The twelfth-century Translation and Miracles of St Guthlac

A chronicle now known to have been written at Crowland abbey has an entry under the year 1136: 'Translatio sancti Guthlaci ab Alexandro Lincolniensi episcopo solemniter celebrata'.[1] This is just one of many entries shared with another more recently recognized Crowland Chronicle, where the entry is a little simpler: 'Translatio sancti Guthlaci, Alexandro episcopo Lincolniensi presente'.[2] A single manuscript from Crowland, now in Douai, has preserved an account of this Translation of St Guthlac, initiated, we are told, by the monks themselves. Abbot Waltheof called in Bishop Alexander only after the saint's grave had been opened. The manuscript dates from the second half of the twelfth century, probably the 1170s or '80s, though it was altered in the thirteenth century with the addition of many new leaves and the removal of some old ones, discussed above by Bolton. The reconfiguration has left this text imperfect at the end. Dating the work itself is more difficult, but it must have been written substantially after the translation took place and perhaps not very long before the extant copy was made. It reflects the lively, if wordy, Latin of the mid-twelfth century, rich in relatively unusual but none the less mostly Classical words rather than the neologisms that had given a bad reputation to eleventh-century saints' Lives. An apograph of this text reached the Bollandists from Douai, and Godfried Henskens SJ (1601–1681) prepared it for publication in the *Acta Sanctorum* in 1675 among the saints whose feasts were kept during April.[3] In treating of St Guthlac Henskens also had d'Achery's edition of Felix's Life, Savile's partial edition of *Pseudo*-Ingulf, and a range of

---

[1]* This edition and translation have benefited from the scrutiny of generous colleagues, in particular Jacob Currie, Christopher McDonough, and Gregory Hays, to whom I am most grateful.

[?] The text was printed from BL MS Cotton Claudius A. v, pt 1, fols. 2r–45v (saec. xiv) [S], first by Joseph Sparke, *Historiae Anglicanae scriptores uarii, e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum editi* (London, 1723), and then, after collating the manuscript text, by J. A. Giles, *Chronicon Angliae Petriburgense* (London, 1845).

[2] BL MS Arundel 10, fol. 71v [A], quoted from C. N. Ispir, *A Critical Edition of the Crowland Chronicle*, PhD dissertation (King's College, London, 2015). Ispir shows that A and S are two distinct witnesses to a Crowland text of an abbreviated general chronicle down to the year 1202.

[3] *Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe omnibus temporibus coluntur*, Aprilis t. II (Antwerp, 1675), 37–60 (at pp. 54–60). For good or ill I have kept Hensken's numbering of sections. The edition was read by Charles Du Fresne, Sieur du Cange, and quoted for a number of very rare words in his dictionary of medieval Latin, which first appeared in 1678. The *Acta* covering January–April were read by Giovanni Bonifacio Bagatta CR (1649–1702), of Verona, with the result that some miracles from this text were included in his systematic collection of miracle-stories, *Admiranda orbis christiani quae ad Christi fidem firmandam, Christianam pietatem fouendam, obstinatamque perfidiam destruendam* [. . .] *aut praeteritis extitere saeculis aut adhuc vigent* (Venice, 1680).

other printed and unprinted materials.[4] His edition has remained with us ever since, serviceable though not immune from improvement. He made more than a few emendations to the readings of the manuscript; his conjectures are signalled here, when accepted, his occasional error is put right silently, but much of my editorial role has been simply to restore the reading of the manuscript. Despite the availability of the *Acta Sanctorum*, the work has received little attention. It is published again here with an English translation and some commentary.

This *Translatio cum miraculis* (*BHL* 3731–2) is a unitary work, written in a distinctive style, and with some tell-tale indicators of a single author. For example, Fulgentius's *Mitologiae*, a work hardly seen in sources from twelfth-century England, is quoted in the prologue and again among the *Miracula* in § 17.[5] The Classical Latin word *decurio* is used in the same, albeit obscure, sense in the *Translatio*, § 8, and among the *Miracula*, § 19. Henskens's hesitation over the unity of the work is not justified.[6]

The writer says nothing about himself or the circumstances in which he wrote. Seeing his work in context is therefore difficult. The translation which forms the starting point of his account took place in 1136, in the presence of Bishop Alexander of Lincoln. The writer does not specify even the date in the calendar, an extraordinary omission, since it is clearly stated at the beginning of the *Translatio* and in the peroration that the Translation was kept as a special feast. And at both points, by his use of the first-person plural, he includes himself as a member of the community, 'Ad singularem huius diei celebritatem digne recolendam, in qua translationem almi patris Guthlaci solempnizamus' (§ 2), 'Exultemus itaque et nos unanimiter omnes in insigni die solempnitatis nostre' (§ 9). When Peter of Blois rewrote the text, he filled the omission, 23 August, a date confirmed by calendars.[7] The year was given by our author as the

---

[4] For *Pseudo*-Ingulf he used H. Savile, *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam* (Frankfurt, 1601), 850–914 (breaking off just before the text of the *Leis Willelme*, Fulman, 88), 915 (Fulman, 114–15).

[5] The author known as the Third Vatican Mythographer made extensive use of Fulgentius, but Eleanor Rathbone's identifying him with Master Alberic of London is not generally accepted now; the work was most likely composed on the Continent early in the twelfth century. John of Salisbury was acquainted with *Mitologiae*, but his ten years in the schools of Paris mean that his knowledge does not represent evidence of English circulation, and in any case he said that the decorated style of Fulgentius had fallen from favour (G. Hays, 'Fulgentius the mythographer?', in *Writing Myth. Mythography in the Ancient World* (Leuven, 2013), pp. 309–333 at pp. 323–24).

[6] 'An unus idemque auctor ista omnia, cum historia Translationis scripserit, non satis constat' (*Acta*, 57C, 58E note a).

[7] Peter of Blois (Sharpe, 'Peter of Blois and Abbot Henry de Longchamp', *infra*) gives the date X Kal. Sept., that is 23 August (*NLA*, ii. 722. 44); this is confirmed by the late twelfth-century Crowland calendar in BL MS Arundel 230, fol 5v (F. Wormald, *English Benedictine Kalendars after AD 1100*, Henry Bradshaw Society 77, 81 (1939–46), i. 113–14, 124).

first year of Stephen's reign, but the year of the incarnation was muddled in the manuscript, although corrected by the editor.[8] A few stories are explicitly dated, but such indications present a less than readily interpreted picture regarding the date of composition or the context for it. There is a direct reference (§ 19) to the twelfth year of King Stephen's reign, that is the year from 22 December 1147 to 21 December 1148. Bishop Alexander was buried in Lincoln on 25 February 1148, also in the twelfth year of the reign. The writer of our narrative refers to him as 'augusti memorie' ('of venerable memory', § 4), and there can be no doubt that his death is a *terminus a quo* for its composition. The translation had been attended by the heads of other abbeys in the area, and the writer names Abbot Robert of Thorney, 'digne memorie' ('of worthy memory'), who died in 1151; Abbot Walter of Ramsey, 'pie recordationis' ('of pious memory'), who served as abbot from 1133 to his death on 4 July 1160; Edward, prior of Ramsey in 1136 and from 1143 abbot of Crowland, whose death is entered in the chronicle under 1173; and Prior William of Ely, elected in 1133 and apparently dead in 1144.[9] Liebermann inferred Edward's death as the *terminus ad quem*.[10] The writer uses no words to acknowledge that Abbot Edward was dead, but the same can be said of Prior William. On the face of it, therefore, the *terminus a quo* for the writing of the narrative is the death of Abbot Walter in 1160. No presumption can made as to whether or not Abbot Edward was alive. Despite the length of his prologue the writer makes no mention of any abbot for whom he wrote. There was a vacancy after Edward's death in 1173, which lasted until 1175, when Robert of Reading, prior of Leominster, was elected abbot of Crowland. The only *terminus ad quem* is the date of the manuscript, judged to be *c*. 1180. We may date the work rather broadly to the 1160s or 1170s, but we have no means to show whether it was composed years before the extant copy was made or whether we should see the manuscript as a near-primary copy despite its many inaccuracies.

Only a wild guess will deliver a more precise date. As has been noted, the manuscript gives an inexplicable figure for the number of years between Guthlac's death and the translation, 'CCCC L I^{o}' (§ 9). Subtracting this number from the date of the Translation takes us back

[8] At the beginning of § 9, the translation was dated to the first year of King Stephen's reign, that is 1136, but the year of the incarnation in the manuscript reads MCVI, possibly an error of copying. The calculation since the time of St Guthlac himself is given as CCCCLI^{o} (Henskens or his apograph missed the I^{o} at the beginning of the next line), and the scribe wrote the word over CCCC, 'quadringesimo'. From 1106, this would have taken the saint's death back to 656, from 1136 to 686, both too early. Henskens corrected the numbers to 1136 and 422, that is counting inclusively from 715.

[9] Dates, with the evidence for them, in M. D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke, V. C. M. London, & D. M. Smith, *Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales* (Cambridge, 1972–2008).

[10] F. Liebermann, *Ueber ostenglische Geschichtsquellen* (Hannover, 1892), 27.

into the seventh century, too early for Guthlac's death. Adding this number to the known date of Guthlac's death gives a different result. It is likely that Guthlac died in 714, but by the twelfth century the year was sometimes thought to have been 715. The 451st year since 714 was 1164, which falls within the likely date-range for the writing of our text. In 1213 the translation of St Neot's relics at Crowland was counted the 499th year since Guthlac's death.[11] Can one accept that the author made such a mistake in his numbers, reckoning from the time of writing instead of from the date of the translation? Although an outsider to the community, Peter of Blois introduced what appears to be a correction when he rewrote the text after 1190, making 1136 the 420th year since Guthlac died.[12]

The writing up of a liturgical translation in the twelfth century was usually undertaken at much the same time as the event itself, not thirty or forty years later. Miracles could be added as they unfolded over time. In this case, however, we have two extended miracle-stories (§§ 5–6) tied to the translation itself, another at the same time more briefly treated (§ 8), and others that happened both earlier and later. The first two *miracula* as set out here (§§ 10–14) had taken place long before the translation, in the time of Abbot Ingulf, who died in 1109. The last story as we have it, cut off by the reconfiguration of the manuscript, was dated to the twelfth year of King Stephen, 1148. The remainder of that story and several further miracles are known in brief in the rewritten version made by Peter of Blois, very likely based on the present manuscript in its original state. These include another episode dated to 1148. According to Peter this was the year when the monastery of St Guthlac was burnt down, 'cum ornamentis eius et utensilibus, cum officinis etiam eiusdem' ('with its furnishings and fittings, with its offices too'), leaving the monks, like the Son of Man, with nowhere to lay their heads.[13] Chronicles from Crowland mention this under the year 1146: 'Ecclesia Croylandie cum multis officinis concrematur', 'Ecclesia Croilandie combusta est cum officinis et ornamentis et libris in Natiuitate Beate Marie', the latter notably similar to Peter's wording.[14] The Nativity of the Virgin Mary was celebrated on 8 September, and it would seem that the fire happened in the tenth year of Stephen's reign. It is implicit in our text that the shrine was not damaged by this fire, since the writer says that its elaborate metal canopy from 1136 was still visible as he wrote. This can hardly be relied on as fact: the visible work may have dated from after 1146. Following the fire, the

[11] 'Actum est hoc anno ab incarnatione domini M^{o} CC^{o} XIII^{o}, a sacro transitu sancti patris Guthlaci CCCC^{o} XC^{o} IX^{o}, qui fuit annus pontificatus Innocentii tertii xvi^{us}, regni Iohannis Anglorum regis xiiii^{us}, domini abbatis Henrici xxiii^{us}' (Douai, MS 852, fol. 2v).

[12] C. Horstman, *Nova Legenda Anglie* (Oxford, 1901), ii. 722. 42.

[13] *NLA*, ii. 726. 12–15.

[14] Giles, 93; Ispir, s. a. 1146. 2.

monks took the relics of St Guthlac on a tour of parts of England, collecting money ‘ad opera misericordie et ad reparationem monasterii’ (‘for the works of mercy and for the restoration of the abbey’). This tour, we are told, brought them as far as Durham, where they kept the relics in the church of St Nicholas—they were not allowed to take human remains into the cathedral—and here a girl was healed through St Guthlac.[15] Such a tour is not unparalleled. The fund-raising tour undertaken by the canons of Laon in 1113 is well documented.[16] None the less, there may be some surprise at the tour’s going into the north, unless there was a desire to evoke the Northumbrian connexions of the former Abbot Waltheof.[17] It can be believed that the miracle took place in the twelfth year of King Stephen and that our writer, Peter’s source, did not provide him with the means to separate that from the date of the fire itself.

There are no later indications of date. Without those phrases, ‘digne memorie’ and ‘pie recordationis’, we should be likely to date the writing to soon after 1148 and perhaps to guess that the rebuilding of the church was a contextual factor in occasioning this account of the translation. Even so, it is surprising that the occasion was not directly addressed. Many a writer in the monastic setting would have named someone at whose behest he wrote, most likely the abbot of his own community, but our writer offers no clue apart from his not adding any pious phrase to the name of Abbot Edward. He gives no reason to think he had been an eye-witness to anything he describes, and he says nothing

---

[15] Bertram Colgrave, of Durham University, read this story while he was working on Felix’s Life of St Guthlac, and drew attention to its unexpected witness to the jealous defensiveness of the Durham monks, ‘St Guthlac of Crowland: a Durham incident’, *Durham University Journal* 46 (1953–4), 93–5.

[16] Herman of Tournai, *De miraculis S. Mariae Laudunensis* (BHL 5398), ed. L. d’Achéry, *Venerabilis Guiberti opera omnia una cum appendice, Hermanni monachi libri tres de miraculis S. Mariae* (Paris, 1651), 526–60, repr. *PL* 156. 961–1017. The Bollandists record five copies from the thirteenth century. The second of its three books deals with the relic-tour in England, discussed, for example, by J. S. P. Tatlock, ‘The English journey of the Laon canons’, *Speculum* 8 (1933), 454–65, and more recently by Simon Yarrow, *Saints and their Communities: Miracle Stories in Twelfth-Century England* (Oxford, 2006), 63–99. For wider background, R. Kaiser, ‘Quêtes itinérantes avec des reliques pour financer la construction des églises (XIe–XIIe siècles)’, *Le moyen âge* 101 (1995), 205–225.

[17] In 1167 Abbot Edward ceded to the prior and monks of Durham all interest in the Berwickshire vill of Edrom in return for a pension of £6 p.a. paid in coin at the priory’s cell of St Leonard, Stamford, in half-yearly instalments (DCM 1. 4. Ebor. 9; J. Raine, *The History of North Durham* (1830–52), app. 111, no. 642). In commenting on King William the Lyon’s confirmation of this agreement, G. W. S. Barrow, *The Acts of William I, King of Scots 1165–1214* (Edinburgh, 1971), 192–4 (no. 105), conjectured that the vill was given to Crowland by Earl Gospatrick in the early days of the veneration of Earl Waltheof at Crowland, 1111–12, or by his son Waltheof, abbot of Crowland *c*. 1126–1138. The second earl Gospatrick gave the vill to Durham, subject to this pension for Crowland, and the implication is that in 1147 the abbey still held a church and vill in Berwickshire in the honour of the earls of Dunbar. Since Edrom was one of the nineteen vills originally granted to Durham by King Edgar, Crowland would have done well to have retained £6 p.a. as a result of its temporary tenure.

about his sources of information. The writing of the account may have been motivated by some perceived need to bring up to date the record concerning the cult of St Guthlac at the time when the surviving manuscript was first put together.

It is pure speculation to link composition to the circumstance of deciding to produce a new dossier. As a hypothesis it answers to the lack of any sense of context provided by the author and it fits with our perception of the Douai manuscript as having a material importance as the abbey's dossier on the saint. We do not know whether it was done in the time of Abbot Edward, or during the vacancy that followed his death, or after Abbot Robert, a monk of Reading abbey, had been elected abbot in 1175. The work must be dated between the death of Walter of Ramsey and the making of the extant manuscript. In relation to the actual translation and any associated miracles, the delayed recording is without doubt anomalous.

The writer presents an account which conforms to the general shape of a translation attended by miracles, despite the unusual lapse of time between event and writing. He appears also not nearly as interested as one might expect in the setting of St Guthlac's veneration. What he says about where Guthlac's body lay before it was translated in 1136 is uninterpretable, and he is very vague about what was discovered and translated into the east end of the church. The translation was initiated by monks who approached Abbot Waltheof, saying it was not fitting that 'uenerande reliquie uili cespite tegantur, luteo uasculo concludantur' ('the venerable remains of our patron Guthlac be covered by lowly turf, be enclosed in a muddy space', § 2), words that suggest a grave in the earth. His 'ossa' ('bones') should be lifted up and venerated. After three days of prayer and fasting, four chosen monks, a conventional number, begin their task: 'humilem repausationis eius locum et abiectum, summo studio ab undique concauant, quonam modo, ad abuoluendum lapidem, commodior pateret aditus' ('they hollow out that low and mean place of repose on all sides with close attention, seeking where more convenient entry should lie open in order' [in biblical phrase] 'to roll back the stone') (§ 3). Peter of Blois certainly understood the text as signifying that Guthlac's body lay in the earth, 'quem adhuc abscondebat gleba humilior' ('whom still a lowlier clay hid', 720. 19), 'ad effodiendum autem hanc preciocissimam margaritam que latebat in terra' ('to dig out this most precious pearl that lay hid in earth', 720. 26). In the traditional manner, they strain with various tools until at cockcrow the saint consents to the opening of his burial: 'lapidem cauando perforant; retinacula et compagines laxantes collidunt. Siquidem eruderato locello' ('they break

through the stone with their digging, they strike to loosen the bonds and fixings. Indeed, as the debris is cleared from the coffin'), they see what they longed for and enter the tomb, 'ingrediuntur uiri Dei tumulum'. An extended adaptation from Psalm 131 follows, so that we can form no idea of what their entering the tomb was meant to convey. In all this one can say only that the language is meant to emphasise the meanness of the old tomb. The language of earth or stone forms no consistent view, and the writer surely had nothing precise in mind. When Abbot Waltheof reports to Bishop Alexander, he mentions raising the coffin, viewing the remains, and translating them *in monasterium*, which I have translated as 'into the abbey church' (§ 4). Yet there is reason to think they were, in reality, already within the church.

One of the appended miracles, set in the time of Abbot Ingulf, appears to refer to the site of St Guthlac's burial at some undefined point before 1109. Here, we read: 'abbas oratorium ingressus, ante sancti patris Guthlaci cancellos genibus prouolutus' ('the abbot entered the church and fell on his knees at the altar rail of the holy father Guthlac', § 11). This suggests at the least a tomb within the church, and that is how it was read by the writer of the Crowland History. One must demand better defined language before interpreting *oratorium* as an oratory outside the church. It is as unsafe to draw definite conclusions from this as it is from the apparently vaguer points of reference in the account of the opening of the tomb in 1136.

Any reader of Felix's Life would know that at the time of his death Guthlac's body was buried in his oratory at Crowland and covered with earth, and that twelve months later, on the anniversary of his death, the body and its vestments were found incorrupt; Pega did not rebury the body but placed it in a monument, which King Æthelbald embellished.[18] Orderic had closely followed Felix's words here:

Felix, *Vita S. Guthlaci*, c. 51	Orderic, ii. 346
Quod ubi Christi famula *Pega* prospexit, *spiritali gaudio commota sacr*atum *corpus* cum diuinarum laudum uenerantia *in sindone, quam eo uiuente Ecgberht anachorita in hoc officium mittebat, reuoluit*, sed *et sarcofagum* non humo terrae condidit, immo etiam in *memoriale quoddam posuit*, quod nunc ab Æthelbaldo rege miris ornamentorum structuris in uenerantiam diuinae potentiae aedificatum conspicimus, *ubi* triumphale corpus tanti uiri *usque* in hodierni temporis cursum feliciter pausat.	*Pega spiritualiter commota sacrum corpus* reuerenter *in sindone quam eo uiuente Egbert anachorita in hoc officium miserat reuoluit et sarcofagum* super terram quasi *quoddam memoriale posuit, ubi usque* hodie honorabiliter requiescit.

[18] Felix, *Vita S. Guthlaci*, cc. 50–51.

Orderic's 'usque hodie' follows Felix's text and is not necessarily correct as of *c.* 1120. Leaving Felix behind, Orderic makes no further mention of St Guthlac until the saint made a contemporary appearance alongside St Bartholomew, apostle and patron of the abbey, to Abbot Geoffrey, authenticating the cult of St Waltheof.[19] Orderic therefore did nothing to bring up to date perceptions of the veneration accorded to St Guthlac's remains. What had happened to Æthelbald's monument during successive works on the fabric of the church is entirely obscure, and we may wonder whether our writer had any idea where the tomb had stood on the eve of the translation, perhaps thirty, even forty years before. The original eighth-century opening of the grave was on his anniversary, 11 April,[20] yet the eleventh-century calendar at the front of the Crowland Psalter records a feast of the Translation of St Guthlac on 30 August.[21] We have no idea when that took place, but, since the manuscript is older than the time of Abbot Ulfketel, we might guess during the late tenth or early eleventh century, when many English saints were first translated.[22] There is a case for thinking that the translation as staged on Sunday, 23 August 1136, represented a re-enactment of some kind, renewing the translation with a liturgical ceremony one week before the established feast. The

[19] Orderic, ii. 348. The story was copied from Orderic in the early thirteenth century in *Gesta Waldeui comitis*, ed. F. Michel, *Chroniques Anglo-Normandes* (Paris, 1836–40), ii. 102.

[20] As Felix tells it, Guthlac died on the Wednesday after Easter (Colgrave, 152). This date fell on 11 April 714 and 3 April 715. Evidence for the year of his death is scant. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle enters his death under 714, but it is stated as 715 by Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, IX 52 (Greenway, 692). Liturgical evidence, such as the Missal of Robert of Jumièges (cited by Henskens, *Acta*, 37–8, who saw it in 1662), and BL MS Harley 1117, both from the eleventh century, and a number of calendars all agree on his feast day as 11 April. On the basis that this date was kept in commemoration from before the use of Anno Domini, one can confidently reason from the calendar to the year and affirm that Guthlac most likely died 11 April 714, the Wednesday after Easter (Liebermann, *Ueber ostenglische Geschichtsquellen*, 26). The opening of his grave on the anniversary in 715 might, conceivably, have been carried out on the equivalent Wednesday after Easter, 3 April 715, but only one source actually enters Guthlac under 3 April, and that is the unprinted *Catalogus sanctorum Pausantium* (J. Blair, 'A handlist of Anglo-Saxon saints', in *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West*, ed. A. T. Thacker & R. Sharpe (Oxford, 2002), 495–565, at p. 537). This could have arisen from working out the date from the year 715. Copying-error in the Latin date is also possible, correctly III Id. Apr. but perhaps miscopied as III Non. Apr.

[21] F. Wormald, *English Kalendars before AD 1100*, HBS 72 (1934), 261. Cited by Colgrave, 10, who adds, 'it is not at all clear what translation this was'. The psalter Bodl. MS Douce 296 (*SC* 21870) (saec. xi), is attributed to Crowland on liturgical evidence (I. Atkins, 'An investigation of two Anglo-Saxon kalendars (Missal of Robert of Jumièges and St Wulfstan's homiliary)', *Archaeologia* 78 (1928), 219–54, at p. 222, no. 5). For more recent discussion, S. D. Keynes, 'The Crowland Psalter and the sons of King Edmund Ironside', *Bodleian Library Record* 11 (1982–5), 359–70.

[22] R. Sharpe, 'The setting of St Augustine's translation, 1091', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest. Churches, saints, and scholars, 1066–1109*, ed. R. G. Eales & R. Sharpe (London, 1995), 1–13; P. A. Hayward, 'Translation-narratives in post-Conquest hagiography and English resistance to the Norman Conquest', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 21 (1999), 67–93.

octave of this new translation coincided with the old translation, and both dates fell on a Sunday. The calendar therefore furnishes proof of careful planning by Abbot Waltheof. The writer's presentation of events—started by eager monks, implemented with the abbot's blessing, and then celebrated liturgically only when secular business allowed the bishop of Lincoln to play his part—is no more than fiction. The choice of date may surprise us, however, in view of the role of St Bartholomew, Guthlac's favoured saint and the patron of the abbey: his feast falls on 24 August. How one wishes for a contemporary narrator to explain what was happening! Our writer had little to go on about the actual context of the translation. His giving the impression of a lowly grave may represent mere supposition, uninformed even by a desire to connect with Orderic's words, despite their being copied into the same book as the *Translatio cum miraculis*. The remains of St Guthlac as found and translated are described in the vaguest terms apart from direct mention of the saint's head 'intra pixidem cristallis et margaritis distinctam' ('in a reliquary embellished with crystals and pearls'; § 7). When this reliquary was made we cannot begin to guess, but it had surely not been buried. Whatever was discovered in his resting-place was carried to the altar of St Mary, which Orderic tell us was at the north side of the church.[23] Here the remains stayed until the day of the translation, when they were carried 'in eminentiorem monasterii locum' ('into the upper end of the abbey church'), where a *feretrum* to the east of the high altar was ready to receive them: 'uenerandum corpus in monumento nouo [. . .] ad orientalem altaris plagam, feliciter collocarunt' ('they happily placed the venerable corpse in a new tomb [. . .] at the eastward side of the altar'). There follow obscure words to suggest the sealing of the tomb with metal fixtures. Whether or not the shrine of the head went into the tomb is unclear. But we are told of a lavish canopy over the tomb, provided by one Robert de Grandineto, 'sicut usque in hodiernum humanis uisibus apparet' ('even as it appears to human sight today', § 8). And here, he says, in formulaic phrasing, numberless miracles take place: 'Here Almighty God works wonders of different miracles, restoring sight to the blind, steps to the lame, hearing to the deaf, reason to the possessed, the use of limbs to those crippled, and flow of words to the mute'. There is a further uncertainty as to what human remains were carried around the

[23] Orderic tells how, in the time of Abbot Oscytel, an aristocrat, his sister Leofgifu, brought the relics of St Neot from Eynesbury (St Neots) to Crowland; the monks of Crowland welcomed the reliquary and 'iuxta altare sanctae dei genitricis Mariae in aquilonali parte honorabiliter collocarunt', 'placed it reverently on the north side of the church by the altar dedicated to Mary the blessed mother of God' (Orderic, ii. 342; cf. *Ps*. Ingulf, 55: 'iuxta sancte dei genitricis Marie altare cum deuocione debita collocauit'). Orderic goes on to say that it was still venerated in that location 'to this day'. Claims and counterclaims concerning the relics of St Neot do not concern us here.

country after the fire of 1146. Our author does not obviously envisage here a portable bier.

Given the date of composition and the author's apparent lack of precise knowledge, we can only wonder how much the contemporary appearance of the shrine informed his words. It would be good to be able to authenticate the donor of the canopy as contemporary with the translation, but I have not been able to do this. The writer's description of the canopy, *crepa*, a word not otherwise attested in English sources, may itself be borrowed from a continental source.

Uncertainty about the physical setting of the cult before and after 1136 is increased by our knowing that there had been fires but not knowing what damage they had caused or how much rebuilding had necessitated the rearrangement or renewal of the shrine. Such changes are not allowed to intrude on the story. During the time of Abbot Ulfketel the building of a new church was begun, 'quia uetus ruinam minabatur' ('for the old one was on the point of falling down').[24] In Abbot Ingulf's time, Orderic relates, there had been a fire: 'pars aecclesiae cum officinis et uestibus et libris multisque aliis necessariis repentino igne combusta est' ('part of the church together with domestic buildings, vestments and books and many other necessary furnishings were suddenly consumed by fire').[25] Whatever damage was done to the church, Ingulf undertook the translation of the body of Earl Waltheof from chapter house into church, placing his body 'prope altare'.[26] This happened in 1091, sixteen years after his execution, and that date is also recorded as the year of the fire.[27] Ingulf's successor from 1109, Abbot Geoffrey, began the building of a new church, and in the third year of his rule miracles began to be reported at the tomb of Waltheof.[28] An active cult of St Waltheof was reported by Orderic, and a series of *miracula* appears to have been documented

---

[24] Orderic, ii. 346.

[25] Orderic, ii. 346. Also in Orderic's *Abbreuiatio* at Crowland, Douai, MS 852, fol. 54v; compare BL MS Cotton Vespasian B. xi, fols. 76r–78v (now 80r–82v) (Gough, *Croyland*, *139). The episode was built up into a great narrative by *Ps*. Ingulf, 96–9, to explain the destruction of the abbey's muniments and library.

[26] Orderic, ii. 346.

[27] Claudius A. v has an entry, s.a. 1091, 'Monasterium Croilandie totum combustum est' (Giles, 64). Arundel 10 has the same wording but also has a unique entry based on Orderic, referring to the translation of Waltheof from the chapter house into the church.

[28] Orderic, ii. 348, and, from Vespasian B. xi, Gough, *Croyland*, *139. The Crowland Chronicle has an entry, 1114. 2, 'Ecclesia noua Croilandie fundata est'. The Crowland history makes more of this, 'statuit nouam ecclesiam fundare, et totum monasterium pro muris luteis cum muris lapideis in fundamento marmoreo, si sumtus sufficerent, innouare' (Fulman, 113), and goes on to describe the fund-raising missions, with monks and relics sent out to Flanders and France, to northern England and Scotland, to Denmark and Norway, and to Wales, Cornwall, and Ireland. Geoffrey's supposed letter to the kings refers to SS. Bartholomew, Guthlac, and Waltheof, doubtless inspired by Orderic's story, repeated nearly verbatim in the later *Vita et passio*. He refers to the need to rebuild the church lately burnt (p. 115).

perhaps as early as *c*. 1130.[29] It is not known whether Guthlac's body was relocated once in the fabric built by Ulfketel and a second time in Geoffrey's new abbey, where Orderic speaks of Waltheof's miracles rather than Guthlac's. If the latter, we are forced to ask how veneration of the martyred earl interacted with honouring the founder's tomb. The *Gesta abbatum* refers to a second burning of the church in the time of Abbot Edward, 'iterum combusta est ecclesia cum officinis in die natiuitatis sancte Marie, sed iterum ab eo et fratribus in melius reedificata'.[30] This is the fire mentioned in the *Miracula* and dated from the chronicles to 1146. Then under Abbot Robert we read in the *Gesta abbatum*:

tempore huius reedificata est ecclesie pars que post obitum Edwardi abbatis antequam ipse ad abbaciam uenerat corruerat; tota etiam nauis ecclesie consummata est illius tempore, et frons feretri sancti Guthlaci fabricata est a Fulcone aurifice de Burgo.

in his time the part of the church was rebuilt that had collapsed after the death of Abbot Edward and before his own coming to the abbey; the entire nave of the church was also destroyed in his time, and the front of the shrine of St Guthlac was made by Fulk the goldsmith of Peterborough.

The Crowland Chronicle clarifies this, s. a. 1174, 'Turris Croilandie cecidit'. Another campaign of building was needed, and then between 1175 and 1190 a third disaster destroyed the nave of the church but, we presume, left the eastern arm of the church intact. Here Abbot Robert commissioned a new *frons*, whatever precisely that signifies, in precious metal, made by Fulk the goldsmith of Peterborough, for St Guthlac's shrine. The relevance this has for us is that it may provide some *terminus ad quem* better dated than the age of the Douai manuscript. We may feel better able to say that our *Translatio cum miraculis* was composed before the collapse in 1174. The writing of the dossier as contained in the primary state of our manuscript may date from the same time or, as the palaeographical eye prefers a slightly later date, from the time of Abbot Robert's beautification of the shrine. A near contemporary source tells us that the shrine was remodelled again for a translation that took place on

[29] *Miracula S. Waldeui martyris*, MS Douai 852, fols. 67r–70v, now appear at the end of the short dossier on Waltheof and were printed in sequence by F. Michel, *Chroniques anglo-normandes* (Rouen, 1836–40), ii. 131–42. The handwriting, however, is substantially earlier than that of the adjacent leaves, giving the impression that the manuscript as originally put together included these *miracula* but not the texts forming the *Vita et passio*. As remarked by Liebermann, *Ostenglische Geschichtsquellen*, 27, the *miracula* are often assigned to a date of the month without a year, perhaps suggesting a close sequence, and the names of men and woman who experienced them are in most cases English. One name is datable, Count Stephen of Brittany (d. 1136). Liebermann suggested that form of names pointed to a date *c*. 1130.

[30] Douai, MS 852, fol. 54v; Cotton Vespasian B. xi, fol. 77r (now 81r) (Gough, *Croyland*, *139).

27 April 1196.[31] None of our sources has provided any clarity over the layout of the church, the parts that were damaged and rebuilt on this or that occasion, or the activity of the cults of Guthlac, Waltheof, and Neot. The writer of this text, looking back from perhaps as late as 1170, seems to have felt very little reason to distinguish the abbey as it was in 1136 from the abbey in his own time. It was not his concern, it seems, to describe the cult of St Guthlac or its setting, which, we may suppose, he took for granted at least within the time-frame of himself and his audience. He had some facts from long ago, some more recent stories, but he writes, it seems, almost timelessly.

The difficulty of extracting any sequence of events leaves uncertainty over the reliability of our evidence. In Abbot Geoffrey's time, when the abbey began its Norman rebuilding, more attention was given to Waltheof's cult, yet the patron Bartholomew and the founder Guthlac showed their approval in the abbot's vision.[32] The translation of 1136 is best corroborated by the evidence of calendars, while the relic-tour of 1148 is a further sign that Guthlac's cult had been renewed under Abbot Waltheof and his successors. We may wonder whether the cult of the martyred earl had faded or been toned down. The dates appear to say that the election of Abbot Waltheof marked a shift in focus from his St Waltheof to St Guthlac, but our sources leave us with no meaningful sense of the location or the activity of that cult from the 1130s to our author's own time.

By the by, our writer has offered a surprising glimpse of two pious women, both, apparently, living close to the monastic community. One is named Gunnilda (§ 5), described as *sanctimonialis*, 'a nun', who was living 'extra cellam monachorum' ('outside the monks' abbey'), but who was in the habit of rising at midnight 'to make her confession to God' (not, it appears, to a priest) and of attending the *matutinae laudes* of the monks, the dawn office of lauds. Such was her devotion that she was a help to others, making her the kind of recluse that drew visitors. At the time of writing it is surprising that our author did not find something improper about her constant presence near the monks, even looking back thirty years or more. If she were veiled by the bishop, she should have been living a regular life in a community of women. The next story concerns 'a woman of devout habit who lived within the area of the abbey (*infra cenobii capacitatem*) on the remnants that were left from the

[31] Sharpe, 'Peter of Blois and Abbot Henry de Longchamp', *infra*, 00, n. 66.

[32] Orderic, ii. 348. The problem of the seemingly competing cults at Crowland in the Anglo-Norman period is discussed by Licence, 'The cult of St Guthlac after the Norman Conquest', *supra*.

brethren's meals' (§ 6). In this case the implication is that she was a lay woman and a charitable dependant. One is reminded of Seitha and Editha, two women devoted to Christ and living close to the abbey at Bury St Edmunds in the late eleventh century.[33] Seitha was clearly allowed by the sacrist to make her devotions even at night in the church. Or somewhat earlier, the *reclusa* named Ælfwen at St Benet Holme was cited as a source of information by Herman the Archdeacon.[34] Somewhat later, Christina of Markyate lived in a hermitage near St Albans abbey from 1123, under the patronage of Abbot Geoffrey, but there was no suggestion that she had the freedom the abbey. Attitudes had changed. The degree of interaction our writer allows between these two women and the monks of Crowland suggests that, despite decades of monastic reform, the community was somewhat behind the times with monastic discipline.

Turning now to what the work covers, it will facilitate a reading if we present something of what is there as distinct from the hoped-for story of the cult that is not there. In telling his tale the writer was able to supply some names, more often of places than of people, and sometimes he can be tied down. Asford, the man at the centre of the second miracle-story (§§ 13–14), from Ingulf's time, is a recognizable tenant of the abbot of Peterborough. He held a little over three carucates of land at the time of the Domesday survey in the first year of Ingulf's abbacy and he is named in a list of the abbot's knights from *c.* 1110. This story, then, was already at least fifty years old when written down. The third miracle (§§ 15–16) relates to the marsh perennially disputed between the monks of Crowland and Spalding: if the protagonist were identifiable, there might be a definite context for this.[35] The writer had materials to work with, then, if only within the monastic memory. From somewhat few facts he spins a long story.

It will be helpful to set out a brief summary of the work as a whole:

---

[33] Goscelin of Canterbury, *Miracula S. Eadmundi*, II 5, ed. T. O. Licence, *Herman the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin. Miracles of St Edmund*, OMT (2014), 274, 276; Anselm, *Ep*. 230; discussion by T. O. Licence, *Hermits and Recluses in English society, 950–1200* (Oxford, 2011), 83–4, and E. M. C. van Houts, 'The women of Bury St Edmunds', *Bury St Edmunds and the Norman Conquest*, ed. T. O. Licence (Woodbridge, 2014), 53–73 (at pp. 62–9).

[34] Herman the Archdeacon, *Miracula S. Eadmundi*, c. 10, ed. Licence, 26–7.

[35] Detailed information so early is lacking, but the account of Abbot Henry's time appended to the Crowland history of *Ps*. Ingulf and *Ps*. Peter is largely devoted to an account of litigation between Crowland and Spalding during the years 1189–1203 (Sharpe, 'Peter of Blois and Abbot Henry de Longchamp', *supra*, 00, n. 45). Disputes no doubt went back to early days when Spalding was founded, 1086 × 1091, at a site too close to the interests of the monks of Crowland for their comfort; *Ps*. Ingulf pushed this back still earlier.

Prologue: largely given over to commonplace statements about the writer's personal inadequacy for this important task, undertaken, it seems, at the request of the monks ('instigante iocunde fraternitatis precepto') but not naming any patron.
Translation: The monks had a desire to elevate the body of St Guthlac from his grave, choosing four of them for the task; after prayers and fasting, overnight they seek to open the grave, succeeding at dawn, when they find the saint's bones in the odour of sanctity. They move them into the abbey church and send word to Bishop Alexander, who promises to come when secular business allows. Meanwhile we are told of two miracles, the miraculous guidance of the recluse Gunnilda to the abbey on the night of the discovery (§ 5), and the healing of another pious woman who lived almost among the monastic community (§ 6). The bishop comes to Crowland and oversees the translation into a shrine behind the high altar (§ 7). The reliquary of Guthlac's head and the canopy over the shrine are specifically referred to, but the condition of the body and the form of the shrine are not. The abbey's master-builder (*architectus*) Alwold was healed by contact with the reliquary of the head (§ 8). The year but not the date is indicated, and the writer ends with a homily in praise of St Guthlac (§ 9).
First Miracle: Abbot Ingulf invokes St Guthlac when the monks have run out of food during the winter, and corn and flour are miraculously provided (§§ 10–12).
Second Miracle: Abbot Ingulf recovers land alienated by his predecessor Abbot Ulfketel from a dishonest man, Asford, associated with Peterborough abbey, who was punished for his sins (§§ 13–14).
Third Miracle: An unnamed administrator at Spalding priory entered into dispute with the monks of Crowland, leading to litigation, but he was converted from his error by St Guthlac (§§ 15–16).
Fourth Miracle: An unnamed farmer from Cave (Yorks ER) was robbed of his pig by a local manorial official, and through St Guthlac's help the official's dishonesty is made known and the pig is recovered (§§ 17–18).
Fifth Miracle: A knight named Rainald of Cornouaille was left somewhere far from England by Earl Gilbert and had to make his own way home; when nearing home he goes mad, but he is miraculously healed close to Crowland. (§ 19; *NLA*, ii. 725. 27–37).

Before the fifth miracle-story is concluded, the text breaks off at the end of a leaf owing to the reconfiguration of the book. Before this loss the same manuscript was already available to Peter of Blois, writing his paraphrase in the 1190s. His text is much reduced from the original, but it retains all these stories and five more. The shorter version is therefore all that we now have for these last five miracles, which we may judge to have been deliberately discarded. From Peter our summary continues:

Sixth Miracle: The priest of *Coueham*, building a new church in honour of St Guthlac, needed timbers for the roof, which he obtained from the other side of the Humber.[36]

[36] It is tempting to identify the vill as Covenham, Lincs, with its two medieval parish churches dedicated to St Mary and St Bartholomew, patrons of Crowland abbey. This goes against the testimony of Domesday Book: in 1086 Covenham was held by monks of Saint-Calais in Le Mans as tenants of the bishop of Durham, William of Saint-Calais; the monks were there at the time of the Lindsey Survey in 1115, and later evidence provides no basis for associating the vill with Crowland. I find no other candidate for *Coueham* at either side of the Humber. Was the writer so tendentious?

The boat returning with the wood is threatened by a storm, calmed by his invoking the saint. (*NLA*, ii. 725. 38–726. 10)
Seventh Miracle: After the burning of the church at Crowland, in the twelfth year of King Stephen the monks came to Durham with relics of St Guthlac seeking funds to repair the abbey. Among the sick who sought out his relics in the church of St Nicholas, a girl of aristocratic birth was healed who had been paralysed for eighteen weeks. (*NLA*, ii. 726. 11–32)
Eighth Miracle: From Ramsey, where the abbey of St Benedict was renowned for its discipline, its internal fellowship, and its external hospitality, two possessed men were brought to St Guthlac and were healed. (*NLA*, ii. 726. 33–8).
Ninth Miracle: A woman named Wihomarch, in Bedford, was seized with madness, whose husband Walter, stirred by the miracles of St Guthlac, which were famous in the district, resolved to take her to Crowland. A Jew offered himself as a help to the woman, which the husband rejected, preferring to go to St Guthlac, who brought the wife to her senses. (*NLA*, ii. 726. 39–727. 10).
Tenth Miracle: A good man from Stoke [*?Stoke Bruerne, Northants*], losing his sight and his mind, was carried to Crowland. In his madness he denied Christ and St Guthlac, but God in his mercy gave him healing for his eyes and his mind, restoring him to health and faith. (*NLA*, ii. 727. 11–24).
Conclusion: 'If I spoke with the tongues of angels' [1 Cor 13:1], I could not tell all the *magnalia dei* worked through his servant Guthlac, nor write them in this book [cf. Jo 20:30]. The book of everyday experience shall teach how much God has magnified his saint. (*NLA*, ii. 727. 24–30).

Three things stand out about the writing. First, the prose is overloaded with words, even by the standards of twelfth-century Latin; it may well be found uncomfortable to read in English translation, since I have aimed to put the writer's words across rather than to recast them in more natural English. Second, the writer was also a reader with a well-stocked memory for phrases from a wide range of different books. Apart from the Bible, he draws on a range of widely-known works, occasionally Classical verse that was read in school, more often mainstream monastic reading, including some works that monks were used to hearing read aloud.[37] He has also read some rarer works, and he shows signs of knowing something of the arts curriculum (§ 16) and of acquaintaince with at least one passage from the recent authority on canon law, Gratian's *Decretum*, in use since about 1140 (§ 13).[38] A line of verse from a modern poem about London suggests that he was up to date in his leisure reading. Relatively ambitious prose and wide reading point to a person of more than basic education, but the work shows no evidence of unusual learning

[37] In the notes to the Latin text, quotations and echoes are identified, and there is an index of non-biblical sources after the edition. Quotation from or adaptation of particular passages from the Bible is marked in the text, but recurrent biblical phrasing is not.
[38] The passage of Gratian quoted in § 13 is one of direct interest to a monk and may not prove that the writer had studied very widely in canon law. The words quoted are found in both the earlier (1139/40) and later (1150) recensions as defined by A. Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2000).

or discernment. Third, the writer does not tell a good story. Indeed his narrative can be unbalanced, even incoherent, and at times seemingly contradictory. The first miracle story, dealing with an episode in Ingulf's time, changes direction alarmingly: in the first half of the story, we are told that the abbot, retreating into his personal devotions, left the welfare of the brethren in the hands of a trusted monk with instructions to turn no supplicant empty away. One day, however, he had gone so far as to give the monks' food to visitors, leaving nothing for the refectory. Then, in an abrupt change, we are told that it is winter and the routes to and from the abbey are closed, resupply is impossible, and a miracle is needed to ensure the monks do not go without supper. Under the circumstances, how could there have been so many visitors to occasion the need? Peter saw the contradiction and avoided it by passing from the general instruction to the circumstance that, one day, the monk found himself without supplies for either monks or visitors. In the fifth miracle story, referring to events in 1148, the scene is set with a story about Rainald's being left in a foreign country by his lord, Earl Gilbert. The year hints at the second crusade. He made his own way back, but his madness in the boat between Cambridge and Crowland, 'from natural causes', is unconnected with the scene-setting, all of which was struck out in Peter's paraphrase. Less serious contradictions or disconnections affect other stories. In the third miracle, it was at once fitting to tell the story of the litigious prior of Spalding and at the same time not fitting to make public the failings of a fellow monk (§ 15). The best told is the fourth miracle, a story about a stolen pig, enlivened with dialogue, but too easily read as parody. Even here, however, there is too much contradictory scene-setting. The farmer's devotion to St Guthlac is pointlessly subordinated to his travelling to make his annual devotion to St Edmund. The writer's evident inability to manage narrative goes a long way to explain the difficulties raised earlier in this discussion: he does not answer the questions that interest us about the cult of St Guthlac within the setting of the abbey at any particular time. However tempting it is to infer that at the time of writing no one knew where the old tomb had been, or that the cult was barely active, it is not justified where a writer who struggles to tell a story does not make all things clear. In fact, notwithstanding evidence of his wide reading, the writer seems unversed in the developing genre of *translatio cum miraculis*. Despite his following the convention of four well-prepared monks' trying to open the tomb by night and succeeding only at dawn, he does not give us what we expect of the genre, in particular about the old and new burial-sites, and in his miracle-stories he overreaches.

Where the writer seems more at home is as a preacher. Twice he abandons narrative for homily, first at the end of the *Translatio* itself (§ 9), and again at the end of the third miracle (§ 16).

In sum, so vague a work can shed very little light on the evolution of the cult of St Guthlac in the middle and late twelfth century. Its witness is neither positive nor negative. The most striking thing to emerge from it is the reference to a reliquary of St Guthlac's head, raising fundamental questions about the status of his burial and his shrine. There were, we may infer, some stories of miracles, in some cases with associated dates, which the writer was able to elaborate in his fulsome Latin. To a reader asking questions about the saint or the church, he offers very little but Latin eloquence, and his work was no more than thirty years old, perhaps less, when, like Felix's eighth-century Life, it was reworked in smoother style by Peter of Blois for Abbot Henry. The more closely we associate the composition with the making of the extant manuscript, the more it appears to represent an effort to reinforce a Latin dossier for a cult in need of more up-to-date literary support. In a larger sense, it would appear that the cult of St Guthlac was represented by an altar surrounded by *cancelli*, the reliquary of the saint's head, and, presumably, something regarded as the site where his remains were entombed. How these were affected by the fires and the rebuildings is beyond reconstruction. The late eleventh and early twelfth century witnessed some enthusiasm devoted to the new cult of Earl Waltheof, treated as a martyr. William of Malmesbury told separately the bad version of Waltheof's end, as put out by the Normans, in his *Gesta regum Anglorum*, and the good version, told by honest Englishmen, in his *Gesta pontificum*. Miracles at Crowland proved that God assented to the English version. But the cult may none the less have been politically sensitive. The date 1136 follows hard on the heels of the date assigned by Liebermann to the account of St Waltheof's *miracula*, and it is possible that this marked a shift to emphasising Guthlac's cult once more. The lapse of time before the translation was described in writing, however, and the lack of clear information on the context hardly reflect the kind of energy we might have associated with the relic-tour of 1148.

The manuscript is now Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 852, with the *translatio cum miraculis* at fols. 32v–46v.[39] The copyist who wrote this portion of the manuscript was probably responsible for a fair amount of error in our text. Turning a *punctus eleuatus* into a *punctus interrogatiuus*

[39] Bolton, 'Guthlac, Waltheof, Crowland, and Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 852', *supra*.

in §11 is a sign that he was not making sense of the Latin. Of course there is no proof that he did not merely repeat the errors of his exemplar, but examples of repetition at close quarters are likely to be scribal and some confusion in the agreement of adjectives likewise. A corrector made many small changes, but the remaining level of error suggests that even the corrector's work was not thorough. An editor would be grateful for a second witness, but Peter's revision was too thoroughgoing to give much help on textual points.

There is one minor witness to the text from a later time. John Leland visited Crowland, probably in the spring of 1534, when he found this manuscript.[40] He seems to have taken possession of it. John Bale later recorded five titles from it, citing as his source, 'Ex bibliotheca Ioannis Lelandi'.[41] Leland certainly studied it and took extensive notes; these have survived in his autograph, and they were also copied by later antiquaries.[42] The excerpts begin with notes from Felix's Life and more briefly from this *Translatio*, copying only three short passages verbatim.[43] On Orderic's *Abbreuiatio*, unascribed in the manuscript, he made one note, 'Quidam monachus impulsore Wlfuuino priore redegit libellum Felicis de uita D. Guthlaci in epitomen, cuius exemplar fuit in eodem codice quo liber Felicis'. He made a fairly full abstract from Orderic's

---

[40] The chronology of Leland's travels must be worked out from very limited cues in his notes and his letters. James Carley treats his visits to Crowland, Thorney, and Peterborough as part of a journey that took him as far as York, and he refers to his walking in York minster in a letter dated 5 June 1534 (*John Leland. De uiris illustribus* (Toronto, 2010), pp. lxxxi–lxxxviii). Oddly the note of six titles seen at Crowland (Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 3, p. 27) does not include any work from this manuscript.

[41] John Bale's Notebook, Bodl. MS Selden Supra 64, fol. 47; printed in an editorial arrangement by R. L. Poole & Mary Bateson, *John Bale's Index of British and other writers* (Oxford, 1902), 71. The layout on the page obscures what is more obvious in the manuscript, that a note on the fourth title interrupts the listing of five titles in order of appearance in MS Douai 852. No other manuscript has them all.

[42] Leland's autograph is now BL MS Add. 38132 (formerly Phillipps 12111), listed as *LeJ 17 in the on-line *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700* (CELM). In 1576 the autograph was still part of the set of Leland's papers (O. D. Wright, 'Motheaten, mouldye, and rotten: the early custodial history and dissemination of John Leland's manuscript remains', *Bodleian Library Record* 18 (2003–5), 460–501 (at pp. 475, 483). From it John Stow made a copy, now Bodl. MS Tanner 464, pt 1, fols. 47v–60v (L. T. Smith, *Leland's Itinerary* (London, 1906–10), ii. 117; Smith printed Leland's Crowland notes, ii. 122–42). The autograph was subsequently separated from the set. When Thomas Hearne printed the Crowland notes in 1711, he used a transcript from the autograph, made for Robert Plot in 1682, when the autograph was in the possession of Henry St George: the seventeenth-century shelfmark NE F. 11. 18 leads to Bodl. MS Bodley 353 (*SC* 2495), pp. 3–22. Hearne's text is found in *The Itinerary of John Leland*, 9 vols (Oxford, 1710–12), iv. 108–27; (Oxford, 1744–5), iv. 126–48; (Oxford, 1770), iv. 138–59. From the third edition the text was reprinted by Jacob Langebek, *Scriptores rerum Danicarum medii aevi* (Copenhagen, 1774), iii. 282–301, who added copious historical notes.

[43] These are from § 8 ('Super lapidem . . . apparet'), § 17 ('uillula quedam . . . Vmbrensis'), and § 19 ('Anno imperii . . . obligauit') (Smith, *Leland's Itinerary*, ii. 125–6).

short history of Crowland and its continuation as *Gesta abbatum*, and he copied the texts on Earl Waltheof *in extenso*. Leland provides evidence that our manuscript was at Crowland still in 1534, therefore, but he provides no independent witness to the text. It seems likely that Leland took the manuscript away with him and that Bale saw it among his books in London. The question of how it reached Douai along with other manuscripts that he had seen in other places is one still to be answered.

Offering a new edition of this text, I am conscious that that a new editor could present the unique manuscript as it stands, seeking to resolve afresh the problems it presents. The Douai manuscript is not entirely reliable, but the contemporary corrections, as far as they go, were well founded. Elementary blunders remain: so in the prologue, 'in dño confidens, cui dño accepta sunt uidue minuta' presents an elementary error, the contracted form of *domino* repeated where *duo* is surely the intended reading. Again, to describe Abbot Robert as 'filius eloquentie' is surely error for the cliché 'fluuius eloquentie'. These and other errors could surely have been put right if the corrector had used a sound copy to compare and used it well. Editing the text in 1675, Godfried Henskens made these corrections and in many places elsewhere in the text he has already dealt with difficulties. At one point he boldly emends 'cum odoriferis thuris' to 'cum odoriferi thuris honore' (§11): it is, I think, easier to regard this as drawn from his knowledge and skill as an editor than as evidence that his apograph derived from a different exemplar from that now in Douai. Sometimes, however, he faced problems caused by faults in the apograph from which he worked.[44] So in § 11, faced with 'quia nec serio refectionis torpor cibum nobis sufficienter ministrabit', he bracketed the words 'nec serio refectionis torpor' as beyond repair. Sight of the original manuscript, however, resolves the difficulty: the reading is 'neccio refectionis tpr cibum' with a contraction mark over the second *c*, and it is to be read, 'necessario refectionis tempore cibum'. The contraction of *tempore* was correctly read elsewhere in this text, and the familiar phrase *necessario tempore* guides the reading. If Henskens had seen D for himself, he would surely have read this rightly, and there is no cause to fill an apparatus now with such problems. Likewise where he simply accepted a false reading in the apograph, such as the phrase in the prologue, 'nec imperitus dejicitur, aut edoctus rejicitur', where the manuscript has 'nec imperitus deicitur, aut edoctus recipitur': *imperitus* and *edoctus* are opposites, and two similar compounds, *deiicere* and

[44] Some such transcripts remain in the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels or in the collections still kept by the Société des Bollandistes, but this is not among them. It was probably marked up for the printer to use.

reiicere loses the point. At times he seems to me too ready to emend, perhaps in reaction to such error in his apograph, but now invisible: where the text of the original can stand, I have passed over the conjectures. Henskens was more likely correcting the author than the copyist. At times this gives pause for thought.[45] Occasionally he appears to have removed what he perceived as difficulties, introducing changes that can hardly be blamed on an inaccurate apograph. For example, towards the end of § 15, the manuscript clearly reads, 'Vbi exactione, audiente et uidente innumera utriusque etatis plebe, multiformiter uentilata', but in place of 'exactione' Henskens printed 're illa': *exactio* in the sense of a claim at law appears not to have been understood, and he replaced it with words to signify 'when the matter was aired'. A bolder conjecture appears in § 3, where the text reads, 'summo studio ab undique concauant, quonam modo, ad abuoluendum lapidem, commodior pateret aditus'; Henskens replaced 'concauant' with 'scrutantur' as if 'studio' demanded a more investigative verb. In § 17 he clearly rephrased what he took for obscurity. Where the text reads, 'prefatum suem laxata clausula a casula fraudulenter abductum, anelatur, atque in horreo suo inter duas meias clanculo occultans, obserat', Henskens replaced the obscure 'anelatur' with the interpretative 'fraudabatur' and omitted 'inter duas meias'. An editor now is more tolerant of the medieval author's infelicities. In the accidentals of spelling and punctuation, Henskens did what seventeenth-century editors always did and edited as he would write or punctuate himself. So the use of j or the digraphs æ and œ is anachronistic. I have silently restored the usage of the manuscript in matters of spelling, trying even to observe his fluctuation between, e.g., *officium* and *offitium*. The scribe writes *nichil* for *nihil*, as one might expect at this period, and more than once *michi* is written without the usual abbreviation. In punctuation I should have liked also to follow the manuscript, which uses single points where we should expect a comma. To preserve the *punctus eleuatus* I have used the semi-colon, and I have been surprised how often this coincides with what was printed in 1675. The modern colon in my text replaces a point only where it introduces direct speech or a quotation. While Henskens uses too much punctuation, the manuscript has too little, and I have added some to avoid confusion to the modern reader. Very occasionally the manuscript shows markings to assist in reading aloud, for example, fol. 34v, line 18, 'patéret' 'adítus', line 26 'suppétia', line 28 'collídunt'. It is, I think, the same hand as added light vertical strokes to mark a pause, also represented here by

[45] For example, the writer uses the Greek genitive correctly once, in the phrase 'matutine sinaxeos laudes' (§ 4), but also incorrectly, 'in prima diei synaxeos' (§ 12), where Henskens emends to 'synaxi'. It is as if the writer were too eager to show that he knew the Greek genitive. This was not a copyist's error.

commas, on the grounds that a medieval reader found the original punctuation insufficient. The implication appears to be that our text was sometimes read aloud. While it is tempting to suppose that this was before Peter of Blois provided something more accessible, a note in the left-hand margin against the story of § 19 reads ‘Miracula legantur usque huc’. The placing of the note is intended to stop the reader continuing into the story that was broken off when the manuscript was reconfigured, and the writing itself is certainly later than the reconfiguration. The *Miracula*, at least, continued to be read from this book long after we might have suspected their retirement.