Whatever happened to St Ethelburga?
- the after-lives of the saints of Lyminge
by Robert Baldwin

Fig. 1: The Seal of St Gregory's Canterbury, © The British Library Board

Readers may remember my earlier discussion in *Lyminge a history Part 7* about how the parish church in Lyminge was originally founded by Queen Æthelburg in or around 634, but that the dedication of the church to her in the latinised form of her name St Ethelburga is in fact a mistake.¹ Today we are used to the idea that names in the past were not spelled consistently. For many centuries it was wrongly thought that the actual dedication of the church to St Æadburg was just another variation on the form of Æthelburg’s name. However, in my earlier article, I argued that although Æthelburg was undoubtedly buried in Lyminge because her tomb is described in the church towards the end of the eleventh century, shortly after the Norman Conquest, the Anglo-Saxon royal saint to whom the church was actually dedicated was a princess of Wessex called Æadburg. Her name is often written in the latinised form Æadburg or Æadurga or in the abbreviated form Bugga. Although it is not absolutely certain, she was probably a
daughter of King Centwine of Wessex, became Abbess of Minster-in-Thunet following the death of St Mildrith in 734, and died in 751. Her body seems to have been brought to Lyminge probably late in the eighth century since she is recorded as buried here in a charter that is dated to 804.

What seems to have happened is this. Princess Æthelburh was daughter of the first Christian King of Kent, Æthelberht I. She and Æthelberht were both converted to Christianity after the arrival in 597 of St Augustine, who had been sent by Pope Gregory to convert the pagan Anglo-Saxons. The mission began in Kent because Æthelberht was already married to a Christian queen, Bertha, daughter of King Charibert I of the Neustrian Franks in northern France. As part of a political strategy to maintain the influence of Kent elsewhere in England following the death of his father, Æthelburh’s brother Eadbald, as King of Kent, arranged for her to marry Edwin, King of Northumbria. However, in 633 Edwin was killed in battle fighting King Cadwallon of Gwynedd and King Penda of Mercia and Æthelburh fled the North to seek safety back in Kent with her brother Eadbald.

The group of accounts setting out the pedigree of the Kentish royal family, collectively known as the Kentish Royal Legend, all agree that Eadbald gave his estate at Lympo to Æthelburh where she founded a monastic community. She seems to have died around 647. The magnificent complex of feasting halls found on Tayne Field by Dr Gabor Thomas in his archaeological excavations from 2012 to 2015 is almost certainly the centre of the royal estate given to Æthelburh when she came to Lympo in or around 634, and this is most likely where she lived with her community. It is not clear whether the community survived her death because the earlier excavations of 2008 to 2010 revealed strong evidence of monastic activity, and an enclosure that extended to the south of the present church, but this was dated to no earlier than 700 on the basis of the archaeological evidence. The earliest written evidence for a minster at Lympo is in a charter of 697, so there appears to be a gap in the chronology. It is possible that a minster was re-established towards the end of the seventh century around Queen Æthelburh’s tomb, which was almost certainly in a church that she had built on the promontory that is now occupied by the current parish church and churchyard. But it is also possible that there was continuity of the community from the time of Æthelburh; it is just that dateable evidence for monastic occupation in the second half of the seventh century is lacking.

Whatever the precise sequence of events, what does seem certain is that Æthelburh was buried at Lympo and her tomb remained there for at least
four centuries. In the 1090s, a Flemish monk called Goscelin of St Bertin, who was then part of the community at St Augustine’s in Canterbury, wrote about Lyminge. He recorded that the tomb of Queen Æthelburh was ‘a prominent and majestic monument’. We will come back to this account later. It is important to note for now that the description makes very clear that Queen Æthelburh was buried in a substantial tomb that was still standing in the church at Lyminge in the last years of the eleventh century.

The other important thing to consider at this point is why St Eadburg was translated to Lyminge from Minster, where she died. In my earlier article in Lyminge a history Part 7, I discussed how Minster and Lyminge appear to have been united for a period at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries under a single abbess called Selethryth. This was a time when the Kings of Mercia were dominating Kent. Selethryth was well-connected and part of the Mercian aristocracy. Through her role as abbess she was wielding power in just the same way as Æthelburh had done - in the seventh century and Eadburch had done in the eighth century, protecting the interests of the ruling royal house through prayer and religious observance and controlling at the same time substantial estates that generated significant amounts of income. Religious houses throughout the mediaeval period reinforced their position by developing cults around the holy relics in their possession. Pilgrimage was not just about travelling long distances to remote shrines. Local people might easily make a short journey to their local saint to seek intercession for small problems. The scale of the problem would generally dictate the amount of effort the supplicant thought they needed to expend. By promoting the cult of their saint and taking credit for the help their saint was believed to have given to supplicants, abbots and abbesses grew the prestige of their communities. The more successful a saint appeared to be, the more wealth was likely to accrue to a religious house in the form of donations of money and land, and the more power that accrued to the head of that house.

The translation of Eadburch to Lyminge seems to have been part of a strategy to develop Lyminge as a shrine. Although she was originally buried at Minster-in-Thanet, Minster already had a very popular saint in St Mildrith. As noted already, Eadburch succeeded Mildrith as abbess and she built her original shrine at Minster. But in a sense Eadburch was surplus to requirements at Minster. St Mildrith was likely to draw in pilgrims on her own account and there was no additional value to be gained having Eadburch there as well. So it would seem that Selethryth made the decision to make use of Eadburch by translating her remains to Lyminge in order to
promote a shrine here too.

Although it is likely that Queen Æthelburh had been buried at Lyminge for 150 years before Eadburch’s relics arrived, and it is probable that she was venerated to some degree locally this alone was not enough to make a successful cult that was recognised more widely. The convention of the time was that sainthood generally required both elevation and translation of the saint’s relics.11 It would seem that Æthelburh had been buried at Lyminge where she died. If her remains had never been translated to a new location they lacked the vital ingredient that was necessary to be considered a saint. By translating Eadburch’s relics from Minster to Lyminge and elevating them in a shrine above ground, Selethryth would have laid the basis for a cult of St Eadburch at Lyminge. This was clearly in progress by 804.

As I discussed in my previous article, by around 1000, Lyminge had come into the possession of the monastery of Christ Church attached to Canterbury Cathedral. In common with many religious houses at this time, the monks of Christ Church seem to have commissioned a set of books, collectively known as a hagiography, to document and promote the holy status of each of the saints whose relics were in their charge. Many of the surviving hagiographies of Anglo-Saxon saints date to this time and they typically take the form of a trilogy, comprising:

Life describing the way that a particular saint had exhibited holy characteristics in their lifetime

Translation recording how the saint’s relics were moved to their current location, often associated with miraculous events and usually justifying why they were where they were

Miracles, setting out the miraculous events attributed to the intervention of the saint after their death; together these works demonstrated the claim of a saint to sainthood.

A number of versions of the Life of St Eadburg have been known for a long time. The recent discovery in the Cathedral Library at Hereford of a Life and Miracles of St Eadburg firmly links Eadburch the Abbess of Minster with a shrine established at Lyminge.12 St Mildrith at Minster was what might be called a first division English saint who attracted a huge amount of interest both locally and nationally. St Eadburch was not in the same league. However, she was in every respect a bona fide saint by the standards of the time. Having a saint bestowed prestige and created the prospect of gifts from grateful pilgrims. So when in the 1080s, the new Norman Archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc, founded in Canterbury just outside the North Gate a new religious house
dedicated to St Gregory the Great, the canonised Pope who had sent St Augustine to convert the English, he naturally looked around for some holy relics with which to endow it. Although Lyminge was within the estates of Christ Church, which were separate from the estates of the Archbishop himself, it seems that Lanfranc was nevertheless able to exercise significant influence over the Prior of Christ Church. However he achieved it, Lanfranc procured the relics at Lyminge. The Easter Table Chronicle records that St Eadburg was translated to St Gregory’s in 1085.\textsuperscript{13}

Other contemporary and near-contemporary sources agree that St Gregory’s acquired the relics of Queen Æthelburh as well as those of St Eadburg. Had St Gregory’s remained happy with this, we might never have known the full story of the translation. However, because the clerics of St Gregory’s made an audacious grab for the relics of St Mildrith as well, we have a very full account of what happened in the last few years of the eleventh century and what happened to the relics of Lyminge.

To understand the full significance of the claim by St Gregory’s, we need to look back half a century before its foundation. In 1030, King Canut granted permission for St Augustine’s Abbey to translate St Mildrith’s relics from Minster.\textsuperscript{14} The local population were not keen to lose their saint and the account of her translation records that Abbot Aelfstan and his monks were chased as they fled with her relics. The possession of relics aroused great emotions. However, although St Augustine’s was clearly keen to secure the relics in 1030, fifty years later, St Mildrith was languishing in a side chapel at the abbey and apparently largely ignored amongst an extensive collection of other relics. At any rate, it would seem that St Gregory’s took the view that St Augustine’s would not miss one of their saints and the need of St Gregory’s was greater than theirs. Within three years of acquiring the relics from Lyminge, it seems that the clerics of St Gregory’s began to put about the story that when the relics had been translated, they had included not just St Eadburg from Minster but also St Mildrith, whom they called Milrude. They claimed that the relics of both Mildrith and Eadburg had been carried to Lyminge by the nuns of Minster when they fled from Danish raiding, sometime in the ninth century. This claim is preserved in the Lives of SS Æthelred, Æthelberht, Milrude and Eadbiba that survives in a fifteenth century manuscript in the State Library at Gotha in Germany.\textsuperscript{15}

This was a claim that St Augustine’s was not prepared to tolerate since every saint was a potential source of revenue. It so happened that the abbey had recently attracted one of the finest authors of the day, Goscelin of St Bertin.
Goscelin was a monk, probably born in Flanders, who over the course of his life travelled between various monasteries, writing religious works, particularly hagiographies. By the early 1090s, he was in Canterbury and his skills were employed by St Augustine's to debunk the claims of St Gregory's. Goscelin wrote a very forthright little book (in Latin the word is libellus, a diminutive of the word for book, i.e., literally ‘little book’) which today we might call a tract or pamphlet. Its Latin title translates as ‘Tract against the foolish claimants to the body of the holy virgin Mildrith’.

In what for the time comes across as a remarkable piece of forensic analysis, Goscelin provides information about the translation of the relics from Lyminge in 1085. He describes how afterwards, when the dispute with St Gregory’s began, Ralph, the priest at Lyminge, was questioned by Abbot Wido of St Augustine’s because it was Ralph who had performed the exhumation of the bodies. Ralph’s account is given in the first person and thus appears to be drawn from the actual record of an interrogation:

“I”, he said, “who with my own hands raised both bodies and emptied their tombs, testify that on nothing that was found or identified as a holy relic was there any name or writing or title or any mark at all, certainly nothing relating to Mildrith, nothing clearly holy there except what was considered to relate to Eadburh [i.e., St Eadburg]...”

This is an interesting account. It has the ring of authenticity and is more or less contemporary with when Goscelin was writing. It indicates that the priest in Lyminge knew he was dealing with the relics of St Eadburg, although there were no inscriptions or anything to record her name. This suggests that St Eadburg’s shrine was known to Ralph and clearly identifiable, regardless of the lack of inscriptions. However, in this quotation from the inquiry, Goscelin records only that Ralph could identify St Eadburg. He does not record what, if anything, Ralph had to say about the other body that was equally unmarked. However, Ralph’s comment that the only holy remains related to Eadburg does indicate that he did not consider the other tomb belonged to a saint. We are unlikely ever to know what Ralph said about Queen Æthelburh. However, Goscelin himself was in no doubt that she was also buried at Lyminge and that this was common knowledge. I have already noted above his description of the tomb, and separately he says:

‘So in the church at Lyminge, which belongs to the Archbishop, Queen Æthelburh is well-known to have been buried’

So we have two very clear statements about the identity of who was buried.
at Lyminge in 1085. Ralph is also very clear that he exhumed only two bodies not three, and there was no evidence whatsoever to suggest that any of the relics related to St Mildrith (or Miltrude as she was called at St Gregory’s).

There is further support for the identity of the relics at Lyminge from Goscelin himself, writing before he became embroiled in the controversy at Canterbury. As mentioned already, over the course of his life Goscelin travelled around a number of monasteries, specialising in writing hagiographies of local saints. In the 1080s, he was working at Ely, where he produced the Life of St Werburg. Werburg was the great granddaughter of Eadbald, and thus great great great niece of Æthelburh. As is common in such accounts, Goscelin gives a summary of her Kentish royal pedigree, and has this to say:

‘So Queen Æthelburh, after the killing of Edwin the Anointed King of the Northumbrians, returned to her brother Eadbald, and built a monastery at his estate in Lyminge, and she lies there with St Eadbald’.²⁰

At this stage in his career Goscelin had no particular reason to be partisan. Moreover, his use of the present tense demonstrates that he believed both Æthelburh and Eadbald were still at Lyminge at the date he was writing. Taken at face value this statement can reasonably be taken as reflecting the actual state of affairs at the time. We do not know when in the 1080s the Life of St Werburg was written, although it is also quite possible that news of the translation in 1085 may not have travelled to Ely very quickly. Thus, using the writings of a contemporary author who initially had no reason to be biased, and then subsequently was hostile to St Gregory’s, we nevertheless have a consistent view. In the 1080s, there were two notable tombs at Lyminge, one belonging to St Eadburg and the other to Queen Æthelburh. The argument that it was the relics of Eadbald and Æthelburh that were taken to St Gregory’s is not without its critics.²¹ However, based on the contemporary evidence of Goscelin’s Life of Werburg and his Libellus, there is a good case that it was the remains of Eadbald and Æthelburh that Lanfranc translated to Canterbury.

The foundation charter in the Priory Cartulary lays claim to ‘St Eadburga, St Mildrith and Queen Ethelburga of the Northumbrians’.²² Although this is most likely to be a forgery of the early to mid-thirteenth century,²³ this is consistent with Goscelin’s account in his Libellus and thus probably reflects the tradition handed down from Lanfranc’s original community at St Gregory’s. The conclusion to be drawn is that St Gregory’s supplemented
their relics by inventing the acquisition of St Mildrith, but in every other respect, they recorded what actually happened. There is no contemporary or even near-contemporary evidence contradicting that Æthelburh and Eadburh did indeed end up in Canterbury.

The community dedicated to St Gregory was established by Lanfranc just outside the North Gate of Canterbury. It comprised six priests and twelve clerks, with a pastoral role ministering to the sick, baptising, hearing confession and burying the poor. It served as a sister establishment to St John’s Hospital which still stands on the other side of the road leading from the North Gate. It was only in 1133 that it became a priory with the transfer of Augustinian Canons from Merton Priory in Surrey. The role of these Black Canons (so-called from the colour of the habits they wore) was also substantially pastoral, ministering to the sick in the Hospital of St John.

The original church of St Gregory’s was believed by the excavators to be a simple long aisleless nave with a small chancel to the east. They proposed that the arrival of the Canons from Merton provided the impetus for a major rebuilding and two transepts were added, each with twin-celled structures to the east, which placed them either side of the chancel (Fig. 2). The general conclusion has been that these were probably side-chapels housing the relics from Lyminge. Goscelin describes the relics as being elevated to the right and left of the altar, which could be taken to imply that the transepts and chapels were part of the original building scheme or simply that initially there was an array of relics at the east of the church. In a recent critique of the excavation, Alan Ward has put forward the view that the stratigraphy supports the view that the transepts and side chapels were all part of the original building scheme and the only later construction involved lengthening the chancel.

As the clergy of St Gregory’s also claimed the relics of St Mildrith (or as they called her, St Miltrud), they needed to create a shrine for her too. There is no archaeological evidence to say what the arrangement was. Goscelin refers to the elaborate provision made for Mildrith’s relics which he considers to have been completely excessive, although he does not say exactly where the shrine was located. However, it is plausible that the shrine to St Mildrith, who was regarded as the most important of the saints, was placed in the high altar in the chancel. This would have left the relics of Eadburh and Æthelburh to be elevated in shrines and displayed to either side as described by Goscelin, whether or not the side chapels were there from the beginning.
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As noted above, the convention of the time required relics to be translated before they could be treated as belonging to a saint. So just as the translation of Eadburch to Lyminge was part of the process of turning her into a saint, the translation of Queen Æthelburh to Canterbury and the elevation of her relics in a shrine would have been viewed as confirming her status as a saint also. It is difficult to know exactly how she was viewed at this time, some 400 years after her death. But it is highly likely that, even if there were some questions about her strict canonical sainthood, she was regarded as intimately connected with the conversion of England, and through her position as Abbess at Lyminge, was treated as a protector of Kent and the royal line of Kent. It may also not have escaped the notice of the Canons of St Gregory’s that Æthelburh was recorded by Bede as a correspondent of Pope Gregory himself, and thus was directly connected with their own patron saint. Perhaps rather late in the day, Æthelburh probably therefore acquired a significance that she had not had previously, and ironically her status as a saint may thus have become rather better established than it had been in Lyminge.

In 1145, disaster struck the priory when fire destroyed a large part of the church. The area of destruction debris found in the excavations showed extensive damage to the nave and south transept, but it seems that the chancel and side chapels survived and, it appears, remained in use while a new church was built.29 The new church extended outside the area of the archaeological excavation, so although the nave was found and a portion of the north transept, the arrangements further east are entirely unknown. Thus there is no archaeological information shedding any light on how the relics were housed in the new church. However, subsequent events suggest that the relics did survive the fire, or at least that no one was admitting that they did not.

In 1224, a significant event occurred that was designed to promote the significance of the relics and highlight the importance of the Priory.30 A ceremony of elevation is recorded in which the relics were formally offered up to the public for veneration. This was part of a process whereby relics were both promoted and publicly authenticated, all designed to encourage renewed public interest. The ultimate objective, of course, was an increased flow of donations. This event was probably not unconnected with the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council of the Catholic Church in 1215 that prohibited venerating relics that had not been authenticated.

The recorded ceremony seems to be associated with some other activity designed to reinforce the status and the history of the relics. This included
the creation of the foundation charter mentioned earlier which is dated to around this time. To be fair to St Gregory's, though the copy of the charter included in the Priory Cartulary appears to be a forgery because there are too many errors and anachronisms for it to be a copy of an original eleventh century document, it did largely reflect what had actually happened and only laid claim to lands that had actually been given. In other words, while the document itself appears to have been made up, the original having been lost, it was simply seeking to back-fill a gap in the paper trail of the Priory's documentation. It was not, unlike many other similar such forgeries at other monastic houses, making fraudulent claims. Even the claim to the relics of St Mildrith was, by the early thirteenth century, hallowed by the tradition of 140 years or so, even if it was still disputed by St Augustine's.

A further element in this renewed effort to authenticate the relics and proclaim their significance was the creation of a new Priory seal. This second Priory seal names St Ediburga to the left side of Lanfranc, but the seal is broken and while the saint to his right is not visibly named, it is most likely to be St Mildrith (Fig. 1).  

The Priory continued running St John's Hospital and ministering to the sick into the sixteenth century. The claim to the relics of St Mildrith was perpetuated, although whether this meant very much by the end of this period is open to doubt. Donors to the Priory do not name her and are more concerned with securing burial within the lay cemetery. In 1535, the return from the Priory that was incorporated into the Valor Ecclesiasticus (listing the wealth of monastic houses throughout the country) revealed its annual income as just 166 4s 5d. This proved to be the death knell for the Priory. The first round of Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries targeted houses with an annual income under £200, and on 23 February 1537, a monk of St Augustine's recorded in his chronicle: 'The monastery of St Gregory was suppressed and the canons expelled. Mr Spilman and Mr Cavendish being the King's commissioners hereon appointed.' The lands and other assets of the Priory were surrendered to the King, although there is no inventory or survey amongst the papers of the Augmentation Office that supervised this work. The only further reference is to the granting of a pension of 20 marks to the former Prior, John Symkins, who became a canon at Rochester Cathedral.

Unfortunately, we therefore have no evidence of what exactly happened to the saints of Lyminge. The strange thing is that we have relatively little conclusive information on what happened to any of the relics that were unshrined at the time of the Dissolution of the Monasteries. The story that
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the bones of St Thomas Becket were burned seems to have originated in Rome where the Pope condemned ‘the King of England, who had commanded the body of St Thomas of Canterbury to be burnt and the ashes scattered to the wind’. This was taken up by Catholic critics of Henry’s actions, but contemporary accounts of bone burnings don’t exist. Even for relics as well-known and prominent as those of St Thomas Becket, there is no surviving instruction to the King’s Commissioners amongst the official papers saying what should happen to them, and there is no eye-witness account recording their fate. There is certainly some evidence from elsewhere in the country that some relics were taken to the Tower of London. Others were quietly buried. Indeed it seems to be the case that a lot was left to local discretion and the King’s Commissioners may even have been involved in the discreet reburying of some relics. The emphasis seems to have been not so much on destruction as on removing the bones from being an object of veneration.

We know that the memory of Eadburh was preserved at Lyminge in the dedication of the church and the name of the well on Tayne Field, long after the relics had left the village. But sadly, by the 1530s, neither Æthelburh nor Eadburh meant much to the citizens of Canterbury. Based upon what happened to other relics it is perhaps most likely that the bones were quietly buried, probably not far away from their shrines. This may have been in 1537, soon after St Gregory’s was suppressed, and can hardly have been much later than October 1541 when the King issued instructions for any remaining shrines to be removed. But nobody seems to have taken any interest and no one saw fit to record what happened to the relics at St Gregory’s. So we can guess but we do not actually know what happened to the two royal Anglo-Saxon saints of Lyminge.

**PLAN OF OLD CHURCH**

On the following page in Fig. 2: Plan of the excavated remains of Lanfranc’s modified church at St Gregory’s Priory (Canterbury Archaeological Trust). The relics from Lyminge were probably located in the side chapels identified either side of the chancel.

See the caption of the picture for more detail.
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2 This is based on the assumption that Abbess Bugga, daughter of Centwine is to be identified with Abbess Eadburch. The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England, which is accessible at: http://pase.ac.uk/jsp/index.jsp does not support or reject this identification. It would however, help reconcile the proposal that St Eadburch of Minster was a correspondent of St Boniface which has been rejected by some on the grounds that Boniface apparently only corresponded with those from his native Wessex.
4 Charter 34 in Brooks and Kelly, 2013 records that Lympinge is ‘where the blessed Eadburch lies’.
5 Colgrave and Mynors, 1969, ii, 9-20.
6 Rollason, 1982, 21. The earliest manuscript is dated to the period 1035-1091, although deriving from an earlier source.
7 Thomas, 2017, 106-11; Interim reports appeared in Lympinge a history parts 6 and 7; Thomas and Knox, 2014 and 2015.
8 Charter 5 in Brooks and Kelly, op. cit. The Latin term used was monasterium, normally translated as monastery or minster. This was a term applied at the time to any kind of religious establishment with a church (Blair, 2005, 3). To avoid
confusion with mediaeval monasteries, because they were a very different kind of institution, I have used the term minster throughout this article.

9 Kelly, 2006, 104.
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18 'Ugitur in ecclesia Limminga, quae est episcopii, regina Æthelburga celebratur sepulta', ibid., 71.
19 Goscelin also notes in his Libellus that local people confused Æthelburh and Eadburgh, but he does not seem to have had any confusion himself. I consider the subtleties of his argument in more detail in my earlier papers (Baldwin, 2016 and 2017).
20 'Æthelburga vero Regina post proprii Regis Nordenbusbrorum Ædumi interfectionem, reversa ad fratrem Eadbaldom in villa Limminga monasterium aesthetics, in quo cum S Ædiburga requiescit', Horstmann, 1887, xx.
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36 The spring is called the 'Well of St Edburge the Virgin' in a will dated to 1490, Hussey, 1907, 204.