Brittany and the nobility of Britain. A list of five generations of ancestors in Britain is succeeded by a list of seven generations in Brittany, beginning with Riwalus, “a duke of Britain” (*Britanniae dux*) who, “coming from the Britons across the sea with a multitude of ships, took control of all of lesser Britain [Brittany] in the time of Clothar, king of the Franks” (*de transmarinis Britanniis veniens cum multitudine navium, possedit totam minorem Britanniam tempore Clotharii regis Francorum*). In Winnoc’s own generation – the seventh in Brittany – the *Vita* lists thirteen sons, including Ss. Judicael (*Iudichaelus*), Judoc/Josse (*Iudocus*), and Winnoc himself, as well as six daughters, including St. Euriela (*Euriala*). It makes a special point of identifying Judicael as “the confessor-king of Brittany, who became a monk at the coenobium of [St. Meven at] Gael under the abbot, Meuen … This Judicael ruled Brittany in the time of Dagobert” (*confessoris Britanniae regis, qui monachus factus Gwadellensi coenobio sub abbate Meguenno… Hic Iudichaelus rexit Britanniam tempore Dagoberti*).

749 VS, *Genealogia* (col. 267F).

750 VS, *Genealogia* (col. 268A).
The monks of Saint-Winnoc seem to have unintentially provided the hagiographer with inaccurate information. King Judicael of Domnonée in Brittany submitted to the Merovingian king Dagobert I (r. 628-39) at Paris in 635. His brother Judoc/Josse (d. c. 668) succeeded him, but renounced the throne c. 636, was ordained a priest and went on pilgrimage to Rome. Eventually, he settled as a hermit near Étapes in Ponthieu, and after his death, his relics were venerated at nearby Saint-Josse-sur-Mer. The AASS commentary for Winnoc suggests that the monks of Bergues had confused their patron saint with Judoc’s relative and successor as hermit, Winoch, who is mentioned in the Vita s. Iudoci [No BHL]. Levison’s commentary concurs and states that this genealogy is heavily dependent on Judoc’s vita as well as that of another Breton saint, Samson of Dol (d. 565). Whatever its veracity, Winnoc’s genealogy seems to be an attempt to counterbalance the revisions to Bertin’s vita made by the monk

---

752 De s. Winnoco: Commentarius Praevius, 14 (AASS, Nov. 6, coll. 257A-B).
Folcard of Saint-Bertin. (He had constructed an account of Bertin’s childhood and written that Winnoc “was instructed in discipline [at Sithiu] from his boyhood.”)\textsuperscript{754}

The saint’s genealogy also serves as a preface to his sanctity. The first chapter opens with the trope differentiating nobility and virtue. It states that Winnoc “adorned the title of nobility with an innate [title] of probity” (\textit{titulum nobilitatis indole adornavit probitatis}). Then it dwells on the development of his virtues during his youth. In particular, the chapter emphasizes his pursuit of the \textit{peregrinatio pro Christo} (self-exile for Christ), stating:

among other things, Brittany was amazed that its inhabitant wandered in its interior and that he exiled himself daily within its borders with new deeds. And he who already lived in exile from his homeland mentally, devoted no little effort so that he might also live in exile bodily, and, as though [he were] another Abraham, with zeal he turned to depart from his land and family.

\textit{inter haec stupebat in sinu suo Britannia civem suum peregrinari et intra fines proprios novis cotidie actibus exsulare. Et qui iam mente a patria exsularat, ut etiam corpore exsularet non aegre operam dabat atque, ut alter Abraham, exire de terra et cognizione sua meditatione versabat assidua.}\textsuperscript{755}

\textsuperscript{754} \textit{Vita tertia Bertini}, II.19 (col. 607E).

\textsuperscript{755} VS, i.I (coll. 268B).
The *Vita secunda* also reports that Quadanoc, Ingenoc, and Madoc joined Winnoc, and that, like the apostles, they left their homeland proclaiming “here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for that city which is to come” (*non habemus hic manentem civitatem, sed futuram inquirimus*).\(^{756}\) This chapter on Winnoc’s childhood directly refutes Folcard’s description of the saint as having been raised at Sithiu from the time he was a boy.

The sections on Winnoc’s genealogy and childhood in the *Vita secunda* not only give him a prestigious bloodline and add elements found in a standard hagiographic *vita*, but they also alter the *Vita antiqua*’s presentation of Winnoc’s relationship to Bertin. By removing Winnoc’s *vita* from the composite *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*’s narrative, the *Vita antiqua* greatly increases Bertin’s authority. This authority dominates the *Vita antiqua*’s opening chapters and is apparent from its first words. The text begins with the line, “when the holy confessor of Christ, Bertin, adorned with signs and powers, governed the multitude of monks at the monastery at Sithiu” (*quando agius Christi confessor Bertinus, signis atque virtutibus decoratus, in Sithiu monasterio multitudini praeerat monachorum*).\(^{757}\) All subsequent events in the text are then placed within a

\(^{756}\) Hebrews 13:14; VS, i.1 (col. 268C).

\(^{757}\) *Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci*, 22 (p. 769).
chronological framework anchored by his abbacy, much as dates in a B.C./A.D. (or B.C.E./C.E.) chronology are anchored by the purported birth of Jesus. The *Vita secunda*’s attention to Winnoc’s genealogy removes him from this frame.

In addition, the *Vita antiqua* describes how Bertin’s reputation for sanctity exerted such a powerful attraction that:

pious men came to him from many and diverse parts, with divine grace having prompted them, desiring indeed that they might strictly adhere with him in the service of God under the yoke of the sacred rule. Among whom were four pious men from the far remote land of the Britons, who were called by these names, Quadanoc, Ingenoc, Madoc and holy Winnoc…

ex multis undique partibus, divina eos stimulante gratia, religiosi ad eum veniebant viri, optantes etiam, ut sub sacrae regulae iugo secum in Dei perseverassent servitio. Inter quos quattuor religiosi viri ex longe remota Brittonum terra, qui his nominibus nuncupati fuerunt, Quadanocus et Ingenocus, Madocus sanctusque Winnocus…

Here, Bertin’s abbacy is not just a marker, but a magnetic force that pulls monks, including Winnoc, to Sithiu from far and wide. At the very end of the *Vita secunda*’s chapter on Winnoc’s childhood, however, the text subtly revises the *Vita antiqua*’s narrative. It states that after leaving Brittany and traveling a great

758 Vitae Audomari, Bertini, Winnoci, 22 (pp. 769-70).
distance, Winnoc and his companions arrived “in the region of the Morini where they ascertained by common report that the monastic life of the saints then flourished” (*regioni Morinorum, ubi fama vulgante religionem compererant tunc floruisse sanctorum*). Rather than presenting Winnoc and his companions as being attracted to Flanders by Bertin’s reputation as in the *Vita antiqua*, the *Vita secunda* presents the companions leaving their homeland by their own agency, *then* hearing of Bertin’s reputation almost by chance. The prime mover in this passage is Winnoc not Bertin.

After reporting on Bertin’s reputation, one might expect the *Vita secunda* to elaborate on his virtues. After all, there were still strong affiliations between Saint-Winnoc and Saint-Bertin. Instead, the *Vita secunda* deflects attention from Bertin with a clever, almost Ciceronian rhetorical ploy. It states that “he who wishes to know the praiseworthy deeds of [Bertin], will have them before him from the little book most fully inscribed with his deeds” (*cuius laudabilia gesta nosse qui velit, ex libello plenissime actibus eius inscripto palam habebit*). The statement acknowledges Bertin’s sanctity, yet declines to discuss it.

The text treads a fine line in its depiction of the relationship between Winnoc and Bertin. On the one hand, there is an evident desire to preserve the facts of Winnoc’s arrival in Flanders. There is even a certain amount of pride in

---

759 VS, i.I (coll. 268C-D).

760 VS, i.II (col. 268D).
Winnoc’s early association with the patron saint of Saint-Bertin, the most important western Flemish institution. On the other hand, the *Vita secunda* carefully alters the seventh-century past in light of eleventh-century concerns.

The *Vita secunda* does not always treat the past so subtly, however. In fact, more often than not, it demonstrates the author’s willingness to make radical changes. At the end of its chapter discussing Winnoc’s life at Sithiu, the *Vita secunda* makes what may be its greatest institutional change to his *memoria*. It states that before the abbot sent the Bretons to Wormhout, he first sent them to “a place situated in the region of the Morini, called the Mount of St. Winnoc up to the present day, where for some time the men of God were located” (*locus Morinorum regione situs, Mons Sancti Winnoci usque in praesentem diem vocitus, ubi viri Dei aliquamdiu positi*).\(^761\) This is obviously a reference to Bergues, which was originally called the *Groeneberg*, but became known as the *Winomontium* or *Winoksbergen* after Winnoc’s relics were translated there in 899.\(^762\) No independent source supports the claim that Winnoc originally settled on the *Groeneberg* before founding a cell at Wormhout, though two entries in Saint-Bertin’s cartulary may have suggested this conclusion, especially to the monks of Saint-Winnoc, who may be the source for this claim. In 857, Abbot Adalard of Saint-Bertin (844-59) issued a confirmation for a property at a place called

\(^{761}\) VS, i.II (col. 268E).

Gruonoberg to the dependent abbey of Saint-Sauveur, and, in 877, Charles the Bald gave Saint-Bertin a property at the same site.\textsuperscript{763} There is, however, no indication that Winnoc ever lived at Bergues. Instead, this note, which resembles the report that Bertin and his companions initially founded the \textit{Vetus Monasterium} before founding Sithiu, appears to be an eleventh-century attempt to depict Saint-Winnoc as a refoundation of a community that Winnoc had founded before Wormhout. As a result, the eleventh-century monks could claim the seventh-century saint as their founder. It was a bold innovation but seems to have gone unchallenged.

The \textit{Vita secunda} also attempts to connect Saint-Winnoc to its chief patron saint by amplifying the \textit{Vita interpolata}'s emphasis on Winnoc’s Benedictine virtues. For example, the \textit{Vita secunda}'s third chapter provides new material for the saint’s \textit{vita}. The chapter reports on life at Wormhout before the death of Winnoc’s three companions, Quadanoc, Ingenoc and Madoc. It describes how the Bretons built the monastery and guest houses for traveling ecclesiastics at Wormhout, and places great weight on how they worked with their hands to supply the needs of others. According to the final line of the chapter, “right up until the end of life they were not deficient in the rigor of the pattern [of monastic

The fourth chapter also embellishes the description of the saint’s humility by adding new scriptural quotations and by repeating almost the same lines about Winnoc’s desire to be loved rather than feared that appear in the Vita interpolata.

Huyghebaert has interpreted this attention to Benedictine ideals as a manifestation of the author’s sympathy for monastic reform. As the Vita interpolata demonstrates, however, this emphasis also would have resonated with the monks of Saint-Winnoc. Reformist sympathies were probably strong at the abbey, which had undergone the process only forty years earlier. Having just transformed Winnoc into the founder of the abbey at Bergues, the hagiographer worked to align the saint’s identity more closely with the identity of the monastic community that housed his relics.

Despite the major changes the Vita secunda makes to the description of Winnoc’s life, the miracles appear essentially as they are found in the Vita interpolata and Miracula recentiora. The few significant revisions are mostly omissions. The Vita secunda’s account of Maluvera’s cure, for example, is a much-abridged version of the sermo’s account and omits her name. It also calls her a woman (mulier) rather than little girl (puellula). More significant is its...
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764 VS, i.III (col. 269A).
765 VS, i.IV (coll. 269B-C).
omission of an entire chapter of Winnoc’s *memoria*: the chapter of canons. The author removed the reference to canons in the *Miracula recentiora*. Rather than stating that the sacristan found Winnoc’s relics when he put his hand “into the hood of his cowl, which, at the time, we canons also used” (*in capitium cucullae suae, qua tunc etiam canonici utebamur*), the text simply states that he put his hand into his hood (*capitium*).\(^{767}\) This simple omission makes the canons’ contributions to Winnoc’s cult invisible. Since canons were, in many ways, monks’ ecclesiastical competitors, the hagiographer may have found it easier to excise them than to explain why a Benedictine saint had offered his *patrocinium* to a chapter of canons.

Less explicable is the *Vita secunda*’s failure to report the foundation of Saint-Winnoc. First, the text contains no mention of the third translation from the collegiate church of Saint-Martin-et-Saint-Winnoc to the abbey church of Saint-Winnoc in 1022. The text leaves the relics in the collegiate church (today, the parish church of Saint-Martin). Second, the hagiographer failed to mention the founding of the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc, the community by which he had been commissioned to write. What makes these omissions so puzzling is the continued focus on Wormhout as the site of Winnoc’s shrine. In all but one of the miracle accounts in the *Vita secunda* – the one concerning the chalice at Éperlecques – people go to Wormhout to communicate with the patron

---

\(^{767}\) *Miracula antiquiora*, 3, (p. 781); VS, i.XIII (col. 271F).
saint of the monastic community at Bergues. In fact, the text is almost apologetic that Baldwin II did not restore the saint to his original resting place. Its version of the translation from Sithiu to Bergues reports that “with the residents of [the town of] Saint-Omer resisting by whatever art they could, [Baldwin II] removed the sacrosanct body and bore it to the place, Bergues” (arte qua poterant obnitetibus Audomaricolis, sacrosanctum corpus abstulit et ad locum Bergas quo destinaverat transtulit). Later, it reports:

[Baldwin II] truly made an agreement with the faithful devoted to God and Saint Winnoc that the sacrosanct body of the saint be carried annually to the place of its first rest, Wormhout, when the annual cycle indicates that the birth of the precursor of the Lord [John the Baptist] be celebrated, although our age conducts the custom of carrying that body when the church solemnly celebrates the coming of the holy Spirit.

Fidelibus sane Deo sanctoque Winnoco devotis convenit sacrosanctum corpus sancti ad pristinae quietis locum Woromholt quotannis deportari, cum natale praecursoris Domini annuus indicit cursus celebrari; quamquam nostra aetas ad deportandum illud morem gerat cum adventum Spiritus sancti ecclesia sollemniter celebrat.

---

768 The text uses both “Sithiu” and “Saint-Omer” to refer to the town. VS, i.XVI (col. 273A).

769 VS, i.XVII (col. 273B).
A description of the translation to the new church and the foundation of the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc might have helped to offset the attention given to Wormhout in this account.

The responsibility for these omissions clearly does not lie with the hagiographer from Ghent. Since the legendary of Clairmarais also fails to mention the events surrounding the foundation of the monastery, the silence appears to have originated from the monks at Bergues. The author was able to consult other hagiographic texts to construct the saint’s purported genealogy, but only the abbey’s own records would have contained an account of such a short translation and the full details of the community’s origins.

At first, the cause of the persistent focus on Wormhout seems to be the same as for the chapter of canons at Bergues. Saint-Winnoc’s institutional influence was also concentrated in the eastern Ternois, where it drew significant revenues from church tithes (see Map 15). The placement of these churches suggests that the foundation of the monastic community had simply reformed the interior rather than the exterior structure of the saint’s ecclesiastical community. By the time the author of the *Vita secunda* wrote, Winnoc’s physical and institutional presence had been focused at Wormhout and in essentially the same region for three hundred sixty-nine years (695-1064) with a break of only fifty-four years when the relics were at Sithiu.
There are, however, signs that the structure of the saint’s cult had shifted drastically since the monks had arrived at Bergues. For example, just a few years after the *Vita secunda* appeared, Baldwin V’s charter (1067) confirmed Saint-Winnoc’s possession of “that land which is called the Groeneberg for the use of the pilgrims of St. Winnoc” (*terram illam quæ Groeneberch dicitur, ad usus peregrinorum S. Winnoci*). This confirmation indicates that a regular pilgrimage traffic, however small, had developed at the abbey. In addition, Drogo’s *Liber miraculorum* describes twenty-five miracles that Winnoc performed at Bergues between 1030 and 1068/78.

It is possible that the monks did not want the *Vita secunda* to report the monastery’s origins because this would have called unwanted attention to Saint-Winnoc’s status as a daughter house of Saint-Bertin. The *Vita secunda* already notes that Bertin appointed Winnoc to govern Wormhout. It also describes how Winnoc’s relics took refuge at Omer’s church during the invasions, implicitly suggesting that Omer (or Bertin) could mount a more powerful defense against the Vikings. An account of Saint-Winnoc’s foundation by monks from Saint-Bertin would provide a third, contemporary instance of Winnoc’s inferiority. It was only in 1067 when Baldwin V gave the abbey the power it needed to assert its independence that the monks recorded their foundation story. Even then,
they recorded it in a charter, not a hagiographic text. Whatever their reasons, the
key point is that it would be Drogo’s task in the Liber miraculorum to focus
attention on Bergues as the location of Winnoc’s shrine.

6.7 Baldwin V’s Charter

Although not included in Winnoc’s hagiographic dossier, Baldwin V’s
charter is an important precursor to Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s Liber miraculorum.
It adopts the topos of communal decline and reform often found in monastic
foundation legends. Remensnyder has noted, for example, that Benedictines in
southern France liked to portray themselves as restoring institutions that had
suffered from neglect or destruction, in contrast to Cistercians, who described
themselves founding new abbeys in the wilderness even though the wilderness
of which they wrote was often a literary construct.770 More importantly,
however, Karin Ugé has demonstrated the influence of the topos in several tenth-
and eleventh-century Flemish hagiographic texts. An early group of texts
connected with monastic institutions that Gérard de Brogne (d. 959) reformed
between 931 and 953 uses the topos to explain monastic foundations and the
acquisition of certain relics. Six of the nine institutions Gérard reformed were
located in Flanders and they included Saint-Bertin (944). Later, she has argued,

770 Amy G. Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in
Abbot Bovo of Saint-Bertin (1042-65) also used the *topos* to describe the events surrounding the reconstruction of the church of Saint-Bertin and the discovery of Bertin’s relics in the *Inventio et elevatio s. Bertini* [BHL1296].

The author of Baldwin V’s charter makes the *topos* the backbone of his narrative as well. Speaking in Baldwin V’s voice, the charter states that Baldwin II founded a church in honor of Ss. Martin and Winnoc in the lower part of Bergues. It also specifies that Baldwin II “installed canons there who should serve God day and night” (*Canonicos, qui diu noctuque Deo servirent, ibidem instituit*). It notes Winnoc’s translations from Wormhout to Sithiu, then Sithiu to Bergues. The charter also states that Baldwin IV built another church in the upper part of Bergues and transferred both the relics and the canons there. It then claims that:

> since pleasure accompanied affluence, and forgetfulness of the commandments of God accompanied pleasure, the aforementioned canons, led astray by their own desires, were found not very much devoted, nay nearly ignorant, regarding the matters which concern God.

---


772 Miræus, *Opera diplomatica*, p. 511.
According to the charter, Baldwin IV had to expel the canons because of their degeneracy. The count then “committed governing the place to the venerable Roderic, at that time, abbot of Saint-Bertin” (locum Venerabili Roderico, tunc temporis Abbati S. Bertini, regendum commisit).

While no part of this narrative appears in any of the hagiography on Winnoc, the charter would have been an important tool for proving Saint-Winnoc’s possession of his relics. Its chief drawback is, however, obvious. It clearly states that the abbey was a daughter house of Saint-Bertin. Leaving this information out of the saint’s vita allowed the abbey more independence.

Finally, Baldwin V’s charter demonstrates Winnoc’s status as the chief patron saint at Bergues. Although by 1067, Saint-Winnoc possessed relics of both Oswald and Lewinna, the charter does not mention these two saints anywhere. It describes Winnoc’s translations, including the translation from the collegiate to the abbey church, but not Lewinna’s translation from England to Flanders. Also, the count signed the charter at Bergues on the feast of Pentecost, the day when the annual procession to Wormhout with Winnoc’s relics was conducted by the

\[\text{Miræus, Opera diplomatica, p. 512.}\]

\[\text{Miræus, Opera diplomatica, p. 512.}\]
monks. In addition, it states that he signed it “in the presence of the holy Body of St. Winnoc” (in præsentia sacri Corporis S. Winnoci). Despite the presence of Lewinna’s corporal relics at Bergues, only Winnoc served as a sacred witness to the charter. As the author of the Vita secunda stated, the abbey at Bergues really was, in a legal sense, “Saint Winnoc’s coenobium” (coenobii Sancti Winnoci).

6.8 The Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci

Huyghebaert has argued convincingly that Drogo of Saint-Winnoc wrote the Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci [BHL 8956] sometime between 1068 and 1078, probably closer to the former date. The text of the Liber miraculorum refers to Abbot Rumold of Saint-Winnoc (1031-68), who died on 22 February, 1068, in a manner that makes it clear that he was no longer alive when Drogo wrote, while it also suggests that Bishop Drogo of Thérouanne (1030-78) probably was. The Liber miraculorum indicates that by the time of its composition, the monastic community of Saint-Winnoc had developed an independent identity that complemented its recently achieved freedom from Saint-Bertin’s control. The text’s description of Winnoc’s patrocinium presents him in three roles: 1) as the chief patron saint of the monks at Bergues, 2) as a patron saint of the inhabitants

775 Miræus, Opera diplomatica, p. 513.

776 VS, Prologus (col. 267C).

of the local area around Bergues, and 3) as a patron saint of the principality of Flanders. In addition, it further clarifies the monks’ relationship both to their chief patron saint and to the inhabitants of the surrounding region by depicting the monks assisting Winnoc in the dispensation of aid to laymen. The text was the decisive literary step in recording Winnoc’s memoria at Bergues.

Because patron saints were so important in forming communal identities, it is likely that Drogo considered the Liber miraculorum his most important composition. Not only did the work contribute to the cult of his abbey’s chief patron saint, but it is the first hagiographic work that unambiguously establishes Bergues as the center of Winnoc’s patrocinium. As a result, the text was an important expression of the religious identity of Saint-Winnoc – the community in which Drogo had been raised since he was, as the text says, a “very small boy” (puer parvulus).\footnote{\textit{LM}, ii.I (col. 275E).}

Drogo employed a different type of literary style in the Liber miraculorum than in his other texts. Where his other texts rely heavily on narrative, the Liber miraculorum relies on repetition, implication and small details to communicate its message. The narrative segments are briefer and less complex since they deal with individual miracles. They appear as a string of anecdotes attesting to the saint’s power.
The most important feature of the Liber miraculorum is its unambiguous identification of Bergues as the center of Winnoc’s patrocinium. Unlike the Vita secunda, the overwhelming number of miracles—twenty-five of thirty—occur at Bergues, while only three take place at Wormhout. So many of the miracles occur at Bergues that the text specifies only four times that suppliants went “to the monastery at Bergues” (in monasterium Bergense). In the remaining accounts, the text uses less explicit phrases, such as the statement that a suppliant went “to that same place” (ad eundem locum) or, more simply, that a person “entered the temple” (templum intrat). The context for these references makes it abundantly clear that they refer to Saint-Winnoc; Wormhout has been effectively eclipsed.

It is not the location of the miracles, however, that defines Drogo’s abbey as the center of Winnoc’s patrocinium. Instead, the Liber miraculorum calls the abbey “that place in which the saint was located [my emphasis]” (eo in loco sancto posito), meaning that he was accessible there. The text expresses no doubts that people should seek Winnoc at Bergues, rather than at Wormhout. In fact, the presence of Winnoc’s relics becomes the primary means for identifying Bergues and its inhabitants. In the account of Drogo’s stay at Hamburg, the Liber

---

779 LM, ii.II (col. 276B).

780 LM, iii.VIII; ii.V (coll. 278B; 277B).

781 LM, ii.VI (coll. 279B).
miraculorum reports that the provost of Hamburg discerned Drogo’s foreign accent and asked his origins. After Drogo stated that he was Flemish, the provost pressed him to be more specific and Drogo stated “the place is called Bergues, where the most precious confessor of Christ, Winnoc, reposes” (Bergensis locus dicitur, ubi pretiosissimus Christi confessor Winnocus requiescit).782

At the same time, the text also demonstrates the power of memory, especially when attached to landscape. In its account of the miraculous cure of a blind boy that occurred at Wormhout, the Liber miraculorum states that:

It is known to many delighting in the crispness of the air [at Pentecost] that the reliquary in which the bones of the venerable father are contained is carried to the place of his own repose with joy and gladness by an exulting crowd of people… It is a place so dear to him, that he is carried… there [from Bergues]...

Notum habetur multis huius aeris subtilitate fruentibus deferri loculum quo continentur ossa venerabilis patris ad locum propriae quietionis gaudio laetitiaeque ab exsultantibus populorum turbis… Est locus adeo sibi carus, ut fertur… ibi…783

Yet again, a hagiographic text remembers Wormhout as the place that the saint chose by immobilizing his reliquary. But the Liber miraculorum reverses previous

782 LM, iii.XXIII (col. 282F).

783 LM, iii.X (col. 278F).
suggestions that people should seek Winnoc at his old shrine no matter where
his relics might be located. Here, the text presents the annual procession as an
extraordinary event. The saint only returns to Wormhout once per year because
the place was so dear to him. The corollary is that Winnoc can normally be found
at Bergues.

Almost as if to counter the knowledge that Winnoc originally chose
Wormhout, the Liber miraculorum records the saint directing a suppliant to
Bergues for intercession. It reports that a certain pauper had a son who had been
paralyzed since birth. After describing the youth’s affliction, the account reports:

but a holy old man most beautiful in his visage appeared on a certain
night to the one affected by the affliction of this wretchedness, and
admonished him that he should go very quickly to the monastery at
Bergues.

verum huiusce affecto miseriae valitudine nocte quadam sanctus senex
pulcherrimus in visu apparuit, et ut ad Bergense monasterium quam festinus iret
ammonuit.784

The father arranged to have his son transported to Saint-Winnoc, where he was
left “before the door of the monastery” (ante ostium monasterii) and lay “not many
days [while] the custodian by the name of Letfridus sustained him with victuals”

784 LM, iii.VII (col. 278A).
(non multis diebus iacuit; quem aedituus nomine Letfridus victu sustentavit).\textsuperscript{785} (At Saint-Winnoc as at other churches, it was a regular practice for poor people to beg for alms just outside or just inside the church doors.) Eventually, the custodian dragged the paralyzed youth inside the church at the youth’s request and left him “before the altar” (\textit{ante altare}), where he was healed.\textsuperscript{786} Just as the story of Winnoc immobilizing his sarcophagus at Wormhout established his desire to remain there, this account establishes the saint’s desire to be at Bergues. Winnoc could have instructed the youth to appear at Wormhout on Pentecost when he would return to his original shrine. Yet, even though the saint appears as the same old man who once appeared to, then healed, a blind youth at Wormhout, Winnoc sends the second youth to his new shrine at Bergues.

This miracle account also reveals that the threshold of the church at Bergues was the threshold between sacred and profane space. The \textit{Liber miraculorum} consistently portrays the interior of churches as sacred spaces in which Winnoc delivered his intercession. Twenty-one of its thirty miracles occur in a church. In addition, for six of the remaining nine miracles, circumstances prevented the miracle from occurring inside a church: they involved the saint protecting monks and craftsmen who fell from the church tower at Saint-Winnoc during its reconstruction.

\textsuperscript{785} \textit{LM}, iii.VII (col. 278A).

\textsuperscript{786} \textit{LM}, iii.VII (col. 278B).
For those suppliants who, like the paralytic youth, began their appeals outside the church, it was not until they entered that they were healed. Furthermore, the accounts sometimes describe the act of helping the afflicted enter the church as charity. For example, at Pentecost, a group of bystanders at Wormhout observed the wailings of a blind woman standing outside. The account reports that they “were moved by mercy on her account, raised her with their hands, lifted her with their arms, [and] led the one affected by misery of this kind into the temple” (super ea misericordia moti, manibus elevant, brachiis attollunt, huiusmodi miseria affectam in templum deducunt).787

In contrast to what Pierre-André Sigal has found, however, the Liber miraculorum does not establish other zones of sacred power. In his study of eleventh- and twelfth-century miracle accounts in northern France, Sigal has observed that such accounts generally describe concentric circles of increasing sacredness based on proximity to a saint’s relics.788 The Liber miraculorum does not note different locations at which miracles occurred, but does not depict them as becoming more frequent the closer one approached to the reliquary. Of the thirty miracles reported, two occur in or near the choir, four in close proximity to the altar, seven in close proximity to the reliquary, another eight at unspecified


locations in the church, six as a result of falls from the church tower, and three outside the church but in close proximity to the reliquary. Nor is there any indication that either the suppliants or Drogo considered certain locations more desirable than others.

While the Liber miraculorum does not establish zones of increasing sanctity, it does show that simple proximity to Winnoc’s relics was critical for obtaining his intercession. One account makes this point particularly forcefully. It reports that one year, “drought, the blast of the wind, [and] the heat of the sun constricted all the land of Flanders” (siccitas, venti uredo, solis calor, omnem Flandriae terram constrinxerant). The conditions made the ground hard, depriving men and animals of food. The inhabitants of the area around Bergues “sought the presence of St. Winnoc, that is, so that he might be carried through the churches of his homeland” (praesentiam sancti Winnoci petere, id est ut per ecclesias patriae deportaretur). The monks obliged and “when [the reliquary] entered the boundaries of a village, all of its surrounding lands were watered by immense downpours” (cum terminos intrabat villae, omnes circumquaque immensis imbribus eius irrigabantur terrae). In addition, the account ends by stating that “[Winnoc] mercifully heard the wishes of the populace, he led the rains with

789 LM, iii.XXIV (col. 283A).
790 LM, iii.XXIV (col. 283A).
791 LM, iii.XXIV (col. 283A).
him, then moreover, returning, he led them back with him” (vota populi clementer exaudivit, pluvias secum duxit, tunc autem revertens secum reduxit). It is tempting to focus on the dramatic progress of the saint’s relics across the parched earth. The simultaneous arrival of both the relics and the rains is particularly striking. In the text, however, this is not the most important aspect of the story. Instead, the statement that the villagers “sought the presence of St. Winnoc” (praesentiam sancti Winnoci petere) is much more important, because this is the point at which the inhabitants of the region petitioned the saint’s aid. As discussed in Chapter 4, many medieval people believed that saints maintained a special living presence at their corporal relics. It was not the saint’s inanimate bones that brought the rains, but the living Winnoc himself.

Paradoxically, in the Liber miraculorum the best evidence for this belief comes from the miracle that occurred farthest from the saint’s corporal relics – one of only two that occurred outside the relics’ immediate vicinity. In the account of this miracle, the Saxon bishop Bovo requests, but is denied, the gift of some of Winnoc’s corporal relics. He is, however, granted pieces of the saint’s original reliquary and says:

If I do not indeed… merit to take something from such a confessor with me, at least these parts of the reliquary, in which his bones were venerated for so many years, will be pledges for me in the place of bones.

792 LM, iii.XXIV (col. 283A).
The bishop then departs for his homeland, resting at Hamburg on the way. At
the time, a demoniac was kept bound in the church at Hamburg while the priests
tried different measures to free him of the demon. Although all of their attempts
had failed, “when Bishop Bovo was inside the temple, the demon cried out
through the mouth of the possessed man by repeating many times ‘Winnoc,
Winnoc, Winnoc expels me’” (*cum episcopus Bovo templo inerat, clamare daemon per
os obsessi hominis multotiens iterando ‘Winnocus, Winnocus, Winnocus me eicit’*).794
The bishop quickly realized that he was carrying pieces of Winnoc’s reliquary in
his pocket, and after a brief exchange in which the demon confirmed Winnoc’s
royal lineage (Drogo seems to have been somewhat concerned about the
reception of the *Vita secunda*’s genealogy), the demon departed. Though it was
pieces of the reliquary that instigated the exorcism, the demon’s cries make it
clear that it was the saint who expelled him.795

---

793 LM, iii.XXIII (col. 282C).

794 LM, iii.XXIII (col. 282E).

795 Alain Dierkins has described numerous other miracles involving empty
reliquaries or spaces that a saint’s relics had recently occupied (Alain Dierkins,
“Du bon (et du mauvais) usage des reliquaires au Moyen Âge,” in *Les reliques: Objets, cultes, symboles*, ed. Edina Bozóky and Anne-Marie Helvétius, Actes du Colloque International de l’Université du Littoral-Côte d’Opale (Boulogne-sur-
The special nature of corporal relics suggests one reason why the Liber miraculorum depicts such a large percentage of miracles occurring in churches. A church provided a sacred space in which the proper relationship subordinating suppliant to saint might be established – even the mighty were expected to display humility before God. This is most apparent in the manner in which people approached Winnoc to request his intercession. Of the twenty-one people who were able to go to the saint (circumstances prevented some, like those who fell, from acting on their own behalf), twelve prostrated themselves. From the ninth century through at least the twelfth century, prostration as a gesture of humility was used to petition kings, counts, dukes, bishops, abbots and lords of other types for their aid or mercy. Other forms included kneeling, clasping the knees of the person being petitioned, touching one’s head to the ground, and, at least in the case of Rollo’s warrior, being ordered to kiss the king’s foot.

Prostration was also used to request that powerful people intercede with yet more powerful people on one’s behalf. As Geoffrey Koziol has observed in Begging Pardon and Favor, prostration as an act of supplication was pervasive in medieval society. In addition, the written sources indicate a widespread and enduring belief that God was the King of Heaven, just as the Carolingians or Capetians were the kings of earthly realms. Therefore, people needed
intercessors to petition God. These intercessors were the saints. And, just as people usually supplicated powerful earthly intercessors on their knees or prostrate, both visual and literary sources depict people supplicating the saints in these positions.\textsuperscript{796} In addition to prostration, four petitioners kept themselves awake all night keeping vigils before Winnoc’s relics, and another four offered gifts, such as candles or sheep, to the saint.

The case of a poor widow who had been blind for eight years is especially compelling for the text’s description of her humility. Arriving at Bergues the night before Pentecost, the widow:

- was led into the temple, in the choir before the steps on the first vigil of the night she lay down amidst the crowd, now praying to God, sometimes weeping, then moreover hitting her chest with her fists, she emitted a cry of pain from the depths of her heart.

\textit{in choro ante gradus in prima vigilia noctis cum multis iacuit, modo orans Deum, aliquando flens, tum autem pectus pugnis tundens, doloris vocem ab alto cordis emittebat.}\textsuperscript{797}

Although the woman was obviously in a pitiful condition, one man was not


\textsuperscript{797} LM, ii.VI (col. 277D).
impressed; he snapped at the woman to keep quiet. The saint, however, was apparently satisfied with her humility, because just after the reprimand she was healed.798

Not even powerful nobles or ecclesiastical lords were exempt from the need to subordinate themselves. In one miracle account, a fratricide makes his way to Saint-Winnoc after a long quest to have the chains binding him released. The man “entered the temple, and for a long time and intently, now prone, now begging mercy, at times standing, he prayed” (templum intrat, diuque et intente, modo pronus, modo veniam petens, aliquando stans, orat).799 After the saint broke his iron bonds, the man informed the monks that “he was a noble in the highest degree from Aquitaine” (se fore Aquitaniensem apprime nobilem).800

Similarly, Malbode, the abbot of Saint-Amand (1018-62), a powerful institution in the eastern part of the Artois, sought Count Baldwin V’s aid against a lord who had usurped property from the abbey. He met the count numerous times but found him unresponsive. Finally, he went to Bergues, where Count Baldwin was conducting business, but did not go immediately before him. Noting to himself that Winnoc stemmed from a line of just kings, the abbot

798 LM, ii.VI (col. 277E).
799 LM, iii.XVII (col. 280D).
800 LM, iii.XVII (col. 280E).
hoped that the saint would influence the count from a sense of royal mercy. On his arrival at Bergues, he proceeded directly to the church and:

though he was tired [from the journey]... he spent that night in prayer.

And, with the morning having come, he sought the ground before Saint Winnoc. “Give to the king thy judgment, O God, and to the king's son thy justice,” he said, and to this verse [he added], “the king's honour loveth judgment.”\(^{801}\) [He also said] “you [Winnoc], moreover, if you are who you say you are, will provide your justice to me this day.”

noctem illam, quamquam lassus... in oratione perpetuat. Mane autem facto terram ante sanctum Winnocum petiiit, “Deus iudicium tuum regi da et iustitiam tuam filio regis,” dixit, huicque versui, “Honor regis iudicium diligit.“ “Tu autem an sis qui diceris, mihi Hodie tuo iudicio apparebit.”\(^{802}\)

Though the abbot challenged the saint, he prefaced his (successful) request with a night of prayers and prostration.

Even proper reverence was not always a defense, however, if Winnoc desired to emphasize his power. The Liber miraculorum reports that the monks of Drogo’s community decided to replace their patron saint’s reliquary with a new, more ornate one. After a goldsmith had disassembled part of the reliquary, he discovered that it was encircled by iron bands underneath the decorations.

\(^{801}\) Psalm 71:2 (Psalm 72:2); Psalm 98:4 (Psalm 99:4).

\(^{802}\) LM, iii.XVIII (col. 281B).
While Abbot Rumold and some brothers surrounded the reliquary singing and chanting, the smith hit the bands twice with his hammer. Since they seemed undamaged, “the third time he gave a blow with the force of his entire body, [and] everyone standing around singing litanies fell to the ground as one” *(tertio omni corporis vi totoque conatu ictum daret, omnes astantes letaniasque cantantes una in terram cecidere).*\(^{803}\) The account was included to prove that the relics had remained inviolate in the reliquary, but it also stresses Winnoc’s power.

Fortunately, for the monks of Saint-Winnoc, the saint usually acted in their interest. The *Liber miraculorum* makes plain Winnoc’s role as chief patron saint of the abbey. Directly after the account of the drought reported above, the text states that:

> at another time while the relics of this saint were borne away on account of a similar necessity, and while he was absent the entire time of autumn, a fever invaded not a few of the coenobium of Bergues, [and] death followed the fever, sparing none.

\(^{803}\) *LM*, iii.XXI (col. 282A).

\(^{804}\) *LM*, iii.XXV (col. 283B).
The monks of Saint-Winnoc hastily dispatched a messenger to their brethren with the relics, and a return “journey of three days was completed in one, [and] the saint was carried to the building in which the sick brothers lay” (iter trium dierum uno perficitur, in domum in qua infirmi fratres iacebant sanctus deportatur).\footnote{LM, iii.XXV (col. 283D).} Two days after the return of the relics, the sick brothers recovered.

More often, however, the \textit{Liber miraculorum} depicts the monks as simply present while Winnoc delivers his intercession to the laity. Six accounts note the presence of the monks in the church when miracles occur. Often, they are just finishing a hymn or the performance of some ritual action. For example, the text states that a miracle occurred at Easter “when the deacon began to read the passion” (\textit{dum diaconus coepit legere passionem}).\footnote{LM, iii.XII (col. 279D).} In another example, the miracle occurs just after “the brothers performing the vespers hymns in the choir sang harmoniously, [and] gave petitions and praises” (\textit{fratres vespertinos hymnos solventes in choro concorditer psallebant, vota laudesque reddebant}).\footnote{LM, iii.XVI (col. 280C).} The presence of the monks of Saint-Winnoc could be a reflection of their ability to create the proper environment for a miracle. As Koziol has put it, monks were “experts... in using ritual and ceremony to create the right atmosphere.”\footnote{Geoffrey Koziol, “Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace in Eleventh-Century Flanders,” in \textit{The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in 403}
monks’ influence in their own church was heightened because it was their space.
The *Liber miraculorum* notes that the abbot of Saint-Amand who challenged
Winnoc “moved his lips in silence” (*silentio movens labia*).\(^{809}\) Perhaps, he did so
because he did not want to anger the monks when he spoke so bluntly to their
patron saint.

The monks’ presence at these miracles also reflected their role as *oratores* –
‘those who pray’. The laity regularly asked that monks, whose prayers were
often thought more efficacious than a layman’s, seek divine intercession for
laymen’s sins. Phyllis Jestice has gone so far as to describe monasteries after the
tenth-century reforms of Gorze, Cluny and Gérard de Brogne as “prayer
machines.”\(^{810}\) While the round of prayers at Bergues may not have been as
extreme as Jestice has described it, the *Liber miraculorum* gives equal weight to
the spiritual and physical intercession Winnoc provided. For example, near the
beginning of one miracle, it reports that:

> many mortals of both sexes, seeking the aid of the holy man, gathered at
> the monastery often named above, some for the purpose of the remitting
> or forgiving the burdens of the sins which they had committed, while

\(^{809}\) *LM*, iii.XVIII (col. 281B).

others hastened to go on account of the afflictions of diverse infirmities and diseases.

-multi mortalium utriusque sexus, quaerentes suffragia sancti viri, aliqui propter remittenda seu indulgenda onera criminum quae admiserant, ad monasterium supra saepius nominatum convenere, aliqui propter diversarum infirmitatum valitudinumque languores accelerarunt properare.\textsuperscript{811}

Obviously, however, the \textit{Liber miraculorum} focuses on physical cures, since those were the most dramatic and easiest intercessions to document.

Drogo’s text invites people of all ranks, even the poor, to seek the saint’s aid because Jesus set the example:

Thus, thus, let him go, O blessed father, thus let him seeking you, imploring you, praying to you, feel your full comfort. Thus let the salvation of spirits and bodies come, thus let mercy for sins be present…

You [Winnoc] imitated the Son of God, who although he was rich in himself, was made a pauper for us… For originating from a royal line, you left behind the glory of the world, your homeland, [and] your parents…

\textit{Sic sic eat, o felix pater, sic levamen tuum omnis te quaerens, te deprecans, te orans, sentiat. Sic veniat animarum ac corporum salus, sic peccatorum venia}

\textsuperscript{811} \textit{LM}, ii.VI (col. 277C).
Drogo, in fact, displayed particular compassion for the poor. In discussing the cure of a blind man, the Liber miraculorum notes that “it happens frequently that not a few mortals oppressed by misfortune of this kind fall into poverty, because by however many days he suffers a portion of his wealth is lost” (accidit crebro nonnullos mortalium huiusmodi infortunio oppressos in egestatem cadere, dum quot diebus in damnum versatur proportio substantiae).

The Liber miraculorum goes to great lengths to depict Winnoc as the patron saint of the lay community surrounding Bergues. Five accounts show him helping the monks, while twenty-two report him helping lay people. The latter include eight paupers (pauperi), two rustics (rustici), two craftsmen, and one nobleman. Although the Liber miraculorum explicitly designates only six of these twenty-two lay beneficiaries as inhabitants of Bergues or the surrounding locale, the number of blind (nine) or paralyzed (six) people among the beneficiaries suggests that a majority were local inhabitants. As the Liber miraculorum notes at times, people with these sorts of maladies could travel only through arduous exertions or with the aid of others, thereby limiting the distances they could travel to seek aid.

812 LM, ii.VI (col. 277D).

813 LM, iii.IX (col. 278E).
Winnoc’s accessibility to local people seems to have been one of his chief attractions to them. There is nothing particularly remarkable about the miracles recorded in the Liber miraculorum. Cures of blind people and paralytics, the two most abundant miracles in Sigal’s study, are also the most common miracles that Winnoc performed. For sick people who had to choose between a nearby saint who offered a cure for paralysis and a distant one who offered the same, the choice was easy. Unfortunately, the text does not define the territorial extent of Winnoc’s local patrocinium.

By the end of the Liber miraculorum, it is clear that Winnoc sustained the monastic community that cared for his relics at Bergues as he had sustained earlier communities that had cared for his relics. It is equally clear that the monks of Saint-Winnoc shared few similarities with the saint’s community at Wormhout or the chapter of canons at Bergues. The monks of Saint-Winnoc had thrown their church open to the laity. This attitude reflects an ethos that Jestice has detected in reports about Richard of Saint-Vanne, whose disciple, Roderic, reformed Saint-Winnoc. She has argued that the Lotharingian reformer had an extraordinary degree of contact with the laity. In addition to his personal activity, he facilitated contact between monks and laymen in his reforms by encouraging processions, allowing some laymen into the monastic refectory to eat, welcoming crowds of laymen on saints’ feast days, and building large

---

814 Sigal, L’homme, p. 255.
pilgrimage churches. Saint-Winnoc certainly appears to have embraced these ideals, including the construction of a pilgrimage church: six of Winnoc’s miracles concern monks or craftsmen whom the saint saves when they fall from the walls of the unfinished church, indicating a sustained and relatively large-scale construction project.

While the *Vita secunda* restores Winnoc’s status as a founder and exemplar for the community that housed his relics, Drogo’s *Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci* removes the tension that is so prominent in the *libri miraculorum* produced by the canons of Bergues. Drogo’s text demonstrates that Winnoc is the patron saint of both the monks of Saint-Winnoc and the inhabitants of the surrounding region through his new shrine at Bergues. Only Winnoc’s role as a patron saint of Flanders remains to be discussed. The following section combines observations from both the *Vita secunda Winnoci* and Drogo’s *Liber miraculorum Winnoci*.

### 6.9 Patron Saint of Flanders

Winnoc’s transformation into a patron saint of Flanders accompanied significant changes in the society that venerated him. Both the *Vita secunda* and the *Liber miraculorum* reveal a major change in the nature of secular authority from the Early to the Central Middle Ages. According to these texts, comital intervention in both secular and ecclesiastical affairs was more accepted by

ecclesiastical institutions in the eleventh century than it had been in the tenth. Flanders had exchanged a distant king for a vigorous local count. For the hagiographers who wrote for Saint-Winnoc, this was a positive development, as Chapter 3 argues with regard to Drogo’s works on Oswald.

The most striking comital intervention in Winnoc’s cult appears in the *Vita secunda*’s revision of the *Miracula recentiora*’s translation accounts. The *Vita secunda* states that Baldwin I (r. 862-79), whose territory was devastated by the Viking invasions:

ruled the principality of Flanders with glory, a man whose excellence in innate greatness and warfare Flanders never had among [its] most outstanding men, for which, from a deed of a particularly brave spirit, he achieved the name “Iron One,” for he was not a little zealous to triumph with a great army and in warfare over the enemy.

\[monarchiam Flandrarum gloriose pollebat, vir cuius ingenio et militia nil in viris clarissimis pretiosius umquam habuit Flandria; cui ex occasione fortissimi animi cognomen accessit Ferreus; milite enim multo et militia de hostibus triumphare non parum erat strenuus.\]

The compliment here is as much in the anachronistic characterization of Baldwin’s loose conglomeration of *pagi* as a “principality” (*monarchia*) as it is in

\[816\, VS,\, i.XV\, (col.\, 272D).\]
the outright praise the text heaps on the count. As Huyghebaert has pointed out, such praise for the Flemish counts was typical of the literary tradition that developed at Saint-Pierre at Ghent where the author was a monk.\textsuperscript{817}

Despite the \textit{Vita secunda}'s testimony, Baldwin I was, like many other contemporary lords, almost completely ineffective in defending his territory against the Vikings. The text, however, cleverly portrays this ineffectiveness as comital piety. It goes on to say that:

\begin{quote}
in these days, the sword of divine adversity drawn from its sheath, greatly slackened the reins of divine vengeance [gave free rein to divine vengeance] on the places near the sea, \textit{for the populace of the land deserved it by merit of its errors} [my emphasis]. For the kingdom of the Danes vomited forth a murderous company from its interior, who devoured whatever lay nearby with a fiery sword, and greatly raged with incredible destruction within the confines of Flanders and the \textit{pagus} of the Mempisci. Whence it happened that the sacrosanct body of the blessed man was borne away from Wormhout, its proper place of rest, and transferred to the church of the blessed Omer at Sithiu, for it seemed favorable in order to evade there the threat of this pest.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{His diebus mucro divinae animadversionis de vagina sua eductus, circa marina maxime loca ulciscendi frena laxavit; merito enim sui erroris populus terrae id}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{817} Huyghebaert, “La ‘Vita secunda s. Winnoci’,” pp. 229-33.
promeruit. Nam regia Danorum satellitem funestum de sinu suo evomuit, qui quaeque circumcirca gladio igni absorbuit, maximeque in Flandrarum atque Menpescorum confinio incredibili desaevit exterminio. Unde contigit sacrosanctum corpus beati viri de loco propriae quietis Woromholt efferri et ad Sithiu in ecclesiam beati Audomari transferri; visum est enim commodum illo ire declinatum pestis huius in commodo.818

The author was obviously embarrassed at Baldwin’s inability to counter the invasions. By interpreting the attacks as divine justice, he excused the count for allowing the devastation to occur. The ferocity of the attacks also offered a rationale for the translation of Winnoc’s relics. Only six chapters earlier, the Vita secunda reports that the saint chose Wormhout as his resting place by immobilizing his reliquary. The saint had done so even though it meant that his relics would have to be kept in a garden until a new church could be built. The text does not state who decided to transfer the relics to Sithiu this time, but it is clear that Winnoc did not oppose the move as he had before.

The Vita secunda then moves directly to the account of Baldwin II’s (r. 879-918) translation of Winnoc’s relics from Sithiu to Bergues at the end of 899. In addition to recording the translation, it uses the account to spell out Winnoc’s role as a patron saint of Flanders. In particular, the text describes the saint as a

818 VS, i.XV (col. 272D).
powerful comital ally in the defense of the principality. First, it notes that Baldwin II fortified locations along the coast against invaders, then that:

it was pleasing to fortify the place called Bergues with a garrison, which would be for the defense of all the country that lay round about, where also he caused to be constructed a church, which he completed dedicated to the names of the confessors of Christ, Martin and Winnoc. He conceived in his mind on top of this… to transfer the sacrosanct body of the blessed Winnoc to that place, so that, in the future, Flanders might rejoice, free of hardships with so great a protector.

locum Bergas dictum praesidio placuit munire, quod munitioni omni circumquaque esset patriae; ubi etiam ecclesiam construui fecit, quam titulis confessorum Christi Martini atque Winnoci insignitam perfecit. Animo insuper… concepit… sacrosanctum videlicet corpus beati Winnoci illo transferre, ut Flandria ulterius secura laborum tanto gauderet protectore.\textsuperscript{819}

Rather than restore Winnoc to his original community, the count placed him at Bergues, a strategic location along the coast, which then contained both secular and sacred defenses. Symbolically, the two structures represented the alliance of comital and saintly power in defense of the new principality. In contrast to the

\textsuperscript{819} VS, i.XVI (coll. 272E-73A).
previous texts in Winnoc’s dossier, the *Vita secunda* does not dismiss secular office as a “vanity.” Instead, it exalts the counts as protectors along with Winnoc.

The *Vita secunda* also praises the counts as territorial princes. It states that “Baldwin [II], named the Bald, raised his most excellent head among the thousands in Flanders” (*surrexit in Flandria optimum inter milia caput Baldwinus cognomine Calvus*).\(^{820}\) The reference to Baldwin “raising his head” here seems to be a way to highlight the count’s name which may have been a reference to his maternal grandfather, Charles the Bald. In addition, like a king, Baldwin II “received the principality of Flanders from his ancestors” (*a progenitoribus Flandriae monarchiam sortitus*), rather than from royal delegation.\(^{821}\) It was also the count who provided for the common defense when he “fortified the borders of Flanders, still easily accessible and open to the enemy at that time, with castles and closed them to all remaining attacks” (*fines Flandiae, facile usque ad id temporis accessibiles et pervios hosti, castris munierat omnique in reliquum impugnationi clauserat*).\(^{822}\)

\(^{820}\) VS, i.XVI (col. 272E).

\(^{821}\) VS, i.XVI (col. 272E).

\(^{822}\) VS, i.XVI (col. 272E).
In addition, much like Dudo of Saint-Quentin’s *History of the Normans*, the *Vita secunda* also records an exchange between its prince and Charles III the Simple (r. 893-922) that ostensibly affirms the traditional order at the same time that it depicts the king off-balance. After reporting that Baldwin II constructed a church dedicated to Martin and Winnoc, it goes on to say:

at that time, King Charles [III the Simple], whom Heribert [II of Vermandois later] captured in an ambush, held the rule of the Franks. The aforesaid prince of Flanders coming to this one (for Baldwin held great sway with him) fortified the resolve of the mind of his king with advice and rejoiced in his exemption. For so soon as he summoned the mind of the king with mention of the aforesaid place [Bergues], he discovered a partner for his own desire, since over that same place he easily obtained a royal exemption, and he acquired the action of consent for it from the royal authority.

*Tenebat ea tempestate sceptrum Francorum rex Karolus, quem dolo captivaverat Heribertus. Quem praefatus Flandrarum monarches adiens, habuit enim apud ipsum plurimum posse, consilium animi sui regis roboravit consilio et magnificavit privilegio. Nam mox ut animum regis super praefati loci mentione convenit, proprii sese voti compotem invenit; quia super eodem loco privilegium regale facile obtinuit, affectusque sui effectum auctoritate regia promeruit.*

---

823 VS, i.XVI (col. 273A).
Count Heribert II of Vermandois (r. 900-43) captured King Charles the Simple in 922 when Robert I (r. 922-23) claimed the scepter of the West Franks. Heribert held Charles until Charles’s death in 929. While appearing to give respect to the dignity of royal authority, this passage carefully notes Charles’s humiliating imprisonment during which he kept the title of king but held no real power. There was no need for this note, since Charles was captured over twenty years after the founding of the chapter at Bergues. The account ends in similar fashion, noting that “this translatio was done by Baldwin, named the Bald, in the year of the incarnation of the Word 900, in the eighth year of Charles the king who was later held captive by Heribert of Vermandois” (acta est haec translatio a Baldwino cognomine Calvo anno humanati verbi nongentesimo, Karoli regis ab Heriberto Virmandorum postea capti anno octavo). Thus, the text repeatedly highlights the king’s weakness.

The two chapters on Winnoc’s translations are crucial in the Vita secunda’s revision of the Vita antiqua. They navigate the shift from the expansive “horizontal” structure Geary has described for the Early Middle Ages to the “vertical” structure of the Central Middle Ages. Rather than a powerful Carolingian monarchy and aristocracy with broad, transregional connections, the

\footnote{824 Jean Dunbabin, France in the Making, 843-1180, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 30, 95.}

\footnote{825 VS, i.XVI (col. 273A-B).}
Vita secunda depicts vigorous territorial princes who act like kings within their own territories. The Flemish counts’ activities in their region appear both more frequent and more intense in comparison to the distant rulers of the previous era. The image of an imprisoned king stands in marked contrast to the Vita secunda’s portrait of counts who build castri, found churches, and translate saints.

Although the Liber miraculorum is not as explicit in describing the Flemish counts as the Vita secunda, it does provide a few intimate glimpses of Baldwin V and his wife, Adela, both of whom it depicts as devoted to Winnoc. For example, in one miracle account, Winnoccures a blind girl while the countess is praying in the church at Saint-Winnoc. After discovering what had happened, she “gave the saint a cloth of hardly a small price, returned rejoicing, [and] proclaimed the merits of the saint to all” (haud parvi pretii pallio sanctum donat, gaudens redit, merita sancti omnibus praedicat).

More importantly, the Liber miraculorum seems to include the account involving Abbot Malbode of Saint-Amand for the express purpose of demonstrating Winnoc’s influence over Baldwin. The work reports that:

A certain powerful man unjustly invaded the inheritance of St. Amand…

The abbot of that place scarcely sought to resist to the force of his violence;

---


827 LM, ii.III (col. 276D).
nevertheless he frequently went to this same man, he spoke to him over that matter, he argued, he exhorted him, lest the man should do an injustice to God and his saint… But he was moved neither by mild words, nor by harsh ones, and was not deflected by prayer and response, neither by the admonition of this abbot nor of some others, not by persuasion, nor indeed was he made milder by exhortation. On account of which indeed the abbot went to Count Baldwin, complaining to the man over the evil injustice and injury. But the count not wishing to offend the powerful knight, at first drew out the negotiation, then, as thus I say, soothed the abbot with sweet words.

Quidam potens hereditatem Sancti Amandi iniuste invaserat… Abbas ipsius loci potestati eius haud vi sua quibat resistere; tamen saepenumero hunc ipsum adibat, super ea illi loquebatur, suadebat, hortabatur hunc, ne iniustitiam Deo et sancto suo faceret… At ille nec mitibus dictis, nequidem duris, movebatur, sive flectebatur oratu responsove, non huius abbatis nec aliquorum ammonitione, non suasione, ne hortatu quidem mitior reddebatur. Quapropter comitem Balduinum idem abbas adiit, super nequam viro iniustitiam iniuriamque clamitans. Verum comes potentem militem offendere nolens, primo negotium protrahebat, tum, ut ita dicam, abbatem dulcibus verbis lactabat.\footnote{LM, iii.XVIII (coll. 280F-81A).}
After going to Bergues and petitioning Winnoc, however, Abbot Malbode overcame the count’s reluctance. In order to affirm that this seemingly unremarkable event was, in fact, a miracle, the text states that Baldwin said, “for in no way is it possible for this thing to have happened, unless indeed Winnoc by divine power put forward that same thing to me to be done. For it was fixed in my mind by an oath never to be turned from my decision” (nam nullomodo id esse posset, nisi is quidem divina virtute ad id facti me ipsum promovisset. Nam mihi ratum in animo fuit nusquam iureiurando flecti sententiam). This miracle reiterates the intercession that Winnoc as a patron saint of Flanders could obtain from the count. It demonstrates that the saint ‘had the count’s ear’.

Political and ecclesiastical boundaries also began to coincide more closely in the eleventh century. When Baldwin II died in 918, his will specified that Arnulf I, his elder son, should receive his lands east of the Audomarois including Bergues, while Adalolf, his younger son, should receive the Boulonnais and western Ternois, including the lay abbacy of Saint-Bertin (see Map 16). As a result, Bergues and Sithiu were located in different political territories. Although Arnulf seized his brother’s territories in 933, he maintained the division, giving

---

829 LM, iii.XVIII (col. 281C).

the west and the lay abbacy of Saint-Bertin to his son, Baldwin III, to administer.\textsuperscript{831} The division grew stronger again in 962, when Baldwin III died and Arnulf I of Flanders was forced to cede the west in fief to Adalolf’s heir, Arnulf of Boulogne.\textsuperscript{832}

Near the end of the tenth century, the political geography shifted again. In 993, Baldwin IV gained control of the eastern portion of the Ternois along with Saint-Bertin. He then united it with the region around Bergues as a single territory, later known as the castellany (comitatus) of Saint-Omer (The same term comitatus was used for both the county of Flanders and the large internal units called castellanies by modern scholars. See Map 15).\textsuperscript{833} Twenty-nine years later in 1022, the count placed the new foundation of Saint-Winnoc under Saint-Bertin’s authority after having reformed the larger abbey only a year earlier.

Bergues probably remained within the castellany of Saint-Omer until the 1050s, but there is evidence that the town and the surrounding area had developed a high degree of autonomy from the castellany of Saint-Omer around the same time that Saint-Winnoc received its independence from Saint-Bertin. Under Baldwin V, or perhaps Baldwin IV, the large castellanies created by


\textsuperscript{832} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, pp. 42-3; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 28-9; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, pp. 49-50.

\textsuperscript{833} Nicholas, \textit{Medieval Flanders}, pp. 46-7; Ganshof, \textit{La Flandre}, pp. 31-3, 35-6; Dhondt, \textit{Les origines}, pp. 55-6, 60.
Baldwin IV at the end of the tenth century were divided into smaller units, called *territoria*. Within the castellany of Saint-Omer, these smaller units were based at Cassel, Aire, Bourbourg, Veurne, Ypres, and Bergues (see Map 17). Their boundaries corresponded to the boundaries of the archdeaconries of the diocese of Thérouanne.\footnote{E. Warlop, *The Flemish Nobility before 1300* (Kortrijk, Belgium: G. Desmet-Huysman, 1975), p. 117.} The *Historia translationis*, for example, refers to the “*territorium Bergensis*.”\footnote{HT, ii.II.71 (col. 627B).} In addition, the *Liber miraculorum* mentions the “vice-lord of the *pagus* of Bergues” (*vicedominus Bergensis pagi*), named Erkanbold, and his wife, Alswida.\footnote{LM, ii.V (col. 277A).} (It is not clear whether this vice-lord was directly subject to the Flemish count or, more probably, to the castellan of Saint-Omer.) In 1071, when Robert I the Frisian (r. 1071-98) seized Flanders from his nephew, Arnulf III (r. 1070-71), the warriors of Saint-Omer sided with Arnulf, while those from Bergues, Ypres, Veurne, Bourbourg and Cassel sided with Robert.\footnote{Chronicon comitum Flandriae [Flandria Generosa] et continuationes, chs. 18 and 20 (MGH SS, IX, p. 322); cited in Warlop, *Flemish Nobility*, pp. 128 and 422 n. 213.} To a certain extent, political and ecclesiastical divisions developed in conjunction.

It is difficult to gauge how much Saint-Winnoc’s growing autonomy might have influenced the development of the castellany of Bergues and *vice versa*. The boundaries of Winnoc’s “zone of attraction” almost certainly extended...
beyond those of the *territoria Bergensis*. Sigal has noted that the majority of people aided by saints came from villages within 30 km of their shrines.\(^{838}\) For Winnoc, this means that his *patrocinium* might have extended to the towns of Veurne, Poperinge, and Cassel, though probably not much to the west since this would have “poached” too directly on Bertin and Omer’s immediate territory (see Map 18). The annual procession to Wormhout may even have extended it farther to the south. The presence of an important abbey in the castellany of Bergues probably assisted in the political consolidation of the district.

The reconfiguration of the county into large castellanies, then the division of those castellanies into smaller ones is representative of the increasing intervention of the Flemish counts into local affairs within their territory. As the structure of western Europe became more “vertical,” comital intervention into the affairs of smaller abbeys, such as Saint-Winnoc grew. In fact, the Flemish counts seem to have been important patrons of Saint-Winnoc in their own right.

6.10 Conclusion

The hagiographic texts added to Winnoc’s dossier by the monks of Saint-Winnoc at Bergues reveal the interdependence of the three senses of the term *virtus*. While the canons of Bergues seem to have had some difficulty identifying their community with a saint who was neither their chapter’s founder nor a

canon himself, the monks of Saint-Winnoc were able to cast him as a Benedictine abbot and fabricate a previous relationship to their community. After the council of Aachen in 816, Winnoc’s monastic virtues, though often similar to those of canon, were of a different ecclesiastical order. Because the community of Saint-Winnoc was a Benedictine monastery and officially shared the same aspirations, it could emphasize his virtues as a way to forge bonds between the monks and their chief patron saint. Because the canons were uncertain about their claim to be Winnoc’s community, they focused on his intercessory power. Since the structure of his patrocinium had not changed, particularly the location of his shrine, Winnoc’s status as patron saint afforded some connection and sense of legitimacy. Saint-Winnoc, however, carried out a reform of the saint’s patrocinium in order to make it reflect the ecclesiastical structure of Winnoc’s community. The monastic community was housed at Bergues, the saint’s relics were housed at Bergues and after Drogo’s Liber miraculorum, Winnoc’s written memoria pointed toward Bergues as well. A critical factor among the changes that occurred was the revelation of a new shrine through the saint’s miraculous deeds. By encouraging people to seek intercession at Bergues, then recording successful petitions, the monks changed people’s expectations regarding the saint’s behavior.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters offer several examples of medieval efforts to shape the record of the past in the service of contemporary goals. Patrick Geary has described such efforts as “part of a way of creating a present within a broadly political process in which the nature of that present, and thus of the past that created it, was in contention.” In other words, turbulence in the present created turbulence in the record of the past. The construction of a new political and social order in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries seems to have produced great turmoil in the written record. According to Geary, aristocratic families reworked the stories of their origins and various institutions remade their official archives. In addition, according to Giles Constable:

---

The golden age of medieval forgery, however, was by general consent the
eleventh and twelfth centuries, when, as Morey and Brooke put it,
“Respectable men and respectable communities forged as they had not
forged before and would never forge again.”

Geary’s description of the changes taking place in the medieval record of the past rests on the idea that medieval authors used the past to justify the contemporary organization of society. For example, certain people and institutions have power in the present because they gained it in the past. Richard II ought to be called the duke of Normandy because his ancestor, Rollo, had been granted the title by the Carolingian king Charles the Simple. According to this view, the past had paradigmatic authority for the present. Amy G. Remensnyder has described a this view of the past operating among the monks of southern France. She has argued that like the creation myths studied by some anthropologists, medieval monastic foundation legends in southern France had constitutive authority for the monastic communities that composed them. The legends report what the monks believed were the true principles defining their communities at the moments of their creation. The legends then functioned as

---


841 Geary, Phantoms, pp. 159-76.
authoritative paradigms for behavior in the present.\textsuperscript{842} The English and American judicial principle of justification by legal precedent or \textit{stare decisis} is a close modern parallel to this description of this medieval view of the past.

The idea that medieval authors saw the past as authoritative suggests that their treatment of it was either terribly cynical or too simplistic. If most of the medieval authors who manipulated the record of the past did so in bad faith, then cynicism might account for their greed and mendacity. If, however, they did so in good faith, believing they were acting well, then they seem rather unsophisticated by modern standards. For example, Constable has argued that medieval authors believed in an intuitive epistemology, which he has described as a personal view of the truth. According to his view, authors believed the faith that motivated an action was the key to its veracity. In addition, “people in the Middle Ages also saw what they wanted and needed to see, and believed to be true what had to be true…. Truth in this sense was the touchstone of authority and authenticity, what was felt to be right.”\textsuperscript{843} By modern standards, such an uncritical approach to one’s sources and how one records the past is much too

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}

\item[\textsuperscript{843}] Constable, “Forgery,” pp. 23-5.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
simplistic. Many of the same comments can be made specifically about hagiography. Either hagiographers were cynical in recording miracles that never occurred, or they were too credulous in believing that such miracles could occur.

The hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc indicate that just as modern prejudices hindered our understanding of hagiography so too the imposition of modern standards has hindered our understanding of how medieval authors approached the past. The texts from Saint-Winnoc suggest that their authors were both less cynical and more sophisticated. They suggest an approach to the past much like the one Horst Fuhrmann has described in relation to medieval forgeries. According to Fuhrmann, medieval authors perpetrated most forgeries to establish or reestablish the order of God’s plan for creation. In his view, except in the most blatant or selfish cases, authors forged in order to provide documentary confirmation of what was known to be true about the divine will. 844 It was not the past that was authoritative, but God’s eternal intention. The hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc suggest that their authors also believed they were articulating what was true even if they had to embellish, forge or destroy the record of the past to do so. In this respect, it is particularly interesting that the same centuries that saw a golden age of forgery also saw a

---

golden age of hagiography. But, since hagiography’s impact was more widespread than many other forms of recording the past, hagiographers’ general approach to the past demands exploration.

This chapter discusses how the hagiographers who worked for Saint-Winnoc approached the past. It examines claims about the past that the texts made both in their contents and by virtue of their narrative forms. More specifically, the chapter considers the ontological, epistemological and ideological content of the texts. A full treatment of any of these topics is, however, beyond the scope of both this chapter and this dissertation. Such a treatment would pale in comparison to more detailed analyses, like that found in Thomas Heffernan’s Sacred Biography.\textsuperscript{845} Instead, what is presented here is an outline of some of the more salient features of the intellectual framework within which the texts discussed in this dissertation were written. My intention is to draw some connections among the various practices discussed in the preceding chapters, and to suggest some avenues for further study.

\textsuperscript{845} Thomas J. Heffernan, \textit{Sacred Biography: Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages} (Oxford, 1988).
7.2 A Theology of Sainthood

In asserting that saints enjoy eternal life in the kingdom of heaven and that they work miracles on earth, hagiographers made theological claims that defined both the saints and their interactions with ordinary mortals. Although these claims were often left implicit in their texts, hagiographers sometimes explicitly addressed theological issues in prologues or introductions. Within the hagiographic corpus from Saint-Winnoc, the introduction to Book II of Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s Historia translationis contains the most explicit statement of a theology of sainthood. The passage, though lengthy and written in the oft-florid style of hagiographic introductions, is worth quoting:

The loftiness of the providence of the Omnipotent, before all times of the world, reserved for the saints, his servants, the height of unseen glory, the splendor of joy, [and] an abundance of rewards… This height of the heavenly kingdom has lain obscured for the most part to nearly all mortals since the first father [Adam], until by the grace of Christ coming in the flesh, He indeed revealed it to His own followers, both in the teaching of the Gospel, and in the abundance of miraculous signs… On account of which it was confirmed, [and] it was believed that that which is thus invisible is superior to the visible, since indeed that substance is more enduring which is not observed in this world than this fallen substance which is caught by the eyes. From which [Incarnation], surely it
happened that certain mortals capable of divine understanding believed that God [Jesus] had come to restore what the envy of the ancient enemy had destroyed, that is to say, man, who fell from the comfort of paradise, whom that same enemy killed with the venom of poisonous deceit.

But the enemy in turn under the feet of the elect ones of the Lord [the saints] afterwards wailed, and the power which he had received he lost over the saints of God. Since, indeed, because these saints fight against him and the ministers of his evil, they triumph from the defeat of that same serpent; receive both the reward of victory, and the palms of praise and blessing. To which saints also the omnipotent Lord promised, that indeed their bones would not perish, with the Psalmist’s testimony, who said, "The Lord watches over all the bones of the just, so that not one from these might be destroyed." 846 And, the Lord [promises] the same in the Gospel, "Not a hair," he said, "from your head will perish." 847 ...what kind of reward do these same [souls] possess along with the angelic host, whose bones the splendor of heaven does not abandon on the earth? I seem to see without a doubt what is incredible to recall, that the death of the saints would become life for them. For then they first began to live. For the saints live, the ones live, I say, whom the author of life loves, he

846 Psalm 33:21.

announces [it] far and wide with signs, he exalts [them] with frequent miracles. Therefore, for men of sound mind, there is no doubt but that they live...

Omnipotentis providentiae altitudo ante omnia tempora mundi sanctis sibi famulantibus preordinuit summam invisibilis gloriae, gaudii claritatem, magnitudinem premiorum… Hæc summa celestis regni maxima ex parte pæne omnes mortales a primo parente latuit, donec gratia Christi uenientis in carnem suis ipsam quidem manifestavit, tum doctrina euangelii, tum miraculorum insignium numerositate… Quapropter firmum fuit, creditum est esse quid tale invisibile quod huic visibili excelleret, quoniam ea quidem substantia firmior est que minime hoc in mundo conspicitur, quam hæc caduca que oculis capitur. Ex quo nimirum contigit quosdam mortales capaces diviniæ mentis credere deum innouare uenisse quod inuidia antiqui hostis perit, hominem scilicet qui a paradisi amenitate decidit, quem isdem ueneno infecte fraudis occidit.

Uerum uersa uice sub pedibus electorum domini postea ingemuit, et ius quod acceperat in sanctos dei perdidit. Qui siquidem cum in eum eiusque nequitiae ministros decertarent, de eis ipsius dejectione triumpharunt, tum victoriae brabium [brabeum], tum laudis premiique palmas acceperunt. Quibus etiam promisit omnipotens dominus, quod nec eorum quidem ossa perirent, psalmista teste qui ait “Custodit dominus omnia ossa iustorum unum ex his non conteretur.” Et idem dominus in euangelio, “capillus,” inquit, “de capite uestro non peribit.” …quid premii e[æ]dem possident cum agmine angelico, quorum
ossa in terris nec celestis deserit claritudo? Nimimum uidere uideor quod
incredibile memoratu est, mortem sanctorum fore eis uitam. Nam tunc primum
incipiunt uiuere. Uiuunt enim sancti, uiuunt inquam quos uite auctor diliget,
signis longe lateque ampliat crebris miraculis extollit. Igitur sane mentis homini
haud dubium quidem habetur quin uiuant…848

Drogo’s theology of sainthood begins with the story of original sin in
Genesis 2-3. Genesis 2 describes the garden of Eden as the place where Adam
and Eve, the first man and the first woman, enjoyed immortal life in unbroken
relationship with God. Genesis 3 describes how the serpent tricked the first two
humans into disobeying God’s command. This disobedience, the original sin,
resulted in humankind’s separation from intimate communion with God and an
ontological tear in the fabric of the universe. According to Drogo’s text, original
sin cast humans into a mortal life, which is mutable, corrupted by evil and
bounded by death in a temporal existence. The angels, however, continue to
enjoy immortal life in the kingdom of heaven. This immortal life is immutable,
maintains the pristine order of God’s plan for creation and, not bound by death,
exists outside time in eternity. Because the eternal world represents the state of
existence originally created by God, it is real, while the temporal world is
contingent, dependent on the eternal world for its existence.

848 HT, ii. Exordium alterum. 49-50 (coll. 622E-F).
The logic of Drogo’s theology continues with the Incarnation’s effect on the temporal world. The Historia translationis states that after Adam, the kingdom of heaven remained obscured from the sight of most mortals. By coming in the flesh, Christ revealed the existence of the eternal world to believers, specifically through the gospels and through the miracles he performed. Believers understood that Jesus had come to restore to mortals the eternal life that the serpent’s “venom” had taken away by introducing death.

Finally, Drogo’s logic moves to the saints. The saints continue Jesus’ battle against evil. As a result, God grants them the eternal life that the serpent had taken from mortals. As part of their status, the saints obtain the protection that Luke 21 depicts Jesus offering his followers. In the chapter from Luke, Jesus discusses the apocalypse with his followers, stating that the Temple will be torn down, that “nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom” (surget gens contra gentem, et regnum adversus regnum), and that various natural disasters will strike. But before all of these terrible events, Jesus states that his followers will be given an opportunity to testify to their faith through numerous trials. He then promises that despite the dangers that will beset them on account of their testimony, “not a hair from your head will perish. In your patience you shall possess your souls” (capillus de capite vestro non peribit. In


The Historia translationis equates the saints with the followers of Jesus who testify to their faith. It states that from their battles against sin they gain protection for their corporal relics, as well as eternal life in heaven. Thus, their deaths mark their entrances into the superior existence of the eternal life. The dates of their deaths are dates of their real births (diei natales). God also performs miracles as signs of their status.

This statement of Drogo’s theology of sainthood precedes the author’s account of Lewinna’s delatio through Flanders. As Chapter 4 notes, this account was less about the movement of the saint’s relics than the miracles she performed on the way. Thus, Drogo’s explanation that miracles were signs of an individual’s sainthood ties the introduction to the section that follows it. It also links the introduction to the last section of Book II in the Historia translationis, which recounts the four miracles Lewinna performed from her shrine at Bergues. In particular, his description of the first miracle at Bergues seems designed to illustrate his theology of sainthood.

The miracle concerned a ten-year-old girl who was unable to travel to Lewinna’s shrine because of deformities she had suffered since birth. The miracle account begins by emphasizing the corruptness of the girl’s deformities:

She suffered paralysis in the joints, limbs and entire body. And, thus, a dreadful fate bound this girl immediately from her birth, and held [her] by

---

the junctures of disjoined joints, and the joining of limbs, where they ought not to have been joined. For, the soles of her feet were held joined to her buttocks, so that they seemed of one piece to one inspecting [them]. Thence, all limbs threatened death, so that if you had approached, you would not have seen anything other than malformed and disgusting material.

\textit{artubus, membris, totoque corpore contractam dolebat. Hanc itaque dira sors protinus ab ipso ortu natiuitatis ligauerat, & disiunctis artuum compagibus, coniunctis etiam membris ubi non debuerant coniungi, tenebat. Nam natibus calces habebantur adiuncti, sic ut uiderentur uniis coniunctionis aspicienti. Deinde omnia membra minitabantur interitum, ut si adesses, non aliud quam informem turpemque materiam cerneres.}^{852}

Pierre-André Sigal has reported that this particular malady, in which someone’s legs were bent backwards and adhered in some way to his or her buttocks, was actually quite common in miracle stories from northern and western France.\textsuperscript{853} In the \textit{Liber miraculorum s. Winnoci}, for example, Drogo described two other people stricken with this condition.\textsuperscript{854} In the \textit{Liber miraculorum}, however, the descriptions of the afflicted individuals are shorter and did not receive as much

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{852} HT, ii.II.66 (coll. 626A-B).
\item \textsuperscript{853} HT, ii.II.66-8 (coll. 626A-E).
\item \textsuperscript{854} LM, VIII, XIV (coll. 278B, 279E-F).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
attention. For example, one man raised only his eyes and hands in prayer to solicit Winnoc, “for all the rest of his body was held all balled together… For his heels adhered to his buttocks” (nam cetera pars totius corporis conglobata tenebatur… Nam calces natibus adhaerebant).\textsuperscript{855} The account in the Historia translationis dwells on the girl’s deformity and highlights it with wordplay involving different terms for joint and joining – artuus, ligare, disiunctus, compages, coniunctus, coniungere, adiunctus, and coniunctio. In addition, the adjectives informis and turpis rendered as “malformed” and “disgusting” above, can connote scandal, shame, indecency and loathing. The full force of these words, however, seems directed at the nature of the temporal world that allows such corruption to exist, rather than at the girl who had the misfortune of being born in such an odious state.

The account then calls to mind an image of the Garden of Eden. It reports that while the girl’s parents were at Mass on Good Friday, she and her nine-year-old brother decided to enter the family’s garden (hortulus) and pray to Lewinna for a cure. Before dragging his sister outside, however, the boy asked her “are you not able to advance a little bit, nor to drag yourself like a serpent some little distance without the aid of another?” (num aliquantulum progredi, num sine ope alterius te ipsam aliquid quamvis parum serpens attrahere?).\textsuperscript{856} The girl responded

\textsuperscript{855} LM, XIV (col. 279E).

\textsuperscript{856} HT, ii.II.66 (col. 626B).
negatively. After the two children entered the garden, they “prayed in the
direction of God’s temple and Saint Lewinna” (*versus templum deum sanctamque
leuuiam adorant*) and the girl was healed. The account states that she then
entered the house that only a short time earlier “she had exited slithering
miserably” (*misere serpens exierat*). Both the term hortulus and the term serpens
evoke the Garden of Eden where the original rift in creation had occurred.
Although the Vulgate never applies the term hortus (garden) to Eden, numerous
medieval authors, such as Isidore of Seville (d. 636), Rabanus Maurus (d. 856),
Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), Peter Comestor (d. 1178), and Alain of Lille (d. 1203),
referred to Eden as a garden. Most of these authors seem to have followed
Jerome’s *Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim*, since their texts echo Jerome’s phrasing.
The *Quaestiones* explains that “[the Bible states:]’And the Lord God planted a
paradise in Eden facing the east.’” For paradiso, it has hortum in Hebrew” (*Et

---

857 *HT*, ii.II.67 (coll. 626C).

858 *HT*, ii.II.67 (coll. 626D).

859 Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, xiv.III.2 (*PL*, vol. 82, col. 496C); Rabanus
Maurus, *De universo*, xii.III (*PL*, vol. 111, col. 334A); Hugh of St. Victor, *De arca
noe morali*, ii.VIII (*PL*, vol. 176, col. 641A); Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica*,
Libri III Regum.XXII (*PL*, vol. 198, col. 1368A); Alain of Lille, *Compendiosa in
Cantica canticorum*, IV (*PL*, vol. 210, col. 82D).
In addition, Drogo’s use of *serpens* rather than *anguis* or *coluber*, which also mean serpent, is suggestive since *serpens* is the term used in Genesis 3.

The miracle account involving the girl at Bergues provides a vivid illustration of Drogo’s theology of sainthood. The girl’s substance (*materia*) was corrupt (*informis et turpis*) like the substance of the temporal world as a result of the venom of the serpent (*serpens*). Lewinna followed Christ in both her virtues and her actions. She used her miraculous intercession to fight the corruption of the temporal world, and created a minor version – a *hortulum* – of the Garden (*hortus*) of Eden by restoring the girl to a pristine state.

The restoration of Eden in the little garden at Bergues seems to have been only transitory: neither the *Historia translationis* nor any other text from Saint-Winnoc mentions the spot again. Drogo’s *Vita s. Godelevae martyris Ghistellae* [BHL 3591t], the only work he wrote that falls outside Saint-Winnoc’s corpus, demonstrates, however, that saints could also create permanent access to divine power. The *Vita Godelevae* relates that its subject, Godelieve of Ghistelles, was strangled one night by two of her husband’s henchmen, then submerged in a stream to make sure that she was dead. The text reports that the waters of the stream had curative powers. In addition, “if anything of our earthly form was blackened, it could be made clean and white with that water,” (*ut si quid terrenae*

The ground where Godelieve had been strangled also turned white, “in order that the Lord might show her merit and make known to all the faithful the place of her death,” (ut meritum huius demonstraret Dominus, et ut patefaceret omni fidelilocus sui interitus), and people who removed stones from this spot found that they later turned to gems (gemmas).

A miracle account from the abbey of Saint-Pierre at Lobbes to the south of Flanders in the county of Hainaut demonstrates that Drogo was not the only hagiographer in northern France to claim that a saint had this ability to create a site of miraculous power. The anonymous *Historia miraculorum in circumlatione per Flandriam* [BHL 8425] describes a *delatio* through Flanders conducted c. 1060 by the monks of Lobbes with their patron saint, Ursmer. At one point, the text states that, urged by the local populace, the monks set Ursmer’s reliquary down

---


862 *Vita Godelevae*, 13 (p. 66; p. 370).
at a crossroads outside the Flemish town of Lille. The local inhabitants then marked the spot with a cross, and from that time forward, the sick who slept there were miraculously healed.863

Examples of similar phenomena from Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica (that Drogo copied into the Vita Oswaldi) hint at a much broader geographic and chronological diffusion for the claim to create miracle-working space. For example, one passage from the Historia ecclesiastica reports that before Oswald’s victory over the pagan Britons at Heavenfield, the saint erected a cross and had his soldiers pray there. According to the text, after Oswald’s death, the name Heavenfield became:

an omen of future things, surely signifying, that a heavenly trophy would be erected in that place, a heavenly victory would be won [there], [and] until this day heavenly wonders would be celebrated [there].

præsagio futurorum... significans nimirum, quod ibidem cæleste erigendum trophæum, cælestis inchoanda victoria, cælestia usque hodie forent miracula celebranda.864

Numerous people received miraculous cures at Heavenfield, and the monks of nearby Hexham abbey kept an annual vigil on the battlefield the night before the

---

863 Historia miraculorum in circumlatione per Flandriam [BHL 8425], I.3 (AASS, April 18, coll. 574C-D); See also, Head, Anthology, p. 346.

864 HE, iii.II; VO, I.9 (col. 95D).
anniversary of the king’s death. Later, a church was built on the site. Bede’s text also reports that miraculous cures occurred at the spot on the battlefield of Maserfeld where Oswald was martyred. These cures included that of a horse, whose rider “as a man of wise nature, understood that there was something of holy wonder at this place, where his horse was cured,” (ut vir sagacis ingenii intellexit, aliquid miræ sanctitatis huic loco, quo equus est curatus). People carrying dust away from the spot created a hole as deep as the height of a man.

Similarly, earth from the spot inside the church at Bardney where monks had poured out water used to wash Oswald’s bones also had miraculous qualities.

Mircea Eliade’s *The Sacred and the Profane* offers a theory of sacred space that seems to explain what hagiographers thought about saints’ effects on the landscape. Eliade’s seminal work argues that for “religious man” space is not homogeneous. Instead, he experiences breaks or interruptions in the amorphous, unstructured space of the profane world caused by hierophanies – irruptions of sacred power into profane space. Hierophanies actually create sacred space, “the only real and real-ly existing space.” Like the ground surrounding the burning bush in Exodus 3:5, sacred space is ontologically different from profane space. It

---

865 *HE*, iii.II; *VO*, I.9-11 (coll. 95D-F).

866 *HE*, iii.IX; *VO*, III.26-28 (coll. 99B-E).

867 *HE*, iii.XI; *VO*, IV.33-34 (coll. 100D-F).

represents a fixed point of absolute reality around which profane space can orient. In addition to the examples given above, Eliade’s description of the fixity of sacred space also recalls the persistence of Wormhout as the site of Winnoc’s shrine despite the founding of the chapter of canons at Bergues.

While the miracle accounts noted above depict sacred space, the Historia miraculorum – the text that deals with Ursmer’s delatio through Flanders – suggests that Drogo and his contemporaries recognized profane space as well. At the Flemish town of Lissewege, the monks of Lobbes invited feuding parties to declare peace with each other. At one point, a man ran out of the crowd and begged forgiveness from a young noble for murdering two knights who were the noble’s brothers. When the noble proved resistant to the man’s entreaties, the monks laid Ursmer’s reliquary on a pallium (in this case, probably a carpet-like covering) on the ground at the feet of the noble so that Ursmer appeared as though he were prostrate and “begging pardon for the guilty man” (quasi veniat petens pro reo). Seeing the shameful position of the saint, the noble then prostrated himself as well. After three hours, the saint became angry at being forced to lie on profane ground in a position of supplication for so long. He levitated his reliquary “from the ground on which he had lain unwillingly” (a terra, qua forsitan non sponte jacebat) while smoke poured out of the reliquary. The monks “quickly lifted up the saint (not without great fear) and hastily put him

back on the altar” (*levantes Sanctum non sine magno timore, reposuerunt festinanter super altare*). The noble then offered his forgiveness. As the episode implies, the proper resting place for the relics of the saints was on an altar or in a church, not on undefined, profane ground.

According to Eliade, sacred space is also a contact point between heaven and earth. It is space where the divine power of creation is manifest and accessible in a way that it is not in profane space. Crossing the threshold between profane and sacred allows people to communicate with divine forces.

The miracles that hagiographers claimed saints worked at the places mentioned above demonstrate that authors from Bede to Drogo shared this sense of sacred space. Godelieve created sacred space at the site where she was murdered, Oswald at Heavenfield and Maserfeld, and Ursmer at the crossroads outside Lille. All of these were spots where saints demonstrated their ability to channel divine power from the kingdom of heaven.

Despite what the hierophanies noted above might suggest, shrines were the preeminent locations to seek divine intercession from saints. Both the development of the cult of the saints and the hagiographic texts from Saint-

---


Winnoc suggest, however, that this was not necessarily because relics created sacred spaces. Early in the development of the cult of the saints, believers focused their attention on the tombs of the martyrs, where they often gathered for ritual meals and celebrations. Gradually, a desire for posthumous contact with saintly intercessors developed, and people began to seek burial _ad sanctos_ (near the saints). This desire was based on a belief that saints would assist Christians buried nearby when souls reunited with resurrected bodies in preparation for the Last Judgment. As the texts from Saint-Winnoc demonstrate, in eleventh-century Flanders, people sought intercession at shrines because saints maintained a living presence at their corporal relics.

It is not clear from the texts, however, what the relationship was between the shrines of the saints and the spaces that housed the shrines. Shrines were almost always located in churches, places that were independently holy: churches were often called the “gates of heaven” (_portae caelis_). The epithet suggests that shrines may have simply augmented the sacrality of the churches within which they resided. In addition, the issue is complicated by Charlemagne’s two decisions to renew the enforcement of the canon _Item placuit_

---


from the fifth council of Carthage, which decreed that altars that lacked relics should be destroyed. This led to the practice of enshrining relics in almost every altar, and it is not apparent what effect this may have had on the line between the sacrality of the church and the sacrality of the relics in the altar.\footnote{Patrick Geary, \textit{Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages}, revised edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 37.}

What does seem clear is that whether they created, sustained or simply augmented the sacredness of churches, relics offered a means of more easily obtaining intercession within sacred spaces. People could go through the familiar ritual of supplication “face-to-face” with the living saint. In a society in which concrete personal ties often functioned where abstract allegiances would today (to provide military service through vassalage, for example), it must have seemed critical to have a personal connection to a divine intercessor. This desire for a personal connection to the divine sheds light on the purpose of hagiography at Saint-Winnoc.

7.3 Hagiography and Ontology

For the authors who wrote the texts studied in the preceding chapters, the chief purpose of hagiography was to illuminate the connections between the eternal and the temporal worlds. More specifically, they focused on the links between individual saints and the temporal world. This made hagiography at
Saint-Winnoc a fundamentally different type of literature than modern history or biography. While historians and biographers generally study the past as intrinsically interesting or as interesting for the light the past sheds on the present, medieval hagiographers discussed the past as a means for understanding the relationship between heaven and earth. With only a few exceptions, discussed below, the eternal world mediated between past and present in hagiography.

Leaving miracle accounts aside, the difference between hagiography and modern history or biography is perhaps most apparent in hagiographic descriptions of saints’ mortal lives. In hagiographic “biographies,” only the saints’ positive qualities appear. In addition, as Lewinna’s *vita et passio* demonstrates, hagiographers found it lamentable if the historical context for these qualities had been lost, but not essential that it be known in any detail. For modern authors who strive to present rounded portraits of a person’s character that include both strengths and weaknesses, medieval hagiography is woefully inadequate. Today, shallow and overly favorable biographies are, in fact, often referred to as “hagiographies.” What this assessment misses is that it was not the hagiographers’ purpose to describe saints in the past. Instead, hagiographers described those qualities from the past that had transmitted to heaven. In the
process of entering heaven, saints were cleansed of their failings, leaving only their virtues. Thus, hagiographic accounts presented rounded portraits of beings in the *eternal* world.

Another aspect of the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc that modern people may find troubling is that they often fail to provide chronological markers allowing precise determination of the relationship between the past and present. The texts rarely, for example, refer to the chronology of events in terms that allow exact placement in a multi-year chronology (year of the Incarnation, regnal years, papal terms, etc.). The presentation of time in these texts most nearly approximates the cyclical and seasonal sense of time found in the medieval liturgical calendar. Often, chronological indicators refer to times of the year, rather than years. For example, the *Vita secunda s. Winnoci* reports that Winnoc healed a blind woman who came to his shrine at Wormhout when “the yearly cycle indicated that the sacrosanct body of the saint was [to be] carried to Wormhout, when the arrival of the Holy Spirit is accustomed to be celebrated solemnly” (*annuus indixit recursus sacrosanctum corpus sancti Woromholt deportari, cum adventus Spiritus sancti sollemniter solet celebrari*).877 In other cases, the chronological indicator refers to a relative chronology established within the text itself. For example, the *Historia translationis* reports that Balger brought Lewinna’s relics to Saint-Winnoc and that the monks placed her in a reliquary.

877 *VS*, i.XXI (col. 274D).
The text then states simply that “afterwards” (postquam) the monks decided to take her relics on a delatio through Flanders.\(^{878}\) It provides neither the year nor the time of year for the delatio. In many other cases, the texts provide no explicit chronological references at all.

The similarity between liturgical and hagiographic time reflects, in part, the perception of a sacred presence in both. Hagiography described both the nature of the sacred and specific examples of how it had irrupted into the profane, examples of hierophanies. Liturgies were hierophanies, regular irruptions of sacred power into the profane. As Heffernan has phrased it:

the liturgy is a ritual founded on the Church’s interpretation of its mission. This mission seeks nothing less than transcendence, to create a timeless interval in an appropriate space where the laity and their God can meet in community.\(^{879}\)

From this perspective, the sacred time in both hagiography and liturgy was a compromise created by the juncture of the eternal nature of the divine, which was not bound by time, and the temporal nature of mortal life, which most certainly was.

\(^{878}\) HT, ii.1.51 (col. 623B).

The similarity between hagiography and liturgy was also the product of liturgical influence on hagiography. Heffernan has, in fact, argued that liturgy was the single most important influence in the development of hagiography. Because hagiographic texts provided examples of virtuous behavior designed to inspire awe and imitation, and because they also provided examples of divine power, they became the sources for many liturgical lectiones. For example, lectio markings suggesting liturgical use appear in texts on all three of the saints at Bergues.\textsuperscript{880} This liturgical usage had a pronounced effect on the shape of hagiographic narratives. In order to be used in the liturgy, hagiographic texts had to be divided into compact and, to a certain extent, self-contained narrative segments.\textsuperscript{881} As a result, the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc often present the past in discrete episodes rather than continuous narratives as do traditional histories. The degree of continuity varies based on the degree to which the subject was encased in the temporal world, with translatio accounts, such as Lewinna’s and Winnoc’s, exhibiting the greatest degree of continuity. Although divine power protected corporal relics, the relics themselves were temporal by nature. Descriptions of the development of a saint’s virtues during his or her temporal life could also display a high degree of continuity. Oswald’s vita,

\textsuperscript{880} See, for example, Bergues 19, f. 6v for Winnoc, f. 81v for Oswald and f. 138r for Lewinna.

\textsuperscript{881} Heinzelmann, \textit{Translationsberichte}, p. 53.
which relies on a literary strategy describing the king’s ever-increasing sanctity, is a good example. Miracle accounts, including ones that reported miracles performed in vita, generally formed the most discrete narrative segments. There is little to connect the account of the miracle Winnoc performed in the mill to the rest of his life. Were it not for the note that he performed the miracle in vita, his appearance as an old man was broadly consistent with other miracle accounts where he appeared to beneficiaries in visions.

A final aspect of the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc that may disturb modern readers is their authors’ willingness to alter the past. This willingness is perhaps most evident in the Vita secunda s. Winnoci’s interpolation referring to a community that Winnoc purportedly founded on the Groeneberg before he founded Wormhout. Because the eternal world was characterized as real and the temporal world as contingent, what was believed to be known about heaven governed how the past was perceived by those in the present. For example, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc believed that a king-saint who had never renounced his throne must have exhibited the virtues of a rex iustus. Therefore, he depicted the king with the traits he and his contemporaries associated with the type. His account not only altered Bede’s presentation, but also revised the tenth-century typology of the rex iustus described by Abbo of Fleury and Gumpold of Mantua. In Lewinna’s case, the cartula that accompanied the saint’s relics to Flanders stated that she had been a virgin martyr. Even though Drogo
could not have known from the *cartula* what her virtues had been any more than he could have known the historical circumstances of her life, he could list her virtues because they were the virtues that he believed all virgin martyrs had. The *Vita secunda Winnoci*’s interpolation, then, is an explanation of what its hagiographer knew as the truth in eleventh-century Flanders. He *knew* that Winnoc was the chief patron saint of the monastic community at Bergues. Since there was no record of the saint choosing to be translated to Bergues and some possibility that he had founded a community there, the interpolation expressed the most likely explanation for the truth. This willingness to deviate from the written or physical evidence of the past can be troubling to a modern audience, but it is characteristic of medieval attitudes.

7.4 Hagiography and Epistemology

It seems quite natural that as social values change modern authors should alter their presentations of the past. For example, a history of European colonization from the nineteenth century would probably look quite different than one from the twentieth. Contrary to the often perjorative application of the term, *all* histories are revisionist. Why then can hagiographers’ alterations of the record of the past seem so troubling? The answer lies in different epistemologies. Modern historians and biographers traditionally rely on an empiricist approach to knowledge. They believe that what is real is that which can be sensed or
measured. For eleventh-century hagiographers, however, revelation provided the dominant mode of knowing. Once again, Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s introduction to Book II of the *Historia translationis* provides the most explicit statement at Saint-Winnoc. Drogo wrote that the kingdom of heaven remained obscured from mortal sight until the Incarnation, when Jesus revealed it to his followers:

both in the teaching of the Gospel, and in the abundance of miraculous signs, in which thing by the signs they were compelled to believe indeed the ones present were driven by the heavenly power, to which power the magnitude of the mysteries testified. For indeed, it is not able to be believed easily, since these things seemed incredible to utter, unless both that heavenly power should recommend that with an abundance of signs, and he who revealed these things by that power should rain down with words and miracles.

*tum doctrina euangelii, tum miraculorum insignium numerositate, quo signa quidem presentes celica ui adacti credere cogerentur, que misteriorum magnitudo testabatur. Nam nec quidem facile potest credi, quæ siquidem incredibilia uidebantur profari, nisi et signorum copia celica uis ipsa commendaret, & is qui hec ipsa demonstrabat uerbis et miraculis plueret.*

---

In the passage, Drogo identified two sources of revelation, the gospel and miracles. This formulation is narrowly focused on the revelation that applies to hagiography. While Drogo’s contemporaries viewed all of the Bible as revelation that could be understood through exegesis, Drogo cited the gospel (and by this he almost certainly meant all four gospels) because these were the bases of the imitatio Christi (imitation of Christ). As Chapter 3 notes, Christ was the type for all of the saints: their virtues were ultimately reflections of his virtues. This tradition stretched back to the first saint, the protomartyr Stephen, whose “hagiographer,” the evangelist Luke, used the Greek literary convention anagnorisis (recognition) to draw parallels between Stephen and Jesus. In particular, Luke depicted Stephen praying for his enemies before his death as did Jesus. Drogo used the same technique rather clumsily in comparing Oswald’s death to Stephen’s and Jesus’. He also used it more subtly in comparing Lewinna to Aeneas. Drogo cited only the gospels in his statement above because they were the principle sources for the life of Jesus, and thus for the typologies of sainthood. By providing exemplars of Christian virtue, saints demonstrated that the revealed truths of the scriptures continued to operate in contemporary society. They provided evidence of a continuing connection between eternal and temporal existence.

---

883 Heffernan, Sacred Biography, pp. 113-17.
As noted above, however, the most important connection with the divine that hagiographers depicted saints forming was the ability to focus miraculous power through their corporal relics. In the next paragraph of his introduction, Drogo proclaimed “for the saints live, the ones live, I say, whom the author of life loves, he announces [it] far and wide with signs, he exalts [them] with frequent miracles” (Uiuunt enim sancti, uiuunt inquam quos uite auctor diligit, signis longe lateque ampliat crebris miraculis extollit). Drogo’s meaning here is obscured by the use of the cognates “signs” and “miracles” to translate signa and miracula. A more precise (though less elegant, I think) translation would use “miraculous signs” and “miraculous wonders.” Even then, the translation would probably fail to convey the sophistication of medieval ideas about miracles.

As Benedicta Ward has noted, Christian authors in the West between Augustine (354-430) and Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) spent little time on developing a theory of miracles. As a result, it is difficult to speculate what people in medieval society might have thought about the nature of miracles. Augustine seems to have set the theoretical groundwork through the end of the eleventh century in his works, De Genesi ad litteram, De trinitate, De utilitate credendi and De civitate Dei. He argued that all of creation was both natural and miraculous, and that therefore, there was only one true miracle, the miracle of creation. Augustine defined miracles as wonderful acts of God that point to the

---

884 HT, ii. Exordium alterum.50 (col. 623A).
divine power of God working throughout creation. He divided the wonder produced by miracles into three categories: first, wonder provoked by the miraculous daily operation of the world that reveals God’s goodness to wise men, second, wonder elicited from ignorant men who are amazed by the workings of nature that they do not understand, and third, wonder provoked by miraculous acts that are unusual manifestations of divine power. These divisions allow miracles to be both awe-inspiring events and signs, terms that Drogo and his contemporaries used. 

Until the end of the twelfth century, medieval authors tended to concentrate on what individual miracles signified, rather than how they had happened. This interest opened up a much broader range of events to interpretation as miracles than our modern sense of miracles as events in which God intervenes directly and against the natural pattern allows. As William of Canterbury later wrote, “the truth is that not a leaf falls from a branch without cause, for to admit the power of chance in the physical world is to detract from the power of the Creator.” In hagiographic texts, miracles were not against nature (contra naturam), but in addition to nature (supra naturam). Winnoc

---


convincing Count Baldwin V to return usurped property to Saint-Amand, workmen surviving falls of a few stories and the discovery of lost relics in a monk’s cowl could all be miraculous. In this view, the sacred permeates the profane even if people cannot always recognize it.

Miraculous revelations were an important way of dealing with the past at Saint-Winnoc because they normalized change. They provided an opportunity for hagiographers to integrate new developments into their community’s understanding of divine creation. Despite the richly decorated reliquary and the monastic procession that bore Lewinna’s relics, the inhabitants of Leffinge did not recognize the new saint’s status until she performed a miracle to prove it.

The community that housed Winnoc’s relics changed from an Iro-Frankish to a Benedictine community and the account of his virtues was revised to reflect the ideals of the monks of Saint-Winnoc. The revisions were then validated by the saint’s continuing miracles. Drogo was also able to affirm the transfer of Winnoc’s shrine from Wormhout to Bergues by describing the miracles the saint performed at Bergues. Miracles rendered change valid.

In his analysis of medieval attitudes toward forgery, Horst Fuhrmann has demonstrated that revelation as a way of knowing was pervasive in medieval society, linking Saint-Winnoc’s hagiography to a broader worldview. Fuhrmann has argued that because the belief that God had set the world in motion according to a divine plan was widespread in medieval society, people sought to
understand the world through exegesis – *more exegetico* – of what its operation revealed. For example, medieval etymologies were closely connected to allegory, as shown by Jacobus de Voragine’s *Legenda aurea*. Before discussing each saint in his compendium of *vitae*, Jacobus commented on the etymology of his or her name. It was not necessary that the etymology be technically correct in our sense. Rather it should express the true meaning of the saint’s virtue. Medieval poets provide another example. According to Fuhrmann, medieval poets typically claimed to “invent” (*invenire*) their verses. They did not, however, mean that they had created their art from their own genius. This is the post-humanist understanding of the artistic process. Instead, they meant that they had “discovered” the poem through divine inspiration. Not coincidentally, *invenire* was also the term used to describe the discovery of previously unknown or lost relics. Fuhrmann’s explanation for the abundant forgeries produced in the Middle Ages suggests that forgery was a way to reestablish order when what was known conflicted with or was absent from the record of the past.\(^{887}\) If Fuhrmann is correct – and he has laid out a good case – then hagiographers do not seem to have been alone in their approach to the past.

---

7.5 Hagiography and Ideology

The articulation of the past, whether in written or oral, individual or group representations, is essentially the articulation of memory. Historical and hagiographic narratives are simply sophisticated ways to remember. Numerous scholars have pointed out that memory is a construct, and have argued that traditional metaphors comparing memory to a filing cabinet or a text from which specific bits of the past are retrieved ought to be discarded. For example, psychologists have argued that memory is a process of creative construction in response to our changing understanding of the world, while biologists have shown that memories are not stored in any one place in the brain. Instead, the fundamental unit for memory may be a system of localized neurological “loops” in which contact between loops creates endlessly changing patterns. These scholars have also argued that each memory is a new construction based on many tiny associations and formed in response to a stimulus in the present.888 By way of illustration, David Thelen has noted that people are frequently surprised upon discovering that friends plan to divorce, “but then they reconstruct their associations with the couple and create a new pattern in which the divorce seems a more logical outcome of what they remembered.”889


It is tempting to attribute responsibility for the construction of the *memoriae* of the saints of Saint-Winnoc solely to the hagiographers who recorded their *virtutes*. As Chapter 1 points out, hagiographers had the most prominent role in the composition of a saint’s “official,” written *memoria*. In *On Collective Memory*, however, Maurice Halbwachs has argued that people need other people to help them validate their interpretations of their own experiences. Other people offer independent confirmation of an individual’s interpretations. Thus, memory is a group activity, even when constructed by individuals.\(^{890}\)

There is ample evidence in the hagiographic texts from Bergues that the saints’ *memoriae* there were the products of group participation. In the *Historia translationis*, Drogo noted that he had been present to witness certain events, while he had learned about other events from Balger, the monk who had stolen Lewinna’s relics, and from other brothers who had been eyewitnesses to the events.\(^{891}\) The *Historia translationis* also provides evidence that the local lay community helped construct the *memoriae* of the saints at Bergues. Its account of the miracle, in which a female pilgrim took sick at Rome and received a cure, notes that the pilgrim returned to Bergues and made the miraculous cure public. Had she not done so, the community would perhaps never have known about


\(^{891}\) *HT*, Epistola.2 (col. 613C).
Lewinna’s miracle.\textsuperscript{892} Pierre-André Sigal has also noted that the recording of miracles at shrines was a process of negotiation in which the shrine’s custodians (usually monks) questioned purported beneficiaries in order to authenticate miracles and detect frauds. Sometimes, when there was no apparent proof, monks questioned neighbors and family members of the alleged beneficiary to verify the person’s affliction.\textsuperscript{893} The \textit{Liber miraculorum Winnoci} provides striking evidence for this process in the miracle account of the paralytic boy healed by Winnoc after the saint appeared to the boy in a vision. The account states that at first, the boy’s father did not believe that his son was infirm. The father repeatedly tested his son by placing his food across the room and making the boy crawl painfully to retrieve it. This bit of information was probably the result of a monk inquiring for proof that the boy had been infirm before the cure.\textsuperscript{894} Although hagiographers had the last opportunity to shape these stories, clearly they were group efforts.

\textsuperscript{892} \textit{HT}, ii.70 (coll. 627A-B).


\textsuperscript{894} \textit{LM}, iii.7.
Efforts like the ones at Saint-Winnoc resulted in what James Fentress and Chris Wickham have called “social memories,” the memories shared within a group. These memories are important because they act like passwords in creating bonds among the members. As Paul Connerton has noted:

It is an implicit rule that participants in any social order must presuppose a shared memory. To the extent that their memories of a society’s past diverge, to that extent its members can share neither experiences nor assumptions.

Social memories are also important because they structure how people perceive the world around them. Memories create categories and expectations that people then use to structure their perception of new experiences. For example, before the twelfth century, people tended to perceive fortuitous natural events as miracles. Their memories of having perceived and their communication of such perceptions structured how they would see natural events in the future. Modern westerners, however, are more inclined to perceive similar events as simply natural. We have a great stock of scientific “memories” that often blunts a sense of wonder (though many scientists profess a sense of wonder at the workings of the natural world).

895 Fentress and Wickham, Social Memory, pp. ix-x.

The social memories created by the hagiographic texts from Saint-Winnoc may prove important when placed next to those created by other communities. Chapter 6 argues that the suppliants who approached Winnoc for intercession were mostly the local inhabitants of the region around Bergues. By studying similar collections of hagiographic texts from other communities, it may be possible to develop a more complex picture of the social composition of local communities in the Middle Ages. The local communities that surrounded great monastic houses, like Saint-Bertin, Saint-Pierre and Saint-Bavon at Ghent, seem especially promising since these abbeys produced large collections of hagiographic texts along with other sorts of evidence.

7.6 The Authority of the Past?

The Central Middle Ages was the “golden age” of both hagiography and medieval forgery. In addition, according to Patrick Geary, it was also a period during which the same monks who wrote hagiography and who forged documents assumed the task of preserving the *memoriae* of aristocratic families in France (including Flanders). The evidence from Saint-Winnoc raises questions about how these monks and their audiences viewed the past. In particular, it raises doubts about the assertion that most people in medieval society granted the past paradigmatic authority over the present. The texts studied in the preceding chapters suggest that authority lay in the eternal world. According to
the texts, although the divine order had revealed itself in the past, it might yet reveal itself in the present, leading to new understandings. In such cases, the interpretation of the past had to change to accommodate the new understanding. The monastic community at Saint-Winnoc only produced, however, nine hagiographic texts in a period that saw the appearance of thousands. Much broader samplings will be necessary to differentiate trends from idiosyncracies.
APPENDIX A: GENEALOGY OF THE COUNTS OF FLANDERS

The Counts of Flanders, 862-1067
The Counts of Flanders, 1030-1111
APPENDIX B

Oswald in Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*

Passages in which the HE mentions Oswald: ii.5, ii.14, ii.20, iii.1-3, iii.5-7, iii.9-13, iv.14

**Book One**
- Æthelfrith compared to Saul (i.34)

**Book Two**
- Æthelfrith fulfills Augustine of Canterbury’s prophecy concerning the destruction of the British (ii.2)
- Mention made of Oswald as the sixth Christian Anglo-Saxon king in England and as the “most Christian king” (*rex Christianissimus*) of Northumbria (ii.5)
- Æthelfrith’s persecution of Edwin (ii.12)
- Edwin’s conversion and his work on a church at York that he left for Oswald to complete (ii.14)

**Book Three**
- Description of Oswald and his brothers in exile (iii.1)
- Oswald’s victory over Cædwalla at *Denisesburn* / Heavenfield (iii.1)
- Miracles at Heavenfield (iii.2)
- Oswald’s request for a bishop from the Irish and his subsequent support for Aidan’s mission to Northumbria (iii.3)
- Aidan’s life and virtues (iii.5)
Oswald’s virtues, including the account of how Aidan’s blessing made Oswald’s arm incorruptible (iii.6)

Oswald’s role in the conversion of King Cynegisl of the West Saxons (iii.7)

Oswald’s death at Maserfelth and miracles performed there (iii.9)

Another miracle concerning Maserfelth (iii.10)

Translation of the king’s bones to the monastery of Bardney in Lindsey by Osthryth, queen of Mercia and Oswald’s niece, and a miracle performed at nearby Partney (iii.11)

A feverish boy at Bardney cured by sitting on Oswald’s tomb throughout the night (iii.12)

Willibrord carried Oswald’s fame to the continent and a miracle performed on the continent (iii.13)

The accession of Oswiu, Oswald’s brother (iii.14)

Book Four

Oswald cured plague-infected monks at Selsey in Sussex (iv.14)

Contents of Drogo of Saint-Winnoc’s Vita s. Oswaldi regis ac martyris

Prologue [Entirely Drogo’s own composition]

Prologus.1. Drogo’s didactic purpose
Prologus.2. Dedication to his brothers at St-Winnoc and methodology
Prologus.3. The superiority of virtuous deeds over high secular station

Chapter I

I.4. Drogo’s summary of Oswald’s lineage with Bede’s comparison of Æthelfrith to Saul (HE i.34 and iii.6)

I.4-5. Drogo’s account of Oswald’s virtues while a youth in exile among Irish (HE iii.1)

I.5. Drogo’s reworking of material from the HE regarding Oswald’s assumption of power and attention to Christian religion in order to show the king’s virtues in manhood (HE iii.3)
• I.6. Drogo’s note on the construction of St. Peter's at York (*HE* ii.14 and ii.20)

• I.6. Drogo’s summary of Oswald’s request for a bishop from the Irish and his reception of Aidan (*HE* iii.3)

• I.7-8. The battle against Caedwalla (*HE* iii.1)

• I.8. Erection of the cross at Heavenfield (*HE* iii.2)

• I.9. Miracles at Heavenfield (*HE* iii.2)

• I.10. The observances of the monks of Hexham at Heavenfield (*HE* iii.2)

• I.11. The broken arm of a monk of Hexham healed by wood from the cross at Heavenfield (*HE* iii.2)

**Chapter II**

• II.12. Oswald’s efforts to convert his people and his request for a bishop from the Irish (*HE* iii.3)

• II.13. Aidan’s observance of the Irish Easter (*HE* iii.3)

• II.14. Oswald’s translation of Aidan’s words into Anglo-Saxon (*HE* iii.3)

• II.14. Drogo’s comparison of Oswald to David

• II.15. Continuation of Bede’s account of the conversion (*HE* iii.3)

• II.16-20. Aidan’s virtues and mission (*HE* iii.5)

• II.20. Oswald’s rule over the Britons, Picts, Irish and Angles (*HE* iii.6)

**Chapter III**

• III.21. Aidan’s blessing of Oswald’s arm at Easter dinner (*HE* iii.6)

• III.22. Transportation of Oswald’s arm to Bamburgh and its continued uncorrupted state (*HE* iii.6)

• III.23. Drogo’s note that Oswald supported the conversion of foreign pagans
III.24. Cynewulf’s baptism *(HE iii.7)*

III.25. Drogo’s summary of Oswald’s life, stating that he passed “from virtue to virtue”

III.26. Oswald’s martyrdom *(HE iii.9)*

III.27-29. Posthumous miracles connected to *Maserfelth* *(HE iii.9)*

Chapter IV

IV.30-31. Two more miracles connected to *Maserfelth* *(HE iii.10)*

IV.32-33. The story of how Oswald’s bones were taken to Bardney *(HE iii.11)*

IV.34-37. The miracles connected to Oswald’s relics at Bardney *(HE iii.11)*

Chapter V

V.38. A young boy cured of a fever at Bardney *(HE iii.12)*

V.39. Oswald’s habit of frequent prayers, prayers at his martyrdom, dismemberment, and translation to Lindisfarne and Bamburgh *(HE iii.12)*

V.40-42. Willibrord brings Oswald’s cult to the continent and the miraculous healing of a scholar *(HE iii.13)*

V.43-48. Despite its inclusion in the AASS edition (see the edition’s footnote), the miracle at Selsey where Peter and Paul appeared to a young boy does not appear in Drogo’s text *(HE iv.13 and iv.14)*
APPENDIX C: MAPS

The maps of Flanders in this section are based, in part, on maps in the following works:


Map 1: The Basic Geography of Flanders
Map 2: Flanders under Baldwin I (r. 862-79)
Map 3: Flanders under Baldwin II (r. 879-918)
Map D: Arnulf I (r. 918-65 AD)

- Boulonnais
- Ternois
- Ostrevant
- Artois
- 931
- Part of Vermandois
- 943
- Ponthieu
- 949
- Inherited
- Taken from Adalolf's heirs in 933 A.D.

Conquests

Map 4: Flanders under Arnulf I (r. 918-65)
Map 5: Flanders under Arnulf II (r. 965-88)
Map 6: Flanders under Baldwin IV (r. 988-1035)
Map 7: Flanders under Baldwin V (r. 1030/35-67)
Map 9: Route of Balger's Ship?
Map 10: Lewinna’s Delatio
Map 11: The Boulonnais and Ternois
Map 12: Diocese

1 = Therouanne
2 = Tournai
3 = Arras
Map 13: Properties of Sithiu
Map M: 10th-century Flanders with properties given to canons in 1022 A.D.

Map 14: Tenth-century Flanders

Probable fortifications 879-900 A.D.

Properties given to the canons at Bergues in 1022 A.D.
Map 15: Church tithes for Saint-Winnoc
Map 16: Flanders under Arnulf I (r. 918-65)
Map 17: Flanders under Baldwin V (r. 1030/35-67)
Map 18: Winnoc’s Zone of Influence?
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