Herefrith of Louth, Saint and Bishop: A Problem of Identities

A. E. B. Owen

My interest in Herefrith was first aroused twenty-five years ago by references in Swaby's *History of Louth*¹ to a mysterious saint who, before the Reformation, had some special association with Louth although neither the precise nature of this nor the saint's identity could be established. Intermittently since then I have been seeking a solution to the problem. I make no claim to finality now, but since there are welcome signs that the early history of Louth may at last receive the attention it deserves, the time seems right to put something on paper.² It is a curious fact that for half a century two different kinds of evidence about our saint were studied by two independent groups of enquirers, each in ignorance of evidence known to the other. On the one hand, local historians in Lincolnshire discussed among themselves the evidence about Herefrith (this, rather than Herefrid, is historically the correct spelling) known from local records of the thirteenth century onwards; on the other, the evidence from saints' lives and calendars of the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries was analysed for an academic readership unconnected with Lincolnshire. For the present purpose it may be best to begin by examining the local records which show the saint's cult established in Louth in the later Middle Ages, before casting the net wider to bring in the evidence which takes us nearer the cult's origins.

The first local historian to notice the Louth Herefrith seems to have been Edward Peacock, who in 1890 drew attention to an inventory of 1486 in the Louth churchwardens' accounts (at that time still unpublished) which lists, among the vestments belonging to the parish church of St. James, an ivory comb 'that was saysnt Herefridis'.¹ In 1891 R. W. Goulding devoted several pages of his study of the Louth corporation records to such references to 'Herefrid' as were known to him; and subsequently, in a paper read to the Louth Antiquarian Society, he collected and discussed all he could find about the cult of this saint.³ Goulding felt obliged to assume the identity of the Louth saint with the only recorded saint of this name, Herefrid bishop of Auxerre in France, although the French bishop who died in 909 had no known associations with England and was buried in his own cathedral.⁴ This identification was repeated in the edition of the churchwardens' accounts published in 1941.⁶

The earliest known local references to the cult of our saint at Louth relate to his church. An agreement concerning lands in Cockerington in 1257 was made in the church of St. 'Herefrids' of Louth.⁷ A bond entered into at Lincoln was to be repaid by Christmas 1272 in the church of St. 'Herfrude' of Louth.⁸ Richard de Farford of Louth, in his will made in 1299, left his body to be buried in the church of the blessed Herefrid of Louth (in ecclesia beatii herefr de Luda) in the chapel which Farford had built therein.⁹ In 1318 the gild of St. Mary of Louth had licence to alienate in mortmain certain rents to support a chaplain to celebrate service in the church of St. Herefrid; this gild had been founded to provide seven wax candles to burn daily before the image of the Virgin in a certain chapel within the church of St. Herefrid of Louth (infra ecclesiam sancti Erefridi de Luda) when mass was celebrated there.¹⁰ In 1348 the body of William Prest, hanged for housebreaking, was brought to the church of sancte Erefride prior to burial.¹¹

It would be natural, if we had no other evidence for its dedication, to suppose that the foregoing references were to the parish church of Louth. But the town has never comprised more than one parish, whose church is now dedicated to St. James; and although I know of no specific reference to St. James's as the parish church before 1445,¹² a church of St. James existed as early as 1235.¹³ The identity of St. Herefrid's church has therefore presented a puzzle to local historians. There is nothing to support its identification with St. Mary's chapel of ease (about which more will be said later), nor is there any evidence that it occupied a site of its own. On the contrary, several of the references to our saint during the last hundred years before the Reformation point clearly to his cult being centred in the parish church of St. James. This suggests that Herefrid and James may either have been joint dedications of the same church, though the names have not been found formally coupled together, or (perhaps more likely) that Herefrid was gradually supplanted by James as the cult of the latter became increasingly popular. In 1447 the gild of St. Mary, which we have earlier seen to be associated with the church of St. Herefrid, was refounded in 'the parish church', i.e. St. James.¹⁴ The 'come of ivory that was saynt Herefridis' which belonged to St. James's church in 1486 has already been mentioned. In 1516 an inventory of goods belonging to the high choir of St. James's includes an 'auterclot stene bey the holy Trete Salyn James & Saynt Herefride with 2 curtans', and a 'cloth arrys of Saynt Herefride heyng at ender ende were dekeny & sodekyt sits'.¹⁵

The feast day of St. Herefrid was celebrated, as we know from the Louth manor court rolls, on 27 February—a circumstance which adds interest to the election of an abbot of Bardney in St. Mary's church at Louth on 26 February 1267, i.e. St. Herefrid's Eve, no doubt considered an auspicious day.¹⁶ No manorial business was transacted on St. Herefrid's day, a fact mentioned in 1430 and 1447. Two cases of assault dealt with in the manorial court on 8 March 1445 are dated by reference to the feast of 'St. Herefrid the bishop' last past.¹⁷ The 1447 entry for 27 February records the adjournment of business until the next court because of 'this venerable feast of St. Winefred (sic) the marty in whose honour the church of Louth is dedicated'.¹⁸ 'Winefred' must be a slip, perhaps because the scribe was not a local man and mistook the local saint for one better known. The reference to martyrdom is unique and may also be a mistake, but is nevertheless suggestive as will be apparent later.

The more academic discussion based on saints' lives and calendars began in 1892 with Birch's edition of the Liber Vitae of New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester.¹⁹ This manuscript,²⁰ written c. 1016-20, includes a copy of a list of resting places of English saints which is found in several manuscripts.²¹ By way of amplification of that list, Birch published as an appendix to his edition a narrative of the later eleventh century 'Concerning the Translation of the Saints who rest in the Monastery of Thorney' from a manuscript formerly at Peterborough,²² which adds to our knowledge of the Thorney saints whose names in the list — 'Hereferth' or 'Herefridus episcopus' among them—are surely recited. The Thorney narrative describes how Aethelwold bishop of Winchester refounded the monastery at Thorney which had been destroyed by the
Danes, and set about endowing it with relics. We are told how Benedict Biscop's body was brought there about 973, and the narrative continues:

Not long afterwards (Aethelwold) heard of the merits of the blessed Herefrid bishop of Lincoln resting in Louth chief town of the same church. When all those dwelling there had been put to sleep by a cunning ruse, a trusty servant took him out of the ground, wrapped him in fine linen cloth, and with all his fellows rejoicing brought him to the monastery of Thorney and re-interred him. (Evolut adversum non multi tempore edoctur de merits beati Herefridii presulis Linconie requiescentis in Lutica uico priumario ejusdem ecclesie. Hunc quoque cautiori consilio soporatis cunctis ibidem manentibus fidelis uernaculis de terra suscipit sindone nobili involuit cunctisque comitis adeo gauitis Thornensi monasterio inducit et recondit.)

Birch, who was unaware of the Herefrid cult at Louth, could throw no light on the identity of this saint. He noted that 'there was Herefrid, Bishop of Winchester, A.D. 825, but nothing seems to connect him with Thornay except, perhaps, Aethelwold's interest in the Abbey'. He might have added that there is equally nothing to connect that bishop with Lincolnshire. The compilers of the Victoria County History article on Thorney, less cautious than Birch, assumed that the Thornay saint was the Winchester bishop. Birch himself supposed it to be more likely that the saint was the 'Herefrid, man of God' who was probably the priest to whom Boniface wrote and who, according to Bede's continuator, died in 747, but there is no evidence that the 'man of God' was a bishop.

Analysis of English medieval calendars by Francis Wormald brought Herefrid's name to light in a Bury St. Edmunds calendar of c. 1040, the twelfth century Thornay relic list, and a Deeping calendar of 1332 said by Wormald to represent the calendar of Thorney (of which Deeping was a cell). The Bury calendar agrees with the Louth records in giving his feast day as 27 February, though in the Deeping calendar it appears as 28 February. The latter has a second entry for Herefrid on 21 August which perhaps represents the date of translation of his remains to Thorney — a feast unlikely to have been commemorated at Louth. None of these dates corresponds to the feast of Herefrid of Auxerre, celebrated on 23 October. It is of particular interest that the two calendars and the relic list unite in describing St. Herefrid as a bishop, agreeing in this with the Thorney narrative, the fifteenth century Louth court rolls, and the list of Thorney saints in the chronicle of Hugh Candidus.

Wormald could say of Herefrid only that his identity was 'extremely obscure'. I believe that the clues to it, such as they are, lie in the Thorney narrative, the role connected account we possess of our saint. Admittedly the details of this appear suspect at first sight. In particular, there were no bishops of Lincoln until a century after the events described — that is, until the sea was transferred from Dorchester-on-Thames to Lincoln in 1072, when Remigius became the first bishop. But there were bishops of Lindsey until that see disappeared at the Danish conquest of Mercia in the ninth century. Lindsey may then for a time have been the concern of York, but after the Danelaw came under English rule Lindsey was, with Leicester, administered from Dorchester, and the sea was never re-established, though on at least two occasions in the tenth century a bishop was appointed to the special charge of Lindsey. However, there are reasons for thinking that the church of St. Mary of Lincoln — precursor of the cathedral — may before 1072 have acquired a pre-eminent position in Lindsey such as Lincoln itself undoubtedly had in secular matters, and this may have led to the titles of Lincoln and Lindsey being regarded as synonymous. Certainly we find Remigius, before the transfer of the see from Dorchester, already referring to the northermost portion of his diocese as Lincoln rather than Lindsey, and there are other examples from the early eleventh century of references to bishops of Lincoln before the transfer. Still, point out that 'the compilers of Domesday Book seem to have regarded Lindsey and Lincolnshire as interchangeable terms'. We should not therefore be surprised at finding the two equated by an eleventh century author in our Thorney narrative.

But if we may there interpret 'Lincoln' as Lindsey, two further problems have still to be solved. First, was Herefrid genuinely a bishop of Lindsey? Though the history of the see, like that of Lindsey generally before the Norman Conquest, is obscure, we possess what seems to be a complete list of its bishops, in which no one of this name occurs, from its foundation until the third quarter of the ninth century. The last bishop of whom we have certain knowledge is Beorhtred, who attests charters from 839 to 862. After that date, various bishops appear in Mercian charters who do not figure in episcopal lists and cannot readily be assigned to a particular see. It has been tentatively suggested that Eadbold, who attests a charter in 866, succeeded Beorhtred and was in turn succeeded by either Eadberht or Burghard, who both attest in 869, but these are really no more than guesses. The fact seems to be that in the twilight years of the see of Lindsey there is still room for another bishop, perhaps holding office for only a brief spell, whose name did not become known to national chroniclers though remembered locally. If our saint was genuinely a bishop of Lindsey he could have followed Beorhtred, or even a successor to Beorhtred, before the final subjugation of Lindsey by the Danes. In this connection it has to be remembered that we do not know when the see was actually suppressed, though it is unlikely to have been later than about 872-3 when the Danish army wintered at Torksey.

The second point is presented by Louth itself. What we are to make of the description of Louth in the Thorney narrative as vico primario ejusdem ecclesie, literally 'chief town of the same church' though in the context we must clearly understand 'church' in its larger sense of 'diocese'? If the diocese in question was Lindsey, the 'chief town' can only mean the seat of the bishop, and so can be none other than the mysterious 'Sidnacester'. But as Lincolnshire historians well know, the identification of this place has provided a fruitful field for conjecture without any wholly convincing solution being ever put forward, so that anyone who makes a fresh proposal does so at his own risk. Before going further, the present state of the case must be set out briefly. At the Council of Cloesho in 803, bishop Eadwulf of Lindsey attested as Eadwulf Syddensis civitatis episcopus. This appears to be the origin of the various forms found in medieval chronicles, such as Sinacostra, Sinacostrensis, Sidnacostrensis, and in civitate quae vocabatur Siddena, all seemingly corruptions, translations or adaptations of the one original attestation. Stow St. Mary near Lincoln was at one time much favoured as 'Sidnacester' but its claims do not survive a critical examination. It is now well recognized that in the Anglo-Saxon period civitas was consistently used to denote places of Roman origin, and there is no evidence of Roman occupation at Stow, nor for that matter any certain evidence for the existence of a church there before 1000. Lincoln itself has naturally been considered, but again there is nothing known which would identify it as 'Sidnacester'. Recent opinion has favoured Caistor.
which besides being a Roman site was of some importance in the late Saxon period, though I do not myself see that it has any better claim than Lincoln to have been the seat of the Lindsey bishops.44

What do we know of Louth’s early history which might enable us to judge its status in the ninth century more effectively? In 792 Offa, king of Mercia, selected Aethelheard, then abbot of the monastery of Louth (Hludensis monasterii), for the vacant see of Canterbury.13

There is no other documentary record until the Domesday Survey, but a pointer to Louth’s pre-Domesday local importance is provided by the villages of Ludford and Louthborough, respectively eight miles west and six miles north of Louth. Ludford, Ludeforde or Ludesforde in Domesday, is explained by Ekwall as ‘ford on the way to Louth’;14 it lies close to the point where the Roman road from Lincoln via Sixhills and Louthborough to the coast intersects the Romanized north-south trackway called High Street,14 and it seems likely enough that early travellers would tend to Louth by the way of this point. Louthborough, Ludburg in Domesday, seems to mean ‘burg (fort)’ belonging to Louth’,14 and it lies where the same Roman road crosses another Romanized trackway, known in the later Middle Ages as Louth Street or Barton Street.15 When we find two villages several miles from Louth in different directions with names derived from it already in existence in the eleventh century, we can be certain that Louth was a place of importance even before those villages received their names. It is also of interest that Bayley in 1834 recorded finds of coins in Louth of ‘Ethehelm, Edwelwold, Buildred, Ludcane’;16 I assume these to be Aethelbert and Aethelwald of Wessex, and Burged and Ludcan of Mercia, all of whose reigns fell within the half century 825-875. By the time we reach 1086, the Domesday Survey shows that Louth was a town — one of five in Lincolnshire — with a market, and a population estimated as exceeding 600 by Darby who finds that it ‘stood out as the main settlement of the Wold area and the area around in the eleventh century’.14

There seems no reason to doubt that the Hludensis of 792 is correctly identified with Louth, since the river Lud is accepted as taking its name from Old English hlud, ‘loud’,14 and Louth itself is regularly Latinized as Luda in the later Middle Ages. But what of the Syddensis of 803? It is tempting to explain this away as a clerical error for Hludensis, but there are reasons why this is most unlikely, not least the fact that it occurs in a formal document whose text shows signs of careful correction for errors. We cannot therefore base any identification of Louth with Sidnaceaster on a superficial resemblance of two place-names. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to reject such an identification merely because these names cannot be made to agree, if the rest of our evidence points to a different conclusion.18

The use of civitas, as has been said, implies a Roman site, a castrum, and Louth occupies what might seem to be a strategic position where the Romanized trackway of ‘Louth Street’ crosses the Lud. The only signs of Roman occupation so far discovered here have been coins. Bayley said that coins of Julius and Augustus Caesar, and a considerable number of coins of various Roman emperors from Tiberius to Hadrian inclusive, ‘as also plenty of Constantines’, had been found in various parts of Louth. He named the areas where coins (Saxon and Norman as well as Roman) had been chiefly found as ‘Saint Mary’s, the south side and the centre of the town’.19 Other finds of Roman coins, one on the Rasen Road, are recorded by Phillips.20 But something more than coins might surely have come to light if modern Louth occupies the precise site of a Roman settlement, unless past generations of townsmen have been singularly unobservant. If not, perhaps there is a neglected site close by; and here I believe that St. Mary’s church may provide us with a clue.

So far as is known, St. Mary’s had the status of a chapel of ease to St. James’s church. Yet there are details of its history which suggest something more. In 1267, as we have seen, an abbot of Bardney was elected in St. Mary’s church. In the fourteenth century St. Mary’s was the home of two gilds, the important one of Holy Trinity which maintained Thomas de Luda’s chantry there (although in the following century this gild was refounded in St. James’s church), and the gild of St. Swithin.21 In 1519 the Visitation of the deanery of Loutheske and Louthborough took place in St. Mary’s Church.22 Both the pre-Reformation accounts of St. James’s church and those of St. Mary’s gild when mentioning St. Mary’s church or churchyard always call it a church, whereas the other Louth chapel of ease, St. John the Baptist, is called a chapel each time.22 Unusually for a town chapel of ease, St. Mary’s had its own churchyard, the area of churchyard and church site together being estimated at one acre in 1724. (It remained in use for burials after the church was demolished, and between 1770 and 1854 was — with the help of an extension in 1827 — the sole burial ground for the parish.)22 The fabric of the church was evidently kept in good repair until the end of its life. In 1497 the churchwardens of St. Mary’s church were repaying by instalments a sum of £10 borrowed from St. Mary’s gild for the ‘beydying and reparacion’ of their church;23 and before it was converted into a school in the mid-sixteenth century it had a wooden steeple and three bells, and an attached chapel substantial enough to be fitted up and used for other purposes when the rest of the church was demolished.22
Not the least interesting feature of St. Mary's is its situation, on the northern edge of the town where there seems to have been only a very limited area of settlement in the post-Conquest period. Its relative isolation is emphasized by the borough charters of 1551 and 1560 which describe St. Mary's as 'near' Louth. Bayley suggested that St. James's church was built because the town had 'gradually receded from the northern hills' and that St. Mary's had been the original parish church. He produced no evidence which would support this, but nevertheless the question remains of why there should have been a substantial church on the edge of the town in addition to the parish church. Recent research has drawn attention to the many post-Conquest 'new towns' where the original parish church lies outside the town. Such a town was often provided with a new church of its own, but this remained a chapelry of the mother church and only rarely achieved full parochial status during the Middle Ages. In a few instances, however, what had been a chapel of ease is known to have taken the place of the original parish church, and it seems not beyond the bounds of possibility that St. Mary's and St. James's may have experienced some such change of status.

There is only one street name north of the Lüd for which there is any early evidence. This is Cisternegate, which adjoins the site of St. Mary's and can probably be identified with the Suxtenegate recorded in 1396. Recently the suggestion, echoing Bayley, has been made that 'part of the medieval and even Saxon settlement may have been on this (northern) side of the river'. Bearing in mind the finds of Saxon and Roman coins on the site of St. Mary's, it does not seem out of the question to suggest that 'Sidnacester' might be looked for on this side of the town. It may not be without significance that the early (c. 500) Anglo-Saxon cemetery in South Elkington parish is only a mile north-west of St. Mary's, for archaeologists have noticed that there seems to be a relationship between such early cemeteries and Roman towns. There is, too, an increasing consciousness that some sort of continuity, however tenuous, existed between Anglo-Saxon towns and Roman sites, whether towns or forts. Examples are of course plentiful of Anglo-Saxon use or re-use of Roman sites. What is uncertain is whether occupation was uninterrupted, especially when, as seems to have been the case with most of the Saxon Shore forts, no more than a church stood within the Roman walls. Is it possible that St. Mary's was such a church on such a site?

We have gone as far as the evidence will allow, and must return to the starting point. The essential credibility of the Thorny narrative of Herefrith seems to me beyond dispute. A good case has been made for the narrator's general faithfulness to his exiguous sources and for his refusal to embellish them when there must have been temptation to do so. Furthermore, when the Louth sources and the Thorny centred sources agree both on Herefrith's feast day and on his having been a bishop, these details can hardly be dismissed as invention. Aethelwold's spies must have learnt these facts at Louth before our saint's remains were removed to Thorny; and if it is accepted that Herefrith's death took place around 873, those spies a century later may well have found old men in Louth whose fathers had first-hand knowledge of the event and could not have been mistaken about his identity. If the Thorny narrator, a century after that, equated Lindsey with Lincoln, the confusion is understandable and, as we have seen, by no means uncommon. I conclude therefore with a hypothesis, whose proof or disproof must be left to archaeologists. I suggest that what is now St. James's church originated as the shrine of St. Herefrith, from which his remains were stolen for the greater glory of Thorny; that, assuming Herefrith was a bishop of Lindsey, and its last bishop, he is at least as likely to have been martyred by the Danes, and so to have warranted a shrine, as was Edmund king of East Anglia; and that such a shrine is likely to have been erected on the site of his martyrdom. St. Albans abbey stands on the traditional site of Alb's martyrdom outside the walls of the Roman city of Verulamium. May not Herefrith's shrine have stood outside the walls of 'Sidnacester'? And if so, does the site of St. Mary's church at Louth represent the site of the cathedral of the bishops of Lindsey?
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