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THESIS ABSTRACT

Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert from the ninth to the twelfth centuries

St Cuthbert’s literary cult was conceived in the late seventh and early eighth century with the production of three vitae, most importantly Bede’s prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti*. Over the ensuing centuries, the cult stimulated the production of a great wealth of hagiographic material: this thesis analyses the key Cuthbertine works that were written by his Church during a turbulent but also prosperous time, between the ninth century and the end of the twelfth. Each chapter takes as a specific focus one of these texts, using it as a basis for exploring a number of themes pertaining to the cult of St Cuthbert, wider developments in the cult of the saints, and the changing and variable uses of hagiographic and historical writing.

The first chapter takes the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto* as an example of a text combining property records with miracles, and written episodically over a period spanning more than a century, establishing the thesis’ triumvirate of themes: the fluidity of texts and of the representation of saints, and the enduring power of the Cuthbertine Church. Chapter Two explores the multi-faceted identity that the Cuthbertine Church sought to convey for itself in Symeon of Durham’s *Libellus de exordio*. The third and fourth chapters focus on two highly flexible and manipulated texts, *Capitula de miraculis sancti Cuthberti* and *Brevis relatio de sancto Cuthberto*, which appear in manuscripts together, and often amalgamated: they are used to examine how a saint’s image could be changed, and to question our often static notion of a text’s identity. The final chapter takes Reginald’s *Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus* to compare the miracle profiles of all the Cuthbertine texts, contextualising them with formative studies in the cult of saints such as the work of Sigal (1985) and Vauchez (1981). The thesis ends by suggesting that Cuthbert’s cult was still thriving at the end of the twelfth century, and continued to do so, in the semi-independent socio-political and cultural sphere of northern England and southern Scotland.

The discussions in these chapters are supplemented by four appendices: a table giving detailed synopses and a thematic breakdown of Reginald’s *Libellus*, and a table categorising and comparing the miracles that appear in all these Cuthbertine works provide the basis for exploring Cuthbert’s changing miraculous persona; a map charting the locations pertinent to Reginald’s *Libellus* shows the vibrant geographical extent of Cuthbert’s cult; a table of manuscripts illustrates the various permutations into which these texts may be worked.
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INTRODUCTION

Part I

Towards the end of the twelfth century, the Church of St Cuthbert at Durham produced a copy of Bede’s prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, now British Library MS Yates Thompson 26.¹ This is just one of 38 extant manuscripts containing that *Vita*, or at least part of it; there is convincing evidence to suggest that to this total may be added nearly 30 manuscripts that are now lost.² But Yates Thompson 26 is outstanding as a rare, beautifully illuminated *Vita*, opulently decorated with gold and rich colours; it is singled out here on account of these unique features, to demonstrate two key points. First, it was produced almost half a millennium after Bede wrote the prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti* in c.721, soon after Cuthbert’s death in 687:³ this manuscript marked 500 years of the importance of literary production in the Church of St Cuthbert. Second, it illustrates the immense wealth of that Church and the enduring veneration of Cuthbert, so long after cult and Church were established. This ornate manuscript, Yates Thompson 26, thus encapsulates the dual purpose of this thesis: to communicate the continual importance of writing to the cult and Church of St Cuthbert, and the continuing potency of Cuthbert’s cult, from the eighth century to the end of the twelfth, and beyond.

¹ The manuscript has been widely discussed, as a rare and rich example of an illuminated saint’s life, most extensively, and with reproductions of the surviving miniatures, in Dominic Marner, *St Cuthbert. His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham* (London, 2000). See also Malcolm Baker, ‘Medieval Illustrations of Bede’s *Life of St Cuthbert*’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 41 (1978), 16-49.
² The *Vita* is published, and its manuscripts discussed, in B. Colgrave, ed. & tr., *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede’s Prose Life* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 142-307 and pp. 20-42.
³ Bede’s prose *Vita* was predominant among the three lives produced soon after Cuthbert’s death. The remaining two are the Anonymous life of 698x705, in Colgrave, *Two Lives* pp. 60-139, and Bede’s verse life of 705x7, in W. Jaager, ed., *Bedas Metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti* (Leipzig, 1935); dating from Michael Lapidge, ‘Bede’s metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*’ in *CCC*, pp. 77-93. For discussion of these three lives, see below, pp. 25-6.
This period is significant for being marked at either end by Northumbrian golden ages. Bede cautioned in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and more explicitly in his *Letter to Egbert*, that the seventh- and eighth-century halcyon period in Northumbria, of which he had been such an important part, was coming to an end.\(^4\) This era had seen Northumbria as the dominant Anglo-Saxon power, particularly under kings Edwin (616-33), Oswald (634-42) and Oswiu (651-70), all of whom held *imperium* south of the Humber, and Ecgfrith (670-85) with whom Cuthbert had close contact.\(^5\) Furthermore, Oswald had overseen the establishment of Christianity in northern England, which stimulated the later-seventh-century literary flowering. It seems fitting that Bede, the greatest Northumbrian author, and champion of Cuthbert’s cult, should also have played a role in the second Northumbrian ‘Golden Age’ of the twelfth century, which also witnessed large amounts of writing and immense political power, as well as great building projects. These periods of immense power in the north of England serve to underline that this was not a marginalised, peripheral area, but a region with its own power structure and identity – this separateness, even independence, is an important underlying theme of this thesis.\(^6\)

This discussion of two powerful Northumbrian eras is not to imply that the interim period between these Golden Ages was a time of hardship and impotence, nor that the end of the twelfth century heralded the sudden collapse of this power. Between the eighth century and the twelfth, the Church of St Cuthbert was constantly changing, responding to outside influences such as Scandinavians, Normans and

\(^4\) Bede, *Letter to Egbert, Archbishop of York, EHD* I, pp. 799-810; Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds., *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History* (Oxford, 1969). See, for example, *HE* iv.26 (p. 429): ‘the hopes and strength of the English kingdom began to ‘ebb and fall away’” after the Northumbrians were defeated at the Battle of Nechtansmere (685) which ended the reign of King Ecgfrith of Northumbria. In the penultimate chapter of *HE*, v.23, Bede describes the portentous comets of 729 (p. 556), and remarks on the uncertainty facing the coming generations (p. 561).

\(^5\) See *VCB* ch. 24, pp. 234-8, in which Cuthbert receives a visit from Ecgfrith’s sister, Ælfflæd, and in which he is appointed bishop by Ecgfrith. Bede lists kings who hold *imperium* south of the Humber (*HE* ii.5, pp. 148-50), referred to later in *ASC* (ACDEF) *s.a.* 829 [827], p. 40, as Bretwalda.

\(^6\) In particular, see below, pp. 188-90.
church reform, in order to maintain its position of spiritual and political authority. Thus the Church moved its base from Lindisfarne, possibly to Norham, then to Chester-le-Street, briefly to Ripon, and finally settled at Durham in 995; the initially monastic Community gradually became a body of clerks holding hereditary positions before they were replaced by Benedictine monks in 1083. The power built and maintained during this time, often in the face of adversity, came to fruition in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, personified by strong bishops such as Hugh du Puiset, and symbolised by the imposing cathedral and castle. Such firm foundations ensured that this power of the Church of Cuthbert did not disappear at the end of the twelfth century.7

The Church and cult of St Cuthbert flourished – rather than merely survived – in the face of these immense changes between the eighth century and the twelfth. This was in no small part due to the writing emanating from the Church during the period: in particular, this very textual community produced several historical/hagiographical works which demonstrated, in spite of the changes, the enduring and intrinsic link between Cuthbert, his Church and his Community. This Cuthbertine writing is particularly fruitful for study not simply because of the quantity of texts that were produced in this formative period: internal references suggest that all bar one of these texts produced by Cuthbert’s Church for his cult are extant.8 These works are therefore a rare collection of works reflecting the unusually rich library that survived at Durham.9 Furthermore, this extant corpus of Cuthbertine texts not only spans a

7 For bibliographical discussion of all these events see below, pp. 10-24.
8 The only exception – the Cronica monasterii Dunelmensis – was, anyhow, largely a composite of surviving Cuthbertine works. It is reconstructed in H.H.E.Craster, ‘The Red Book of Durham’, EHR, 40 (1925), 504-35.
9 On this impressive library see Anne Lawrence-Mathers, Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 16-26.
broad temporal range of five centuries, but also varies greatly in style, and in location and circumstances of production.

Three *Vitae*, one by a monk of Lindisfarne and two by Bede, were written between 698 and c.721, within 35 years of Cuthbert’s death.\(^{10}\) The *Historia de sancto Cuthberto*, a hagiographical history interspersed with property grants, was produced at Chester-le-Street and at Durham in several stages between the late-ninth and mid-eleventh century.\(^{11}\) The *Capitula* (or *Liber* de miraculis et translationibus sancti Cuthberti), a collection of twenty-one Cuthbert miracles, was probably written in three groups between 1083 and 1124 in Durham.\(^{12}\) Within the same period, between 1104 and 1107-15, Symeon of Durham wrote his *Libellus de exordio procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*: a history focusing far more on the church and community than simply on their saint.\(^{13}\) A further text of around the same period - the *Brevis Relatio de sancto Cuthberto* - combines an abbreviated *Vita* with extracts from these two early-twelfth-century works. The final work in this corpus of Cuthbertine texts is Reginald of Durham’s *Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus*, a miracle collection of 141 chapters written in several stages between c.1165 and 1174.\(^{14}\)

Owing largely to this literary wealth, coupled with its material remains, Cuthbert’s cult has been extensively studied, particularly in recent years. Editions of

---

\(^{10}\) See above, p. 1, n. 2 and 3.

\(^{11}\) Its full title: *Historia de sancto Cuthberto, et de commemoratione locorum regionumque ejus priscæ possessionis, a primordio usque nunc temporis*. Ted Johnson South, ed. and tr., *Historia de sancto Cuthberto* (Cambridge, 2002); Arnold, *Sym.Op.* i. pp. 196-214. The dating has been the subject of recent debate: see below, pp. 34-41.


two of the above texts – the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto* and Symeon’s *LDE* – have been published within the past four years.\(^\text{15}\) Two diverse collections of essays – *St Cuthbert, his Cult and his Community to A.D. 1200* and *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* – and William Aird’s *St Cuthbert and the Normans* provide an impressive range of scholarship from the last fifteen years on Cuthbert’s cult and Church.\(^\text{16}\)

More broadly, this great range of literature emanating from Cuthbert’s cult over half a millennium provides a valuable focus for exploring the majesterial range of work on hagiography and saints cults produced over the last century. To highlight those works most pertinent to this study, Hippolyte Delehaye’s *Les légendes hagiographiques* was the first major study of the development of the hagiography, as a genre and in terms of individual cults.\(^\text{17}\) André Vauchez’s *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages* offers a wide-ranging typological study of saints in the western church, while Peter Brown’s *Cult of the Saints* analyses the way in which cults operated in society.\(^\text{18}\) Pierre-André Sigal’s vast study, *L’homme et le miracle*, categorises miracles and provides a thaumaturgical profile for western saints in the high middle ages.\(^\text{19}\) Ronald Finucane similarly uses a wide range of hagiographical sources, this time to explore the role of the miraculous within society.\(^\text{20}\) Many of the typologies put forth in these surveys of sainthood and hagiography offer interesting comparison with this focussed study of Cuthbertine hagiography, as do the ideas in more specific

---


work such as Thomas Head’s localised study of hagiography in the diocese of Orléans, Aviad Kleinberg’s work on living saints, and the scholarship of Baudouin de Gaiffier on property and saints’ cults, so often the twin bastions of a Church’s power.\footnote{Thomas Head, \textit{Hagiography and the Cult of the Saints. The Diocese of Orléans, 800-1200} (Cambridge, 1990); A. Kleinberg, \textit{Prophets in their own Country} (Chicago, 1992); Baudouin De Gaiffier, ‘Les revendications de biens dans quelques documents hagiographiques du XIe siècle’, \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 50 (1932), 123-38.} The theories and typologies of hagiography and sanctity in these works offer a well-defined background for this thesis, and will be drawn upon and questioned in this thesis, particularly in the final chapter which draws the Cuthbertine texts together.

The purpose of this thesis is thus firstly to use the wealth of scholarship on saints’ cults and hagiography and to complement these existing studies of Cuthbert’s cult and Church, to analyse the textual development of the Cuthbertine Community over the 500-year period of extensive literary production, examining the way in which historical writing can simultaneously use the recorded past and rewrite it. More generally it will explore the many genres of hagiographical writing exemplified by the corpus of Cuthbertine works; based on the strong and manipulative manuscript transmission of Cuthbertine material it will question the notion of identifying and defining specific texts. Thirdly, it will consider how saints’ cults may themselves be manipulated and adapted over a long period of time. Finally, returning to the specific focus of the work, it will question the widely accepted notion that Cuthbert’s cult declined from the later twelfth century to suggest that it maintained its power through this adaptation and manipulation.
Part II: Background to Cuthbert’s Church and Cult

Origins of Church and Cult

The wealth of secondary material on the Church and cult of St Cuthbert means that only a brief summary is required here. The church on Lindisfarne was established under the great Northumbrian king Oswald (634-42) in 635, after his victory over pagan rulers Penda of Mercia and Caedualla, rex Brittonum, at Heavenfield in 634. Oswald requested help from the church on Iona to convert the Northumbrian people and Bishop Aidan was sent. Aidan utilised royal centres in his missionary work, and the episcopal seat that he established on Lindisfarne was not simply reminiscent of the island site of Iona, and other Celtic foundations, but was also in close proximity to the Bernician royal seat at Bamburgh: from its outset, the church on Lindisfarne was at the heart of royal as well as ecclesiastical and spiritual power.

Aidan and Oswald have often been portrayed along with Cuthbert, as forming a saintly trio that formed the basis of the Church’s power; this ‘triptych’ is prevalent in Symeon’s LDE, in the inclusion of vitae of Aidan and Oswald in several manuscripts containing Bede’s Vita sancti Cuthberti, and in the dedications in the Chapel of the Nine Altars, behind Cuthbert’s shrine in Durham Cathedral. However,

---

22 On Northumbria in this period see David Rollason, Northumbria 500-1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom (Cambridge, 2003), and N. J. Higham, The Kingdom of Northumbria A.D. 350-1100 (Stroud, 1993); on St Cuthbert’s cult and Church from their beginnings, with a range political, archaeological and literary perspectives, see CCC; Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans also gives a useful summary of the Church from its foundation to the mid-twelfth century, with an emphasis on political and material power and associations. Anglo-Norman Durham discusses the power of Durham in the twelfth century, including much architectural and manuscript discussion.

23 HE iii.1-2, pp. 212-8. Caedualla is often identified as Cadwallon, king of Gwynedd, but this has recently been questioned by Alex Woolf, ‘Caedualla Rex Brittonum and the Passing of the Old North’, Northern History, 41 (2004), 5-24.

24 HE iii.3, pp. 218-20 and iii.5, pp. 226-8. On the relevance of the Celtic church’s involvement in this missionary activity, see Clare Stancliffe, ‘Oswald, “Most Holy and Most Victorious King of the Northumbrians”’, Clare Stancliffe and Eric Cambridge eds., Oswald, Northumbrian King to European Saint (Stamford, 1995), pp. 33-83 at 67-70.

25 See for example LDE i.1-3. pp.144-50. The nine altars are detailed in Rites of Durham, pp. 1-3. The vitae of Oswald and Aidan are derived from Bede’s HE and appear together in Oxford, Bodleian, MS
all these examples date from the twelfth century or later, and it seems that Cuthbert’s cult was given far greater precedence from its inception – only Cuthbertine vita were produced by the Church in the seventh and eighth centuries - and the resulting dominance of Cuthbert continued until the twelfth century and beyond.

St Cuthbert died in 687, a hermit living on Farne Island. The ostensibly contemplative and solitary situation of his death belies the very active nature of most of his earthly life. Even through the ascetic overtone of the anonymous hagiographer and Bede, it is evident that Cuthbert was very much involved in political and ecclesiastical events of the time. Cuthbert devoted himself to God as a child, after being cured by an angel, and vowed to enter a monastery after seeing a vision of Aidan’s soul at the time of his death. He entered the monastery of Melrose in 651, under the tutelage of Boisil, but soon went to Ripon when his Abbot, Eata, was sent there from Melrose by King Alhfrith (c.655-64). Cuthbert’s hagiographers and Eddius Stephanus, author of Wilfrid of Ripon’s Vita, all fail to divulge why, around the late 650s/early 660s, Eata, Cuthbert and the other Melrosian monks were forced from Ripon back to Melrose by the same King Alhfrith. However, the king’s choice of Wilfrid to replace Eata suggests that an adherent to the Roman practices was

Digby 175; Laon, Bibliothèque Publique MS 163; Oxford, Bodleian, MS Laud Misc. 491; London, British Library MS Add. 35110; Dijon, Bibliothèque Publique 657 (396); Vatican Library MS Codices Regiae Sueciae 483. See also A.J. Piper, ‘The First Generations of Durham Monks and the Cult of St Cuthbert’, CCC, pp. 437-446 at p. 439 and p. 443. See below, pp. 85-7, for discussion of this triumvirate.

26 For discussion of the following events of Cuthbert’s life, and discrepancies between the anonymous and Bedan vita see Clare Stancliffe, ‘Cuthbert and the Polarity between Pastor and Solitary’, CCC, pp. 21-44 at pp. 21-36.

27 VCB chs.1-4, pp. 154-66. A connection between Cuthbert and Aidan is important in the early vita, although it seems that the mantle of spiritual leadership is being passed from Aidan to the young Cuthbert, rather than them being presented as equally powerful saints. This dominance of Cuthbert is supported by the fact that the head of Oswald was kept in a coffin very clearly made for Cuthbert.
preferred over the Celtic monasticism of the Melrose brethren.\textsuperscript{28} From an early stage in his career, Cuthbert was involved in the political machinations of Northumbria.\textsuperscript{29}

Cuthbert remained at Melrose for some time, an exemplary monk, and prior from 664, who counselled fellow brethren and preached far from the monastery.\textsuperscript{30} At this time, his \textit{vitae} report, he came to be known for his great personal devotion, his prophetic ability, and his miraculous powers – a reputation recognised, and called upon, by kings, sheriffs, and peasants alike.\textsuperscript{31} The \textit{Vitae} skip rather hurriedly over Cuthbert’s appointment as prior of Lindisfarne and his first few years there, during which there appears to have been conflict between Cuthbert and some of the brethren who disliked his ways; Bede and the anonymous author prefer to emphasise their saint’s growing piety as he became a hermit on Farne Island several years after moving to Lindisfarne, possibly in 676.\textsuperscript{32}

Even as a hermit, though, Cuthbert was exposed to worldly affairs: this was implicit in his connection with King Ecgfrith’s sister Ælfflæd, in his continuing business with Eata at Melrose and, most of all, in his election to the bishopric of Lindisfarne in 685.\textsuperscript{33} In the style of St Martin, the model monk-bishop, Cuthbert’s episcopal status is portrayed in conflict with his asceticism;\textsuperscript{34} his continuing travels and the growing popular demand for his miraculous powers must also have interfered with his contemplative life.\textsuperscript{35} Whatever the tensions in his life, therefore, Cuthbert’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} VCB ch. 8, pp. 180-4, and Eddius Stephanus, \textit{Vita Wilfridi} ch. 8, B. Colgrave ed. and tr., \textit{Eddius Stephanus’ Life of St Wilfrid} (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 16-18.
\item \textsuperscript{29} On dynastic-church relations and Cuthbert, see J. Campbell, ‘Elements in the Background to the Life of St Cuthbert and his early cult’ in \textit{CCC}, pp. 3-19.
\item \textsuperscript{30} VCB ch. 9, pp. 184-6.
\item \textsuperscript{31} VCB chs.10-15, pp. 188-206.
\item \textsuperscript{33} VCB chs.23-25, pp. 230-40.
\item \textsuperscript{34} VCB chs.24, pp. 234-8, and 26, pp. 240-2. On the inherent, and ideal tension in the monk-bishop role see Stancliffe, ‘Pastor and Solitary’, pp. 36-42. See below, pp. 94-8 and 143 on monk-bishops.
\item \textsuperscript{35} VCB chs. 29-35, pp. 252-66.
\end{itemize}
reputation as a powerful churchman, pious hermit and thaumaturge was well-established before his death.

After Christmas in 686 Cuthbert returned to Farne Island, knowing that his death was near. He died on 20\textsuperscript{th} March 687, after making preparations for his burial and having expressed concern over the influx of pilgrims. He also prophetically suggested that the brethren should carry his body and flee should they ever face ‘the yoke of schism’.\textsuperscript{36} The first concern, over visitors to his tomb, could only have been compounded by the elevation of Cuthbert’s incorrupt body eleven years after his death, in 698. Cuthbert’s sanctity was underlined by this miracle, which stimulated his cult even further, and gave rise to the production of his first, anonymous \textit{Vita}.

**Locations of Church and Community**

The incorrupt body of Cuthbert was to become central to the survival, popularity and indeed identity of this Lindisfarne church, which became known as the Church or Community of St Cuthbert. The body of a saint inevitably became an essential tangible facet of many cults, making it possible to locate the cult in a precise position,\textsuperscript{37} and this issue of location is most pertinent in the case of Cuthbert. In many cults, once the relics had been placed, the edifice built around the shrine became synonymous with the saint’s cult. But Cuthbert’s body had no permanent abode and thus it was his body itself and not any geographical location which became the only permanent physical focus of the cult, at least until the settlement at Durham in 995.

Before tracing the movements of Cuthbert’s body and Community, however, it is necessary to discuss the importance of Lindisfarne itself. The island was the home of the Church of St Cuthbert for over a century after his death. During this time,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{36} VCB chs. 37, pp.270-80, and 39, pp.282-4.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} The importance of a saint’s body as representative of his presence in heaven and on earth is discussed in Brown, \textit{Cult of the Saints}, pp. 3-4.
\end{itemize}
Lindisfarne was a combination of safe haven, centre of political power, and, as a result, target for aggression from both sea and land. There is comparatively little written about the Church during this period, but three examples serve to illustrate:

King Ceolwulf retired to Lindisfarne in 737, escaping from troubles in the Bernician royal house,\(^{38}\) in a possibly connected event of 750, a certain Offa, son of Aldfrith king of Northumbria (686-705), fled to Lindisfarne from Ceolwulf’s successor Eadberht (737-58), resulting in Eadberht imprisoning Bishop Cynewulf of Lindisfarne at Bamburgh, and besieging his Church.\(^{39}\) The final example is that of the Viking attacks on Lindisfarne from 793. According to the \textit{LDE}, and more famously in Alcuin’s letters, these attacks inflicted huge losses on the Church.\(^{40}\) However, the fact that it remained on Lindisfarne for some time after 793 demonstrates the enduring power of this location. Indeed, much later it was a safe haven for the Community, when it fled from William of Normandy’s ‘harrying of the north’ in 1069, and when Edward the Monk rebuilt the church there in the twelfth century, its status as a popular cult centre was enhanced. It is significant that the focus of the cult on Lindisfarne became the \textit{tumba} where Cuthbert’s body had once lain, and that the church there bore many striking similarities to Durham cathedral: Lindisfarne by the

\(^{38}\) \textit{HSC} 8, p. 48; \textit{LDE} ii.1, p. 78; \textit{H.Reg. s.a.} 737, p. 32; Campbell, ‘Elements in the Background’, p. 15. \(^{39}\) \textit{LDE} ii.2, pp. 78-80; \textit{H.Reg. s.a.} 750, pp. 39-40. Aird discusses the relationship of Cuthbert's Church to Northumbrian dynastic struggles, \textit{Cuthbert and the Normans}, pp. 22-3. \(^{40}\) \textit{LDE} ii.5, p. 91: ‘So the church of Lindisfarne was ravaged and despoiled of its ornaments, but nevertheless for a long time afterwards an episcopal see remained there with the holy body of the blessed Cuthbert and those monks who had been able to escape from the hand of the barbarians/\textit{Taliter ecclesia Lindisfarrensi uastata et suis ornamentis spoliata, nichilominus tamen in ea sedes episcopalis et qui barbarorum manus efugere poterant monachi apud sacram corpus beati Cuthberti multo post tempore permanerunt’}. Alcuin’s letter to Æthelred, king of Northumbria, of 793 dramatically describes ‘the Church of St Cuthbert, spattered with the blood of the priests of God’, \textit{EHD} i, no. 193, pp. 842-844; his letter to Higbald, bishop of Lindisfarne goes so far as to question why Cuthbert does not defend his own, \textit{EHD} i, no.194, pp. 844-846.
twelfth century was intrinsically connected with Durham, still harbouring Cuthbertine power but as an echo of the ultimate power held at Durham.\textsuperscript{41} The first translocation of Cuthbert’s Church is recorded only in \textit{HSC} which claims that during Ecgred’s episcopate (830-846/7), the church of Lindisfarne was transported to Norham and rebuilt. The author is careful to note that the body of Cuthbert was translated at the same time.\textsuperscript{42} Whilst there is no evidence elsewhere for this move, concentrated Viking attacks on churches in the period 820-830 show that there was a real threat to the exposed location of Lindisfarne.\textsuperscript{43} It is significant that Norham became an enduring cult centre due to its association with Cuthbert’s body and Community: it had a church dedicated to the saint and several later-twelfth-century miracles demonstrate the continuing importance of the site.\textsuperscript{44}

There is no extant evidence for the Community’s return to Lindisfarne, but the \textit{HSC} and \textit{LDE} concur that the Community fled from that island in the face of renewed Viking attacks led by Halfdan; the \textit{Historia Regum}, also partly attributed to Symeon, confirms that this was in 875.\textsuperscript{45} Cuthbertine sources convey great hardship


\textsuperscript{42} \textit{HSC} 9, pp. 48-50. The body of Ceolwulf, king of Northumbria (729-37, d.764) and dedicatee of Bede’s \textit{HE}, who resigned his royal position in favour of the monastic life, was also translated to Norham. It could be ventured that the term \textit{reædicavit} used in \textit{HSC} is figurative, referring to the re-establishing of the Community, rather than to a physical process of construction. Equally, the reference to transporting the Church could refer to the people rather than the building. Indeed, \textit{LDE} ii.5, p. 92, implies that a new church was built at this time, although Eric Cambridge writes that the wooden church built on Lindisfarne in the seventh century survived transportation to Norham. Eric Cambridge, ‘Why did the Community of St Cuthbert settle at Chester-le-Street?’ in \textit{CCC}, pp. 367-386 at p. 371. Cf. \textit{LDE} ii.5, p. 92, which discusses Norham but records that a church was built at Norham, dedicated to Cuthbert, Peter and Ceolwulf, but housed only the body of Ceolwulf.

\textsuperscript{43} Aird, \textit{Cuthbert and the Normans}, p. 25; P.H. Sawyer \textit{Kings and Vikings} (London, 1982), pp. 84-5 shows that, according to the \textit{Annals of Ulster}, nearly 80% of Viking attacks between 820 and 920 took place from 820-830.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Libellus} ch. 20, 57 and 73; pp. 43, 115 and 149.

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{HSC} 12, pp. 50-2 and 20, p. 58. \textit{LDE} ii.6 and 13, pp. 100-2 and 120-2. \textit{H.Reg. s.a.} 875, p. 110. For authorship see Rollason, \textit{LDE}, p. xlviii.
being endured during the ensuing period of wandering, when the Cuthbertine Community travelled as far as Whithorn in Galloway. However, as David Rollason argues, the route covered during these travels networks the vast swathe of lands held by the bishop and Community. It is possible that, far from being a time of aimless wandering in poverty, this period was in fact spent asserting the power of a foundation that remained very rich despite its displacement. Indeed, this argument is supported by the fact that the Community and coffin resided at Crayke for several months towards the end of these wanderings: this mansio was a key Cuthbertine possession about ten miles north of York on a route linking with Chester-le-Street and Lindisfarne, along with other land holdings.

The Community settled in Chester-le-Street, some time between 880 and 885, and this perhaps illustrates further the great power of the Cuthbertine church, even in the face of Viking incursions. The Community increasingly received land in the southern reaches of Northumbria and beyond; the settlement at Chester-le-Street would have facilitated better jurisdiction over these southern holdings than could have been wielded from Lindisfarne. If Lindisfarne had been at the heart of the initial endowment of land when the monastery and see were founded, this gradual expansion to the south rendered Chester-le-Street nearer to the ninth-century geographical centre of the patrimony. The Community remained there for just over a

46 The hardship is particularly evident in LDE ii.12, pp.120-126.
48 HSC 5, p. 46; LDE ii.13, pp. 120-6. Eric Cambridge notes the importance of Crayke as a staging post on the route between Lindisfarne and York. Furthermore, in support of the great material power of the Community and See, Cambridge uses archaeological evidence to suggest that Lindisfarne may have been connected to Chester-le-Street prior to the settlement there, Cambridge, ‘Why Chester-le-Street?’ pp. 379-382 and p. 385.
49 See Rollason, LDE, pp. 123-4, n.78 for discussion of these dates. The prosperity of the Cuthbertine community continued in contrast to many other foundations at the hands of the Vikings. The trend was one of great land loss and often closure of monasteries, R. Fleming, ‘Monastic lands and England’s defence in the Viking Age’, EHR, 395 (1985), 247-265.
hundred years until 995 when the second wave of Viking incursions caused them to flee with the body of Cuthbert. They went to Ripon, a connection possibly forged by Cuthbert’s time there with Eata of Melrose,\(^{51}\) remaining there for a few months before their attempts to return to Chester-le-Street were thwarted, apparently by Cuthbert’s intercession. His coffin became immoveable at Wrdelau and was only released when a vision prompted the Community to re-establish at nearby Durham.\(^{52}\) This failure to return to Chester-le-Street may, however, have been stimulated by more than Cuthbert’s miracle alone. It is peculiar, especially when compared with ostensibly less significant locations such as Norham, that there is no mention of an active Cuthbert cult at Chester-le-Street in any text after the tenth-century HSC, and this perhaps implies that the Church was unable to return for political reasons but found it more diplomatic to explain the decision via a miracle.

The choice of Durham as a new location for the Church probably owes most to political incentive. Earl Uhtred of Bamburgh was the son-in-law of Bishop Ealdhun and was involved in building the new church: these familial connections probably led the church to Durham in 995. Work began almost immediately on ‘a church of noble workmanship and by no means small in scale’; Cuthbert’s body was translated there three years later, but not before his presence in a temporary church had stimulated miracles and created a minor cult centre.\(^{53}\) This church was itself replaced when in 1093 work began on the cathedral that now stands in Durham, under the instruction of Bishop William de St Calais.\(^{54}\) This powerful edifice represented

\(^{51}\) \textit{VCB} ch. 7, pp.174-9.
\(^{52}\) \textit{LDE} (iii.1, pp.144-8) records that they were led from Chester-le-Street by Bishop Ealdhun following a vision warning of imminent Viking attack. However, the dating could be confused here, as the \textit{ASC} (CDE) records Scandinavian raids not in 995 but in 993 (p. 83), when Bamburgh was sacked.
\(^{53}\) \textit{LDE} iii.2-4, pp. 148-152. “\textit{presul antedictus [Bishop Ealdhun], amore Christi et sancti Cuthberti feruens, ecclesiam honesto nec paruo opere inchoavit, et ad perficiendum omni studio intendit’}. See also \textit{Libellus} ch. 16, pp. 28-32.
\(^{54}\) \textit{LDE} iv.8, p. 245.
the power of the Church in the north; Cuthbert offered his sanction when his body was translated to the cathedral in 1104 and found to be still uncorrupt.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, much later, in 1537 when Henry VIII’s men sought to crush the monastic life in Durham, Cuthbert’s body and its miracle of uncorruptness continued to inspire fear and reverence.\textsuperscript{56}

The Community

Just as Cuthbert’s body was an essential symbol of continuity for this itinerant Church, so the Community that carried it and protected it became synonymous with the institution. Indeed, the Community was required to sustain the link between Cuthbert and Church, in the day-to-day maintenance of his cult and, most pertinent here, by their writing.

The number of Community members, and the type of religious observance followed by them, changed markedly during the period, although any assessment of the Community’s composition is obscured by texts with a strong monastic emphasis, in particular De miraculis and LDE.\textsuperscript{57} It appears that, although several monks were killed, monastic observance continued on Lindisfarne beyond the first Viking raid of 793:\textsuperscript{58} whatever the Community’s connection with Norham in the 830s, the influence seems to have been monastic in character, because the HSC records Tilred’s efforts to become Abbot of Norham in the early tenth century.\textsuperscript{59} By 875 however, those monks who had survived the Viking raid of 793 had died, and the Community, or


\textsuperscript{56} Rites of Durham, Rev. Canon Fowler, ed., SS 107 (1902), p. 102.

\textsuperscript{57} See below, pp. 92-8 and 143-4.

\textsuperscript{58} LDE ii.5 and 6, pp. 86-104.

\textsuperscript{59} HSC 21, pp. 58-60.
congregatio\textsuperscript{60} as they became known until 1083, was composed of ‘those who had been brought up and educated among the monks from childhood, albeit in the habit of clerks’.\textsuperscript{61} The difference between the observance of these clerks and that of the earlier monks is not described and nor is the reason for this transition, although it may be inferred from tales of barbaric Viking attack that a fully monastic life was no longer tenable.

From the first generation of clerks, the Cuthbertine Church was represented by a core of bishop, an ‘abbot’/dean, and seven men, from whom were descended the congregatio until it was replaced by Benedictines in 1083.\textsuperscript{62} This core was surrounded by priests and clerks,\textsuperscript{63} but the congregatio itself was composed of these seven men, often referred to during the period of wandering as Cuthbert’s coffin bearers, guarding the Church’s great relic. It seems that, although clerical in habit, the congregatio continued to follow for two centuries the customs passed down by the last generation of Lindisfarne monks, until the episcopate of Walcher (1072-80) who ordered that offices of the clerks be observed.\textsuperscript{64}

However, despite the continuing monastic observance, this group was formed of hereditary posts. The congregatio passed down their positions, along with prestige

\textsuperscript{60} The earliest use of the term congregatio is in HSC 31, pp. 66-8.
\textsuperscript{61} LDE ii.6, pp. 102-3: They ‘followed the body of the holy father wherever it was carried, and they always preserved the custom – which had been handed down to them by their teachers the monks – of singing the day and night offices’.
\textsuperscript{62} The title ‘abbot’ appears concerning the period after 875, eg. in De Miraculis ch. 2, Sym. Op., i, p. 234-7, and LDE ii.11, p. 112, possibly to emphasise that monasticism continued in some form. The term ‘dean’ appears in LDE iv.3, p. 230. For more on the composition of the Community, see M.Foster, ‘Custodians of St Cuthbert: The Durham Monks’ views of their predecessors, 1083-c.1200’, AND, pp. 53-65 at p. 53; cf. Hall, ‘Community of St Cuthbert’, p. 110, who suggests that the number seven, as with the number of years wandering, is symbolic and thus possibly legendary. On Symeon’s representation of the clerical Community, see Piper, ‘First Durham Monks and the Cult’, pp. 439-41.
\textsuperscript{63} A group of varying size that travelled with the congregatio is mentioned several times in Symeon’s LDE, eg. ii.10, p. 110, and ii.12, p. 116.
\textsuperscript{64} LDE iii.18, pp. 194-6.
and sections of the church’s land, through the generations; these men were by no means fully monastic, and lived in a secular world of families and material possessions.\(^{65}\) Thus, the core of the Cuthbertine Church at this time did not simply lie in a compact and enclosed community and its cult, but extended through a network of familial and patrimonial ties. Of course, throughout the Church’s history there was a secular group of people – the haliwerfolc (people of the saint) – who inhabited land in Cuthbert’s patrimony and therefore became associated with the power of the Church.\(^{66}\) But the hereditary congregatio was a far more direct form of extended secular control than was seen after monasticism had been reintroduced in 1083.\(^{67}\)

There has been some debate over whether Cuthbert’s misogynist miracles, notably in \(LDE\) and in Reginald’s \(Libellus\), are an indication of hostility after 1083 to this worldly clerical Community.\(^{68}\) However, it seems unlikely that Symeon would contradict his efforts, seen throughout the \(LDE\), to underline the perpetual monastic-style presence surrounding Cuthbert.\(^{69}\) Indeed, punishing women who threatened to violate the monastic piety maintained around Cuthbert could be seen as an illustration of his constant protection over his congregatio. Furthermore, it is possible that such misogyny was indicative of the need after 1083 to establish convent control over land

\(^{65}\) The most obvious example is of Elfred Westou, given especial prominence in \(LDE\) iii.7, pp. 160-6. Elfred’s significance is enhanced further in Reginald’s \(Libellus\) where he becomes revered as great-grandfather of Aelred of Rievaulx: \(Libellus\) chs. 16, pp. 28-32, and 26, pp. 57-60. On the prestige of descent from another two of the congregatio, see \(LDE\) iii.1, pp. 146-8. See also \(Libellus\) ch. 15, pp. 22-8 and ch. 16, pp. 28-32.

\(^{66}\) The Haliwerfolc appear as populus sancti Cuthberti on several occasions – in particular, see \(De mir.\) ch. 9, Sym. Op. ii, p. 339; \(LDE\) ii.11, p. 114 and n.66; other instances are at \(LDE\) index, p. 342. See Aird, \(Cuthbert and the Normans\), pp. 5-8 and Hall, ‘Community of St Cuthbert’, ch. 1. G.T. Lapsley, \(The County Palatinate of Durham: A Study in Constitutional History\) (London, 1900), pp. 22-4, n.6, discusses the term.

\(^{67}\) Aird, \(Cuthbert and the Normans\), pp. 116-22.

\(^{68}\) V. Tudor, ‘The misogyny of Saint Cuthbert’, \(Archaeologia Aeliana, 5^{th}\) series, 12 (1984) 157-167; see also Rollason, \(LDE\), p. lxxxiii.

\(^{69}\) \(LDE\) ii.6, pp. 104-5: ‘So the body of that same father Cuthbert, who was at the same time both bishop and monk, never lacked the zeal and obedience of monks down to the time of the aforementioned Walcher’? ‘Nec tamen corpori eiusdem patris Cuthberti pontificis simul et monachi, monachorum unquam usque ad predicti Walcheri tempora sedulitas defuit vel obsequium’. See also \(LDE\) i.2, pp. 20-2. Discussed by Foster, ‘Custodians of St Cuthbert’, p. 58.
that was held by the hereditary *congregatio*, some of it by women who had married its members.\(^{70}\)

The monastic implantation of 1083 certainly involved a great change in personnel, if not in observance. In that year, the Benedictine monks from the recently re-established Wearmouth and Jarrow were transferred to Durham by Bishop William de St Calais; Symeon of Durham, our most detailed source on this event, states that only one member of the *congregatio* entered the new convent.\(^{71}\) Such a sudden change might be expected to stimulate opposition, especially from the secular nexus surrounding the *congregatio*, dispossessed of land as well as ecclesiastical position; the lack of record of such opposition has led Aird to conclude that there was rather more continuity between the *congregatio* and 1083 Benedictine convent than Symeon suggests. However, as Rollason has argued, such distortion seems unlikely in Symeon’s near-contemporary account.\(^{72}\) It is however possible that, whilst sudden change did occur within the immediate Church brethren, the transfer of land was a rather more gradual process, thus avoiding reaction against events of 1083. Eric Cambridge’s suggestion, that the high-status church at Norton was built for the usurped *congregatio*, certainly implies that the actions of 1083 were compromising and not ruthless.\(^{73}\)


\(^{71}\) *LDE* iv.3, pp. 228-34. Walcher, bishop of Durham (1072-80), had facilitated the refoundation of Wearmouth and Jarrow. See below, pp. 101-3 for significance of Wearmouth and Jarrow in connection with Bede.


The introduction of Benedictines in 1083 certainly did not remove the issue of the Cuthbertine Community’s interest in property and rights. Tensions between bishop and convent over material and jurisdictional power persisted throughout the twelfth century and into the thirteenth, reflecting the changing roles of different members of Cuthbert’s entourage. Throughout the wanderings and purported sufferings of the late-eighth to the eleventh century the bishops had largely been portrayed as strong leaders, representing monasticism and guiding the *congregatio*.

By the late eleventh century, bishops were far more secular lords than pious figureheads: Walcher (1072-80) serves as a good example: a non-monastic bishop who concurrently held the earldom of Northumbria from 1076, until he was murdered in 1080.

Walcher’s successor, William de St Calais (1080-96) appears, through Symeon’s somewhat roseate lens, to have enjoyed cordial relations with the convent, but he laid the foundations for later unrest, dividing church property into episcopal and conventual; his lengthy exile and the three-year vacancy after his death allowed the convent to assert its influence, under the priorate of Turgot.

Property issues and growing convent power initiated under William de St Calais combined to create problems between the episcopate and monks under the notorious Ranulf Flambard (1099-1128) and similarly autonomous Geoffrey Rufus (1133-41). By the end of

---

74 Eg. *De mir* chs. 2 and 6, *Sym. Op*. i, pp. 234-7 and pp. 245-7; *LDE* ii.6, p. 100 and p. 104; ii.16, p. 128; ii.20, p. 142; iii.1, pp. 144-6. There are some exceptions, notably Æthelric and his brother Æthelwine during the eleventh century, *LDE* iii.9, pp. 168-72; iii.11, p. 174; iii.17, pp. 192-4.

75 *LDE* iii.18, pp. 194-6 and iii.23, p. 212. See below, pp. 94-8 and 112-8 for discussion of bishops and their relations with the Community.


77 For detailed discussion of these problems, see Aird, *Cuthbert and the Normans*, pp. 167-83. As J.O. Prestwich writes (‘The Career of Ranulf Flambard’, *AND*, pp. 299-310), Flambard’s career has
this latter episcopate, the convent was in the ascendency, and under William de Ste
Barbe the monastic franchise and status of the prior grew considerably. The power-
struggle re-emerged though, under Bishop Hugh du Puiset (1154-95), culminating in
the deposition of Prior Thomas in 1162. Again, though, the convent reasserted itself,
largely through a series of forged charters backdating monastic rights to the late
eleventh century: a very powerful example of the use of writing by this textual
community. While issues over rights were finally somewhat settled during Hugh du
Puiset’s episcopate, and officially resolved with the Convenit in the early thirteenth
century, the pattern had been established, of powerful bishop alternately conflicting
with and balancing a powerful convent.

Whilst the above relations between bishop and convent were formative, it is
important to note that they do not appear to have destabilised the Cuthbertine Church.
The ongoing struggle for balance of power did not distract from, or make vulnerable
to, the outside world; rather it confirmed and asserted the integral power within the
Cuthbertine Church in the twelfth century. Furthermore, such tensions were not
unique to Durham, but characterised many bishop/convent relationships in the Anglo-

---


80 Offler, Durham Episcopal Chapters, nos. *3-*7, pp. 6-63. For some discussion of these charters see the appendix of Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, pp. 300-7; David Bates, ‘The Forged Charters of William the Conqueror and Bishop William of St Calais’, AND, pp. 111-124; Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans, pp. 156-60.

Norman period. As well as reflecting twelfth-century monastic reform, this widespread conflict over convent rights was largely due to the fact that bishops were figureheads of Norman influence, ruling over churches that remained largely Anglo-Saxon for some time. The resilience of the Cuthbertine convent in the face of such Normanisation is clear testimony of the enduring independence of the Church in the twelfth century.

Associations of the Church

Thus far, discussions of the Community and locations of the Cuthbertine Church have been rather insular. This is representative of the autonomy of the Church, but should not imply that it was isolated. Indeed, the Church’s vast network of secular and ecclesiastical connections was essential for its survival and maintenance of power. Such connections are the major impetus behind some of the Cuthbertine texts, and so will be discussed in further detail in the relevant chapters, but some summary is appropriate here.

It has been seen that the Lindisfarne Church was founded by the Northumbrian king, and that Cuthbert, during his life, was associated with royalty. The location of Lindisfarne, just across the water from the royal Bernician seat at Bamburgh, served to emphasise the connection between these great ecclesiastical and secular powers which was to endure throughout the period in question. As England became nominally unified, Northumbria maintained some degree of independence.

---

82 Crosby, Bishop and Chapter, pp. 30-47. For example, the monks of Bury St Edmunds conflicted with the bishops of Norwich, although it should be noted that this is different from the Durham example of conflict between a bishop and his own monastic church. See Jocelin of Brakelond, Chronicle of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, Diana Greenaway and Jane Sayers, ed. & tr. (Oxford, 1989). Another example is that of Canterbury: see Crosby, Bishop and Chapter, pp. 66-105.
84 The lack of Domesday coverage for this part of England is clear evidence for the semi-independence of this area. See below, pp. 188-90, for discussion.
85 In particular King Ecgfrith and his sister Ælfled. See above, p. 9.
and the House of Bamburgh, along with the Cuthbertine Church, was key to upholding this. Earls of Bamburgh afforded especial significance in the Cuthbertine texts are Uhtred, who was instrumental in the settlement of the Church at Durham in 995, and Tostig, who influenced the choice of Durham bishops and was a generous benefactor.\textsuperscript{86} Relations were not always cordial or entirely positive: to the examples mentioned above, of King Ceolwulf (729-37) and Offa, son of King Aldfrith (686-705), can be added several other problematic instances. Often the Cuthbertine Church seems to have been a bastion of unity amidst the feuding northern earls and kings: King Osbert (848/9-62; restored 867) and Ælle (862-7) were in conflict and then allied to seize lands from Cuthbert’s Church,\textsuperscript{87} and Osulf murdered the Norman implanted Copsi in 1067.\textsuperscript{88}

The involvement of Normans in the North sheds an interesting light on the relations between the Church and the native earls. In two cases – of Cospatrick and Waltheof – the Normans were directly responsible for the native ruler’s demise, but the lack of local reaction implies that, as Aird writes, the Church and haliwerfolc feared the local nobility just as much as the Normans.\textsuperscript{89} Waltheof was, in fact, the last native earl of Northumbria. His replacement by Walcher, the first bishop of Durham implanted by the Normans, reflects the Norman attempts to harness the north in the late eleventh century, and is further evidence of the Cuthbertine Church’s intrinsic involvement in secular politics.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{86} LDE iii.2, pp. 148-50; iii.9, pp. 170-2; iii.11, pp. 174-6.
\textsuperscript{87} HSC 10, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{88} H Reg s.a. 1072, pp. 143-4. Interestingly this was not recounted in LDE, which only mentions Copsi briefly, iii.14, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{89} LDE iii.16, p. 188-92 and iii.6, pp. 95-9. Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans, p. 67. Earl Cospatrick (1067-72), was deposed, possibly owing to a failed rebellion against the Normans and Waltheof (1072-5; d.1076) was an important player in a feud and eventually executed for rebelling against William of Normandy.
\textsuperscript{90} LDE iii.23, p. 212.
The Cuthbertine Church was not, therefore, a powerless bystander amidst secular conflict. Indeed, the Church seems to have actively fostered dynastic connections outwith Northumbria from an early stage. Probably the earliest example of this is in relations with Scandinavians. Certainly, there was some risk from Viking leaders, such as Halfdan in 875, and Ragnald and Onalafald in the early tenth century, but the Church withstood such threats, and fostered positive links by helping to install Guthred as King of York (883-95).\footnote{Halfdan: \textit{HSC} 12, pp. 50-2; \textit{LDE} ii.6, pp. 94-6, ii.13, pp. 120-2. Ragnald and Onalafald: \textit{HSC} 22-4, pp. 60-2, \textit{LDE} ii.16, pp. 128-32; Guthred: \textit{HSC} 13, pp. 52-3; \textit{LDE} ii.13, pp. 122-6.} The \textit{HSC} slightly awkwardly projects Cuthbertine connections with the West Saxon dynasty back to 878: in an often-cited miracle, Cuthbert helped Alfred to victory against the Vikings. However, relations with the West Saxons were probably forged during the subsequent reign, of Edward the Elder, and strengthened under Æthelstan and Edmund, all of whom gave generously to the Church, the latter two also visiting the shrine.

There is a dearth of information concerning the Cuthbertine community in the second half of the tenth century, but this mutual support between the powerful West Saxon dynasty and the Church of St Cuthbert seems to have established a pattern of English kings venerating Cuthbert, often to secure favour in the independent north. There are two prominent examples depicted by Symeon: a pious Cnut embraced the cult of Cuthbert by making a barefoot pilgrimage to the shrine at Durham;\footnote{\textit{LDE} iii.8, pp. 166-8.} William of Normandy was initially sceptical of Cuthbert’s power but after the violent murder of his Norman Earl Robert Cumin (1068-9), and following a well-timed intervention by Cuthbert, the king was persuaded of Cuthbert’s power.\footnote{\textit{LDE} iii.15, pp. 182-4, iii.19-20, pp. 196-200.}
This latter example is indicative of William’s realisation that Cuthbert and his Church held immense influence in the north. The widespread dedications to Cuthbert and the close links with other important ecclesiastical institutions provide more earthly evidence in support of the miraculous manifestations. Cuthbert was the patron of many churches across northern England and southern Scotland, and dedications and liturgical texts show that his cult was also venerated further south in England and on the continent, and possibly in Ireland. Alongside this popular support for Cuthbert’s cult, the Church was part of an institutional northern nexus including Melrose and Rievaulx, and was linked to Waltham and to St Albans in the south.

**Part III: The Texts**

From the diverse and complex history of the Cuthbertine Church between the eighth century and the twelfth, it is clear that it was largely defined by change. Changing circumstances generated a need to redefine and justify the identity, power and parameters of the Church, cult and community, and texts responded to this need for change. They were created to form an unbroken literary thread through an often interrupted existence.

---


96 Walcher forged the connection with Waltham, *LDE* iii.23, pp. 210-2. There was tension with St Albans over the possession of Tynemouth, iv.4, pp. 234-6, but the prominent role of Abbot Richard of St Albans at the 1104 exhumation of Cuthbert’s body implies that relations were cordial, *De mir* 18, *Sym. Op.* i, pp. 247-61, and 19, *Sym. Op.* ii, pp. 359-61.
Of course, this literary thread began in the late seventh and early eighth centuries, with the three lives of Cuthbert. Much scholarship has been produced on these, particularly on the work of Bede, and these *vitae* are therefore not discussed individually in this thesis, but they do require some introduction here to lay the foundations of the texts that are focal to the current study. In particular, Bede should be seen as the literary root of the Cuthbertine hagiographical tradition.\(^97\) The first *Vita sancti Cuthberti* was written soon after the death of the saint, between 699 and 705, and Bede wrote a metrical life c.705 to accompany the anonymous *Vita*.\(^98\) But Bede’s prose work was written c.721 to create a higher profile for the cult of Cuthbert and replace the earlier anonymous *Vita* as the basis for the veneration of the saint.\(^99\)

This is demonstrable in several ways. First, according to their prologues, both Bede’s prose and the anonymous *Vitae* were written at the request of the same bishop, Eadfrith; it seems unlikely that the same man would have requested a second prose life had he not considered the first in need of replacement. Second, Bede wrote his prose life to accompany his verse, conforming to the models of Sedulius’ *Carmen* and *Opus Paschale*, as he himself acknowledged in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and thus enhancing the profile and prestige of the written cult.\(^100\) Third, one must look to the circumstances that prompted Eadfrith to request a further *Vita*, and Bede to seek further prestige for the cult. Late seventh- and early eighth-century Northumbrian ecclesiastical politics centred on the division between the Celtic and Roman Church. Wilfrid was heavily involved in this controversy, and his cult was growing in the

---

98 Colgrave gives these dates for the first *Vita*, *Two Lives*, p. 13. Michael Lapidge discusses the verse life, ‘Bede’s Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*’.
99 Dating given by Colgrave, *Two Lives*, p. 16.
early eighth century, possibly prompting a need to reinforce Cuthbert’s cult against opposition.\footnote{On Wilfrid’s cult and its political context, see D.H. Farmer, ‘Saint Wilfrid’ in D. Kirby, ed., \textit{St Wilfrid at Hexham} (Newcastle, 1974), pp. 35-59 and in the same volume, D.P. Kirby, ‘Northumbria in the time of Wilfrid’, pp. 1-34.} Furthermore, the anonymous life was written at a time when it was politic to illustrate only the Roman connections of Cuthbert, ignoring his Ionan connections: the Bedan \textit{Vita} was apt to mention that Cuthbert was tonsured at Melrose, conflicting with the anonymous author’s claim that he received a Petrine tonsure. Twenty years after the anonymous \textit{Vita}, it may have seemed more expedient to present a Cuthbert personifying the melange of Roman and Celtic Christianity within the English Church.\footnote{This would render Cuthbert superior to Wilfrid who was usually portrayed with strong Roman leanings. Stancliffe, ‘Pastor and Solitary’, pp. 23-4; Carole E. Newlands, ‘Bede and Images of Saint Cuthbert’, \textit{Traditio} 52 (1997), 73-109 at 78.} Finally, a comparison of the manuscript transmission of the three early \textit{Vitae} shows that Bede’s prose \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti} was the most widely produced and distributed of the early Cuthbertine \textit{Vitae}: there are eight extant manuscripts of the anonymous life,\footnote{Colgrave’s \textit{Two Lives} lists seven but Donald Bullough pointed out the existence of an eighth manuscript, the ninth-century Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 15817, Donald A. Bullough, ‘A Neglected early-ninth-century Manuscript of the Lindisfarne \textit{Vita S. Cuthberti}, \textit{Anglo-Saxon England} 27 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 105-37.} nineteen of Bede’s verse and thirty-six complete Bedan prose lives. As G.H. Brown wrote: ‘it is clear from manuscript history that Bede’s prose life won the palm in the Middle Ages’.\footnote{G. H. Brown, \textit{Bede the Venerable} (Boston, 1987), p. 72.} It was therefore predominantly Bede’s prose \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti} that was used by subsequent Cuthbertine authors.

Bede’s importance to the Cuthbertine Church is not simply implicit, through the use of his works. His cult became closely associated with Durham, particularly when his relics were moved there in the eleventh century, and his prose \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti}, as well as his \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} and other works, were frequently copied by Cuthbert’s Community throughout the period from the eighth century to the
twelfth. They were used as sources for, and often appeared in manuscripts with, the Cuthbertine texts discussed in this thesis.

Despite their common root, though, each Cuthbertine text has a very different form, tone and agenda: from the model *Vitae*, leaping to the cartulary-history style *HSC*, through the church (rather than specifically cult) history of the *LDE*, to *De miraculis* combining Cuthbert’s violence with a modicum of healing, and *Brevis Relatio* presenting an alternative amalgamation of tales, finally ending with Reginald’s verbose and often clinical late-twelfth-century miracle collection. With these such clearly differing aims, each chapter will take a particular text as representative of a specific theme of Cuthbertine historical/hagiographical writing. Whilst using that text as a guide to that particular chapter, the relevance to that theme of all the Cuthbertine works will be considered. Indeed, whilst the works above are listed as separate entities, manuscripts contain many permutations of them, and this fluidity will be a central theme of the thesis. There is a wealth of other material that was produced by the Cuthbertine Church between the tenth century and the end of the twelfth. The Durham *Liber Vitae*, the *Annales Lindisfarrenses et Dunelmensis*, the *Historia Regum*, the *Cronica monasterii Dunelmensis*, the *Boldon Book*, charters and tracts such as *De obsessione Dunelmi* and *De iniusta vexatione Willelmi Episcopi Primi* do not pertain directly to Cuthbert’s cult and, in the case of the *Cronica* is not extant, but are nonetheless significant as part of the writing tradition in the Church.¹⁰⁵

the *Libellus de nativitate sancti Cuthberti* and the collection of miracles of Farne are closely associated with Durham but not produced there, but provide important context to Reginald’s *Libellus*.\(^\text{106}\) these works are incorporated, where appropriate, into discussion of the core texts of this thesis.

Chapter One, focusing on the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto*, begins the thesis with the recurrent theme of manipulable texts, suggesting that the *HSC* was written over the course of more than a century, providing regularly updated protection for the Church’s property and dynastic connections. The second chapter uses Symeon of Durham’s *Libellus de exordio* to analyse how a Church could represent and re-present itself. Chapter Three looks at the adaptations to *vitae* over time, and the manipulations of images of saints in hagiography; Chapter Four extends this to question whether we can define individual texts amidst such manipulation, and explores the diverse range of saints that can emerge from within the hagiographic tradition of a single cult. Finally, Chapter Five uses the latest of the texts, Reginald of Durham’s *Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus*, as a basis for comparing the miraculous in the preceding Cuthbertine works, charting the development of Cuthbert’s cult over the period from the eighth century to the twelfth, and using the works of Sigal, Vauchez, Finucane et al to contextualise the cult. It ends with the suggestion that Cuthbert’s cult thrived throughout the period in question, leading to

---

the conclusion which reflects that Cuthbert’s cult occupied a prominent position in northern England and southern Scotland, where its power was to continue far beyond the twelfth century.
CHAPTER 1
RIGHTS, POSSESSIONS AND DYNASTIC CONNECTIONS: THE HISTORIA
DE SANCTO CUTHBERTO

Introduction

The great period of upheaval for the Cuthbertine Church extended from the late eighth century to the eleventh. Changes throughout England - invasion and settlement, dynastic transformation and ecclesiastical reform - were to have an impact on this great northern church, as well as the specific concerns of changing location and community size and status. In view of such shifting circumstances, it is not surprising that the Cuthbertine Church should have produced a text defending its position. The Historia de sancto Cuthberto was this text, to connect Cuthbert’s cult with the Church’s legal, material and spiritual power. This connection is of great significance: the construction of the HSC may seem a curious juxtaposition of land grants and miracles, but is in fact representative of the intrinsic – not simply supportive - link between material and spiritual.¹ This chapter will therefore discuss how the Church, through the HSC and accompanied by other texts, asserted its own secular and spiritual power.

The Historia de Sancto Cuthberto et de commemoratione locorum regionumque ejus priscæ possessionis a primordio usque nunc temporis has been variously described, by Symeon of Durham as ‘the cartulary of the church, which records the former munificence of kings and other religious men towards the saint’,² and in the same vein, by Rolls Series editor Thomas Arnold as ‘an estate-roll of the monks of St Cuthbert, with biographical and historical particulars interspersed’ and

¹ As Baudouin De Gaiffier noted, ‘Les revendications de biens dans quelques documents hagiographiques du XIe siècle’.
² LDE ii.16, pp. 129-31: ‘ecclesie cartula, que antiquam regum et quorumque religiosorum munificentiam erga ipsum sanctum continet’.
by D.J. Hall as ‘little more than a cartulary’.\(^3\) The earliest critical examination, by
Craster, was similarly focussed on the property elements of the text.\(^4\) Whilst the value
of the HSC is now recognised more than in 1848 when H. Petrie wrote that it was ‘of
little value as all the facts appear more fully elsewhere’,\(^5\) it does still deserve further
attention, as more than simply a historically-tinged property list. The importance of
the HSC as a source for the political connections of Cuthbert’s Church has been
exemplified more recently, for example by Luisella Simpson in her examination of
the West Saxon dynasty and Cuthbert,\(^6\) and Ted Johnson South’s edition provides a
valuable modern commentary. Questions still remain, though, over the construction
and intrinsically linked dating of the text, and discussion of these will form the basis
for this chapter.

**Construction**

The HSC is composed of 34 sections in its fullest form. It appears in three
extant manuscripts: the eleventh-century Bodleian Library manuscript, Bodley 596
(containing sections 8-33), the twelfth-century Cambridge University Library MS
Ff.1.27 (sections 1-28), and the fifteenth-century Lincoln’s Inn Library manuscript,
Hale 114 (sections 1-34).\(^7\) The section numbering was imposed by the nineteenth-
century editor, Arnold, but is useful nonetheless as it identifies discreet parts of the
text. These sections fall into several groups, each with a common theme: this is a
composite work, not written by one author but layered by various authors over two
centuries.

---


\(^6\) Luisella Simpson, ‘The King Alfred/St Cuthbert Episode in the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto*: its
significance for mid-tenth century English History’, *CCC*, pp. 397-411.

\(^7\) For discussion of these manuscripts, see South’s introduction to his edition of HSC, pp. 14-25. The
Sections 1-3 briefly and awkwardly recount Cuthbert’s life, abbreviating Bede’s *Vita* but adding specificity: the *HSC* gives placenames, such as where Cuthbert was shepherding, describes the political context of Cuthbert’s election to the see, and specifies time such as the nine years spent by Cuthbert on Farne, as well as adding a grant of land. Such alterations create a rather staccato account of Cuthbert’s life, but it nonetheless incorporates all the essential *topoi* of a saint-bishop’s earthly life: Cuthbert’s pious childhood, early devotion, and the first miracle, which inspired him to enter Melrose are recounted in section 2. These are followed by his move to Lindisfarne and subsequent isolation there, and his appointment as abbot before he reluctantly became bishop (section 3).

Sections 4-7 describe the initial endowment of the Lindisfarne Church, and various other lands apparently given in response to Cuthbert’s miracles. The group ends with the arrival of the *Scaldingi* in Northumbria. There then follows a chronologically disordered and stylistically inconsistent series of sections (8-13). Section 8 goes back 60 years to King Ceolwulf (729-37) who became a Lindisfarne monk and gave property; we are then told that Cuthbert’s death (687) was followed by the episcopate of Ecgred (830-45) who moved the Church to Norham and gave further land; in the much lengthier and more narrative section 10 we hear of Osberht and Ælle (both d.867) who temporarily misappropriated Cuthbertine land. Sections 11-12 appear to have been written to follow from 7: they are similarly brief and annalistic, contrasting with the narrative of section 10, they refer to the final line of

---

8 *HSC* 2 and 3, pp. 42-6; cf. *VCB* ch. 4, pp.164-6, and ch. 24, pp. 234-8. On Bede’s avoidance of temporality, see below, pp. 134-5.

9 His time at Ripon is omitted, probably simply because he spent little time there. It could also be indicative of the fact that the Church has no land claims to that area. It is unlikely that the omission of Ripon is to avoid association with Wilfrid: *HSC* 7, p. 48, shows Cuthbert and Wilfrid working together to help King Ecgfrith.

10 The *Scaldingi* are Scandinavians: Danes according to South (*HSC*, p. 49) although their provenance is not entirely certain. The *HSC* states that the *Scaldingi* crushed York and the land around, and does not mention the Lindisfarne attack specifically. *ASC (DE)* s.a. 794, pp. 36-7, records the heathen raiding in Northumbria.
section 7, and they repeat elements from sections 8 and 9. We are told how, before
the arrival of the *Scaldingi*, King Ceolwulf and Bishop Ecgred gave land. Then
follows an account of the *Scaldingi* ravaging, and being punished by Cuthbert (875).
Finally, in section 13 we see Guthfrith (Guthred in *HSC*) installed, with Cuthbert’s
assistance, as King of York (883), and giving the right of Sanctuary to the Church.
The inconsistencies between these sections indicate that they were probably written
independently of one another; the connection of sections 11 and 12 with 7 emphasises
that these parts may have been added to the *HSC* in various stages and permutations,
and this is important evidence in the dating discussion below.

Sections 14-28 show greater continuity, following the connections of the West
Saxon kings with the Cuthbertine Church, from Alfred to Edmund, but again there are
indications that these were written in various stages. 14-18 recount a single story, of
King Alfred, given food by Cuthbert when in hiding, and then helped in his battle
against the Danes (878). Section 19 can be separated into two parts: in 19a Alfred
passes his veneration of Cuthbert to his son Edward before dying; in 19b, we return to
Guthfrith, of section 13, and the lands acquired from him. The mention of Abbot
Eadred ties 19b with section 20, which tells of the purported seven years of
wandering with Cuthbert’s body from 875, and the miraculous prevention of its
passage to Ireland. Sections 21-5 all relate to the reign of Edward the Elder (899-924)
and possess a flow that is rare in the text, describing how land was lost to and then
regained from Scandinavians, and finally showing Edward, just before his death,
passing his patronage of Cuthbert’s cult to Æthelstan. The following two sections
(26-7) record Æthelstan’s visit, and numerous gifts to Cuthbert’s Church written in
charter form, and repeat the instruction to the successor, this time Edmund, to
venerate Cuthbert. Section 28 similarly shows Edmund visiting Cuthbert’s shrine.
(c.945), offering goods and confirming the rights established by Guthfrith. It ends
abruptly, not with Edmund dying, but with his departure.

There follows a disparate group of four sections (29-32) recording land given
to Cuthbert’s Church by Snaculf, and by Styr during the reign of Æthelred (978-
1016), a grant of land by Bishop Ealdhun (990-1018) to three Earls,\textsuperscript{11} and finally the
land grant from Cnut, dated to between 1016 and 1031.\textsuperscript{12} The two sections that
complete the \textit{HSC} differ stylistically from the previous four, and refer back once
more to the time of Guthfrith: section 33 recounts a miracle in which Cuthbert aids
Guthfrith in battle against the Scots, and 34 confirms the Cuthbertine Church’s
perpetual ownership of its land. Again, the disparity between sections is a key feature.
But it is also significant to note the common themes of the whole text, which emerge
once more in these final sections: the establishment of property and rights, and the
cementing of connections with kings and nobles.

\textbf{Dating the \textit{Historia de sancto Cuthberto}}

\textit{i. Two-stage production: tenth and eleventh centuries}

The disjointedness of the \textit{HSC} has given rise to much debate over the date of
its production. There are two main dating theories that have been put forth. The first
is that the text was produced in two stages, that sections 1-28 were written in the mid-
ten\textsuperscript{th} century, and that the remaining sections 29-33 were added in the eleventh. This
was the model suggested by Surtees Society Editor, John Hodgson Hinde, and

\textsuperscript{11} On the identity of these earls see South’s commentary, \textit{HSC}, pp. 112-3.
\textsuperscript{12} The earliest of these dates is given as a time when Cnut may have been in the north for the battle of
pp. 102-5. Craster, ‘Patrimony of St Cuthbert’, 195, dates the visit to c.1031, when the \textit{ASC} (DE) \textit{s.a.}
1027 [1031], p. 101, records Cnut taking submission from three Scottish kings. This is supported by
B.T. Hudson who identifies one of the kings as Macbeth, who reigned from 1029. ‘Cnut and the
expanded upon by Edmund Craster, they both based their conclusions on manuscript evidence. The *HSC* survives only in later manuscripts: all three are based on earlier manuscripts as they contain errors from misreading insular hands. One of these, Cambridge University Library MS Ff.1.27, contains only sections 1-28. Hodgson Hinde and Craster therefore postulated that this Cambridge version was copied from an earlier manuscript than the Bodleian and Lincoln’s Inn versions, which continue to section 33 and 34 respectively. Thus, they argued, section 28 was the first intended end of the *HSC*, and this could be tentatively dated according to internal evidence: the first line of the *HSC* stated that it was a record of Cuthbert and his patrimony ‘from the beginning to the present time’, and Hodgson Hinde and Craster suggested that section 28 marked this ‘present time’. They then concluded that further sections were added to this initial version during the eleventh century, to recognise in particular Cnut’s involvement with Cuthbert’s Church.

There is a complication to this two-phase model: Craster argued that sections 14 to 19a must be an interpolation. Firstly, sections 13 and 19b both refer to the reign of Guthfrith, in 883, and indeed 19b would follow neatly from 13; the intervening sections recount a tale from five years earlier. Furthermore, in recounting Alfred’s victory over the Danes at *Ethandune* (Edington) in 878, the text reads *Assandune*. Craster, following the Rolls Series editor Arnold, argued that this is an erroneous reference to the 1016 victory of Cnut over Edmund Ironside at *Assandun* either

---

14 South, *HSC*, p. 25. This is interesting in the context of the debate over *Assandun* – see below, pp. 36 and 40.
Ashdon or Ashingdon (both in Essex);\textsuperscript{16} this would make 1016 the \textit{terminus post quem} of that part of the \textit{HSC}.	extsuperscript{17}

However, Luisella Simpson, agreeing that the \textit{HSC} was written in two phases, demonstrated that sections 14-19a are inseparable from the rest of this first phase of the text (sections 1-28). Most importantly sections 14-19a are an essential element of the central theme of the West Saxon kings. The slight chronological disorder allows the \textit{HSC} to flow, from the narrative hagiographic tale of Guthfrith, incorporating grants to Cuthbert, to the similarly narrative miracle sequence of Alfred and Cuthbert, which leads neatly into the account of other West Saxon kings. Simpson showed that sections 14-19a dovetail stylistically and thematically with adjacent chapters and are thus integral to the thematic continuity of the text.\textsuperscript{18}

There remains the \textit{Ethandune/Assandune} confusion to account for. Simpson argued that as none of the manuscripts is the original \textit{HSC}, all dating from after the late eleventh century, this could simply be attributed to a copyist’s error.\textsuperscript{19} This seems very plausible: the error could be one of just a single letter, as the ‘s’ character could look very similar to the Anglo-Saxon thorn.\textsuperscript{20} As South noted, all three manuscripts ‘contain scribal errors in personal and place-names caused by the misreading of letters written in an insular script’, for example the Oxford manuscript scribe mistakes the insular ‘s’ for the Gothic ‘r’, and all three manuscripts confuse ‘d’ with ‘th’ due to the Old English eth.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{ASC} (CDE) s.a. 1016, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{17} Arnold, \textit{Sym.Op.} i, p. 205; Craster, ‘Patrimony of St Cuthbert’, p. 178.
\textsuperscript{20} I am grateful to Alex Woolf for bringing this to my attention.
\textsuperscript{21} See also South, \textit{HSC}, p. 25-6. But for further discussion of this, with an alternative for the erroneous spelling of Edington, see below, p. 40.
ii. The eleventh-century theory

Recently, this two-stage production has been dismissed in favour of the entire text having been written in the eleventh century. Michael Lapidge suggested this one-stage production, arguing that the *HSC’s* apparent influence on the post-970 first Life of St Neot was in fact oral.\(^{22}\) South has recently offered a more detailed argument for the eleventh-century dating. First, he contends that the tenth-century dating has been based on inconclusive manuscript evidence. Craster believed that the Cambridge manuscript, containing only sections 1-28, must have been copied from an earlier version than the Oxford manuscript; South argues, on the basis of ‘unusual variant spellings’, that they appear to have been copied from similar or identical exemplars, and that the scribe of the Cambridge manuscript may simply have run out of space and did not want to add a leaf to the quire.\(^{23}\) Second, he argues that the two-stage, tenth- and eleventh-century dating implies that several authors worked on the text at different stages, but that this negates the thematic integrity of the *HSC*.

For South, the key lies in the Alfred miracle of sections 14-19a: he agrees with Simpson that this seems to be integral to the text, but he believes the *Assandune/Ethandune* confusion conclusively dates the story to the eleventh century.\(^{24}\) If the Alfred miracle was written in the eleventh century, and if one ‘acknowledges the essential unity of the *Historia*’, the entire text must have been written at that time. Finally, he supports this eleventh-century dating with Antonia Gransden’s typology of Anglo-Saxon hagiography: she identified a late-eleventh

---

\(^{22}\) St Neot, like St Cuthbert, is said to have appeared to Alfred to help at the Battle of Edington, M. Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots with the Vita Prima Sancti Neoti* (Cambridge, 1985) p. cv.

\(^{23}\) South, *HSC*, pp. 25-6 and 34-5. See above, p. 36.

\(^{24}\) South, *HSC*, p. 36. But see below, p. 40, for an alternative location for *Assandune*. 
century focus on defining ecclesiastical property, contrasting with the tenth- and early eleventh-century preoccupation with monastic revival.\textsuperscript{25}

\textbf{iii. Questions over these dating proposals}

South’s dating theory is certainly the most detailed, and has now been widely accepted, but it still displays problems. Not least among these is the fact that Antonia Gransden intentionally did not apply her typology to the \textit{HSC}, presumably in recognition of the fact that the north of England was very separate from the tenth- and early eleventh-century monastic reform.\textsuperscript{26} While reformers Dunstan, Æthelwold and Oswald, worked alongside King Edgar (957-75) to reintroduce Benedictine monasticism in the south of England, and stimulated a flurry of commemorative hagiography at the start of the eleventh century, the north maintained its secular church communities. It was not until the later eleventh century, after the arrival of the Normans, that Benedictine monasticism was invited into northern England. Equally, the \textit{HSC} does not follow Gransden’s typology for the eleventh century. The land concerns expressed in the text are for the period from the seventh century to the tenth. The eleventh-century land transactions of the \textit{HSC} are communicated in brief, cartulary style, contrasting with the passionate defence of Cuthbertine lands seen elsewhere in the text.\textsuperscript{27} These contrasts with Gransden’s typology are a further reminder that the north was largely autonomous and should not be forcibly moulded into southern English patterns.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. South, who implies that Gransden’s coverage of the \textit{HSC} contradicted her typology, \textit{HSC}, p. 14, n.42.
\textsuperscript{27} See below, pp. 68-9, for discussion of this brief eleventh-century section.
More generally, there appears to be little positive evidence supporting the eleventh-century dating proposal. It does not deal fully with the nature of the text, and the content and its context, and two issues serve to accentuate this: the HSC’s portrayal of Scandinavians and of the West Saxons. First, and the basis of Luisella Simpson’s argument, West Saxon connections with Cuthbert’s church are strongly emphasised in the HSC, even when the southern dynasty appears to have little relevance to the narrative: ‘King Ragnald came with a great multitude of ships and occupied the territory of Ealdred, son of Eadwulf [of Bamburgh], who was a favourite of King Edward, just as his father Eadwulf had been a favourite of King Alfred’.29 It is difficult to justify such a powerful and intrinsic depiction of these West Saxons by an eleventh-century author. Second, Cuthbert’s protection against the Scaldingi invokes a negative depiction of them in the HSC: ‘the Scaldingi killed nearly all the English in the southerly and northerly part [of England], and demolished and plundered churches’.30 But if Cnut was also a Scalding, the positive depiction of him, in a brief record of a land grant later in the text, is problematic for the argument that the HSC was written in the eleventh century.31 It seems unlikely that an author writing shortly after Cnut’s reign would vividly convey the evil deeds of his Danish ancestors without also extolling the contrasting virtues of Cnut.32

29 ‘Regenwaldus rex venit cum magna multitudine navium occupavitque terram Aldredi filii Eadulfi, qui erat dilectus regi Eadwardo sicut et pater suus Eadulfus dilectus fuit regi Alfredo’, HSC 22, pp. 60-1.
30 ‘Scaldingi omnes prope Anglos in meridiana et aquilonari parte occiderunt, ecclesias fregerunt et spoliaverunt.’ HSC 12, pp. 50-1.
31 HSC 32, p. 68. This is based on the premise that Scalding is interchangeable with Scylding. I am grateful to Alex Woolf for bringing this to my attention.
32 There are examples elsewhere of the piety of Scandinavian rulers being emphasised by tales of their predecessors’ evil actions: Cnut himself was instrumental in translating Ælfheah, a martyr of Viking attack, to Canterbury – the story is recounted by Osbern of Canterbury in a passio and translatio, H. Wharton ed., Anglia Sacra (London, 1691), vol. II, pp. 122-47. See also David Rollason, Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England (Oxford, 1989), p. 158. Normandy offers an interesting parallel: writing in the early eleventh century, Dudo of St Quentin compared the earlier Vikings who threatened the Normandy church with those who, from the tenth century, were its patrons, Dudo of St-Quentin, De Moribus et actis primorum Normanniae Ducum, Jules Lair, ed. (Caen, 1865), p. 141; Cassandra Potts, Monastic Revival and Regional Identity in Early Normandy (Woodbridge, 1997), p. 6.
Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the eleventh century dating relies heavily on the Assandune/Ethandune confusion. It has already been postulated that this could simply have arisen from a scribal error of one letter, ‘s’ appearing very much like the Anglo-Saxon thorn. But there is also an alternative location to Assandun (Ashdon/Ashingdon), to which the HSC’s ‘Assandune’ may refer. Before Alfred defeated the Vikings at Edington in 878, he had fought another famous victory, at Ashdown in 871: the Abingdon Chronicle records this place as Essedune. The HSC is undoubtedly describing the 878 battle at Ethandune (Edington), as Alfred was not yet king at the time of Ashdown in 871. But it seems that the HSC’s use of Assandune for Ethandune may well result from conflating two of Alfred’s battles, rather than from a less likely confusion with Cnut’s 1016 victory. Thus, the scribal error could date from much earlier than the eleventh century.

The two-stage production theory does, however, also pose problems. In particular, the proposed first-phase ending of section 28 seems an unlikely conclusion. This section records the visit of Edmund to Scotland, probably in 945, when he visited Cuthbert, offered money and gifts and confirmed the legal rights of the Church. The problem lies in its abrupt end: ‘When he finished [his] prayer, having commended himself and his whole army many times to the holy confessor, he departed’. It is worth noting that Edmund’s departing could not be a euphemism for death: the verb is abeo, not obeo which is employed elsewhere in the HSC to denote the death of West Saxon kings.

---

33 See above, p. 36.
34 Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon, Joseph Stevenson ed., 2 vols, RS (1858), i, p. 50. In Asser’s Vita Alfredi, ch. 37, Ashdown is spelt Æscesdun, W.H. Stevenson, ed. and tr., Asser’s Life of King Alfred (Oxford, 1904), p. 28; discussion in Stevenson’s commentary of the confusion arising over this reflects the longevity of this placename debate, p. 238.
35 I am very grateful to John Hudson for pointing this out to me.
37 Eg. HSC 20, p. 58; 25, p. 64; 27, p. 66.
in response to the visit from Edmund of section 28, it seems odd that this section does not also mention the subjugation of Strathclyde by Edmund that resulted from his campaign in the north, perhaps attributing the victory to Cuthbert’s intervention. It seems that either this part of the HSC was left unfinished, or that we have lost the section of the text that continued Edmund’s story. In either case, there still remain more general problems with the notion of a two-stage production, as with the eleventh-century model: the stylistic and chronological inconsistencies throughout the text, and these will form the basis for my alternative production model for the HSC.

The discrepancies between all the dating theories are inevitable for such a peculiar text, only preserved in later manuscripts. But these contradictions are particularly interesting. The debate pits Craster’s claim over the disjointedness of the text, against Simpson’s argument for its thematic homogeneity, and South’s similar contention (although for a different date) for the text’s unity. It is when one allows these elements to complement each other that a third dating theory emerges: that this is a composite text, produced in several stages over a long period of time.

**The Composite Text: Content and Context**

Before presenting this composite text model, it is necessary to identify the multiple concerns of the HSC: the Cuthbertine Church’s relations with dynasties and nobility, and its possession of land and claims to legal rights. All these concerns should be set against the backdrop of constantly changing secular power in Northumbria at the time. It was the Church’s ability to respond to the fluctuating Scandinavian/Anglo-Saxon dynastic situation that secured its survival. The following account serves to illustrate the constantly shifting rulership.

---

38 Edmund’s activities in Strathclyde are described in ASC (C) s.a. 945, p. 72, and in CMD, Craster, ‘Red Book’, 526.

39 See below, pp. 51-2, for discussion of this brief treatment of Edmund’s reign.
The Northumbrians had rarely accepted southern overlordship before the West Saxon Æthelstan in 927; both Alfred and Edward attempted to gain West-Saxon control over regions under the Danes and to thus unite England, but before their reigns, from 865, the Danes had been attempting to rule the North. Halfdan was the first Scandinavian king of York from the mid 870s: a position held alongside, but not necessarily in cooperation with, a ruler of the Northumbrians, often from the House of Bamburgh. Halfdan was driven out in 877 but not replaced by a king at York until Guthfrith was elected in 883. He was followed by a chain of Danes on whom little is written - punctuated by the brief acceptance of West Saxon Æthelred I's son, Æthelwold, as king (c.900-902) - until Ragnald was established at York in 919.

Meanwhile, as the case of Æthelwold shows, the West Saxons were gaining in strength. In c.880 Alfred received the submission of Æthelred of Mercia, and at about this time made a treaty with Guthrum, king of the East Angles. Edward the Elder extended this power over southern Danelaw from 912 to 920, when Ragnald accepted his overlordship. When Æthelstan became king of the Anglo-Saxons in 924 he preferred to ally with Ragnald's successor Sihtric, but when he died in 927 Æthelstan drove out Guthfrith II of York and took control of Northumbria. Æthelstan underlined his power with victory over the Scots and Norse at Brunanburh in 937, but southern influence was to fade when Edmund succeeded to the English throne in 939. The Northumbrians chose as king Olaf I, son of Guthfrith II, who soon extended his jurisdiction to rule all land north of Watling Street. Olaf I died in 941 and Edmund

---


41 This division marked Olaf's control over the 'five boroughs': Lincoln, Leicester, Nottingham, Stamford and Derby.
regained the ‘five boroughs’ in 942, but did not defeat the returning king Olaf I for rulership of Northumbria until 944.

Edmund was murdered in 946 and the West-Saxon dynasty’s entanglement with Danes continued, although the following half-century is a rather dark period for the north of England, not least in the HSC, which has no record for between c.945 and the final decade of the tenth century. Eadred, son of Edward the Elder, succeeded Edmund to the English throne. He wrestled with Olaf II, Ragnald II and Eric Bloodaxe for Northumbrian control, losing and regaining power twice before it became a permanent part of England in 954. There followed a period of exclusively West-Saxon power: Eadred's heir Eadwig, son of Edmund, replaced him in 955; in 957 he retained control to the south of the Thames but Edgar was chosen as king to the north, gaining the southern part when Eadwig died in 959. Edward the Martyr succeeded his father in 975 but his reign was cut short by the divided allegiances of the time when he was murdered in 978, to be replaced by Æthelred II, also son of Edgar.

The Danes returned to the scene and in 1013 Swein Forkbeard caused Æthelred to be exiled to Normandy. There followed West Saxon resurgence from Æthelred, returning in 1014, and then Edmund Ironside after his father's death in 1016, but Cnut was invading from 1015 and became king of England in 1016 (to 1035), the latest ruler to be mentioned in the HSC.

This regular shifting of secular power demanded shrewd manoeuvring from the Cuthbertine Church. The Church’s changing allegiances, detailed below, reflect that it was sufficiently powerful to dictate its dynastic relationships, aiming to secure protection and wealth. It was these changing allegiances that the HSC sought to illuminate and clarify.
i. Danes

If the HSC is a text that combines property issues with hagiographic elements, the sections concerning Cuthbert and the Scandinavians encapsulate this characterisation most neatly. As has been noted above in discussion of the Scaldingi, Scandinavians are portrayed both negatively and positively. Initially, they were depicted as aggressors against Cuthbert’s Church and the north: in addition to the Scaldingi who killed the English and despoiled churches, the HSC tells how Halfdan, king of the Danes, sailed up the Tyne ‘devastating everything and sinning cruelly against St Cuthbert’, and was punished when ‘he began to rave and stink so badly that his whole army drove him from its midst’ (875). We then learn how a section of the army of Halfdan and of Ubba, duke of the Frisians, wrought much damage in southern England and ‘destroyed all the royal kindred except for Alfred, the father of King Edward, who hid for three years (875-8) in a Glastonbury marsh in great want’. This and a later section (22) show the West Saxon dynasty entangled with Scandinavian tales, indicative of the dynastic situation in England at the time. The HSC records how King Ragnald attacked the land of the House of Bamburgh forcing the Earl Ealdred, a favourite of King Edward (‘dilectus regi Eadwardo’), to seek aid in Scotland from King Constantine, who was then defeated by Ragnald at the battle of Corbridge (c.918). The same Ragnald is shown two sections later, probably in the same battle, slaughtering a multitude of English at Corbridge before perishing: this

42 See above, p. 39 and nn. 31-2.
43 ‘Halfdene rex Danorum in Tinam intravit et usque Wircesforde navigavit, omnia vastans et contra sanctum Cuthbertum crudeliter peccans…Nam adeo cepit insanire et foetere, quod totus exercitus suus eum a se expulit, et longe in mare fugavit nec postea comparuit’, HSC 12, pp. 52-3. The word foetere is translated here as ‘stink’, rather than using South’s rendering of ‘reek’ which carries a more ambiguous meaning.
44 ‘per tres annos multa mala egerunt omnesque regii generis interfecerunt, praeter solum Elfredum patrem Eadwardi regis, qui his tribus annis in Glestigensi palude latuit in magna penuria’. HSC 14, pp. 52-3.
45 HSC 22, p. 60.
repetition is important evidence for the composite nature of the text. Finally comes
the most powerful image of direct Scandinavian opposition to Cuthbert, when
Onlafbaald, given some of Cuthbert’s estates appropriated by Ragnald, publicly
declares Cuthbert’s impotence inside his church; needless to say, Cuthbert’s
retribution is swift and decisive as Onlafbaald is despatched with a violent death.

The positive Scandinavian connections with Cuthbert’s Church are depicted
alongside these tales of destruction. Indeed, where the *HSC* tells how a part of
Halfdan and Ubba’s army invaded the south of England, it also recounts how another
part of the army ‘rebuilt York, cultivated the surrounding land and settled there’. This
peaceful and respectful portrayal complements the immediately preceding
section of the *HSC*, describing how Cuthbert was instrumental in making Guthfrith
King of York (c.883). Instructing Abbot Eadred of Carlisle in a vision, Cuthbert says:

> ‘Go across the Tyne to the Danish army, and say to them that if they
> wish to be obedient to me, they must show to you a certain boy purchased by
> a widow, called Guthred, son of Harthacnut, and in the early morning you,
> and the whole army, are to offer to the widow a price for him. And at the
> third hour give the above price; at the sixth hour lead him before the whole
> multitude, so that they may elect him king. At the ninth hour lead him with
> the whole army to the top of the hill called Oswigesdune, and there put on
> his right arm a gold armlet, so they may all appoint him king. Also say to
> him, after he has become king, that he must give to me all the land between
> the Tyne and Wear, and whoever flees to me, whether because of homicide
> or of any other necessity, is to have peace for thirty-seven days and nights.’

---

46 *HSC* 24, p. 62. For discussion of the battle/s of Corbridge, see South’s Commentary, *HSC* pp. 105-7
and Craster, ‘Patrimony of St Cuthbert’, 191, n.1. On there having been just one battle of Corbridge,
Wainwright, ‘The Battles at Corbridge’ in his *Scandinavian England* (Chichester, 1975), pp. 163-80 at
of whom believe that there were two battles, one c.914 and the other c.918.

47 *HSC* 23, pp. 60-2

48 ‘Eboracum civitatem reedificavit, terram in circuitu coluit, et ibi remansit’, *HSC* 14, pp. 52-3.

49 ‘Vade’, inquit, ‘super Tinam ad exercitum Danorum, et dic eis ut si volunt mihi obedientes esse,
ostendant ibi emittance quendam puerem cuiusdam viduae nomine Guthred filium Hardacnut, et summo
mane da tu et totus exercitus pro eo precium vidue, et hora tertia super precium, hora vero sexta duc
eum ante totam multitudinem ut eum regem eligant, hora vero nona duc eum cum toto exercitu super
montem qui vocatur Oswigesdune et ibi pone in brachio eius dextero armillam auream, et sic eum
omnes regem constituant. Dic etiam ei postquam rex effectus fuerit, ut det mihi totam terram inter
Tinam et Wyrram, et quicumque ad me confugerit, vel pro homicidio vel pro aliqua necessitate, habeat
pacem per triginta septem dies et noctes’, *HSC* 13, pp. 52-3.
Significant here is the control exercised by Cuthbert: whether facing Scandinavian threats or alliance, Cuthbert’s Church was shown to manipulate circumstances to its advantage.

Practical evidence underlines the ability of the Church to shift easily between fielding attacks and negotiating for stability and influence. Danger from Viking raids led to the flight from Lindisfarne with Cuthbert’s body, and to the ‘seven years’ of wandering, but the decision of the community to remain at Chester-le-Street was probably the result of protection offered by the new Danish king. A move back to Lindisfarne would have gained the community protection from Eadwulf at Bamburgh, but instead they preferred the safety offered by Guthfrith, whose throne at York was in much closer proximity to Chester-le-Street.\textsuperscript{50} Importantly, this Danish protection enabled the Church to settle in the centre of their patrimony, which had by this time shifted south from its initial fulcrum at Lindisfarne.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, the association with Guthfrith brought the first grant of the right of Sanctuary, protecting the Church’s rights as well as simply its claim to property. The importance of this mutually supportive relationship with Guthfrith (as well as the composite nature of the text) is underlined by the miracle that appears later in the \textit{HSC} (sections 33-4), in which Cuthbert aids him in battle against the Scots and in return Guthfrith grants rights similar to those seen in the earlier Guthfrith tale of section 13.

The other major Scandinavian ally of Cuthbert’s Church appears far more briefly in the \textit{HSC}. Cnut (1017-35) is simply mentioned giving a list of estates during the time of Bishop Edmund (c.1019-c.1040). The very brief notarial style here may seem odd: the \textit{HSC} could have incorporated such narrative detail as it does to emphasise the connections between Cuthbert and other kings. However, this is a

\textsuperscript{50} G. Bonner, ‘St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street’, \textit{CCC}, p. 389. The distribution of property was the other key reason for the community remaining at Chester-le-Street. See below, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{51} See section on property below for the location of these endowments, p. 55.
further reminder that the text is an amalgamation of many authors’ work, and perhaps an indication that this part was added very soon after Cnut’s visit, before a lengthy tale had grown around Cnut’s visit. Indeed, where later eleventh- and early twelfth-century Cuthbertine texts record Cnut’s gifts, they also express Cnut’s dedication and piety, describing how he walked barefoot for five miles to reach Cuthbert’s shrine.52

It is important when recounting Cnut’s patronage of Cuthbert’s cult to look from his perspective as well as from that of the Church. Cnut’s relationship with Cuthbert was part of a far wider policy as he, like many West Saxon and Danish kings before him, exploited the cults of Anglo-Saxon saints to his advantage. In particular, he was associated with the cult of Edmund, and other saints at Bury, and with Mildrith and Ælfheah who were both moved to Canterbury with some involvement from Cnut.53 His actions were part of a far wider trend, identified by David Rollason, of Anglo-Saxon kings employing saints’ cults to create a network that bound England together as it moved towards political unity. He cites the importance of the Secgan - a list of saints’ resting places, preserved in an early-eleventh-century manuscript – which groups together saints instrumental in the important periods and locations of English church development, building a picture of the Church’s unity.54 Inevitably the dominant West Saxon dynasty were important protagonists in this trend, and it is to them that we now turn.

ii. West Saxons

By discussing the Danes first it was my intention to accentuate the fact that it was they who appeared first in the HSC, and were therefore a concern of the text

52 LDE iii.8, pp. 166-8; also in CMD, Craster, ‘Red Book’, 526-7.
before the West Saxon dynasty became significant. The logical extension of this is that the HSC is not a panegyric of the West Saxon dynasty, but a record of relations between the Church and a wider secular nobility. Nonetheless, West Saxon kings are the focus of a sizeable part of the HSC, and this is representative of the dynasty’s own active patronage of Cuthbert’s cult.

Sections 14-28 all refer to the West Saxon dynasty in some way, from Alfred to Edmund, whether recounting a property grant from a king, or an implicit link such as the parallel tales of Alfred’s time in hiding and the wandering of Cuthbert’s Community with his body, or simply a statement that an event occurred during the reign of a specific king. There is only one miracle directly involving the West Saxon dynasty – that in which Cuthbert provides food for Alfred, and guides him in battle. This occupies sections 15-18 of the HSC, and is written in a lengthy, narrative style which is rare in the text. The dating problems posed by this miracle are discussed in some detail above; here we are concerned more with what the HSC tells us of Cuthbert’s relationship with the West Saxon dynasty. While this miracle is followed by the claim that Alfred passed his veneration of Cuthbert down to his son and successor, Edward, there is no corroborative evidence to suggest that Alfred had any contact with Cuthbert’s cult. Rather it seems that this tale backdates the West Saxon connection with Cuthbert, to give a firm basis to this bond by placing it in the time of the victorious Alfred. The speech which Cuthbert makes to Alfred is particularly telling, stating: ‘God will have delivered to you your enemies and all their land, and hereditary rule to you and to your sons and to your sons’ sons. Be faithful to me and my people because to you and your sons was given all of Albion. Be just, because

---

55 Cf. Simpson, ‘Alfred/Cuthbert Episode’, who believes that the HSC was written in the first instance shortly after the reign of Edmund as a record mainly of connections with the West Saxon dynasty.
56 Above, pp. 35-6.
you have been chosen as king of all Britain’. 57 The West Saxon right to hereditary rule over Britain is forcefully communicated here, illustrating the Cuthbertine Church’s support for this. Moreover, these notions, of rule over Albion and all of Britain, were frequent in tenth-century texts: evidence that this part of the HSC was probably written at that time. 58

After this miracle, the references to West Saxon kings take more or less the same form: each king is admonished by his predecessor to venerate Cuthbert and then gives land and material possessions, and confirms the rights of the Church. Edward’s reign, though, is given especial prominence: it appears in five sections of the HSC, compared with only two for Æthelstan and one for Edmund. Even more telling than the coverage received by Edward’s reign is the curious forward-looking genealogical remark that introduces Alfred as ‘the father of King Edward’. 59 Although there is no evidence that Edward visited the shrine, nor that he gave anything to the Church, this focus on his reign celebrates the fact that he was probably the first West Saxon king to be connected to Cuthbert’s Church; more significantly for the construction of the text, it could also be evidence that the West Saxon part of the HSC was not all produced at one time, that it was initially written just after Edward’s reign and covered only Alfred and Edward’s connections with Cuthbert.

While there is little evidence beyond the HSC for Edward’s connections with Cuthbert, there is much material proof of Æthelstan’s patronage of the cult. Indeed, if all the West Saxon sections of the HSC had been written after Edmund’s reign, then surely it would have been Æthelstan who was the focus rather than Edward. The HSC lists a number of gifts, given by Æthelstan to Cuthbert when he was on campaign

58 Simpson, ‘Alfred/Cuthbert Episode’, p. 401; Rollason, Saints and Relics, p. 149.
59 HSC 14, pp. 52-3, see below, p. 66.
against the Scots, and some of these still exist. The significance of his visit to Cuthbert’s Church is underlined in the Historia Regum, and in the extended account in Symeon’s LDE. The Durham Liber Vitae provides further evidence of Æthelstan’s importance to the Cuthbertine Church. It lists the benefactors of the Church chronologically, reaching Æthelstan on the verso of the first folio, but he was apparently deemed worthy of far greater recognition; a tenth-century hand therefore added his name to the top of the recto of the first folio. Also revealing, both of Æthelstan’s patronage and of the importance of Cuthbert to all the West Saxon kings, is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183. Most obviously, this manuscript contains a miniature depicting Cuthbert and Æthelstan, with the king reading from a book and being blessed by the saint. David Rollason’s detailed study of the manuscript’s contents clarifies this image of mutual support. It was almost certainly produced in Wessex: its composite parts all reflect southern origins, even Bede’s prose and metrical Vitae which differ from the Durham manuscripts. The Office was influential throughout many regions of West Saxon rule, implying that the dynasty had a hand in its production; the Mass was in evidence mainly in the south; the Hymn was an almost unique example amongst new hymnals brought into the English Church through monasteries reforming in the tenth century, and thus through institutions connected with royalty; the translation feast was used in much of Wessex, possibly conceived at the royal city of Winchester. Gerald Bonner suggests that the

60 HSC 26, p. 64. See below, pp. 57-8.
61 H.Reg. s.a. 934, p. 93 and p. 124; LDE ii.18, p. 136. Whilst the ASC and the Annales Lindisfarneenses record Æthelstan’s campaign in Scotland, neither of them refers to his visit to Cuthbert’s tomb. ASC (A) s.a. 933; (C) s.a. 934, p. 69; AL 924, p. 485.
63 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183, 1v.
mass and office may have been composed for the chapel of King Edward, indicating the importance of Cuthbert to Edward, just as Edward was important to Cuthbert’s Church. More generally, though, this manuscript offers compelling evidence for the active patronage of Cuthbert’s cult by the West Saxon kings.

Edmund is the last West Saxon king to be mentioned in the *HSC*; like Æthelstan he demonstrates his active veneration for Cuthbert by visiting his shrine en route to campaign in the north. The passage is brief, recounting simply that Edmund visited the tomb on his journey north, offered gifts and confirmed the rights of the Church, and then departed. The abrupt ending of this section is discussed above in terms of its relevance for the dating of the *HSC*, but some discussion should be added here of the significance for the West Saxon dynasty’s relationship with Cuthbert’s Church. It seems likely that this was not the intended end for this part of the *HSC* on the West Saxon dynasty, that further sections were to be added or that part of the *HSC* is now lost: either suggestion would explain the complete absence in the *HSC* of material on the second half of the tenth century. A dearth of information on Edmund’s visit elsewhere in Cuthbertine sources, such as the *Historia Regum* and the *Annales Lindisfarncenses*, and the general paucity of sources on the north of England for the second half of the tenth century support the former suggestion, that the writing of this part of the *HSC* was suddenly curtailed.

It is possible to offer a tentative explanation for this hiatus in the *HSC*’s production. If nothing further was written on Edmund, concerning for example his victory in Strathclyde, or indeed if such sections on Edmund were intentionally discarded, there may have been a personal reason. The West Saxon appropriation of northern cults extended beyond that of Cuthbert: in 909, the body of Oswald (whose

---

65 Bonner, ‘St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street’, pp. 393-4.
66 *HSC* 28, p. 66.
67 See above, pp. 40-1.
head was kept with Cuthbert) was translated from Bardney in Lincolnshire to Gloucester by King Alfred’s daughter Æthelflæd, and relics of Aidan, as well as those of Hild and Ceolfrith were said to be held at the monastery of Glastonbury. David Rollason has suggested that this Glastonbury relic collection may have been acquired by Edmund when on campaign in the north; such despoliation would not only ‘assert political dominance’ but could also have offended Cuthbert’s Church, especially in the case of relics of Aidan and Bede. It should, however, be added that Symeon of Durham’s LDE, which uses the HSC as the basis for its second Book, does include unique information on Edmund’s campaign against Scotland and on his successor, Eadred’s visit to Cuthbert’s Church, before a very brief summary of the late tenth century: perhaps Symeon worked from a slightly lengthier version of the HSC than exists in extant versions.

There cannot, however, have been any lengthy hiatus in links between Wessex and Cuthbert’s Church, even if his cult was no longer so actively patronised by West-Saxon kings in the second half of the tenth century. The manuscript called the ‘Durham Ritual’ is a monastic liturgical text, to which was added a mass in honour of Cuthbert which probably originated in Wessex. According to the gloss provided by Aldred, a priest of Cuthbert’s Church, the Durham Ritual was acquired by Ælfsige, bishop of Chester-le-Street, on 10th August 970 at Oakley Down in Dorset. The

---

70 Rollason, Saints and Relics, p. 152.
71 LDE ii.18 and 20, pp. 134-42. See below, p. 111.
72 There is no evidence that West Saxon kings after Edmund visited Cuthbert’s shrine, or made any donations to the Church.
73 Durham, Cathedral Library MS A.IV.19.
74 On this manuscript see Bonner, ‘Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street’, pp. 392-5.
presence of a Cuthbertine bishop and priest in Wessex at this time implies that they may have had some role in the council of Winchester, usually dated to 970, which resulted in the production of the *Regularis Concordia*. There was a precedent for Cuthbertine bishops being involved in West Saxon kings’ councils: Bishop Wigred (c.925-c.941/2) was at Æthelstan’s council at Colchester in 931. Such involvement in 970, and indeed the acquisition of the monastic ‘Durham Ritual’ itself, may be evidence that the Cuthbertine Church was seeking to generate or maintain monasticism in its Community. But the continuing secular clerical elements of life in Cuthbert’s Church demonstrate that while it may have been involved in King Edgar’s monastic reforms, it was by no means importing them to its own Community. Once again, independence is the keynote of the Cuthbertine Church’s involvement with dynastic powers.

**iii. Possessions and Rights**

**Land**

The most powerful demonstration of the Cuthbertine Church’s power and independence was the extent of its patrimony. This landholding was augmented by the acquisition of legal rights, and the material wealth of the Church was most visible in its collection of moveable riches. These three elements of secular power – land, rights and material possessions – were all prominent concerns of the *HSC*. They appear in the text intertwined with records of dynastic relations and miracles; property and rights were integral to relations with the secular world, and to the spiritual power of the Church.

---

75 Gerald Bonner notes Symeon’s postulated date of 973 for the council of Winchester, but suggests that preparations for the council could have spanned several years, ‘Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street’, pp. 394-5.

The complex process by which the Cuthbertine Church acquired land has been thoroughly dealt with by several scholars, most notably in E. Craster’s article on ‘The Patrimony of St Cuthbert’, in D.J. Hall’s thesis on the Community of St Cuthbert’s properties, rights and claims, and in the commentary and maps provided by Ted Johnson South in his edition of the *HSC*. Therefore, I will provide here only a brief account of the Church’s lands, much of which derives from accounts in the *HSC*.

The initial endowment at Lindisfarne is not recorded in contemporary sources, but is described in the *HSC*, anachronistically claiming that the lands were given to Cuthbert himself. If the *HSC* is to be believed, this initial swathe of land, possibly given by the Church’s founder Oswald, extended across much of the eastern side of Lothian and Northumbria, from the Forth to about 20 miles south of Lindisfarne, forming one of the largest areas controlled by a single medieval English church.

Oswald’s brother, Oswiu, gave further land, and Northumbrian kings continued this pattern. In particular, Ecgfrith is mentioned in the *HSC*, giving land along with Archbishop Theobald of York apparently in conjunction with installing Cuthbert as bishop. The land they gave, in York and just north of the city in Crayke, extended Cuthbert’s Church’s lands to the south, and their gift of Carlisle gave jurisdiction over this western city that was to continue, possibly with an interruption when it was controlled by the Norse, until it was lost before 1101. A further gift from Ecgfrith, of Cartmel in Lancashire, extended this western influence, and, characteristically for

---

77 Craster, ‘Patrimony of St Cuthbert’; Hall, ‘Community of St Cuthbert’, in particular chs. 3 and 4, pp. 50-93; South, *HSC*, pp. 72-118.
78 *HSC* 3 and 4, pp. 42-6.
79 South, *HSC*, fig.2. *HSC* 4 shows that a line could be drawn between the river Esk, in the northeastern corner of the map, to the river Breamish in the central western part.
80 *HSC* 3, pp. 42-6.
81 *HSC* 5, p. 46.
82 Carlisle is discussed by Craster, ‘Patrimony of St Cuthbert’, p. 181, and by South, *HSC*, p. 81. The loss of Carlisle is recorded in *LDE continuatio* 1, p. 274.
the *HSC*, was recorded as being given in response to a St Cuthbert miracle.\(^8^3\) King Ceolwulf should also be mentioned in terms of the early endowment of the Church: when he gave up his crown to become a Lindisfarne monk, he brought with him lands stretching further south along Northumbria’s eastern seaboard, almost reaching to the Tyne.\(^8^4\)

The territory of the Church, already extending southwards during its early period, continued to expand to the south in the ensuing centuries. Bishop Ecgred is responsible in the *HSC* for taking Cuthbert to Norham, establishing the importance of this location, and he also gave land as far south as the river Tees.\(^8^5\) The gift from Guthfrith in response to his instalment as king at York is described as ‘all the land between the Tyne and the Wear’, presumably filling a rare but sizeable gap among the Cuthbertine possessions along the eastern Northumbrian coast.\(^8^6\) This southward growth, as has been suggested above, probably stimulated the Church’s settlement at Chester-le-Street.\(^8^7\)

This reason for settlement at Chester-le-Street, based on the wealth of the Church, is of course not entirely in accord with the *HSC* which implies that suffering led to the wandering of the Community, and that hard-earned peace led them to settle.\(^8^8\) The *HSC* contains accounts of land misappropriated from Cuthbert’s Church, by Osbert and Ælle, but concludes with a tale of divine vengeance: ‘but soon, terrified by the wrath of God and St Cuthbert, the army having been struck down he [Ælle] fled, and fell, and lost life and kingdom’.\(^8^9\) Such miracles of vengeance are typical of

---

\(^8^3\) *HSC* 6, p. 48.
\(^8^4\) *HSC* 8, p. 48.
\(^8^5\) *HSC* 9, pp. 48-50.
\(^8^6\) ‘*totam terram inter Tinam et Wyrram*’, *HSC* 13, pp. 52-3.
\(^8^7\) See above, p. 46.
\(^8^8\) *HSC* 20, p. 58.
\(^8^9\) ‘*sed mox ira Dei et sancti confessoris perterritus, ceso exercitu fugit et corruit, vitamque et regnum perdidit*’, *HSC* 10, pp. 50-1.
the *HSC*’s defensiveness towards the Cuthbertine Church’s lands and rights,\(^{90}\) most notably in the face of Viking attacks, which purportedly led to the flight from Lindisfarne. The route of this wandering though, as far as it may be discerned, crossed the key locations of the Cuthbertine patrimony as detailed above. In particular Crayke is mentioned, and Derwentmouth, on the west coast. As David Rollason has argued, it seems likely that the Community’s journeys, if they were made at all, were made to assert dominance over their property, not as a panicked escape.\(^{91}\)

Whilst there are sizeable sections of the *HSC* recording events during the reigns of West Saxon kings, only Æthelstan is shown giving land to the Cuthbertine Church.\(^{92}\) This is perhaps not surprising when one considers how tenuously the West Saxon’s must have held power in the north. However, in this West Saxon part of the *HSC*, there are accounts of members of the Community buying lands for the Church and also donating them to nobles, in particular Bishop Cutheard (899-911x14), although his land dealings are not recorded in any other land-related Cuthbertine document.\(^{93}\) This again serves to emphasise the bargaining power held within the Church in the face of various secular powers, although it should be noted that there is far less concern in this West Saxon part of the *HSC* (sections 14-28) to record land transactions than in the earlier part. There is a counterbalance in the West Saxon section, of an increased concern to depict the Church’s interaction with the Kings, and this indicates once more the composite nature of the text, that its concerns had once more shifted. Another shift is clear in the late-tenth- and early-eleventh-century

\(^{90}\) See for example *HSC* 23, pp. 60-62. On miracle types, see below, pp. 138-42.

\(^{91}\) I owe thanks to David Rollason for raising this question, and to all at the Early Medieval Europe conference at York, 2004, for stimulating discussion on the subject. See Rollason, ‘Wanderings of St Cuthbert’; see also South, *HSC*, p. 100 and n.88.

\(^{92}\) *HSC* 26, p. 64; the West Saxon kings are far more notable for their gifts of moveable goods, see below, pp. 57-8.

\(^{93}\) *HSC* 21-2, pp. 58-60. On Cutheard and these land transactions, see South’s commentary, *HSC*, p. 101-5.
part of the text, where the entries are all brief, charter-like, and make no attempt at
narrative.\textsuperscript{94}

\textbf{Moveable Possessions}

Whilst the West Saxon kings did not donate much land to the Cuthbertine
Church, they did provide a great number of moveable goods, which must have been
particularly important for a mobile Church. In much the same way that each West
Saxon king passes his veneration of Cuthbert to his successor, Alfred is shown
conveying two armlets and a golden thurible to the saint through his son Edward.\textsuperscript{95}
Edward himself is not seen giving land or moveable goods to the Church, but
\textit{Æ}thelstan’s list of gifts includes a great number and variety of portable riches:

\begin{quote}
In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I King \textit{Æ}thelstan give to St
Cuthbert this gospel book, two chasubles and one alb, and one stole with a
maniple, and one girdle, and three altar coverlets, and one silver chalice, and
two bowls, one made of gold and the other Greek, and one silver thurible,
and one cross crafted from gold and ivory, and one royal headdress of gold
fabric, and two panels made of gold and silver, and two silver candlesticks
decorated with gold, and one missal, and two gospel books decorated with
gold and silver, and one \textit{Vita} of St Cuthbert, written in verse and prose, and
seven palls, and three hangings, and three tapestries, and two silver cups
with lids, and four great bells, and three horns made of gold and silver, and
two standards, and one lance, and two gold armlets.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

After a lengthy list of lands also donated by \textit{Æ}thelstan, he is said to have
‘filled the aforementioned cups with the best coin, and at his order his whole army
offered St Cuthbert twelve hundred [coins] and more’. Edmund’s army is similarly
said to have offered sixty pounds, while he himself gave two Greek palls and, just
like Alfred and \textit{Æ}thelstan, two golden armlets. It is probable that one of Edmund’s

\textsuperscript{94} \textit{HSC} 29-32, pp. 66-8.
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{HSC} 19, p. 58.
palls is the Nature Goddess Silk, now in the Monks’ Dormitory at Durham Cathedral.\textsuperscript{97} The stole and maniple given by Æthelstan are believed to be those now in the Durham Cathedral Treasury. They both have inscriptions stating that they were made by order of Queen Ælfflæd (d.pre-916), second wife of Edward the Elder, for Bishop Frithestan of Winchester (909-31), giving evidence of their West Saxon provenance and providing a tenuous but tantalising physical connection between King Edward and Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{98} Finally, the gospel book which appears in Æthelstan’s charter is probably British Library, Cotton Otho MS B.ix. It was largely destroyed in the Cotton Library fire in 1731, but was described as containing a miniature showing Æthelstan kneeling before Cuthbert. Like Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183, this provides evidence of the active West Saxon patronage of Cuthbert’s cult through books.\textsuperscript{99}

**Legal Rights**

The *HSC*’s emphasis of the legal rights of the Cuthbertine Church protected its lands and moveable gifts. Particularly prominent was sanctuary: a powerful legal shield, often bolstered by miraculous protection, that provides a practical demonstration of this connection between secular and spiritual.\textsuperscript{100} Sanctuary is mentioned explicitly in Cuthbertine sources for the first time in the *HSC*, in Cuthbert’s request that Guthfrith grant that ‘whoever shall flee to me, whether for homicide or for any other necessity, may have peace for thirty-seven days and


\textsuperscript{100} On the laws of Sanctuary and specifically that of St Cuthbert’s Church, see David Hall, ‘The Sanctuary of St Cuthbert’, *CCC*, pp. 425-36.
nights’. There is, however, a much earlier mention of sanctuary, in Bede’s *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, where Cuthbert instructs his brethren on where his body should rest:

‘it will be more expedient for you that I should remain here [Inner Farne], on account of the influx of fugitives and guilty men of every sort, who will perhaps flee to my body because, unworthy as I am, reports about me as a servant of God have nevertheless gone forth; and you will be compelled very frequently to intercede with the powers of this world on behalf of such men, and so will be put to much trouble on account of the presence of my body’.

In these words attributed to Cuthbert, with the employment of the humble saint *topos*, the right of sanctuary is deemed a hindrance to the spiritual well-being of the Community. But in *HSC* it clearly is not, and it was a key ecclesiastical power in Anglo-Saxon England, pre-dating the Lindisfarne Church. David Hall draws a comparison between the earliest English lawcode, of Æthelberht, and the claims of Symeon of Durham and the *Cronica monasterii Dunelmensis*, that the fine for breach of church peace was equal to that for breach of the king’s peace. But however long the Church had enjoyed the right of sanctuary, it clearly became particularly important in the production of the *HSC*. It was perhaps pertinent due to the sometimes itinerant nature of the Church: asserting, as Cuthbert did to Guthfrith, that his body was the focus of sanctuary meant that the Community could be protected wherever they were, as long as Cuthbert’s body was with them. The legal rights of the Church are confirmed by King Edmund; even more forcefully, the initial statement concerning sanctuary is bolstered by a further mention of Guthfrith, confirming the Church’s legal rights once more, in what appears as the final section of the text.

The *HSC* clearly established the importance of recording the Cuthbertine Church’s

---

101 ‘quicumque ad me confugerit, vel pro homicidio vel pro aliqua necessitate, habeat pacem per triginta septem dies et noctes’, *HSC* 13, pp. 52-3.
102 *VCB* ch. 37, pp. 278-9: ‘Sed et vobis quoque commodius esse arbitror ut hic requiescam, propter incursionem profugorum vel noxiorum quorsumlibet. Qui cum ad corpus meum forte confugerint, quia qualiscunque sum, fama tamen exitit de me quia famulus Christi sim, necesse habeitis sepius pro talibus apud potentex saeculi intercedere, atque ideo de praesentia corporis mei multum tolerare laborem’.
104 *HSC* 28, p. 66; 34, p. 70.
legal rights. For example, Symeon’s *LDE* not only showed Cnut and William of Normandy confirming the laws and customs of the Church, but also paired King Alfred with Guthfrith, establishing the law of sanctuary.\(^{105}\)

**iv. Omissions**

Finally, it is instructive to note the events and themes omitted from the *HSC*. There are two main issues: first, the general dearth of information on the second half of the tenth century and early part of the eleventh. This has been discussed above, as symptomatic of the paucity of material written in and about the north of England during this time. The reasons for this dark period are unclear, but the result for the *HSC* is that it fails to record events which would appear to marry well with the themes of the rest of the text. For example, the subjugation of Strathclyde by King Edmund would have complemented the tale of Guthfrith’s victory over the Scots, and may have provided scope for a further miracle of Cuthbert’s help in battle to also partner his miraculous aid for Alfred.\(^{106}\) Also drawing on the theme of Scottish hostility, the invasion of the new Durham settlement in 1006, recorded in the late-eleventh-century *De obsessione Dunelmi*, would have made a useful parallel to the Guthfrith tale.\(^{107}\) Regime changes between Scandinavian and southern kings in this period would also undoubtedly have affected the Cuthbertine Church, but are unrecorded in the *HSC*.

More important is the second issue. Arguably the key Cuthbertine event from this dark period of the *HSC* is conspicuous in its absence: the relocation from Chester-le-Street to Durham in 995. In arguing for the eleventh-century dating of the

\(^{105}\) *LDE* iii.8, p. 166; iii.20, pp. 198-200; ii.13, pp. 124-6.

\(^{106}\) See above, pp. 51-2. The Guthfrith and Alfred tales of battle victory appear in *HSC* 33, pp. 68-70 and 15-18, pp. 54-8 respectively.

text, South wrote that the author would not have been concerned with recording the relocation, asserting that: ‘the move to Durham may not have seemed particularly momentous in the first century after it took place, and may have even been considered another temporary change, with hopes for an eventual return to Lindisfarne’. He suggested that Durham only became a definite location some time later, supported by the fact that Cuthbert’s miraculous sanction of the Durham location only appeared in the early twelfth century, in Symeon’s *LDE*.

However, it seems that Durham was regarded as a long-term location for the Cuthbertine Church very soon after 995. Symeon of Durham writes that almost immediately after the Community’s arrival at what is now Durham, they built a stone church ‘of some size’, completed in 998.\(^\text{108}\) This is in contrast to the wooden church that had served the Community at Chester-le-Street. Whilst timber churches were by no means unusual as structures intended for long-term usage when the Cuthbertine entourage arrived in Chester-le-Street in 883, Eric Cambridge has argued that the failure to build a stone replacement implies that the Community intended only a temporary stay there.\(^\text{109}\) After a century in this wooden church, the Cuthbertine Church may well have viewed it with a greater sense of permanency, especially if one takes into consideration the technological decline in the region,\(^\text{110}\) but this only serves to underline the long-term intentions behind building a stone church at Durham.

One further omission is also interesting in the context of the settlement at Durham. Uhtred, son of Earl Waltheof of Northumbria and earl himself from 1006, who was the secular power behind the Community’s decision to settle at Durham in

---

\(^\text{108}\) *LDE* iii.2, pp. 148-50; iii.4, p. 152.

\(^\text{109}\) He asserts that there were many stone churches in the Chester-le-Street area in the late ninth century, and that the church in Chester-le-Street was built within a Roman fort, providing plentiful materials, E. Cambridge, ‘The Early Church in County Durham: A Reassessment’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 137 (1984), 65-85 and Cambridge, ‘Why Chester-le-Street?’, pp. 371-4.

995 and who defeated the Scottish siege of Durham in 1006, receives only a brief mention: he is the third in a list of three earls to whom Bishop Ealdhun (990-1018) gives land.\textsuperscript{111} This is particularly noteworthy given that the Cuthbertine Church produced a tract containing far more detail about Uhtred, his defeat of the Scots and Church lands, \textit{De obsessione Dunelmi, et de probitate Uhtredi comitis, et de comitibus qui ei successerunt}.\textsuperscript{112} If the entire \textit{HSC} was written in the eleventh century, as a record of property and associated dynastic connections, it seems odd that, having given such fullsome accounts for West Saxon kings, the author would give Uhtred such cursory treatment. This is particularly true as the story of Uhtred would marry well with the themes of the settlement of the itinerant Church, and the defeat of attacks on Church land, particularly by the Scots. It seems that the section referring to Uhtred was appended to the \textit{HSC} some time after its inception, perhaps when the text became used as a store for land transactions. Thus, more broadly, not only is there a complete absence of material in the \textit{HSC} on the latter half of the tenth century, but the inclusions for the eleventh century are rather brief and without the concerns seen earlier in the text, indicating that they were added to the \textit{HSC} after the earlier sections had been compiled.

\textbf{The Composite Text: Proposed theory for the \textit{HSC}’s production}

The numerous concerns of the \textit{HSC} reflect the changing needs of Cuthbert’s Church, and the many stages in which the text was written. It has been widely accepted that it is a compilation of various sources: of miracles, charters and other property documents, and records of legal rights.\textsuperscript{113} However, it has also been argued,
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{111} \textit{HSC} 31, pp. 66-8.
\item \textsuperscript{112} For discussion of this text see Richard Fletcher, \textit{Bloodfeud. Murder and Revenge in Anglo-Saxon England} (London, 2002), pp. 4-7 and \textit{passim}, and Morris, \textit{Marriage and Murder}.
\item \textsuperscript{113} See for example South, \textit{HSC}, pp. 4-8 and p. 33.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
in the eleventh-century model, that this compilation was created by one single author, on the basis that it possesses an ‘essential thematic unity’.

Certainly, the main concerns of the *HSC*, of dynastic connections, possessions and legal rights, are woven together in the text, but it seems logical that several authors could have produced such ‘thematic unity’. The problem with single, or even two-stage authorship arises with the *HSC*’s lack of logical sequence and stylistic continuity. Several examples of this have been identified above. Drawing upon them, it is possible to propose a model for the composite production of the *HSC*.

Fig. 1 gives a summary of the *HSC*. It shows groupings of sections which indicate the possible phases in which the text was written; fig. 2 then offers one suggestion for the order in which the sections may have been written. This suggestion is not intended as a definitive alternative model for the *HSC*, but is described below as an example of how such a composite text may have been created over time, with several possible intended end-points. Indeed, the first 13 sections of the *HSC* contain such stylistic inconsistencies, thematic leaps and repetitions that one may only attempt several suggestions as to how that part of the text was constructed.

Sections 1-3 were compiled to summarise Cuthbert’s life and to connect a number of land acquisitions directly with the major *topoi*. I have separated sections 4-7 as they are stylistically different, far more akin to charter-style, even when mentioning a healing miracle, than the preceding narrative group. These sections could have been compiled as the first stage of the *HSC*: a collection of accounts establishing the territorial extent of the Cuthbertine Church to the late eighth century.

The last line in section 7 links with section 11, through their common mention of Scaldings. 7 and 11 also share a rather haphazard lack of chronology: the former...

---

115 See pp. 72-3.
discusses Ecgfrith’s defeat of Wulfhere, in 674, alongside the arrival of the Scaldings, presumably in the late ninth century; section 11 records that prior to the Scalding invasion, King Ceolfwulf (d.764) and bishop Ecgred (830-45) gave land to the Church. Placed together, the last line of 7 and the first of 11 dovetail: ‘after his [Ecgfrith’s] death, the Scaldings came and crushed York and devastated the land.’ ‘Before the Scaldings came to England, King Ceolwulf and Bishop Ecgred gave to Cuthbert four vills...’. It seems possible that a compiler wanted to correct the absence of any mention of land given by King Ceolwulf, and to mention him alongside Ecgred would be appropriate given that this bishop purportedly translated Ceolwulf’s remains to Norham. Equally, though, it is plausible that section 11 was inserted after 8 and 9 (concerning Ceolwulf and Ecgred) were written, to remedy the fact that some estates given by these two men had not been mentioned.

Such internal referencing and lack of chronological order point towards this part of the HSC having been reworked several times. This reworking may have resulted in a number of permutations, and the placing of sections 8 to 10 between the neatly matched 7 and 11 supports this. Again, there is repetition, this time of the land grants from Ceolwulf and Ecgred that are also mentioned in section 11. Sections 8 and 9 do offer context for these grants, stating that King Ceolwulf retires to Lindisfarne, and that Ecgred transports the Church to Norham: perhaps the HSC previously did not have sufficient information on these two key figures in the Cuthbertine Church.

116 The late-eighth- and early-ninth-century Danish incursions are not mentioned elsewhere in the HSC. Section 11 (p. 50) refers to the episcopate of Ecgred (830-45) as before the Scaldings arrived in England. This raises a question over the level of impact felt when the Danes arrived in the eighth century. See Sawyer, Kings and Vikings, p. 94, and see below, p. 109.


118 AL 830, p. 483; LDE ii.5, p. 92, but see note 33 on that page which discusses the textual inconsistencies over this claim.
The following section 10 tells of the misappropriation of lands by Osberht (d.867) and Ælle, and of their defeat by the Danish under Ubba. Its narrative style follows comfortably from section 9, and it leads smoothly into 12 which starts ‘So, with Ælle and his brother Osberht slain…’, again underlining the odd placement of 11 with its very abrupt return to Ceolwulf and Ecgred. A similar interruption occurs between 12 and 14, connected by Halfdan; the mention of Ubba in 14, continuing from the theme of section 10, implies that these three sections, 10, 12 and 14, were written together but enmeshed rather awkwardly with other insertions. Here, the apparent interloper is section 13, concerning Guthfrith’s election as king and his provision of lands and sanctuary. The Guthfrith theme links this with 19b, which states that Abbot Eadred bought land from that king: 19b is currently oddly placed within the lengthy West Saxon part of the HSC. It is also feasible that section 20 was written at this stage: it recounts the wandering of the Community and the settlement at Chester-le-Street, linking with Guthfrith, who enabled their settlement there, and neatly concluding this pre-West Saxon section of the HSC. This could indeed be an intended end-point of the HSC, as the settlement at Chester-le-Street would provide the ideal stimulus for producing a text on the Church’s possessions.

Until now, an attempt has been made to discern the order in which the rather haphazard sections 1-14, 19b and 20 were written. The above explanations should demonstrate that the HSC was from its outset a composite piece, an attempt to work together several complementary but sometimes overlapping scraps and longer pieces on the Cuthbertine Church. These explanations should also show that these sections may have gone through many stages of reworking, before reaching the order in which the HSC now appears, which had been established by the late eleventh century, the

119 The exception is the final line which seems to have been added later, to link with King Alfred. For discussion, see below, p. 67.
date of our earliest manuscript. Some concerns of sections 1-14 and 19b - the extent of the initial Lindisfarne endowment, defence against Danish and local attack, cordial relations with Northumbrian rulers – imply that the early HSC was written while these concerns were still current, before the advent of West Saxon involvement, and not in the eleventh century. There is far clearer evidence for the piecemeal composition of the text, and for the dating of at least some stages, in the following sections.

Sections 15 to 28 record the Cuthbertine Church’s relations with the West Saxon dynasty. The compiler appears to have had some problem with engineering this section into the text, due to the desire to include a backdated and probably fabricated connection with King Alfred. Here emerge the chronological and stylistic inconsistencies that have led to the debate over whether the Alfred miracle was interpolated. It seems that it was indeed inserted into a pre-existing text: not an HSC written entirely in the mid-tenth century as Craster argued, but the early sections described above, which ended with the association with Guthfrith and settlement at Chester-le-Street. The problem for a compiler lay first in the fact that Alfred’s reign (871-99) predates Guthfrith’s (from 883), and second in his intention to depict parallel images of suffering, of Alfred’s years in hiding (875-8) and the ‘wandering’ of the Community (875-883).

It is probably for these reasons that the West Saxon part of the HSC sits rather awkwardly with the preceding text, and indeed appears to have been inserted with some difficulty. Thus, the West Saxon part (15 to 28) was worked around 19b and 20 (concerning Guthfrith and the wandering). Lines seem to have been added to pre-existing sections to create some semblance of homogeneity: the final line of section 20 tacks the death of Alfred on to the account of the wandering Community that
eventually settled at Chester-le-Street. If the position of section 20 was manipulated, the compiler succeeded in shifting the original emphasis of this section: initially its link with Guthfrith underlined the importance of the settlement at Chester-le-Street; now section 20 is far more about the wandering, to parallel Alfred’s suffering.

Another possible added line provides evidence that the West Saxon sections should not be grouped together. The final sentence of 14 neatly leads from discussion of the marauding Danes to the suffering of King Alfred. Significantly, Alfred is referred to as ‘the father of King Edward’. This phrase is pivotal to our understanding of the *HSC*. It implies that this part was written while Edward was held in the highest regard by the Cuthbertine Church, and this is supported by the numerous sections regarding events during Edward’s reign, compared with far fewer entries on the other West Saxon kings Æthelstan and Edmund.120 The later importance of Edward’s son, Æthelstan, to the Church indicates that the sections of the text concerning Alfred and Edward, which follow from this key line, were added to the *HSC* shortly after the death of Edward, before Æthelstan was of particular importance to the Church. There is further evidence that the end of Edward’s reign, in section 25, formed an intended end-point of the *HSC* in the conclusive ending to that section: Edward advises Æthelstan to honour Cuthbert and then ‘after making this admonition, he happily died’.121 It would indeed be likely that the Cuthbertine Church would commemorate this, their first real connection with a West Saxon king. The prominence of Edward thus provides strong evidence that the text was written in various stages, giving firmer support to the less demonstrable discussion of earlier sections above.

From this stage onwards, the *HSC* seems to have developed largely in the order in which it appears in the surviving manuscripts. It appears that Æthelstan and

120 See above, p. 49.
121 ‘Qua ammonitione facta, feliciter obiit’, *HSC* 25, pp. 64-5.
Edmund may have been added separately. The end of Æthelstan’s reign in section 27 provides a convenient end-point similar to the death of Edward above: before a campaign to the north, he advised his brother Edmund to venerate Cuthbert, and then ‘he departed, fought happily, returned successfully, ruled wisely for many years afterwards and at last died happily’. Finally, the West Saxon dynasty part is ended with Edmund. The abrupt ending of his brief section may, as discussed above, imply that some of the HSC has been lost or discarded. An attempt at dating this section is impossible, but it could be ventured that, like the Edward and Æthelstan parts, it was added just after the Edmund’s reign, possibly in response to the turbulence which must have been felt by the Cuthbertine Church under his brother King Eadred, whose control over Northumbria was lost in 947, regained in 948, lost again in 950 and regained to become a permanent part of England in 954.

Sections 29-32 form the next extant stage of the HSC, leaping several decades from the reign of Edmund to that of Æthelred (978-1016), and ending in the time of Cnut. These sections contrast starkly with much of the preceding text: they have no narrative content and are unconnected, other than through a common cartulary style. They appear to have been added piecemeal to the established HSC, which must by this time have been recognised as a text to which the Church should periodically add information pertaining to its property and connections.

The composite nature of the text is exemplified once more in the final sections, 33 and 34. These recount further deeds of King Guthfrith: his victory over the Scots and confirmation of the rights of the Cuthbertine Church. It could be argued that these narrative sections were contemporary with the other Guthfrith sections, and indeed their style is very similar to that of earlier parts of the text. In particular, there

is an echo of Cuthbert’s speech to Alfred in the words of guidance that the saint offers to Guthfrith: he assures the king that he will have divine support and instructs him for the imminent battle.\textsuperscript{123} Or it could be that they were added after the time of Cnut, to express the Cuthbertine Church’s power over the Scots in the later eleventh century. Whether or not these sections initially formed part of the \textit{HSC} that ended with the reign of Guthfrith, their placement now, after land grants of the eleventh century, indicates again that the \textit{HSC} was open to additions and manipulations. Indeed, it was not uncommon for a series of land grants to be followed by a miracle tale: the \textit{HSC} is just one example, albeit a curious one, of a common style of monastic compilation.

\textsuperscript{123} HSC 33 and 16, pp. 68-71 and 54-7.
texts, and in Richard Sharpe’s recent work, *Titulus*, in which he cautions against the
‘deceptive simplicity’ of identifying author and text.\(^{124}\)

But there are many texts that were active for many centuries, accumulating
additions under the same title. *Libri Vitae* provide a good example: they recorded
people associated with a particular church and thus required frequent updating.
Indeed, the Durham *Liber Vitae* is an interesting parallel to the *HSC*.\(^{125}\) It was begun
in the mid-ninth century as a list of names of secular and ecclesiastical people
probably associated with Lindisfarne, and added to during the tenth and eleventh
centuries in the same vein, before it was used from c.1100 to record names of
Durham monks. Importantly, the earlier period of its existence is concurrent with, and
presumably complementary to, the multi-phase production of the *HSC*. The
Cuthbertine Church existed within the shifting dynastic and ecclesiastical
environment of northern Anglo-Saxon England; it produced figuratively as well as
physically mobile texts that could be used to actively respond to such changes.

\(^{124}\) Walter Pohl, ‘History in Fragments: Montecassino’s politics of memory’, *Early Medieval Europe*
10 (2001), 343-74 is a summary of his *Werkstätte der Erinnerung: Montecassino und die Gestaltung
der langobardischen Vergangenheit* (Vienna, 2001); Richard Sharpe, *Titulus. Identifying Medieval
Latin Texts* (Turnhout, 2003), p.3. See also B. Cerquiglini, *Eloge de la variante: histoire critique de la
See also below, pp. 152-4.

\(^{125}\) On the current Durham *Liber Vitae* project, see [http://www.kcl.ac.uk/humanities/cch/dlv.html](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/humanities/cch/dlv.html), and Rollason et al, *Durham Liber Vitae and its Contexts*. 
FIG. 1

**Summary of Historia de sancto Cuthberto**

1. Incipit
2. Cuthbert’s vision of Aidan’s death [651]; he becomes a monk.
3. King Oswiu [d.670] gives land on account of Cuthbert’s saintliness; Cuthbert becomes hermit, then bishop of Lindisfarne.
4. The lands of Lindisfarne.
5. King Ecgfrith [d.685] and Archbishop Theodore give lands in, and around York, and Carlisle.
6. Cuthbert raises a boy from the dead; Ecgfrith gives lands.
8. Ceolwulf becomes king [729-37] but retires to Lindisfarne [d.764]; he gives land to Cuthbert.
10. Kings Osberht and Ælle take from Cuthbert; they are defeated by Ubba (and Cuthbert).
11. Before Scaldings came to England, King Ceolwulf and Bishop Ecgrd give land [730s and 830s].
12. After Osberht and Ælle are slain, Scaldings ravage; Halfdan devastates Cuthbert’s property but driven away raving and reeking [877].
13. Cuthbert installs Guthfrith as King [883]; Guthfrith gives right of sanctuary.
14. Danes/Frisians under Ubba and Halfdan control from York south; they drive King Alfred into hiding [878].
15-18. Cuthbert provides food for Alfred, and guides him to defeat the Danes.
19a. Alfred conveys gifts to Cuthbert through his son Edward.
19b. Abbot Eadred buys land from Guthfrith.
20. Bishop Eardulf [854-99] and Abbot Eadred lead community and Cuthbert from Lindisfarne [c.875]; attempt to take to Ireland but prevented by miracle of waves of blood.
23. Ragnald divides Cuthbert’s lands between Scula and Onlafbald [c.915]. Onlafbald questions Cuthbert’s holiness and is killed. Cuthbert regains land.
25. King Edward instructs Æthelstan to love Cuthbert, then dies [924].
26. King Æthelstan en route to Scotland; gives land and portable goods to Cuthbert (charter form).
27. Æthelstan instructs Edmund to venerate Cuthbert. He dies [939].
28. King Edmund visits Cuthbert en route to Scotland and offers money and goods, and confirms legal rights [945?].
29. (Charter form) Styr gives land (via King Æthelred [978-1016]).
30. Snaculf gives land.
32. Cnut gives lands [poss. 1031].
33. Guthred defeats the Scots via Cuthbert’s powers.
34. Guthred gives rights and protection.
FIG. 2

**Possible order of writing of Historia de sancto Cuthberto**

1. Incipit
2. Cuthbert’s vision of Aidan’s death [651]; he becomes a monk.
3. King Oswiu [d.670] gives land on account of Cuthbert’s saintliness; Cuthbert becomes hermit, then bishop of Lindisfarne.
4. The lands of Lindisfarne.
5. King Egfrith [d.685] and Archbishop Theodore give lands in, and around York, and Carlisle.
6. Cuthbert raises a boy from the dead; Egfrith gives lands.
7. Egfrith defeats Wulfhere through Wilfrid and Cuthbert’s help; gives land to Cuthbert. After his death Scaldings devastate around York.
8. Before Scaldings came to England, King Ceolwulf and Bishop Ecgred? give land [730s and 830s].
10. Kings Osberht and Ælle take from Cuthbert; they are defeated by Ubba (and Cuthbert).
11. After Osberht and Ælle are slain, Scaldings ravage; Halfdan devastates Cuthbert’s property but driven away raving and reeking [877].
12. Danes/Frisians under Ubba and Halfdan control from York south; they drive King Alfred into hiding [878].
13. Cuthbert installs Guthred as King [883]; Guthred gives right of sanctuary.
15-18. Cuthbert provides food for Alfred, and guides him to defeat the Danes.
19a. Alfred conveys gifts to Cuthbert through his son Edward.
20. Bishop Eardulf [854-99] and Abbot Eadred lead community and Cuthbert from Lindisfarne [c.875]; attempt to take to Ireland but prevented by miracle of waves of blood.
23. Ragnald divides Cuthbert’s lands between Scula and Onlafald [c.915]. Onlafald questions Cuthbert’s holiness and is killed. Cuthbert regains land.
25. King Edward instructs Æthelstan to love Cuthbert, then dies [924].
26. King Æthelstan en route to Scotland; gives land and portable goods to Cuthbert (charter form).
27. Æthelstan instructs Edmund to venerate Cuthbert. He dies [939].
28. King Edmund visits Cuthbert en route to Scotland and offers money and goods, and confirms legal rights [945?].
29. (Charter form) Styr gives land (via King Æthelred [978-1016]).
30. Snaculf gives land.
32. Cnut gives lands [poss. 1031].
33. Guthfrith defeats the Scots via Cuthbert’s powers.
34. Guthfrith gives rights and protection.
CHAPTER 2
IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH AND COMMUNITY:
*LIBELLUS DE EXORDIO PROCURSU ISTIUS, HOC EST DUNHELMENSIS, ECCLESIE*

**Introduction**

On Friday 26th May 1083, William de St Calais, bishop of Durham, replaced the clerical Community of St Cuthbert with a convent of Benedictine monks. For this Church, characterised by immense change, this was the last upheaval before the sixteenth-century reformation; as was so often the case with medieval texts, Symeon’s *Libellus de exordio procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*¹ was written in response to upheaval: it is generally assumed that this was the monastic takeover of 1083.

This *Tract on the Origins and Progress of this the Church of Durham* was written, probably by a team led by Symeon of Durham,² between 1104 and 1107x15.³ It was produced at the behest of Symeon’s superiors in the convent and was therefore noted by H.S. Offler to be an ‘official history’ of the Church.⁴ Whilst other Cuthbertine works, in particular the *HSC*, may have been officially authorized, what sets the *LDE* apart is that, continuations aside, it was written within a very specific

---

¹ Rollason, *LDE*.
³ On the dating of the *LDE*, and relevance of MSS see Rollason, *LDE*, pp. xix-xx, xlii. There are several references within the text which show that Turgot was prior at the time of writing. The capitalisation of his name in the list of Durham monks, probably part of the text’s original preface, is consistent with the similar highlighting of later priors, *LDE* Preface, p. 6. See Rollason, *LDE*, pp. xviii-xx for discussion of the MSS which shows the list to have been part of the original MS. This is corroborated by the statement later in the text, that Turgot ‘to this day holds in the Church of Durham the office of prior, which was some time ago entrusted to him by Bishop William’ (*hodie in hac id est Dunelmensi ecclesia dudum sibi traditum a Willelmo episcopo prioratum tenet*) *LDE* iii.22, pp. 206-7. This line, visible in London, British Library MS Cotton Faustina A.V, is erased in other MSS: see Rollason, *LDE*, p. 207, n.85. Turgot was prior of Durham Cathedral Priory from 1087. In 1107 he was elected bishop of St Andrews, but he may have remained prior to 1109, or until his death in 1115. The translation of Cuthbert’s tomb in 1104 to the current cathedral in Durham (*LDE* i.10, pp. 52-3, and n.67) is the latest datable event of the *LDE* and therefore its earliest production date. Furthermore, the fact that it is mentioned early in the text indicates that the whole work was written after this date.
time-frame and conceived in the form in which it appears in Rollason’s edition. It records the establishment of the monastery and episcopal see on Lindisfarne under King Oswald and Bishop Aidan, and the early development of the Church including Cuthbert’s role and the literary contribution of Bede. Then follows the suffering of the Church, its flight from Lindisfarne, its wandering and settlement at Chester-le-Street, and its relations with various Scandinavian and West Saxon kings and nobles. It records the final translocation to Durham and accounts of various bishops. The LDE reaches its climax with the events of 1083, and with death of William de St Calais.

By recording the history of the Church from its origins, the LDE aimed to establish the identity of the Church, to create a flowing narrative of an institution subject to great change over many centuries, but marked by continuity, particularly through its Community, its writing, and the cult of Cuthbert. The issue of defining a particular identity is a thorny one; I do not wish to become entangled with it here. It is however important to note two points: first that identity is often explicitly represented or described when it is threatened in some way, or precipitated by a crisis; second, it can be argued that the need to define a community’s identity can render that identity an artificial construct – if the common identity existed, there would be no need to define it. Thus the identity that the LDE portrayed was constructed in the twelfth century, at a critical time for the Church. It is the purpose of this chapter to ascertain how the Cuthbertine Church constructed its identity in the LDE. How did the Church

---

5 Walter Pohl, ‘Memory, Identity and Power in Lombard Italy’, Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, eds., The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 9-28, uses the example of a thirteenth-century tale of the Lombards to explain this concept.

6 Zygmunt Bauman, Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 11-12: ‘Since ‘community’ means a shared understanding of the ‘natural and ‘tacit’ kind, it won’t survive the moment in which understanding turns self-conscious, and so loud and vociferous’.
define itself? What was the role of the written tradition in this? And what part did Cuthbert play?

It has long been accepted that the events of 1083 stimulated the production of the *LDE*. Where opinions diverge is over why these events could have led to the writing of such a lengthy, polished, official history of Cuthbert’s Church. This question forms the foundation to this chapter’s discussion of the *LDE*’s expression of identity. In his edition of the *LDE*, David Rollason argued that the replacement of the clerical *congregatio* with monks in 1083 must have been highly controversial, and the source of disagreement over property and the legitimacy of the new convent. Beyond this local context, Rollason asserted that the *LDE* ‘breathes the spirit of reconciliation between the native English and the continental incomers’: after the violent impact of the Normans in the north, including the events of 1083, Symeon’s work highlighted the continuing importance of the Church’s Anglo-Saxon past, albeit under the new foreign control.⁷

Other scholars have also conveyed the abruptness of change in 1083, and the overriding factor of Norman control, in stimulating the production of the *LDE*. Bernard Meehan showed that Symeon asserted the post-1083 monks’ claim to rights and property, defensively guarding against external interference whilst accepting the Norman influence.⁸ Meryl Foster argued that the implanted monks sought, through the *LDE*, to simultaneously show their continuity from the pre-1083 *congregatio*, and the inherent problems with that community.⁹ Alan Piper also emphasised that the *LDE* was not critical of the pre-1083 Community, but sought to justify the position of

---

⁷ Rollason, *LDE*, pp. lxxxi-xci. See also David Rollason, ‘Symeon of Durham and the Community’.
⁹ Foster, ‘Custodians of St Cuthbert’.
the new convent, as a continuation of the monks who had served the Lindisfarne Church and subsequently Cuthbert’s cult.\textsuperscript{10}

It is implicit in all these arguments that the \textit{LDE} was written by and for the Community, as opposed to the Durham Church as a whole: for the monks as separate from the episcopal and jurisdictional elements of the institution. William Aird was far more explicit on this issue, and offered an alternative reason behind Symeon’s \textit{LDE}: a detailed discussion of the idea that H.S. Offler put forth.\textsuperscript{11} Aird argued that, whilst the events of 1083 formed the climax of the \textit{LDE}, the specific stimulus behind Symeon’s text lay in the convent’s need to assert its position against the overbearing bishop Ranulf Flambard (1099-1128).\textsuperscript{12} This issue of the monks’ rights became prominent under William de St Calais (1080-96), who began the process of defining and instituting the rights of the convent as distinct from those of the episcopate, mainly in the context of conventual appointments and property.\textsuperscript{13} Relations between William de St Calais and the Durham monks were unproblematic, possibly because his absences enabled the convent – particularly Prior Turgot - to wield influence, but his policies were to generate discord under his successor. Ranulf Flambard’s previous role, exacting from vacant bishoprics and abbeys for William Rufus, is a fitting precursor to his actions as Bishop of Durham. Hampered initially by his own exile and the influence of a convent led by Turgot, Flambard gradually established his own power, promoting his kin, reducing monastic privileges and conveniently despatching Turgot to be Bishop of St Andrews. A vacancy of over four years followed Flambard’s death in 1128, enabling the convent to reassert its power, including, possibly, through the writing of the continuations of the \textit{LDE} which are more critical of bishops than the

\textsuperscript{10} Piper, ‘First Durham Monks and the Cult’.
\textsuperscript{11} Offler, \textit{Medieval Historians of Durham}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{12} Aird, ‘Political Context’.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{LDE} iv.3 and iv.5, pp. 228-34 and 236-8.
main text. 14 Behind Aird’s argument, that the LDE was produced in response to these episcopal-convent problems, lies his assertion that the events of 1083 were far less cataclysmic than Symeon would have us believe; 15 concerns of the early twelfth century, when, after all, the LDE was written, are far more likely to have been behind the production of the text.

Aird’s arguments, while forcefully countered in particular by Rollason, 16 raise two issues that are crucial to our understanding of the text. First, the assertion that the LDE exaggerates the level of change in 1083 is part of Aird’s thesis that the Normans did not have an overwhelming and dictatorial influence on the Church of Durham. The LDE gives many examples of the Cuthbertine Church demonstrating its power over the Normans: Cuthbert’s protection during the ‘harrying of the North’, and against Earl Robert Cumin; the punishment of William the Conqueror’s impious misgivings over Cuthbert’s incorrupt presence at Durham; and the rebuke of William Rufus’ tax-gatherer, tentatively identified as the later bishop Ranulf Flambard. 17 There is more concrete evidence behind Aird’s caution against viewing the Normans’ impact on Cuthbert’s Church as violent and military, and behind his suggestion that they ‘recognised the power of the traditions of that institution and became, in their turn, devotees and advocates of the Halig wer [Cuthbert]’. 18 To take an example pertinent to the LDE, William de St Calais could be seen as a bishop implanted by

14 See below, pp. 114-6, on the criticism of bishops. For a detailed discussion of these convent-episcopate events see Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans, ch. 4, particularly pp. 170-1 on the debate over the notoriety achieved by Flambard. Aird maintains a rather more cautious view of Flambard than that of Sir Richard Southern, ‘Rannulf Flambard and Early Anglo-Norman Administration’.
16 Rollason, LDE, pp. lxxxi-lxxxii.
17 LDE iii.15, pp. 182-6; iii.19, p. 196; iii.20, pp. 196-8 and n.73.
18 Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans, pp. 268-75. See also below, pp. 187-90.
Normans to introduce blanket reforms and thus cement Norman control,\(^{19}\) but William in fact spent very little of his episcopate in Durham.\(^{20}\) Furthermore, in the list of monks who formed the Benedictine convent of 1083, the names are almost entirely Anglo-Saxon – according to Symeon, from Northumbria and southern England - implying that Bishop William was not wielding outside control through the infiltration of Norman monks;\(^ {21}\) as Aird argues, there is no reason to assume that the post-1083 convent was not largely native, including members of the pre-1083 community who had welcomed Benedictine reform.\(^ {22}\)

This example of Community influence leads to the second issue raised by Aird, that the LDE presented the Community as separate from the episcopate of the Church. This is not to say that Community and bishop always worked independently: as David Rollason points out, the monks joined with bishops to claim land misappropriated from the Church in the decades following the Norman conquest,\(^ {23}\) and in the LDE itself, and in the near-contemporary miracle collection De miraculis, accounts of troubled times show bishops working with the congregatio, with no indication of separate rights or property.\(^ {24}\) The LDE does, though, depict bishops such as Æthelric and his brother Æthelwine acting against the Church.\(^ {25}\) By the final book of the LDE, covering the episcopate of William de St Calais (1080-96), there is a consistent portrayal of a Community very separate - indeed independent – from the bishop. In particular it stresses that Bishop William’s separation of his lands from monastic property ‘was made necessary by the ancient custom of this Church that


\(^{21}\) This list appears in one LDE manuscript: Durham, University Library, MS Cosin V.II.6, ff.6 r-v.

\(^{22}\) Aird, Cuthbert and the Normans, p. 138 and p. 272.

\(^{23}\) LDE iv.5, pp. 236-8 and discussion on pp. lxxvii-lxxxviii. See also H.Reg s.a. 1121, pp. 260-2.

\(^{24}\) Eg. LDE ii.6, pp. 100-2; iii.1, pp. 144-6. De mir ch. 2, pp. 234-7; ch. 6, pp. 245-7.

\(^{25}\) LDE iii.9 and 11, pp. 170-2 and 174.
whoever should serve God there in the presence of the body of St Cuthbert should hold their lands segregated from those of the bishop’;\textsuperscript{26} this statement tacitly defends the monks’ position against the power of Bishop Ranulf Flambard (1099-1128), the probable stimulus for the \textit{LDE}.

The identity that is depicted in the \textit{LDE} is thus geared specifically towards serving the Community’s needs, not those of Cuthbert’s cult. Here, the \textit{LDE} forms an interesting contrast with the other Cuthbertine texts in this study: it is explicitly about Church issues, rather than dealing with these issues through the lens of Cuthbert’s cult. The \textit{LDE} does undoubtedly have a place, though, among the Cuthbertine texts of this study: it is compiled with the other texts in many manuscripts, and was probably used as a quarry for new composite works, such as the \textit{Brevis Relatio}.\textsuperscript{27} Cuthbert does play an important, but certainly not focal role in the \textit{LDE}: the cursory reference to the momentous rediscovery of his incorrupt body in 1104 is a clear indication that this text is not concerned specifically with Cuthbert’s cult.\textsuperscript{28} However, the fact that the \textit{LDE} often appears in manuscripts with \textit{De miraculis}, including its lengthy account of the 1104 exhumation, provides a fine example of the Cuthbertine texts working in harmony: the early twelfth century saw Cuthbert’s church needing to justify the settlement in Durham, the position of the post-1083 Community, and the events of 1104; the \textit{LDE} satisfied the former two, \textit{De miraculis} dealt with the third.

The \textit{LDE} therefore sought to convey the identity of the Church: of a Community rightful in its occupation of Durham, in its guardianship of Cuthbert’s body as heir to the Lindisfarne monks, in its position \textit{vis à vis} the episcopate, and finally resilient and powerful in the face of Norman influence. The following

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{LDE} iv.3, pp. 232-3: ‘\textit{Antiqua enim ipsius ecclesie hoc exigit consuetudo, ut qui Deo coram sancti Cuthberti corpore ministrant, segregatas a terris episcopi suas habeant}’.

\textsuperscript{27} See below, ch. 4, especially pp. 161-2.

\textsuperscript{28} This is discussed further below, pp. 87 and 99.
discussion shows how this identity was conveyed, first with an explanation of the 
*LDE’s* structure, and then with a detailed examination of how this structure built the 
Church’s identity.

**Structure of the *LDE***

**Book Formation**

The *LDE* was constructed in four books that charted phases of the Church’s 
development, all the while conveying the continuity of the Church from its outset to 
1083 and beyond. Owing to its New Testament parallels, the four-book structure was 
not unusual in medieval historical texts, but it may have held additional significance 
for the Church of St Cuthbert as the earliest *Vita* of Cuthbert by a Lindisfarne monk 
was similarly written in four books.

Each book of the *LDE* recounts a separate stage in the Church’s history: the 
first book establishes the monastic origins of the Church particularly through the role 
of Cuthbert and of Bede; the second conveys the suffering of the Church and the 
efforts to maintain a quasi-monastic presence around Cuthbert’s body as the 
institution was forced to relocate several times; the third book is concerned with the 
settlement at Durham and the episcopal-secular machinations of the Church as it 
cements its power; finally, the fourth book is dominated by the return to monasticism. 
The book format thus identified the Church’s temporally defined stages of 
development and ascribed to each stage a distinct layer of identity.²⁹

---

²⁹ Continuations to the *LDE*, added after Symeon’s initial writing of the text, are discussed below, pp. 
122-3.
Dating Clauses

Throughout these stages, continuity is emphasised by repetition of themes: monasticism, the roots of the Church and the importance of Cuthbert are the most prevalent. The most obvious device for conveying these themes is the dating clause: all important events are accompanied by an elaborate system of dates, each of which carries particular significance. Taking as an example the LDE’s pivotal date, 26th May 1083 was described via six events – Incarnatione Domini, William the Conqueror’s reign, Cuthbert’s death, Bishop Ealdhun’s settlement in Durham with the saint’s body, Aldwin’s arrival in Northumbria to bring monasticism to the north of England, and William de St Calais’ episcopate. These six elements to the dating clause connected the events of 1083 with divine and Norman recognition, the centrality of Cuthbert, the significance of settlement in Durham, the importance of Aldwin’s re-established monasteries at Wearmouth and Jarrow, and the role of Bishop William de St Calais. Further prominent themes in dating clauses were the length of the see’s existence from its establishment under Aidan and Oswald, and references to events such as the flight from Lindisfarne in the late ninth century which led to changes in the type of observance followed by the Community. Dating clauses were tools by which Symeon emphasised the main themes of his work; the repetition of these themes helped to create continuity by identifying the present Community with its past permutations.

30 LDE iv.3, p. 228
Part I: Origins

Venerating the Past

The essential nature of continuity, from the inception of the Church to the twelfth century, was established from the outset of the LDE. Book One, concerned with the origins (de exordio), introduces the elements of the Church’s past that formed the basis of its identity: these were Lindisfarne, the founders Oswald and Aidan, Cuthbert, monasticism, and Bede. It should be noted that Cuthbert’s position here is among a number of other elements: he and his cult, whilst ever-present, certainly were not central to this text.

Lindisfarne

This tract on the origins and progress of the Church fittingly begins with Lindisfarne, the original home of the Church.

Although for various reasons this Church no longer stands in the place where Oswald founded it, nevertheless by virtue of the constancy of its faith, the dignity and authority of its episcopal throne, and the status of the dwelling-place of monks established there by the king himself and by Bishop Aidan, it is still the very same Church founded by God’s command.  

This, in the very first chapter of the LDE, underlines the facets of the Lindisfarne Church that were continued through to the twelfth-century Durham Community: the religious dedication, the episcopacy, and monasticism. A lengthy dating clause in the second chapter of this first book heralds the importance of 635, when Lindisfarne was established, and associates the event with the coming of Christianity to England in 597. After the importance of Lindisfarne has been established in Book One, and just like the other elements of the Church’s identity in this first Book, it is mentioned periodically through the LDE. Symeon includes a description of it by ‘our

31 LDE i.1, pp. 16-17.
32 LDE i.2, pp. 20-1.
forefathers’, amidst his description of the Viking attacks of 793, looking to the Lindisfarne past as a model of spiritual perfection in better times.33

By later in the text though, Lindisfarne once more has an active role, as a safe haven for the Community, and as a pilgrimage site;34 De miraculis and Reginald’s Libellus also reflect this active Lindisfarne role, and indeed the latter describes how a new Church was built on Lindisfarne under Edward the monk in the late eleventh century. This piece of ‘architectural propaganda’, was strikingly similar to the new Durham Cathedral, strengthening the legitimacy of Durham as the location of the Church and its saint. A cenotaph, placed on the site where Cuthbert had been entombed on Lindisfarne, pertinently marked the fact that his body no longer lay there and insinuated the physical presence of Cuthbert at Durham.35 The LDE was therefore not only communicating the importance of the original location of the Church, and all that it stood for, but also the current, regenerated role of Lindisfarne as a Durham Church centre in the early twelfth century.

Finally, and perhaps the event that sparked the renovation of the Church at Lindisfarne, it was used as a model for the new Durham Community. William de St Calais conducted thorough research into the origins of the Church as a basis for the convent at Durham from 1083, and according to Symeon used Bede’s Vita and his Historia Ecclesiastica as his sources on the Lindisfarne community.36 When he established the new monastic community in 1083, he drafted in monks who had recently settled at Wearmouth and Jarrow under Aldwin, who was also inspired by

33 LDE ii.5, pp. 86-88.
34 Eg. LDE iii.15-16, pp. 184-192.
Bede’s accounts of monasticism at Lindisfarne,\textsuperscript{37} and the offices given to this post-1083 Durham monastic Community were determined according to further consultation of Bede’s work.\textsuperscript{38}

\textbf{Oswald and Aidan}

Oswald and Aidan are venerated from the first chapter of the \textit{LDE}, bound together as the founding fathers of the Church. Their attributes are described in turn, in the first and second chapters. First ‘it seems proper to include by way of introduction a few words about the nobility of the flesh inherited by [the Church’s] founder King Oswald’, and so follows an account of the King’s lineage. While giving great respect to Oswald, the account is brief, and refers the reader to a lengthier depiction in Bede’s \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}; Aidan is dealt with in a similar fashion in the second chapter, which quotes directly from Bede’s \textit{HE},\textsuperscript{39} setting the pattern in the \textit{LDE} for referring the reader to other texts, noting the textual heritage of the Church and particularly marking the importance of Bede.\textsuperscript{40}

The significance of Oswald and Aidan in the \textit{LDE}, as with the prominence of Lindisfarne, echoes the rekindled enthusiasm for these men in the twelfth century. Reginald’s \textit{Libellus} again provides evidence of this, as does his writing of a \textit{Vita} of Oswald in the 1160s;\textsuperscript{41} moreover, five of the 21 twelfth-century manuscripts containing Bede’s \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti} also contain \textit{vitae} of Oswald and Aidan derived from Bede’s \textit{HE}, and a further manuscript contains the life of Aidan and a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} \textit{LDE} iii.21, p. 200.
\item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{LDE} iv.8, pp. 244-6.
\item \textsuperscript{39} \textit{LDE} i.1, p. 18 and i.2, p. 22. See also i.3, p. 24.
\item \textsuperscript{40} See below, pp. 98-103.
\item \textsuperscript{41} \textit{Libellus} chs. 42 and 80, pp. 87-9 and 165-8. The \textit{Vita} is printed in incomplete form in Arnold, \textit{Sym.Op.} i, pp. 326-85. See Victoria Tudor, ‘Reginald’s \textit{Life of Oswald}, Osw\textit{ald}, pp. 178-94.
\end{itemize}
Hymn and Office of Oswald. These men, in the *LDE* and elsewhere, illustrated key facets of the twelfth-century Durham Church’s identity: together they represented the founding of the Church, in particular when mentioned alongside the consecration of Ealdhun’s church at Durham. Oswald was the bastion of Northumbrian power and independence; and the *LDE* stated that the monasticism maintained in the Church was ‘following doubtless the example of the first bishop Aidan who was a monk and accustomed to lead the monastic life together with all his companions’.

**Cuthbert**

If Oswald is the focus of the first chapter, and Aidan the second, Cuthbert’s entrance in the third chapter completes ‘a most effective triptych of the saints at the heart of the Durham cult’. Inevitably, Cuthbert’s depiction shines more brightly than those of the other two: whilst Aidan and Oswald are clearly portrayed as the founders of the Church, Cuthbert is accredited as the ‘father’ of the Community later in the text, during the period of the Community’s wandering. But there are many occasions on which Cuthbert is placed alongside Aidan and Oswald, just as in the manuscripts of Bede’s *Vita*. Indeed, the opening lines of the *LDE* illustrate the physical proximity of Cuthbert and Oswald: ‘In praise of God and under his perpetual guardianship [the Church] preserves those relics of devout veneration, the undecayed body of the most saintly father Cuthbert and the venerable head of that same king and

---

42 The MSS containing both *Vitae* are: Oxford, Bodleian MS Digby 175; Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 491; Laon, Bibliotheque Publique, MS 163; Durham Cathedral Chapter MS A.iv.35; London, British Library MS Add. 35110. Cambridge, Trinity College MS O.3.55 contains the Office and Hymn to Oswald: see Colgrave, *Two Lives*, pp. 20-39. See also David Rollason, ‘St Oswald in Post-Conquest England’ in Oswald, pp. 164-77 at pp. 165-6.

43 *LDE* iii.4, pp. 152.

44 *LDE* i.2: ‘*ad ipsius ecclesie presulatum monachi solebant eligi, exemplo nimirum primi antistitis Aidani qui et monachus erat, et monachicam vitam cum suis omnibus agere solebat*’.


46 *LDE* ii.11, pp. 114.
martyr Oswald, both lodged in a single shrine’.\textsuperscript{47} Cuthbert is inserted into the account of the founding of Lindisfarne, entering Melrose in the year of Aidan’s death, long before he became a member of the Community at Lindisfarne; the occasion of Cuthbert’s death connects him again with Aidan and Oswald, as they form part of a dating clause;\textsuperscript{48} and a later miracle links Cuthbert with Oswald once more, emphasising that their relics resided together.\textsuperscript{49}

Despite his rather prominent role in this triptych, though, Cuthbert’s has a low profile in the \textit{LDE} compared with the other Cuthbertine texts. This is not to say that his importance to the Church had declined in any way by the early twelfth century: as was discussed above, the same period saw the production of many manuscripts containing \textit{De miraculis}, a miracle collection usually appended to Bede’s \textit{Vita} that would have satisfied the cult requirements of the time.\textsuperscript{50} But it is necessary, in this chapter dealing with the projected identity of the Church, to explain the place of Cuthbert within this identity, within the \textit{LDE}.

As has been noted above, Cuthbert is a major subject of the first book, which draws heavily on Bede’s prose \textit{Vita} and \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}. All the major events and topoi of Cuthbert’s life are accounted for, most in more detail than they had been in the \textit{Historia de Sancto Cuthberto}. He is first mentioned becoming a monk at Melrose.\textsuperscript{51} Cuthbert’s arrival at Lindisfarne is the next significant event, followed by his desire to be a hermit: both these chapters are accompanied by references to miracles, of driving away spirits and healing the sick, underlining the importance of

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{LDE} i.1, pp. 16-17: ‘videlicet que in Dei laudem et perpetuam sui tutelam ipsas sacre venerationis reliquias, incorruptum scilicet sanctissimi patris Cuthberti corpus, et eiusdem regis ac martyris caput venerandum, intra unius loculi conservat hospitium’.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{LDE} i.10, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{LDE} iii.16, pp. 188-90.
\textsuperscript{50} See above, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{LDE} i.3, pp. 24-6.
the topoi.\footnote{LDE i.6-7, pp. 32-40.} Cuthbert’s election to the bishopric followed, along with a description of his exemplary monk-bishop role.\footnote{LDE i.9 and 10, pp. 44-8.} The \textit{LDE} then records his return to Farne, his premonition that he had little time left to live, and his death.\footnote{LDE i.10, pp. 48-54.} Finally, the elevation of Cuthbert’s uncorrupt body in 698 is recounted, the last major topos of his \textit{Vita}.\footnote{LDE i.11, pp. 54-6.} This summary of Bede’s \textit{Vita} was not, however, the central theme of the first Book. Cuthbert’s life is covered in just six of its fifteen chapters, and it is interspersed with continuing references to the operation of the bishopric and Community, and most notably to the influence of Bede: a point to which I return below.\footnote{See below, pp. 98-103.}

The \textit{LDE} uses the miracle tradition that had developed since Bede’s \textit{Vita} in its continuing depiction of Cuthbert. His protective role, building dynastic links and defeating threats, is in evidence. Cuthbert, ‘the father’ of the Community, causes three waves of blood to prevent his body being borne to Ireland;\footnote{LDE ii.11, pp. 112-4.} he guides the bearers of his body through times of poverty and suffering, notably via a miracle when his visionary appearance resulted in finding the gospel book;\footnote{LDE ii.12, pp. 116-20.} and he provides stability after the seven years of wandering, crushing Halfdan, guiding the depleted \textit{congregatio} to Crayke and enthroning the amicable Guthfrith.\footnote{LDE ii.13, pp. 120-6.} As is clear from the miracle involving Guthfrith, Cuthbert not only protects the Community directly, but also offered assistance to dynastic figures who would give reciprocal support if required. His relationship with the West Saxon kings was well attested by the \textit{LDE}, as he is recorded, just as in the \textit{HSC}, saying to Alfred: ‘if you and your sons are faithful to me and to God, you will thereafter have in me an invincible shield to crush all the
strength of your enemies’.

Later, Cuthbert provides protection against the Norman incursions, emphasising the fact that his Church did not bend to these incomers, and in the statement that, in response to Cuthbert’s demonstrations of power, ‘King William himself held the holy confessor and his church always in great veneration’, we see a subtle reminder that the LDE is concerned with the Church and not just the saint.

Whilst there are echoes in these parts of the text of the HSC’s record of the Church’s, and Cuthbert’s, external relations, the LDE mainly shows Cuthbert’s role within the Church, his direct involvement with the Community: again it is clear that this text is about the Church’s internal needs. Throughout the LDE, the Community has a prominent role in the portrayal of Cuthbert. Its members often ask for his help, where in other works of his cult the earthly had no part in stimulating a manifestation of his power. Cuthbert’s aid was frequently sought by the Community in times of adversity, or where direction was required, for example in the decision to leave Lindisfarne in 875, in the request for guidance in 995 which resulted in Cuthbert’s intervention to make them remain at Durham, in the election of Edmund to the bishopric, and in Cuthbert’s rebuke of William Rufus’ tax-gatherer, Ranulf.

The Community’s diligent care for Cuthbert’s body is the clearest message of Cuthbert’s direct involvement with the Community in the LDE: the coffin was the focal point of the Church at all times, particularly when it was forced to relocate. Thus, the 875 flight from the Vikings is depicted as follows, through the transportation of Cuthbert:

---

60 LDE ii.10, p. 112-3: ‘Si autem Deo michique fideles extiteritis, me posthac ad conterendum robur omne inimicorum inexpugnabile defensionis scutum habebitis’; HSC 16, pp. 54-6. LDE ii.16, p. 130, tells how Cuthbert prevented Scula from introducing taxes in Edward’s reign: ii.17-18, pp. 132-8 record the successes of Æthelstan, and ii.18, pp. 138-40 also tells of Edmund’s munificence.

61 LDE iii.20, pp. 198-9: ‘rex ipse Willelmus sanctum confessorem et illius ecclesiam in magna semper veneratione habuit’. See also LDE iii.15, pp. 182-4; iii.19, pp. 196.

62 LDE ii.6, p. 100; iii.1, pp. 144-6; iii.6, pp. 158-60; iii.20, pp. 196-8.
Now when the bishop had taken with him the venerable relics, and had fled from the aforesaid island and deserted the church, there soon followed a dreadful destruction of that place and of the whole kingdom of the Northumbrians, the army of the Danes led by King Halfdan ravaging cruelly everywhere...So the bishop and those who were with him were accompanying the body of the holy father could have nowhere to rest but wandered from place to place, moving hither and thither, backwards and forwards, fleeing in the face of the cruel barbarians.  

For this church with no permanent abode, Cuthbert’s body gave a tangible symbol of continuity and, with its uncrupt state, a divine approval of the Church. It should be noted, though, that in this same chapter, Cuthbert’s relics are joined by others, those of former bishops of Lindisfarne, Eadberht (688-98), Eadfrith (698x731) and Æthelwald (c.731-737/40), and, as further evidence of the triptych, bones of Aidan and the head of Oswald. In the LDE, Cuthbert was the dominant saintly symbol of the Church, but his cult was linked with many others.

Using Cuthbert as a symbol of continuity, the Church’s *congregatio* that formed after the disintegration of the Lindisfarne monastery, is identified in the *LDE* via Cuthbert’s body:

No one was allowed heedlessly to touch the coffin of the holy body or the vehicle on which it was carried, but the reverence due to such holiness was observed, and from among all of them seven men were specially designated for this purpose that, if the coffin or the vehicle needed any attention or repair, none but these should dare to lay a hand on them.

Caring for the body was one of the most important roles within the Community. The priest Elfred Westou, who lived during the time of Bishops Edmund (1021/2-1042) and Æthelwine (1056-71), was a noted devotee of Cuthbert. He was said to have a special relationship with the saint: he possessed one of Cuthbert’s hairs with fire resistant properties that he demonstrated to visiting friends, and according to the *LDE*

---

63 *LDE* ii.6, pp. 104-5: ‘*Cum ergo episcopus una cum venerandis reliquiis fugiens insulam prefatum et ecclesiam deseruisset, mox et ipsius loci et totius Northanhymbrorum provincie seua depopulatio est secuta, exercitu Danorum dactu Halfdene regis crudeliter abique debachante...Unde antistes et quicum illo sancti patris corpus comitabantur nasquam locum requiescendi habere poterant, sed de loco ad locum, hac atque illuc euntes et redeuntes, ante crudelium barbarorum faciern discurrebant*’.  

64 *LDE* ii.10, pp. 110-11: ‘*Nec tamen sacri corporis loculum, nec in quo ferebatur vehiculum passim cauilibet attingere licitum fuerat, sed observata tante sanctitati reverentia, ex omnibus specialiter septem ad hoc ipsum constituati fuerant, ut si quid in his cura vel emendatione indigeret, preter ipsos nemo manum apponere auderet*’.  
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he was held in great reverence by the bishops and fellow clerics, due to his familiarity with Cuthbert. His descendants shared this reverence: they held the powerful church of Hexham, and Elfred’s great-grandson, Aelred of Rievaulx, made certain that his family would be strongly commemorated in later writing. Significantly though, Elfred Westou was also closely connected with other saints. He was an avid collector of relics – Symeon lists those of nine saints - and in particular the LDE underlines Elfred’s efforts to acquire Bede’s bones. The significance of Bede is discussed below; here, this serves as yet another example that the LDE does present Cuthbert as the prominent saint but that his cult existed among many others.

Later, with the reintroduction of monasticism, the custody of Cuthbert’s undecayed body became an official post, symbolising the link in the LDE between monasticism and the saint. When William de St Calais arrived in Durham his decision to re-institute a monastic Community was partly stimulated by the destitution in the north which left Cuthbert’s body with an inappropriate level of service, in other words without completely monastic surroundings. This criticism of the canons’ care for Cuthbert is of a specific time, after the Norman forces ravaged the north following Walcher’s death: it does not contradict the earlier significance of the reverence afforded to the body, and the claim that Walcher made steps towards monasticism. But the fact that Symeon cited the need to serve Cuthbert’s body with a monastic presence as the reason for the 1083 community change does show the connection between Cuthbert’s presence and monastic identity. The official relationship of

68 LDE iii.7, pp. 162-4.
69 LDE iv.2, pp. 224-6.
70 LDE iii.21, pp. 202-4. See also LDE, p. 224, n. 9.
monastic community with corpse is made evident in the fact that custodianship of the un decayed body was the first monastic office to be assigned in 1083.\footnote{\textit{LDE} iv.3, p. 232.}

\section*{Monasticism}

This connection between monasticism and Cuthbert underlines the fact that in the \textit{LDE}, his main role was not as the focus of the text but as an embodiment of monasticism. This was behind the emphatic description of Cuthbert’s entry to the monastic life:

\begin{quote}
To express many things in a few words, he became a monk. Wholly a monk! A monk, I say, venerable and in all respects worthy of praise, and one who was in body, mind and way of life a dweller in the camps of the lord.\footnote{\textit{LDE} i.3, p. 26.}
\end{quote}

Cuthbert’s piety and suitability for the monastic life was then described throughout the first book of the \textit{LDE}. Symeon depicted Cuthbert exemplifying the principles on which the Lindisfarne Church had been founded in 635, the same ideals with which the post-1083 Durham Church identified itself.

Monasticism was, then, the ideological focus of the \textit{LDE}, complementing the characters of Oswald, Aidan and Cuthbert, and the location of Lindisfarne, that also represented the ‘origins’ of the Church. The aim was to convey the continuity of monasticism in the Church, beginning with how Aidan, with Oswald’s help ‘established a dwelling-place for the monks who had accompanied him…so that the religious observance should always afterwards gain increase through the monastic institution’.\footnote{\textit{LDE} i.2, pp. 20-1: ‘\textit{ubi et ipse antistes iubente, suffragante et cooperante rege, monachorum qui secum venerant habitationem instituit…[ut] monachica institutione semper in posterum caperet augmentum religionis observantia’}.}

The continuing presence of monasticism was then carried first through Cuthbert, but also through other characters, such as King Ceolwulf at the start of
Book Two, who entered the Lindisfarne monastery after giving up his rule over Northumbria.\textsuperscript{74}

While Cuthbert continued to be used as a representative of monastic virtues, the most important message to be conveyed was that the Community, wherever it wandered or settled, lived largely as monks. Most importantly, this was stated in the \textit{LDE} at the point at which it seems the Church had to abandon some of its monastic practices, when the Vikings arrived in the ninth century:

\begin{quote}
‘those who had been brought up and educated among the monks from childhood, albeit in the habit of clerks, followed the body of the holy father wherever it was carried, and they always preserved the custom – which had been handed down to them by their teachers the monks – of singing the day and night offices. As a result all their descendants who succeeded them down to the time of Bishop Walcher followed the tradition of their fathers in the custom of singing the hours according to the regimen of the monks, rather than that of the clerks’.\textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

Indeed, nearly two hundred years after the departure from Lindisfarne in 875, the \textit{LDE} recounts Walcher’s arrival at Durham, when he instructed the clerks to begin to observe offices according to their role as clerks rather than imitating monastic custom.\textsuperscript{76}

The assertion of ever-present monasticism was essential to the \textit{LDE}, to justify not only the implantation of the post-1083 Community, but also the existence of the interim quasi-monastic \textit{congregatio}: Symeon was not attempting to sully the name of this Community. The coffin bearers facilitated a constant monastic style presence around the saint in the early years after leaving Lindisfarne. The seven men were carefully appointed in this role, descendants of the men mentioned above who had

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{LDE} ii.1, p. 78. \\
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{LDE} ii.6, pp. 102-5: ‘\textit{qui inter eos ab etate infantili in habitu clericali fuerant nutriti atque eruditi, quocunque sancti patris corpus ferebatur secuti sunt, moremque sibi a monachis doctoribus traditum in officiis – dumtaxat diurne vel nocturne laudis – semper servarunt. Unde tota nepotum suorum successio magis secundum instituta monachorum quam clericorum consuetudinem canendi horas usque tempus Walcheri episcopi paterna traditione observavit’.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{LDE} iii.18, pp. 194-6.
\end{flushleft}
been educated by those last monks of Lindisfarne.\textsuperscript{77} These devoted men were revered by generations to come, particularly, according to the \textit{LDE}, by their direct descendants; importantly, the married status of these men was not hidden, but commended as a facet of the network supporting the ostensibly suffering Church.\textsuperscript{78} It seems that the customs and piety of the bearers were deemed a sufficient continuation of monasticism.\textsuperscript{79} It can be assumed that Elfred, the venerated sacristan with Cuthbert’s miraculous hair, epitomized the similar monkish devotion of all those clerks who cared for Cuthbert while wandering, or at Chester-le-Street or Durham.

The claims of a continuing monastic lifestyle are difficult to substantiate: the only extant written evidence, other than the \textit{LDE}, is in \textit{De miraculis} which implies that the Community never ceased to be composed of monks between 875 and 1083.\textsuperscript{80} As David Rollason notes, there are further indications of the pre-1083 Community’s piety: Edmund Craster’s reconstruction of the book held on the High Altar at Durham, written in the decade before 1083, shows the extensive literary activity of the pre-reform Church, and there exist a number of skilfully carved stone crosses and a grave cover, displaying the artistic activity of the Church.\textsuperscript{81}

Symeon, though, evidently sought incontrovertible proof of the continuing monasticism in the Church, and used the bishops as bastions of the uninterrupted presence of genuine monks in the Church. Using Aidan and Cuthbert as the model monk-bishops,\textsuperscript{82} the \textit{LDE} repeatedly tells of the fact that all bishops down to the time of Walcher were monks. As with so many other key issues, an extract from Bede was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{LDE} ii.5-6, pp. 86-104.
\item \textsuperscript{78} \textit{LDE} ii.12 and iii.1, pp. 116 and 146-8.
\item \textsuperscript{79} The careful presentation of the clerks’ Community and the seeming lack of criticism for the non-monastic character is discussed below, pp. 104-7.
\item \textsuperscript{80} \textit{De miraculis} refers to the pre-1083 Community as monastic, living in a \textit{monasterium}, eg. \textit{De mir.} ch. 5, \textit{Sym. Op.} i, pp. 243-5.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Rollason, ‘Symeon’, pp. 188-9; Craster, ‘Red Book’.
\item \textsuperscript{82} \textit{LDE} i.2, pp. 20-4 and ii.6, pp. 100-2.
\end{itemize}
used to introduce this custom, from his prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti* where he wrote that, just as Aidan the first bishop had been a monk, ‘so in succession to him all the bishops of this same place down to the present day exercise the episcopal office in such a way that…all the priests, deacons, cantors, lectors and other ecclesiastical grades keep in all things the monastic Rule along with the bishop’.  

The monastic education of subsequent bishops is then frequently reasserted, particularly when the Community is described leaving Lindisfarne having lost its last monks: ‘so the body of that same father Cuthbert, who was at the same time both bishop and monk, never lacked the zeal and obedience of monks down to the time of the aforementioned Walcher’ because all bishops ‘are known to have been monks and never to have failed to have two or three monks with them’. 

The presentation of bishops in this way, as official bastions of monasticism for a Community that was clerical in many elements of its lifestyle, is particularly prominent in Book Three; the way in which Symeon clings to these figureheads, despite the fact that the sequence of monk-bishops was twice interrupted, is described by Piper as ‘close to tendentious obfuscation’. It is interesting to note that, while the text as a whole was concerned with the Community as separate from the episcopate, the audience is guided through this third Book by the bishops. The *LDE* was still, in this section, essentially geared to the Community, but at this stage so close to 1083, it was expedient to show characters other than the clerks as continuators of monasticism. Symeon was negotiating a delicate balance to illustrate on the one hand

---

83 *LDE* i.6, pp. 34-5: ‘*Unde ab illo omnes loci ipsius antistites usque hodie sic episcopale exercent officium ut…omnes presbiteri, diacones, canones, lectores, ceterique gradus ecclesiastici monachicam per omni cum ipso episcopo regulam servent*’; *VCB* ch. 16, pp. 208-9.

84 *LDE* ii.6, pp. 104-5: ‘*Nec tamen corpori eisdem patris Cuthberti pontificis simul et monachi, monachorum unquam usque ad predicti Waltheri tempora sedalitas defuit vel obsequium*’; ‘*post quos episcopi sequentes usque ad sepe dictum Waltheri monachi, sine duobus vel tribus monachis nunsquaeuisse noscuntur*’. For discussion see Piper, ‘First Durham Monks and the Cult’, pp. 440-1.

the enduring and uninterrupted presence of monasticism in St Cuthbert’s Church, and on the other, the necessity to replace the clerks as guardians of Cuthbert’s body: to extol too enthusiastically the monastic virtues of the Community shortly before recounting the reversion to monasticism would be to undermine the necessity and justification of this event.

The monasticism of bishops is described in striking detail in Book Three. Symeon tells how a voice from Cuthbert’s tomb proclaimed the priest Edmund as the bishop to fill the vacancy left by Ealdhun’s death, but that ‘he confessed that he could in no way ascend the episcopal throne of his predecessors who had been monks, unless he were to emulate them and be vested in the monastic habit himself’. Following Bishop Edmund’s death (1021/2-1042) Eadred, a clerk, purchased the bishopric from King Harthacnut but his reign was shortlived as divine vengeance struck him down before he could officially take his episcopal position.

His successor, Æthelric’s story shows how a monastic education could override the custom of electing bishops only from within the Community. He was a monk, acquired by Bishop Edmund from Peterborough to teach him the monastic discipline. A constant companion to Edmund, Æthelric gained power in the Church, but three years after he received the bishopric, he was expelled by the clerks as an outsider. Although he was reinstated due to the ‘fearful power’ of Earl Siward’s backing, the LDE’s accounts of Æthelric and his brother Bishop Æthelwine (1056-71) are far from wholly positive. The passage of nine chapters (iii.9-17) concerning the period of these two bishops recounts the constructive alongside the destructive, the

---

86 LDE iii.6, pp. 160-1: ‘At ille cathedram predecessorum suorum qui monachi fuerant, nullo modo se posse ascendere fatabatur, nisi illos et ipse monachico habitu indutus imitatetur’.
87 LDE iii.9, p. 168.
88 LDE iii.6 for Æthelric’s passage from Peterborough to Durham, and for evidence that bishops had previously come from within the Community: ‘For according to the canonical institutes they had been accustomed to elect bishops from amongst none but members of the same Church’ (‘Nam secundum instituta canonum non nisi ex eadem ecclesia pontifices eligi consuuerant’).
conservation and protection intermingled with theft and deception. Æthelric rebuilt the Church at Chester-le-Street in stone but also took much money from the Church; similarly, Æthelwine took ornaments and riches from the Church but also led the Community with Cuthbert’s body to Lindisfarne in 1069/70. These depictions exemplify succinctly the fine balance that Symeon was trying to convey. Whilst it was essential to show the continuing monastic presence, there were other issues to be communicated: the material losses suffered by the Community, the dangers of Cuthbert’s retribution, the independence or even insularity of the see, but most importantly the problems preceding the appointment of Walcher and the resulting moves towards monasticism.

Walcher (1072-80) is the final bishop in Book Three and, although not a monk and not a member of the Community, he is portrayed as the forerunner to William de St Calais, laying foundations for the rapid installation of monasticism in 1083. The LDE does not mention the fact that Walcher, a Lotharingian, was one of William the Conqueror’s officials, and replaced Æthelwine, the last of the Anglo-Saxon bishops. Rather it justifies his election to the position, arguing that ‘Although…he was the first from the order of clerks to become bishop of this Church since the time of Aidan, he always showed himself by the manner of his praiseworthy life to be at heart a pious monk’. Inspired by the monks of Wearmouth whom he supported and protected, he intended to establish monks at Durham and to take the habit himself. This intention was curtailed by his murder, although there is evidence, both archaeological and within the LDE, that he had begun construction on monastic buildings at Durham.

---

89 LDE iii.9, p. 170; iii.9, p. 172. LDE iii.11, p. 174; LDE iii.15, pp. 184-6.
90 LDE, p. 195, n.68.
91 LDE iii.18, pp. 194-5: ‘Ipse quidem…primus post Aidanum ex clericali ordine ipsius ecclesie suscepit presulatum, sed vite laudabiles conversatione religiosum preferebat monachum’.
before his death.92 Here one can at last see Symeon bringing the Church from ostensibly difficult times towards the reinstitution of monasticism, beginning to tie together the monastic element of the Church’s origins with the twelfth-century present.

Using the written past: Bede

St Cuthbert’s Church was recognised for its historiographical tradition, and it was therefore essential that Symeon represent this element of the Church’s identity. It is a recurrent theme of this thesis that the Cuthbertine works were interwoven with one another, and that each new text used its predecessors; Symeon did so explicitly, stating the association of the LDE with the written past of the Community from its first chapter:

Our present purpose is that everything concerning the origin and progress of this Church of Durham which could be found in Bede’s History and in other little works should, in order to preserve its memory for posterity, be assembled and arranged to form the substance of this tract.93

Bede was the inevitable literary root for the Community, and it has been seen above that his works were cited extensively,94 but his role in the LDE goes beyond this: Symeon showed that Bede’s cult as well as his writings were an important facet of the Church’s identity. The LDE records Bede’s birth, erroneously connecting it

---

93 LDE i.1, pp. 18-19: ’Porro hic nos id studium occupat at ex huius sancte hoc est ecclesie Dunhelmins exordio, proculsa, queque in prefata historia alii quoque opusculis inveniri poterant, ad memoriam posterorum in unum ex ordine compacta, quoddam libelli corpusculum perficient’.
94 See above, pp. 87-8.
with Cuthbert’s second year on Inner Farne.\textsuperscript{95} It tells of how he entered the monastery of St Peter and St Paul at Monkwearmouth, and continues with an unfettered veneration of him.\textsuperscript{96} After Cuthbert’s death, Bede assumes an even greater role in the first Book. Perhaps most telling, the great discovery of Cuthbert’s incorrupt body in 698 is almost upstaged as Symeon’s narrative turns to discuss Bede’s piety and writings.\textsuperscript{97} Through this understatement of the discovery of Cuthbert’s incorruption in 698, as well as in 1104, the \textit{LDE} presents an identity of the Church that extends far beyond Cuthbert; it is perhaps Symeon’s personal views on his author role model that here allow the cult of Bede to eclipse that of the Church’s patron.

Bede’s importance to the first book, establishing the origins of the Church’s identity, is evident in the fact that his life and works are the focus of its final chapters. The death of Bede provides a fine example of Symeon’s often verbose reverence, including complex dating clause and lengthy eulogy:

\begin{quote}
In the year of Our Lord’s Incarnation 735, the seventh year of Ceolwulf’s reign and the eleventh of the pontificate of Æthelwald, that lamp of the catholic Church went to the light which had illuminated it, that vein of water leaping toward eternal life reached the living spring which is God, the writer of holy books, the venerable priest and monk Bede, died in the fifty-ninth year of his age, the hundred and first year since King Oswald and Bishop Aidan had established a pontifical see and a dwelling-place of monks on the island of Lindisfarne, the sixty-second year from the construction of the monastery of Peter at Wearmouth, and the forty-ninth year from the passing of father Cuthbert. Now Bede lived hidden away in the extreme corner of the world, but after his death he lived on in his books and became known to everyone all over the world.\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{95} Symeon believed 59 to be Bede’s age at his death (735) rather than his age on completing his \textit{HE} (731). \textit{Rollason, LDE}, pp. 41-2, n.50.

\textsuperscript{96} \textit{LDE} i.8, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{LDE} i.11, pp. 56-8.

\textsuperscript{98} \textit{LDE} i.14, pp. 64-5: ‘\textit{Anno autem Dominice incarnationis septingentesimo tricesimo quinto imperii autem Ceolwlf septimo, episcopatus vero Æthelwoldi anno undecimo, illa ecclesie catholiclie lucerna ad eam que se illuminaverat lucem, illa vena aque salientes in vitam eternam ad venerabilis presbiter et monachus Beda defunctus anno etatis suo quinquagesimo nono, ex quo autem rex Oswaldus et antistes Aidanus pontificalem cathedram et monachorum habitationem in Lindisfarnensi insula instituerant anno centesimo primo, a constructione vero monasterii Petri apostolii in Wiramathe sexagesimo secundo, porro a patris Cuthberti transitu quadragesimo nono anno. Quo videlicet Beda in extremo quidem mundi angulo vivens latuit, sed post mortem per universas mundi partes omnibus in libris suis vivens innotuit.’
This statement of Bede’s importance was followed by a list of his own works taken verbatim from his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Finally, the letter sent by Cuthbert, one of Bede’s pupils, to another monk, recounting his piety and learnedness, his death song, and his last hours, formed the finale to the first Book.

Of course, the *LDE*’s enthusiastic representation of Bede was reflective of his importance to the Church in a wider context. Symeon told how the renowned sacrist Elfred Westou secretly transported Bede’s remains to Durham where they were kept in Cuthbert’s tomb, in a linen bag to separate them from the other relics; he added that Elfred’s relic collecting was to safeguard against theft, and that Bede’s were the most coveted bones. This was not the only reference to Bede’s relics: they are mentioned in the *LDE* immediately after Cuthbert’s elevation, again somewhat undermining - or perhaps intended to enhance - the importance of the event. The attention given to Bede’s relics in the *LDE* bears witness to the reverence afforded this man by the Church and its patrons.

Inevitably, this veneration of Bede the person is echoed in Symeon’s extensive use of Bede’s prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Occasionally tales from Bede’s writing are unattributed, only inferring a link between it and the *LDE*: for example, the miraculous wind which prevented fire from damaging the cathedral alludes to similar miracles in Bede’s *Vita Cuthberti*. Generally though, Bedan references were clearly stated, connecting the twelfth-

---


100 *LDE* iii.7, pp. 164-6. On Elfred Westou see above, pp. 90-1 and 94, and below, pp. 232-3.

101 *LDE* iii.7, pp. 162-4 and n.29-34. The other relics enshrined with Cuthbert, according to *LDE*, were ‘those of the anchorites Balthere and Billfrith, the bishops of Hexham Acca and Alchmund, and King Oswine, together with those of the venerable abbesses Æbbe and Æthelgitha’ (‘ossa videlicet Baltheri et Bilfridi anachoritarum, Acce quoque et Alchmundi episcoporum Hagustaldensium, et regis Oswini, necnon etiam abbatissarum venerabiltium Ebbe et Aethelgithe’). No other source mentions this bag of relics, although the relic collection in Cuthbert’s coffin is mentioned in *De situ Dumelmi*, Sym.Op. i, pp. 221-2, and *De Miraculis* ch. 7, pp. 252-3. Bede’s relics were transferred to a separate tomb in the Galilee Chapel in 1370, where they remain.

102 *LDE* i.11, pp. 56-8.

103 *VCB* chs. 13 and 14, pp. 198-202.
century present with the literary past. Such references appear in two ways: first
Symeon often refers the reader to the eighth-century texts, rather than repeat the detail
recorded in them. This associates the LDE with Bede whilst simultaneously exalting
him and his works, and expressing that the LDE did not strive to supplant them. For
example, on Cuthbert Symeon wrote: ‘Anyone who desires to know how strenuously
he summoned everyone to heaven by word and by example, how sublimely he
radiated the glory of miracles, what light of prophetic grace shone in him, should read
the book of his life mentioned above’.\(^{104}\)

Second, Bede’s works are referred to via direct quotation or paraphrase. This
was used through much of Book One, largely in unattributed sections of text. When
Symeon quoted key parts of the Historia Ecclesiastica or prose Vita sancti Cuthberti,
such as the episcopal election of Cuthbert, his death and burial, and the first elevation
of his body, a verbatim account need not be attributed: the audience would be
assumed to be familiar with Bede’s renditions of these events.\(^{105}\) Symeon mentioned
his use of Bede where he intended to venerate the writer as well as the text; this is
probably most notable in the inclusion of Bede’s list of his own works from the
Historia Ecclesiastica.\(^{106}\) By using Bede’s work, Symeon associated the LDE with
that Golden Age of Northumbrian culture during which Bede wrote, and assimilated
his time with those earlier years.

There is one further use for Bede in the LDE: his direct significance in the
reinstitution of monasticism. Aldwin, Prior at Winchcombe, ‘had learned from the

\(^{104}\) LDE i.3, pp. 28-9: ‘Qui quam studiose verbo et exemplo universos ad celestia vocaverit, quam
sullimiter miraculorum gloria choruscaverit, quanta gratie prophetalis luce prefulsit, qui nosse
desiderat, prefatum vite ipsius librum legat’. On Cuthbert, LDE i.6, p. 36, advises those who wish to
learn from Cuthbert to read his Vita. See also LDE i.1, pp. 16-20 on Oswald; HE iii.1-3, pp. 212-20;
iii.6, p. 230; iii.9-13, pp. 240-54; iv.14, pp. 376-80. LDE i.3, pp. 24-8 on Aidan; HE iii.6, p.230; iii.14,
pp. 254-60; iii.15, p. 260; iii.17, pp. 262-6.

\(^{105}\) LDE i.9, p. 44; i.10, pp. 52-54; i.11, pp. 54-6. These are taken from a combination of HE iv.28-30,

\(^{106}\) LDE i.14, pp. 64-8. See also i.13, pp. 62-4, from the preface to HE, p.2 ; LDE i.2, p. 22, from HE
iii.17, p. 266; LDE i.6, p. 34, from VCB ch. 16, pp. 206-8.
History of the English that the kingdom of the Northumbrians had once been full of numerous choirs of monks and many hosts of saints’. He resolved to visit this cradle of monasticism, inspired by the writing of Bede, and came to Northumbria with two brothers from Evesham, Elfwy and Reinfred, in 1073/4. Initially, they settled at Monkchester but, as this was governed by the earl of Northumbria, Bishop Walcher offered them an alternative location, the ruined monastery at Jarrow, which was under ecclesiastical rather than secular jurisdiction. The description of these monks at Jarrow, living in poverty, cold, hunger and penury, provided for only by alms, is eremitic in essence, harking back to Cuthbert’s self imposed suffering on Inner Farne. These three men at Jarrow inspired others to seek the monastic life in the north and soon Walcher rejoiced that in Jarrow ‘the light of monastic life which had been extinct for so many years was being rekindled in his time’. Aldwin sought to spread monasticism further and travelled to a deserted Melrose with Turgot; when they faced persecution from Malcolm III king of Scots, Walcher recalled them and gave them the ruined monastery at Wearmouth, the home of Bede. This pattern of using Bede’s writings and his monastic home was repeated in the events of 1083. William de St Calais’ decision to return monasticism to Cuthbert’s Church ‘tallied with the little book about his life and with the Ecclesiastical History of the English

\[LDE\] iii.21, pp. 200-1: ‘Didicerat ex Historia Anglorum quod provincia Northanhybrorum crebis quondam choris monachorum, ac multis constipia fuerit aminibus sanctorum, qui in carne non secundum carnem viventes celestem in terris conversationem ducere gaudebant’. Knowles, Monastic Order, pp. 165-71 has more on the mission.

Newcastle, according to H.Reg, s.a. 1074, p. 201.

The ruin of Jarrow probably dates from the ‘harrying of the North’ (1069-70), LDE pp. 202-3, n.78.


\[LDE\] iii.21, pp. 204-5: ‘et iam per multa annorum volumina in illis partibus extinctam monachice conversationis reviviscere suo tempore lucernam’. So important was the link between Walcher and Jarrow that when he was murdered, it was the brothers of Jarrow whose mourning Symeon mentioned, iii.24, p. 218.

\[LDE\] iii.22, p. 208.
People’; the Benedictines who were introduced to Durham came from the reestablished foundations at Wearmouth and Jarrow.

The prominence of Bede in the 1083 reintroduction of monasticism to Cuthbert’s Church is of course dependent on Symeon’s depiction. The Historia Ecclesiastica was used by many church reformers in post-conquest England. But here Bede has an additional, local significance, exemplified in the veneration of him as well as his works. Symeon thus provides a local context to the events of 1083, rooting them, via Bede, as well as Lindisfarne, Cuthbert, Oswald and Aidan, in the Church’s former Golden Age.

**Part II: Progress**

**II.i Suffering and Survival**

Symeon set out the origins, the original identity which the twelfth-century Church strove to recapture, in the first book of the *LDE*. The ‘progress’ phase of the work then follows, recounting the process through which the Church went in order to recapture the essence of the Northumbrian Golden Age. The *LDE* needed to explain the ostensibly clerical existence of the Community between the two monastic eras, the suffering that they endured, and their means of maintaining power during this period. Symeon worked a fine balance, of justifying the twelfth-century monastic community whilst maintaining the continuity essential to the Cuthbertine Church; his depiction had to be one that did not criticise the Community too much, but that portrayed a situation requiring change in 1083.

---

113 *LDE* iv.2, pp. 226-7: ‘vite illius Libellus et Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum concordat Hystoria’.
114 *LDE* iv.3, pp. 228-30.
Clerks

We have already heard that Symeon emphasised the constant monastic presence around Cuthbert’s body, but that the Community was by no means fully monastic for much of the period between the eighth and the late-eleventh centuries.\(^{116}\) It is difficult to assess how the Community did live during this interim, and indeed to give any precise dates, but the \textit{LDE} is our main source for this information and does provide important clues. The fact that Symeon does not give any detail of the type of religious life led by the Lindisfarne community between the first Viking raids of 793 and those of 875, that led to the seven years of wandering, implies that for the twelfth-century historian, too, it was difficult to ascertain how the community was living. Most monks are said to have perished or dispersed as a result of these Viking attacks, but the same passage states that although the Community had become largely clerical in habit, Cuthbert was always attended by a monastic presence, and the clerical \textit{congregatio} still followed monastic offices.\(^{117}\) The continuation of monastic practice beyond 875 is not surprising: as Alan Piper points out, there were unlikely to have been other liturgical usages at Lindisfarne pre-875 to which the Community could have changed.\(^{118}\) The shift to non-monastic life was gradual, but most importantly to Symeon, the Community remained righteous through its monastic elements.

Symeon’s fundamental consideration in his portrayal of the \textit{congregatio} was for minimal criticism; he presented them as night watchmen between the times of monastic light. There are, therefore, few negative comments on the clerks’ lifestyle.

\(^{116}\) See above, pp. 93-5.  
\(^{117}\) \textit{LDE} ii.5, pp. 88-90; ii.6, p. 102-4. See pp. 90 and 93.  
\(^{118}\) Piper, ‘First Durham Monks and the Cult’ pp. 440-1.
Perhaps the only obvious example is the passage concerning the Episcopal vacancy after Ealdhun’s death:

Since it was hard for any of them [the clerks] to give up the joys of the world, to relinquish the charms of life, to eschew pleasures, it was difficult to find anyone willing to consent to assume an office of such sanctity.

But it should be noted that this statement highlighted the fact that Edmund, a clerk of the Community, was elected bishop only after he had been vested in the monastic habit, illustrating the reverence with which the episcopal position was held.\footnote{LDE iii.6, pp. 158-9: ‘Et dum illorum unicuique durum esset mundi gaudia deserere, blandimenta seculi relinquere, voluptates abicere, grave erat ad suscipiendum sanctitatis officium consentire’.


The misogynist miracles are found in LDE ii.7-9, pp. 104-10. See ii.6, pp. 102-4 and above, p. 93 for the monastic nature of Cuthbert’s guardians.}

It has been suggested that the misogyny, attributed to Cuthbert for the first time in the \textit{LDE}, was the post-1083 Convent’s way of denigrating the clerks, to strengthen the Durham monks against hostility to their usurpation of the pre-1083 Community by highlighting its unsavoury worldly and marital status.\footnote{There are two main sources discussing the issue: R.Hill, ‘Saint Cuthbert, the women and the weasel’, unpublished paper, International History Conference in Oxford, September 1972. She is cited by V. Tudor, ‘The misogyny of St Cuthbert’, Archaeologia Aeliana, 5\textsuperscript{th} series, 12 (1984), 157-67. See also below, pp. 229-30.

The misogynist miracles are found in \textit{LDE} ii.7-9, pp. 104-10. See ii.6, pp. 102-4 and above, p. 93 for the monastic nature of Cuthbert’s guardians.} Three miracles concerning women do indeed follow directly from, and in juxtaposition to, the section of the \textit{LDE} emphasising the constant monastic presence around Cuthbert’s body after 875.\footnote{There are two main sources discussing the issue: R.Hill, ‘Saint Cuthbert, the women and the weasel’, unpublished paper, International History Conference in Oxford, September 1972. She is cited by V. Tudor, ‘The misogyny of St Cuthbert’, Archaeologia Aeliana, 5\textsuperscript{th} series, 12 (1984), 157-67. See also below, pp. 229-30.

The misogynist miracles are found in \textit{LDE} ii.7-9, pp. 104-10. See ii.6, pp. 102-4 and above, p. 93 for the monastic nature of Cuthbert’s guardians.} In two of these tales, women are punished by Cuthbert for transgressing the restriction on women entering churches in which the saint had lain: the first died almost immediately and the second became mad and eventually cut her own throat.

The first of these chapters concerning women, however, demonstrates that Symeon was unlikely to have been criticising the pre-1083 Community. It states that Cuthbert, in response to the fire at Coldingham which punished the male and female inmates’ ‘improper familiarity with each other’, severed his monks, \textit{vel presentes vel futuri}, from women. It is the mention here of the monks’ successors which casts
doubt on whether this misogyny was indeed a covert line of criticism against all the clergy. The *LDE* communicated above all the continuity of the Cuthbertine Community, conveying the positive, night-watchmen role of the pre-1083 *congregatio*; criticism via misogynist miracles could hardly be compatible with Symeon’s efforts to justify the Community as continuing largely in the way of their predecessors. It seems more plausible that these miracles of punished women do not convey the pejorative anti-clerical message, but rather more positively highlight the continuing monastic basis of the Community.

These misogynist miracles could, more broadly, represent the protection offered by Cuthbert against violation of his Church. A further miracle in which a woman is punished appears later in the *LDE* in Book Three, amongst three other punitive tales: evil is represented through the common imagery of a snake, fire and the blackened communion wine and bread, as well as a woman.\(^{122}\) It was indeed hardly unusual at this time for women to be the embodiment of the devil.\(^{123}\) Far from criticising the pre-1083 Community, the tales of punished women emphasised the monastic piety of the clerks and illustrated Cuthbert’s protection for this rightful Community.

The *LDE* justified the existence of the pre-1083 Community by conveying their worthiness and piety. The reverence afforded to the core seven men was seen above. Significantly, the hereditary lineage of these men was held in high esteem: on more than one occasion, Symeon extolled the genealogies of the most renowned coffin bearers.\(^{124}\) Symeon was also careful to mention the women and children who accompanied this core group, presumably during the wandering and when settled at

---

\(^{122}\) *LDE* iii.10-13, pp. 172-80.

\(^{123}\) See, for example, Christina Grossinger, *Picturing Women in late Medieval and Renaissance Art* (Manchester, 1997).

\(^{124}\) *LDE* ii.12, p. 116; iii.1, pp. 146-8.
Chester-le-Street and Durham. The fact that the three earlier misogynistic tales are immediately followed with a laudatory description of the fugitive group including the wives and children of the *congregatio*, reinforces the notion that such anti-feminism was not included as a criticism of the clerks, but rather to highlight their devotion.\(^{125}\)

The group – the *Haliwerfolc, or populus* in the *LDE* - was mentioned on several other occasions: they lamented when Cuthbert was to be taken to Ireland, were forced by poverty to leave the wandering group, accompanied the body again when imminent Viking attack led to flight from Chester-le-Street, and when Norman ravaging led them to return to Lindisfarne.\(^{126}\) This group including families of the Community, men, women and children, were shown by Symeon to be an important part of the multi-faceted network in the Patrimony which underpinned the power of Cuthbert’s Church.\(^{127}\)

**Hardship**

According to Symeon’s depiction, it seems that the change to non-monastic life was in the practical rather than liturgical sphere: consistent instability in the north of England, whether through Viking raids or local magnates, meant that the Community could not rely upon the patronage of nobles and required its own network of secular power in order to survive. Thus, familial ties stemming from married Community members formed the basis of the Church’s influence between the ninth century and the eleventh.

Suffering was essential to justifying the worthiness of St Cuthbert’s Community in this period. It was as if they had had no other option but to relax the

---

125 *LDE* ii.10, p. 110.
126 *LDE* ii.11, pp. 112-4; ii.12, p. 116; iii.1, pp. 144-6; iii.15, p. 186. In the latter two references, the people were connected more specifically with Cuthbert: the body was said to have travelled *omni eius populo*.
127 On the power of the *Haliwerfolc/populus sancti Cuthberti* see above, p.17; Aird, *Cuthbert and Normans*, pp. 5-8, and Hall ‘Community of St Cuthbert’ ch. 1, in particular p. 4.
constraints set by monasticism: the gravity of suffering went some way to explaining why the Community had been forced to move and change over a long period of time. Significantly, while the suffering theme of the *LDE* may have given Symeon an opportunity to illustrate Cuthbert’s support for the secular Community, David Rollason has convincingly argued that it is unlikely that the Community experienced anywhere near this degree of hardship.\(^{128}\) It should be noted in this context that had Symeon wished to discredit the clerks, he would not have needed to place such emphasis on the suffering that affirmed the pre-1083 Community but that probably did not exist.

Instability in Northumbria came via three main routes. The ‘cruel crimes’ and ‘ravaging and rapine’ of Scottish attacks gave an opportunity to convey the victimisation of the Community.\(^{129}\) Viking raids, particularly those of 793 and the 870s, were a far greater destabilising force, apparently leading to the period of wandering in poverty. The Community’s survival in the face of this prolonged and severe adversity was testimony to the protection offered by Cuthbert, and indeed he had made provision for these extreme eventualities. The *LDE* paraphrases from Bede’s *Vita* where Cuthbert gave permission for his body to be moved should the integrity of the Community be threatened.\(^{130}\) The wandering therefore had, more than simply Cuthbert’s approval, a remarkably prophesied inevitability. The Community could thus be seen to survive due to Cuthbert’s constant guardianship, which he would hardly have offered to those of whom he disapproved.

---

\(^{128}\) Rollason, ‘Wanderings of St Cuthbert’, p. 47. See also above, p. 56.

\(^{129}\) *LDE* ii.13, p. 126. See also iii.9, p. 168: the Scots besiege Durham in vain under Duncan, adding to the instability of the region; and iii.22, p. 208: Turgot and Aldwin are persecuted for refusing to swear fealty to Malcolm III.

\(^{130}\) *LDE* ii.6, p. 100; *VCB* c.39, p. 284. The wording of *LDE* is, however, closer to that of *De Miraculis* ch. 2, pp. 234-5.
The hardship that Viking attacks imposed on the Community was well attested in the LDE. Symeon dramatically describes the lament of the diminished Church, the bishop, ‘abbot’ and seven bearers:

“What are we to do?...Whither shall we carry the relics of the father? Fleeing from the barbarians we have travelled across the whole kingdom for seven years, and now in the country there is no place of refuge left...On top of all this the burden of dire hunger presses upon us, and compels us to seek solace for our lives anywhere we can, but the swords of the Danes ravage everywhere and prevent us from travelling with this treasure [Cuthbert’s body]”.

The sensationalism here was probably in keeping with the dramatic exaggeration of Viking attacks stemming from Alcuin’s letters but, more specifically, it allowed Symeon to justify the measures taken within the Community to survive.

The Norman invasion allowed the suffering theme to extend to, and to initiate, the establishment of monasticism in 1083. The earliest Norman trouble in the LDE, the devastation wrought by William the Conqueror around York, led to the Community’s flight to Lindisfarne after being saved by two of Cuthbert’s miracles: his protection was ever-present. This destruction by King William in 1069 was worsened by Odo of Bayeux who, enticed by the vacuum left by Walcher’s murder went to Durham in 1080 and laid waste much of the land. The cumulative effect of Norman ventures to the north left Cuthbert’s land desolate by the time of William de St Calais’ arrival. As the LDE portrayed it, the situation had reached a critical and intolerable stage. Action needed to be taken, and so the suffering of the Community could finally come to an end under this strong bishop, to establish fully the monasticism which had always lived with the Community.

---

131 LDE ii.12, pp. 116-7: ‘Quid facturi sumus? Quo patris reliquias ferentes ibimus? Barbaros fugientes per septem annos totam provinciam lustravimus, iamque nullius in patria fuge superest locus...Super hec omnia fames dirae incumbens, quacunque solacium vite querere compellit, sed gladius Danorum ubique seviens nobis cum hoc thesauro transitum non permissit’.
132 Peter Sawyer argues that the gravity of the events of 793 has been increasingly emphasised over time, Kings and Vikings, p. 94.
133 LDE iii.15, pp. 182-8. Cuthbert plays a strong guardian role here, sending the fog which halted William’s army. He also parted the sea to allow the entourage a safe passage to Lindisfarne.
134 LDE iii.24, pp. 218-20.
Using the written past: the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*

Survival was not simply a case of suffering. In more practical terms, the *LDE* needed to communicate the power that the Church could wield through property and rights - incidentally, the very power that makes the extreme hardship unfeasible. The extent of Cuthbertine wealth and its intrinsic link with royal associations was seen in the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, and this text was therefore a valuable source for the *LDE*: indeed, it was the basis for much of Book Two, with some rearrangement and embellishment. Obviously, there were very different motives behind this and the use of Bede’s works: the *HSC* did not hold the same multi-level relevance to the Community and was thus not as intricately woven through the text. But the use of the *HSC* in Book Two formed another layer of the continuing literary tradition of the Community.

It was not necessary for the *LDE* to itemize all the property mentioned in the *HSC* which was probably itself available in the Church. It is possible that Symeon was referring to the *HSC* in mentioning charters and a cartulary;\(^{135}\) whether or not he was, he believed that copious lists would be ‘lengthy and unnecessary’, superfluous to the *LDE*’s aims.\(^{136}\) Symeon was therefore selective in his use of land references from the *HSC*, using only those most significant to the growth and power of the Community, such as the gifts of Carlisle, Crayke and Norham, all important locations for the Church.\(^{137}\) The grant of the right of sanctuary, which featured heavily in the *HSC*, was particularly strongly emphasised in the *LDE*, where it was mentioned with

---

\(^{135}\) Hall is very certain on this point: the author of the *Historia* ‘was not producing a history, a narrative of events, but, in Symeon’s words, ‘*ecclesiae cartula*’, ‘Community of St Cuthbert’, p. 16.

\(^{136}\) The lands given soon after Cuthbert had become bishop were said to be recorded ‘*in cartulis ecclesie*, *LDE* i.9, pp. 46-7 which is also said to contain an inventory of the gifts from Æthelstan, again tying in with *HSC* (26, p. 64), *LDE* ii.18, p. 136.

\(^{137}\) *LDE* i.9, pp. 44-6, *HSC* 5, p. 46; ii.5, pp. 92-4; *HSC* 9, p. 48. See above, pp. 54-5, on the significance of these locations.
relation to kings Guthred (Guthfrith of the *HSC*), Alfred, Æthelstan, Edmund and William of Normandy.\(^{138}\)

The *LDE* also used the *HSC* to depict the dynastic impact upon the survival of the Cuthbertine Church: Guthfrith and the West Saxon dynasty were portrayed in the *LDE* via the *HSC* as instrumental in the growth of the Church’s power. It does indeed seem that Symeon was using the *HSC* specifically, as well as other texts (such as *De miraculis*): for example the marsh in which Alfred hid was located in Glastonbury in only the *HSC* and the *LDE*,\(^{139}\) and Symeon’s depictions of West Saxon kings passing their throne and reverence for Cuthbert on to their heirs is remarkably similar to those in the *HSC*.\(^{140}\)

The second Book of the *LDE* does continue briefly beyond the tenth-century end of the *HSC* as it appears now in manuscripts: the abrupt departure of King Edmund from Cuthbert’s tomb. The *LDE* also tells that Edmund campaigned against Scotland, and that he died and was succeeded by his brother Eadred in 948, who also visited Cuthbert’s Church and offered gifts. Other than the succession information, these details for Eadred and Edmund are unique to the *LDE*; it seems possible that Symeon worked from an *HSC* with a lengthier tenth-century section than survives in the extant manuscripts. Whether or not this was the case, the half century from Eadred’s reign, through that of Eadwig to Edgar and then Æthelred, was described by the *LDE* with only scant succession information: there was little evidence available to Symeon, and apparently to all English authors, for this period.\(^{141}\)

\(^{138}\) *LDE* ii.13, pp. 124-6; ii.18, p. 136 and pp. 138-40; iii.20, pp. 198-200; cf. *HSC* 13, p. 52. The words here were probably derived from *CMD* and *De Miraculis* but the *Historia* was the earliest exponent of these rights.

\(^{139}\) *LDE* ii.10, pp. 110-2, see *LDE* p. 112, n.65; on the other West Saxon kings that appear in the *HSC*, see *LDE* ii.15-18, pp. 128-40.

\(^{140}\) See above, pp. 48-9.

\(^{141}\) *LDE* ii.20, p. 142. See above, p. 51.
Symeon does briefly refer to later parts of the *HSC*: in particular the grant from Styr, son of Ulf, which is said to be recorded in writing elsewhere must be a reference to the *HSC*.\textsuperscript{142} But the *LDE*’s main use of the *HSC* was for its more narrative part, to the mid-tenth century, to establish how the Church’s political and material rights had been formed. This gave a tangible and permanent basis to the Church’s identity, and explained how the survival had been possible.

II.ii Bishops and Durham: the Rebuilding

The focal event of Book Three is the transportation of the Church to Durham in 995:

In this way the episcopal see, which had been founded originally on the island of Lindisfarne by the former King Oswald and Bishop Aidan, has remained in this place until the present day in the presence of the holy body.\textsuperscript{143} Having firmly established the Community’s continuing existence via their roots, their monasticism and solidified by their material and political strength, Symeon could begin to show the more active, positive developments of their identity as well as the projection into the past. The move to Durham heralded the beginning of the era to which Symeon’s Community more clearly belonged. Whether or not in reality they had little in common with the Community of 995, the early-twelfth-century monks at least shared a geographical link with their predecessors, a tangible sense of place which supported the notion of a shared heritage.

Durham was more than simply a physical base, home to and thus representative of, generations of the Cuthbertine Community. As the *LDE* portrayed it, it was only since the Church had rested at Durham that it had begun to grow in stature once more; after years of struggling to survive, the Cuthbertine foundation

\textsuperscript{142} *LDE* iii.4, pp. 152-4.

\textsuperscript{143} *LDE* iii.4, pp. 152-3: ‘\textit{Taliter usque in presens cum sancto corpore sedes episcopalis hoc in loco permansit, que a rege quondam Oswaldo et pontifice Aidano primitus in insula Lindisfarnensi fuerat instituta’}. This is an interesting echo of the first chapter of the *LDE*. See above, p. 83.
was starting to build a far reaching presence which would eventually lead to the reintroduction of monks. Monastic continuity was conveyed through bishops, and towards the end of the third Book the prospect of the monastic ideal becoming reality at Durham was developed through Walcher. But the growth in stature was at first confined largely to establishing the Community’s identity in terms of its political power and great independence, portrayed through the interplay between bishops and secular nobility.

**Secular ties: Bishops and the Earls of Northumbria**

The kings of Northumbria and England were inevitably of constant importance to such a dominant Church as this: their pivotal role in establishing and perpetuating its physical existence was clearly expressed in the *LDE* as integral to the Church’s survival via patronage and confirmation of rights. But as this building stage of the *LDE* was reached, the Church’s role in these relationships changed: it became far more active, even the driving force, in its political associations.

The third Book showed, far more than before, the close association between Cuthbert’s Church and the Northumbrian earls, particularly through the increasingly powerful bishops of Durham. The future earl, Uhtred, was indispensable in installing the Church at Durham in 995, and indeed could have been instrumental in deciding on this location due to his close links with Bishop Ealdhun: Uhtred was married to the bishop’s daughter. This same bishop showed the immense counter-power of the Church by temporarily transferring land to needy Northumbrian earls. Further connections with Earls were described: Earl Siward (c.1041-55) gave invaluable

---

144 See above, pp. 94-7.  
145 *LDE* iii.2, pp. 148. The *LDE* explained this choice of location through a miracle of Cuthbert. On Uhtred’s marriage see *De obsessione Dunelmi*, and Fletcher, *Bloodfeud*, pp. 75-7.  
146 *LDE* iii.4, p. 154.
backing to the outsider Bishop Æthelric enabling him to return from the expulsion enforced by the clerks, and Tostig, Siward’s successor, aided Æthelric’s brother, Æthelwine in becoming bishop.\textsuperscript{147} Despite the \textit{LDE}’s hostility towards these latter two bishops, Tostig – along with his wife and household - was highly praised for his generosity and veneration of Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{148} The Church showed support for the region’s secular rulers, but also wielded its own authority in its relations with them.

Bishops were central to this third book of the \textit{LDE}, and to the power held by the Church. Throughout the text, nearly every bishop’s character, actions and contributions to the Church are briefly described, but it is in the third book that these descriptions become more lengthy and encompass for the first time the negative, materially driven attributes of the bishops. Only Sexhelm, who was bishop for only a few months before 948, was criticised earlier in the \textit{LDE}, but the full tale does not appear until Book Three, when it is placed in the context of other bishops and their negative actions. At this stage of the \textit{LDE}, Sexhelm’s ‘avarice and tyranny’ are said to have driven the Community to bury great treasure at Chester-le-Street, expressing the enduring piety and righteousness of the Community in adversity.\textsuperscript{149} This later reference to his greed appears in a phase of the \textit{LDE} which heavily criticises three eleventh-century bishops: Eadred, the simoniac who bought the episcopate from Harthacnut, but was struck down by Cuthbert before he could take the episcopal office,\textsuperscript{150} and brothers Æthelric and Æthelwine who both took riches from the Church but were eventually imprisoned.\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{LDE} iii.9, pp. 168-72.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{LDE} iii.11, pp. 174-6 and iii.14, p. 180. On these earls, see Aird, \textit{Cuthbert and Normans}, chs. 1 and 2.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{LDE} ii.19, p. 140; \textit{LDE} iii.9, pp. 170-1.
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{LDE} iii.9, pp. 168-72. The fact that Eadred failed to be officially installed was essential in maintaining the unbroken line of monastic bishops.
\textsuperscript{151} \textit{LDE} iii.9, pp. 170-2; iii.11, pp. 174 and iii.17, pp. 192-4. For the significance of the \textit{LDE}’s partial treatment of these two bishops, see Meehan, ‘Outsiders and Insiders’, pp. 51-3.
The criticism of bishops, and their increasing integration into the secular world, was an important statement concerning the convent’s dissatisfaction with the episcopacy, and also a way to avoid presenting the Community itself in a negative light: indeed, it is plausible, as Walcher found the Community using monastic offices, that there would have been little over which to criticise the Community. Symeon juxtaposed the monasticism of the preceding two books with the moral decay wrought by over-involvement in the secular world; by singling out bishops as the protagonists, he could represent a Community in need of reform, without directly criticising the Community. Bishop Walcher in particular personified the secular role of bishops when he received the earldom of Northumbria (1076-80): whilst this bishop is revered in the LDE for his reforming efforts, the depiction of him as earl is far from positive. It was only after he had taken that position that any negative characteristics were attributed to him: he turned a blind eye to the theft and violence of those under him, and his violent murder was said to be divine recompense for his inaction.

The subtle criticism of William de St Calais’ political life is perhaps even more surprising, in view of his heroic role in establishing the Durham monastery. The truth about Bishop William’s activities outside the Church was only hinted at in the LDE, but was nonetheless implied in two examples. Firstly, the admonitory miracle, in which Boso had a vision predicting the death of the bishop, intimated that the bishop had been less pious and generous than he could have been. Secondly, the fact that William de St Calais’ expulsion by the king, William Rufus, receives a very

152 LDE iii.18, pp. 194-6. See above, p. 93.
153 LDE iii.23, p. 212.
154 LDE iii.23 p. 212.
155 On being told of this vision, William de St Calais ‘began thenceforth to take greater care of his soul, being more generous with alms-giving, praying at greater length and more intently, and not setting aside on account of any business the periods reserved for daily prayer in private’ (‘ille [William] talia contremiscens vehementer expavit, atque studiosius deinceps sue salutis curam gerere cepit, largiores videlicet elemosinas faciendo, prolixius et intentius orando, nullius negotii gratia privata orationum cotidianarum statua pretermittendo’), LDE iv.10, pp. 250-2.
guarded and evasive explanation implies that his exile was not simply due to ‘the machinations of others’. Indeed, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 1087 corroborates this, stating that William had joined Odo of Bayeux’s revolt in 1088.

Both Walcher and William de St Calais were instrumental in bringing monks to Durham; that Symeon was willing to criticise even these bishops - not just bastions, but promoters and founders of Durham monasticism – is testament to the overriding importance of the Community, as separate from the bishops, in the LDE. Of course, Ranulf Flambard, the overpowering bishop whose actions probably stimulated the writing of the LDE, was in office at the time of its production, but comments in one of the LDE’s continuations reflect the convent’s displeasure at his worldliness.

**Miracles of Vengeance: the Community’s control**

Symeon’s depiction of the bishops was contradictory: they represent the perpetuity of monasticism as well as the danger of secular involvement and the focus of the Community’s discontent. This is reconciled to some extent by the bishops’ negative characteristics inducing retribution, divine or otherwise. Walcher’s murder, the imprisonment of Æthelwine and Æthelric, and the death of Eadred were all deserved punishment, and part of a wider group of punitive miracles in this part of the LDE. The prominence of these, in Book Three in particular, expresses the view that the secular associations of the Community were increasingly open to abuse, but that the power of Cuthbert and his rightful Community were victorious.

A series of unconnected punitive miracles is placed among the tales of Æthelwine, Æthelric, Eadred, and the earlier bishop Sexhelm in Book Three: a priest

---

156 LDE iv.8, p. 242.
157 ASC (E) s.a. 1088 [1087], pp. 166-7.
158 LDE continuation, Appendix B, chs. 1 and 2, pp. 266-80, in particular p. 266.
who had led an unchaste life saw the communion bread and wine turn the colour of pitch; a woman died after stepping into the cemetery of Cuthbert’s Church; an evil man was permanently afflicted by a serpent, until he prayed to Cuthbert; and a man who concealed coins from Cuthbert’s tomb in his mouth suffered intolerable burning.\textsuperscript{159} There follow miracles where Cuthbert punished others in order to protect the Community, most notably Gillo Michael’s vision of death, punishing him for obstructing the Community as it fled to Lindisfarne (1069/70).\textsuperscript{160}

More importantly in the context of criticising the over-secularisation of the Church, Earl Cospatrick of Northumbria was also attacked in this Gillo Michael miracle, for taking treasures from the deserted Durham Church, expressing the Church’s power over even the most influential secular Northumbrian nobility. Cuthbert’s intervention also demonstrated the Church’s control over the Norman king and his men: the most powerful example involved William of Normandy himself, who was forced to flee by a burning heat when he demanded proof that Cuthbert resided in the church.\textsuperscript{161}

Secular involvement in the Church was thus countered by the overriding power of Cuthbert, a representation of the power of the Community itself. The third book showed the convergence of earls, bishops, and Norman involvement; this was portrayed as the climax of the Church’s power in the clerical era, although its ability to survive shows that the Church maintained immense influence throughout this secular period. But Symeon’s depiction obscured the Community’s involvement in this secular world by focussing on the bishops in this phase. The bishops were often the instigators of these problems, and so it was implicitly left to the Community to uphold the principles of their Church, led by their holy guardian, Cuthbert.

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{LDE} iii.10-13, pp. 172-80.  
\textsuperscript{160} \textit{LDE} iii.16, pp. 188-92.  
\textsuperscript{161} \textit{LDE} iii.19, p. 196.
Whilst Symeon required proof that the clerks’ Community was no longer feasible, he also needed to convey the Community’s right to continue in another guise, that it was not entirely discredited by its secular political involvement. He used the earls as representative of the dangers of secular ties, but also essential to landed wealth needed for survival; the bishops were sometime scapegoats, reflecting how the Church’s secular power could be abused. Thus, the Community was able to maintain its righteousness in the face of problems with which it could so easily have been connected.

Part III: The Final Identity

In 1083 the LDE showed a Church finally able to accommodate monasticism once more. This was the climactic moment of the LDE. It had shown the Church moving from powerful roots through troubled times and then rebuilding itself to arrive at this point. This was a smooth curve of development, high in prestige, influence and control to the early eighth century, slowly declining power and then monasticism as that century progressed and the ninth and tenth ensued, and then increasing control again from 995 through the twelfth century. Of course, this linear progress is misleading: the Church had experienced fluctuations in its practices, its geographical base, its allegiances and its very fabric – the nature of the members themselves; this was hardly the basis for a controlled, smooth, developmental curve. Indeed, the time when the Community was seen to have the least control, wandering haplessly from one refuge to another, was ironically when it showed the great extent of its self-determination, asserting power across the patrimony.162

162 Rollason, ‘Wanderings of St Cuthbert’.
While the Church’s progress was depicted as a slow decline and rebuilding, the reinstitution of monasticism was a rapid and smooth transition. On 26th May the monks of Wearmouth and Jarrow were united as the new Community at Durham. Three days later, their position was officially confirmed and ‘those who had previously dwelt in the Church, and who had been canons only by name since they in no way followed the rule of canons’\textsuperscript{163} were told that they could only remain if they became monks – only one did. Finally, after another three days, monastic offices were assigned to the new Community. This ostensibly neat transfer of personnel belies two rather less clear issues: first, to what extent was this a smooth and uncontested event? Second, to what extent did it demonstrate Norman control over the Church? Both questions are important to the identity that Symeon conveyed, and they return us to the current debate described at the start of this chapter, over the level of change in 1083, and the extent of Norman influence.\textsuperscript{164}

Symeon gives no indication that there was opposition to the new Benedictine convent in 1083; the possible reasons for this, discussed by William Aird, are that the families of the pre-1083 Community maintained control over their lands and, more controversially, that many more than just one member of that Community entered the new Benedictine house.\textsuperscript{165} It does indeed seem plausible that the Community had been undergoing gradual reform from the time of Walcher: Symeon’s description of ‘canons only in name since they in no way followed the rule of canons’ implies that the Community under Walcher had not in fact changed from monastic to clerical

\textsuperscript{163} \textit{LDE} iv.3, pp. 230-1: ‘Eos vero qui prius inibi habitaverunt, nomen tantum canonicorum habentes, sed in nullo canonicorum regulam sequentes…’. Note the vague description of those who preceded the monks.

\textsuperscript{164} See above, pp. 76-9.

and that possibly Walcher envisioned the Community becoming Benedictines rather than being replaced.\footnote{\textit{LDE} iii.18, pp. 194-7: ‘Finding his church served by clerks, he [Walcher] instructed them to observe the day-time and night-time offices according to the customs of the clerks, for previously they had rather imitated the customs of monks in these offices’ (‘\textit{Qui cum clericos ibidem inveniret, clericorum morem in diurnis et nocturnis officiis eos servare docuit, nam antea magis consuetudines monachorum in his imitati fuerant}’).}

The inconsistencies and vagaries of Symeon’s account demonstrate that it was difficult to reconcile continuity with the notion of the Community’s ultimate unsuitability in 1083. The depiction may have been more definite had Symeon’s singular intention been to justify the events of 1083. However, if, as Aird argues, Symeon’s aim was to define the Community vis-a-vis the episcopate, the vagueness of his descriptions is explained: the \textit{LDE} showed continuity and the rightfulness of the Community at all costs, cementing their position against that of the bishop.

The distinctness of Community from bishop is shown through William de St Calais’ domination of Book Four. He is depicted as devoted to, but very separate from, the Community: perhaps a model for the overbearing episcopate of the twelfth century. This bishop undoubtedly had a lasting influence on the Church: it was he, after all, who organised the Benedictine reform, and ordered the building of the great cathedral in 1093.\footnote{\textit{LDE} iv.2-3, pp. 224-34; iv.8, p. 244.} But it was also under William de St Calais that the separateness of the Community became institutionalised. Upon establishing the Benedictine convent, ‘he segregated his own landed possessions from theirs, so that the monks should possess their lands for the purpose of their maintenance and clothing, entirely free and quit of episcopal service and of all customary exactions’.\footnote{\textit{LDE} iv.3, pp. 232-3: ‘\textit{Denique terrarum possessiones illorum ita a suis possessionibus segregavit, at suas ommino ab episcopi servitio et ab omni consuetudine liberas et quietas ad suum victum et vestitum terras monachi possiderent}’.} Furthermore, William was frequently absent from Durham, whether in exile or occupied with the...

\footnote{Walcher’s intentions to establish a monastery at Durham are described, \textit{LDE} iii.22, pp. 210. See also p. 211, n.93 on Walcher’s building activity.}
king’s business elsewhere, and as a result the Community, under the strong leadership of Turgot, further developed its own independence.\textsuperscript{170}

William de St Calais was closely associated with Norman power - in particular he led the Domesday Survey\textsuperscript{171} - but this Community independence means that his reforms are not the product of Norman dominance of the Church. Certainly it would be convenient to perceive reform in Durham as part of a wider phenomenon: in many cases, the monastic revival in the Norman world was part of a process by which royal government could gain control, particularly over the farthest reaches of the realm.\textsuperscript{172} However, the growth of monasticism in late-eleventh-century Northumbria is not a clear case of Norman imperialism: the majority of the monks who arrived at Durham were Anglo-Saxon,\textsuperscript{173} and one should not forget the level of independence wielded by the Church of St Cuthbert and the northern reaches of England, far from the power-centre in the south. While Symeon was keen to recognise Norman kingship and its associations with the Durham Church, his depiction of the reform was of a movement stimulated by and enacted within a sphere controlled by the Church of Durham.

Indeed, the Normans were never portrayed as overpowering in the \textit{LDE}, as the miracles preventing Norman attack and punishing William of Normandy’s doubt over Cuthbert’s presence demonstrate.\textsuperscript{174} The events of 1066 are briefly described, without dwelling too heavily on the power of the incomers.\textsuperscript{175} At the same time, Tostig, a Godwineson who caused great problems for the Normans, receives a

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{LDE} iv.5-8, pp. 238-46.


\textsuperscript{173} Cassandra Potts’ work on Normandy offers detailed case studies of Norman control through founding monasteries, \textit{Monastic Revival and Regional Identity in Early Normandy}.

\textsuperscript{174} See above, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{175} \textit{LDE} iii.15, pp. 182-4; iii.19, p. 196.
positive depiction in the *LDE*.\(^{176}\) Admittedly, the ravaging of the Normans in 1069/70 drove the Community to escape to Lindisfarne, but Cuthbert’s protection allowed them to endure any threats.\(^{177}\) Whilst the saint’s power was used by Symeon to reflect the Community’s control, he also hinted at the force of the ‘people’, who were willing to defend themselves against destruction and mistreatment.\(^{178}\)

By ending his work with the death of William de St Calais, Symeon concluded with a hopeful note, that future bishops would allow the Community the independence that it deserved. The continuation to the *LDE* sheds a little more light on the specific relevance of this message. It criticises Ranulf Flambard directly, stating that ‘when he had been made procurator of the whole realm, he used the power he had received so insolently, that when he was pressing the king’s business most pertinaciously, he thought nothing of offending many people’, and it describes machinations involving subsequent bishops.\(^{179}\) The Community was under pressure to define itself, to justify its position and to preserve its own power within the Church.

The additions to the *LDE* are revealing in other ways. The summary gives a brief rendition of the text, but with two major changes: it criticises the pre-1083 Community, stating that they ‘set aside the strict way of life which had been handed on to them, and they began to hate ecclesiastical discipline and to yield to the allurements of a laxer life’, devoting themselves to ‘flesh and blood and begetting sons and daughters’;\(^{180}\) and it ends with 1083, and the statement that William de St

\(^{176}\) *LDE* iii.11, pp. 174-6.

\(^{177}\) *LDE* iii.15, pp. 184-6.

\(^{178}\) The events of 1066 were recounted in *LDE* iii.15, pp. 182-3; in this same chapter, the ‘rebelliousness of the Northumbrian people’ (‘populos Northanhymbrorum...rebelles’) intimated the potential force of the Haliwerfolc and their influence was also felt when Ranulf attempted to exact tribute (iii.20, pp. 196-8). Aird presents this idea that the Community invited Norman involvement, realising that it was most expedient to ally with the most stable option.

\(^{179}\) *LDE* continuation, pp. 266-7: ‘Totius namque regni procurator constitutus, interdum insolentius accepta abutens potestate, cum negotiis regis pertinacius insistere plures offendere parui pendebat’.

\(^{180}\) *LDE* summary, appendix A, pp. 260-1: ‘sed tradita sibi districione paulatim postposita, ecclesiasticam disciplinam odio habuerunt, remissoris vite illecebras secuti’; ‘Seculariter itaque
Calais ‘did not establish there a new order of monastic life, but rather he re-established an ancient one which God was renewing’.\(^{181}\) Both of these extracts undermine or indeed nullify the efforts of the pre-1083 Community that Symeon has so carefully represented; the continuation could certainly have been added to serve just that purpose, to make the \textit{LDE} into a critique of the clerics. This would have been in keeping with Durham attitudes of 1123 which were probably behind the accusation of the clerks’ ‘depraved and incorrigible way of life’ in a diploma of Pope Calixtus.\(^{182}\) It is perhaps the shifted emphasis of the summary that has led many to believe that the \textit{LDE} is about reform; as Meryl Foster points out, the content of Symeon’s \textit{LDE} alone is very different\(^ {183}\) – a pertinent example of the ways in which an ostensibly complete text can be altered, and its audience manipulated.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item omnino viventes, carni et sanguini inserviebant, filios et filias generantes’. For discussion see also p. lxvi.
  \item \textit{LDE} pp 264-5: ‘Sicque ad illud monachice conversationis ordinem non novum instituit, sed antiquam Deo renovante restituit’.
  \item Foster, ‘Custodians of St Cuthbert’, pp. 61-2.
\end{itemize}
CHAPTER 3
RENOVATING BEDE’S PROSE VITA SANCTI CUTHBERTI: Capitula de Miraculis et Translationibus sancti Cuthberti

Introduction

In a window installed in 1945 in the north aisle of Durham Cathedral, just above the door to the Galilee Chapel, Cuthbert is depicted in episcopal dress, surrounded by an arc of seabirds – terns, kittiwakes and puffins – the consummate saint of nature.¹ This is in accordance with his image in eighth-century vitae, in which he communed with nature, humbly healed the sick, and stole away to a quiet life of contemplative solitude. But by the tenth century Cuthbert struck fear into all around him, generating waves of blood to warn his Community, inflicting pain on the impious, and negotiating with great secular rulers. Into the twelfth century, he maintained this powerful image, and offered protection over a wide geographical area, but also healed once more.

Great changes in the Cuthbertine Church, of location, personnel and power, meant the saint had to alter accordingly, and each textual layer facilitated this alteration. In the introduction to her translation of the Libellus de Ortu sancti Cuthberti, Madeleine Hope Dodds noted that ‘St Cuthbert was fortunate in the number of his biographers’.² The number of texts certainly did ensure the continuing power and popularity of this saint and his Church, from the earliest anonymous life well beyond the twelfth century. But Cuthbert’s fortune, or at least that of his cult, benefited not simply from the quantity of biographers, but from the diverse depictions that they provided, and that were drawn from combining texts in a prolific manuscript tradition.

¹ The window was designed by Hugh Easton. Thanks to the Dean of Durham, the Very Reverend Michael Sadgrove. See R. Norris, The Stained Glass of Durham Cathedral (Norwich, 2001).
W. M. Aird and Ted Johnson South have addressed this change in Cuthbert:
Aird discussed the political context, as part of the political process by which a miracle
collection is written;\(^3\) South focussed on the aggressive depiction of Cuthbert in the
HSC.\(^4\) This chapter aims to look more at the importance of the Church’s textual
tradition in these changes to Cuthbert, focussing on the Capitula, or Liber, de
miraculis et translationibus sancti Cuthberti,\(^5\) a miracle collection of twenty-one
chapters usually found appended to Bede’s prose Vita sancti Cuthberti. Bede’s Vita
was initially extended with two miracles from his Historia Ecclesiastica: posthumous
cures performed at Cuthbert’s tomb and with his relics.\(^6\) By the twelfth century, De
miraculis began to be included in three stages. Miracles 1-7, relating to the period
from the late-ninth century to pre-1083, were added to very early twelfth-century
manuscripts. Chapters 8-17 are miracles dating from the priorate of Turgot (1087-
1107) and written while he was still alive (d.1115). The third group of chapters 18-20
were included a little later, the first recounting Cuthbert’s exhumation in 1104 and the
others pertaining to that event, possibly also including miracle 21.\(^7\) This accumulation
of miracles was a continuation of Bede’s formative Vita, changing the emphasis set
down by the great eighth-century author. This was not a straightforward change
through a unitary text: De miraculis, as is implied by the three groups, was layered

\(^3\) W. Aird, ‘The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the Liber de translationibus et miraculis
\(^4\) Ted Johnson South, ‘Changing Images of Sainthood: St Cuthbert in Historia de sancto Cuthberto’,
\(^5\) A sixteenth century manuscript gives the title Liber de miraculis etc. to two Historia Ecclesiastica
miracles (iv.31 and 32) and the twenty-one miracles of De miraculis (British Library, MS Harleian
4843, f.32r.). See below, p. 133, n. 32, for discussion of the title. The miracle collection is discussed by
Colgrave, ‘The Post-Bedan Miracles’.
\(^6\) HE iv.31 and 32, pp. 444-8. The earliest MS of VCB is the early-tenth century Cambridge, Corpus
Christi College MS 183. The two miracles from Bede’s HE appear in this immediately after the Vita.
\(^7\) Colgrave’s numbering from ‘Post-Bedan Miracles’ is used here, and the groupings are discussed by
him, pp. 326-32. Cf. Arnold’s numbering which places the translation chapter after miracles 1-6. The
order in which the miracles were written is the subject of some debate: Arnold numbers the translation
chapter as 7, but this would separate one of the pre-1083 miracles from the other six. He also places
the tale of the new bell (21) before 19-20, arguing that this would not have been purchased after the
opening of the cathedral. However, the bell tale marries well with the miracles following the
translation tale, although it would also fit well with the cure during the building of the cathedral in 16.
over time, and appeared in manuscripts in various permutations, sometimes in combination with other texts, each manuscript depicting a different Cuthbert. The following two chapters explore this textual fluidity within Cuthbert’s cult: the current chapter discusses how saints can be changed over time, by analysing the ways in which Bede’s image of Cuthbert was altered by De miraculis; the following chapter looks at how various forms of De miraculis fit, alongside and within other texts, into the Cuthbertine manuscript tradition.

**Changing Saints**

The notion of a saint’s persona changing through textual depictions is not uncommon. The character was shaped to fulfil specific criteria, as Hippolyte Delehaye wrote: ‘historical persons are deprived of their individuality, removed from their proper surroundings…An idealized figure takes the place of history’s sharply defined and living portrait, and this figure is no more than the personification of an abstraction’. ⁸ Over time, this abstraction had to suit different ideals; the resulting various depictions of saints are evident in many cults. Such variation could arise from diverse patronage, or from the needs of one patron changing over time. For example, some cults were appropriated by different social, geographic or ethnic groups at an early stage. St Modwenna offers a clear illustration of this: the Scots and English both claimed possession of her body, while the Irish possessed important secondary relics: these three strands of Modwenna’s cult developed largely separately; she was also referred to by several names - Darerca, Moninne, Monenna as well as Modwenna.⁹

St Benedict is another example as his relics were claimed by both Monte Cassino and Fleury. Each community produced suitably distinct hagiography, both

---

rooted in Gregory the Great’s late-sixth-century Life of Benedict from his *Dialogues*, in which Benedict is a universal figure, the father of monks and the writer of the Rule. In Desiderius’ eleventh-century work, Benedict resides at and protects Monte Cassino; in miracle collections of the ninth century to the twelfth, Fleury claims possession of the same body and resulting local protection; eleventh-century Benedictine Cluny also linked itself with the relics at Fleury.

Benedict’s cult also shows how a saint’s depiction could change over time, within one hagiographic tradition, a series of interconnected hagiographic texts emanating from a single institution. Between the ninth century and the twelfth, the several hagiographers of Benedict at Fleury depicted him initially as a fierce protector and punisher, then more as a focus for pilgrimage, next as just a part of the political events surrounding Fleury, and finally, increasingly as a healer. All these depictions of Benedict were written as a continuous miracle collection, within one hagiographic tradition.

For Cuthbert’s cult it was also a case of the same institution shaping the saint according to changing circumstances. By comparing cults such as those of Benedict and Cuthbert, Benedicta Ward identified a three-stage pattern of development. A cult would begin by recording merciful (that is mainly curative) miracles encouraging pilgrimage and establishing sanctity. Popularity ensued, inducing the need to protect the shrine and community through tales of punishment and protection (acts of power); these were increasingly

---

counter-balanced with cures as the shrine stabilised. Ward fitted these into a universal time-frame – the third phase coincided with the end of the twelfth century when merciful miracles were more appropriate in a climate of more regularised cults and with the advent of formal canonisation. Essential context for this pattern is provided by Sigal, who identified a western political environment as responsible for the growth in the eleventh and twelfth centuries of punishment miracles: the inadequacies of royal authority, he argued, had led to usurpation of power, rendering ecclesiastical establishments defenceless against the threats of secular lords. Cuthbertine hagiography would appear to correlate with the combined patterns of Ward and Sigal: De miraculis spans Ward’s second and third phases, beginning with a group of violent miracles but tending towards more gentle miracles, mainly cures, in the later chapters. Reginald of Durham’s mid- to late-twelfth-century Libellus de admirandis Beati Cuthberti virtutibus also appears to continue with the beneficent third phase style miracles. However, these texts were written in response to specific local stimuli: Cuthbert’s cult existed in a sphere largely separate from the dynastic world discussed by Sigal, and was not part of the canonisation process discussed by Ward, although it was regularised in line with other cults at that time. Thus, rather than attempting to discern a common pattern over a wide geographical, cultural and

13 Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 62. See p. 34 for an explanation of the two main types of miracle – acts of power and acts of mercy.
14 Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 184-191 explains the relevance of the canonisation process.
16 See below, pp. 193-7 for further discussion of the patterns in saints cults, and on the problems of over-emphasising the canonisation process.
social range, it seems more significant and more revealing here to consider the individual needs of the cult at a particular time.\footnote{Thomas Head, \textit{Hagiography}: ‘…the posthumous cult of the saints is best studied within such a local framework’, p. 152, n.54.}

**Local Context**

The changing representation of Cuthbert was indeed very closely geared to the needs of the cult and Church at a particular time. \textit{De miraculis} therefore provides rich evidence for the changing circumstances of the Community, and this was the focus of Aird’s study of the text.\footnote{Aird, ‘Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection’, 6-23.} Unsurprisingly, \textit{De miraculis} expresses concerns similar to those seen in the near contemporary \textit{LDE}; it was mentioned above that this collection of Cuthbert’s miracles complemented the \textit{LDE}, which did not focus on the saint.\footnote{See above, p. 80.} We saw in the previous chapter how the rights of the convent versus those of the bishop were crucial under William de St Calais (1080-96) and Rannulf Flambard (1099-1128).\footnote{See above, pp. 77-8 and 122-3.} Their episcopates spanned the period of \textit{De miraculis’} production, and these relations between convent and bishop thus form the backdrop to the miracle collection.

\textit{De miraculis} therefore does display evidence of changing relations between episcopate and community, but in a far less marked way than in the \textit{LDE}. The key role of Bishop Eardulf in guiding the pre-monastic \textit{congregatio} through troubled times is mentioned in two chapters: he led the community in flight from Lindisfarne, and died after he had brought some stability to the church.\footnote{De mir chs. 2 and 3, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i. pp. 234-40} Thereafter, in miracles of post-1083, the only active part played by a bishop is the \textit{non}-involvement of Flambard in Cuthbert’s 1104 elevation, and his sermon that was mercifully and
miraculously ended by a rainstorm.\textsuperscript{22} This same bishop is also criticised, although only tacitly, when one of his officials steals a loose thread from a Gospel Book that had been studied by Cuthbert, whilst the bishop is holding it.\textsuperscript{23} The only other mentions of bishops are of two highly significant events - the murder of Walcher and William de St Calais’ return from exile – which are given lengthy and emotive accounts in Symeon’s \textit{LDE}, but are only briefly mentioned in \textit{De miraculis}.\textsuperscript{24} Bishop-convent relations were only implicitly expressed in \textit{De miraculis}.

As with the \textit{LDE}, there is no criticism in \textit{De miraculis} of the pre-1083 \textit{congregatio}. Indeed, \textit{De miraculis} refers to the members of the Community as monks whether before or after William de St Calais’ implantation of Benedictines. What this miracle collection does show is the increasingly powerful role of the convent, again supporting the argument that concerns of the period focussed on overpowering bishops rather than troublesome former Community members. The post-1083 Benedictine community was instrumental in ten of the fourteen post-1083 miracles of \textit{De miraculis}, whilst in the seven pre-1083 tales, the \textit{congregatio} did not play an active role. In particular, the absence of an active bishop in miracles after 1083 is balanced by the growing prominence of Prior Turgot. He was portrayed as leader of the Cuthbertine cause and arbiter between the saint and those at the mercy of his power: Turgot presided mercifully over the fate of a man whose horse fed on monastic land, of pirates who stole from one of the monastery’s boats and of a man whose leg swelled after stealing a thread from Cuthbert’s St John’s gospel, he was the \textit{memoratus Prior} who helped Abbot Richard of St Albans when he was healed, and it

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{De mir} ch. 18, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i, p. 260.  
was not Bishop Flambard but Turgot who officiated at the 1104 translation of Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{25} The brethren also featured actively in many of these miracles, requesting Cuthbert’s aid on behalf of others.\textsuperscript{26}

*De miraculis* communicated the main concerns of the convent in the early twelfth century: the defence of the 1083 community against increasingly powerful bishops. But insight into these concerns can be more readily gleaned from Symeon’s *LDE* which was written specifically to address them. Indeed, rather than attempting to glean further evidence on these matters from the miracle collection, it is perhaps more revealing to consider why this is the case: why were the issues only implicit in *De miraculis*, a text written at almost the same time, probably in the same scriptorium, as Symeon’s work? The *LDE* was written to record the unbroken history of the Church from its foundation in 635, before Cuthbert’s time, through relocations and changes in community. Thus the *LDE* discussed Cuthbert’s cult only as part of the far wider development of the Church. Conversely, *De miraculis* remained far more muted on issues of monastic and episcopal power: its prime concern was not the airing of monastic grievances but the perpetuation of Cuthbert’s cult.\textsuperscript{27}

Thus, while *De miraculis* can yield evidence of the inner workings of the Cuthbertine church, it is also valuable to consider its role as the extension to Bede’s


\textsuperscript{26} *De miraculis* chs.10, 21. Interestingly, when the miracle is to directly benefit the community, they are not seen asking for Cuthbert’s help, eg. ch.11, *Sym. Op.*, ii, pp. 343-5 in which a shoal of fish is miraculously provided for the monks who had been deprived of their tithe of an earlier catch. Aird, ‘Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection’, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{27} It is important to note here that I do not attempt to completely separate issues of Church and issues of cult – they were intrinsically linked and mutually supportive. However, it is significant to recognise that the overriding purpose of a particular text distinguishes it in character and content from other texts written for the same cult and church.
Vita. Susan Ridyard writes how Anglo-Saxon saints were adopted by the Normans after 1066, their cults adapted to the changing circumstances, not reinforced against sceptical incomers. De miraculis should be seen in this context: it adapted Cuthbert’s cult, and actively adapted Bede’s formative work, although under the control of the Church rather than an external Norman influence.

The Connection between the VCB and De miraculis

De miraculis appears almost exclusively as an addition to Bede’s prose Vita sancti Cuthberti. It is appended in various permutations to twenty-two of the thirty-eight extant copies of Bede’s prose Vita; up to nine of the remaining sixteen manuscripts may have been produced before De miraculis was written, or at least before it was in circulation. Parts of the miracle collection appear without Bede’s Vita in only five manuscripts, and three of these contain evidence suggesting they may have once appeared alongside the VCB. Evidence within the manuscripts compounds this close connection between Vita and De miraculis. Most follow the same pattern, and all are written in continuous script by the same hand throughout: the prose life is generally followed by two miracles from Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica, often linked to Cuthbert’s Life by a clause highlighted in red ink. De

29 See above, pp. 76-9.
30 Colgrave lists the MSS of VCB and offers dates of between the early tenth century and the twelfth century (possibly early) to nine manuscripts, Two Lives pp. 20-39.
31 See Appendix 3, p. 260. The manuscripts in which VCB does not appear with De miraculis are as follows: BL MS Cotton. Nero A.II, which contains only chs. 18-21 of De miraculis. Part of ch. 18 is missing, suggesting the loss of a tract of the text, perhaps including VCB. BL MS Sloane 1772 contains only ch.20, a miracle which would be unlikely to appear without the related translation chapter (18), again indicating that some of the manuscript may have been lost – see below, p. 27. Bodleian, MS Bodley 514 contains only part of ch.18 – it is feasible that this key translation chapter could have been intended to appear alone, although possible again that other parts of the manuscript are lost. In the remaining two manuscripts, the chapters from De miraculis are used in the LDE, replacing Symeon’s versions of the same miracles: York Cathedral Chapter Library xvi.i.12 and BL MS Cotton. Titus A.ii substitute De miraculis chs. 1, 4, 5, 7 and 12 for parts of Symeon’s LDE: respectively, ii.10, pp. 110-2; ii.13, p. 126; iii.11, pp. 174-6; ch.7 follows from iii.24; iv.4, pp. 234-6.
miraculis directly followed these Bedan tales, often not separated by any title but simply as part of this list of posthumous, post-vita Cuthbert miracles. This inextricable bond with Bede designates De miraculis as a text used for enhancing Cuthbert’s cult.

The bond between De miraculis and Bede’s prose Vita is compelling evidence against the notion that Vitae belong to a genre separate from miracle collections. Miracle collections were usually produced to be added to a Vita: miracles recorded in scedulae at shrines would be selectively added to new copies of a saint’s life. Some foundations compiled a volume of works on the patron saint, a textual relic to be kept with corporeal remains; in these cases such a comprehensive miracle collection was not necessarily to be disseminated as widely as the Vita, but had significance locally and for pilgrims. It has been generally agreed that a Vita was intended to show the spiritual virtutes of a saint for liturgical use, and was thus more widely distributed than a miracle collection which was to respond to the needs of the specific Church and its people and was rarely used for liturgical purposes: the difference in their miracles could be explained partly by this literary distinction. But it does not necessarily follow that a Vita would often be copied and distributed widely to satisfy its liturgical function, while a miracle collection appeared in only a few manuscripts,

32 The clause varies somewhat, but basically communicates the same information: ‘Explicit liber de vita et miraculis beatissimi patris Cuthberti Lindisfarnensis ecclesie episcopi. Item de quo super ex quarto ecclesiastice gentis anglorum libro’ (from British Library, Digby 175, ff.23r). A notable exception is the sixteenth-century BL, MS Harleian 4843, in which the HE miracles and De miraculis are headed ‘Liber de miraculis et translationibus sancti Cuthberti’, f.32r.
33 One such volume was kept at Fleury containing the Vita, various miracle collections and sermons of Benedict (Archives du Loiret H20); a volume entitled the Liber feretrarorium concerning King Edmund was kept at Bury St Edmunds (BL, Cotton MS Tiberius B ii), Head, Hagiography, pp. 128-9.
34 For example in a Saint-Denis manuscript containing the Vita s. Maximini II and Letaldus’ Miracula s. Maximini, the Vita is noted with lectio-markings but the miracle collection is not, implying the former’s liturgical use, Vatican, Reg. lat. 528, fos.2-35, cited in Head, Hagiography, p. 184. See also Ward, Miracles, p. 166. Head gives a description of the processes of producing and delivering liturgical texts, pp. 121-7. There are inevitably exceptions to this: Aimo’s miracles of Benedict, often appended to Gregory the Great’s Vita, were possibly for liturgical use, as were some miracles of Ste Foy and of Thomas Becket. E. Pellegrin, ‘Notes sur quelques recueils de vies de saints utilisés pour la liturgie à Fleury-sur-Loire au XIé siècle’, Bulletin d’information de l’Institut de recherches et d’histoire des textes, 12, 7-30 at 26-7; Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 166.
for local needs. The fact that, once the *De miraculis* had been compiled, Bede’s *Vita* rarely appeared without it, indicates that by the twelfth century one should not attempt to separate *Vita* and *miracula* in the cult of St Cuthbert.

**Changing Cuthbert**

**The VCB**

It is necessary to reiterate here the importance of Bede as the literary root of the Church. Bede usurped the anonymous *Vita* to establish what was to become the formative image of Cuthbert. He certainly used the earliest life by retaining the overriding gentle image of Cuthbert, continuing the emphasis on curative miracles and those involving animals.\(^{35}\) However, with subtle changes he fundamentally altered the anonymous *Vita*’s depiction.\(^{36}\) Firstly, by alluding to classic hagiographies, he portrayed a saint in development, progressively becoming more holy, and emphasised Cuthbert’s role as a monk-bishop model.\(^{37}\) Secondly, he wrote for a wider audience. This is implied in his didactic emphasis,\(^{38}\) and shown more clearly by his avoidance of the temporality seen in the anonymous *Vita*. Bede omitted

---

\(^{35}\) Twelve of the anonymous author’s chapter’s involve cures, while Bede recounts sixteen separate cures (39% of all miracles in *VCB*) and refers to several others. Both authors have four chapters recounting miracles involving animals.

\(^{36}\) Newlands, ‘Bede and Images’ discusses how and why Cuthbert’s image differs between the anonymous *Vita*, Bede’s verse life and his prose version. Cf. South in ‘Changing Images of Sainthood’, who argues that the depiction of Cuthbert is virtually identical in the anonymous and two Bedan *Vitae*.

\(^{37}\) In his use of classic hagiographies, Bede particularly used Sulpicius Severus’ *Life of Martin of Tours*, the earliest monk-bishop model. See C. Stancliffe, ‘Cuthbert and the polarity between Pastor and Solitary’ in *CCC*, pp. 21-42. Alan Thacker, discusses Bede’s concerns over the decline in church leadership eg. in his *Epistola ad Ecgbertum* of 734 (Plummer, *Opera Historia* I, 406-23); in Bede’s prose *Vita*, Cuthbert is therefore an *exemplum* for church leaders, ‘Bede’s Ideal of Reform’, P. Wormald, D. Bullough and R. Collins eds., *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 1983) pp. 130-53 at pp. 138-42; Newlands, ‘Bede and Images’, p. 80. Bede particularly used Sulpicius Severus’ *Life of Martin of Tours*, the earliest monk-bishop model.

\(^{38}\) Catherine Cubitt compares the Anonymous and Bedan version of a miracle in which food is provided for Cuthbert – Anon *Vita* i.6, Bede’s *Vita* ch.5. ‘Memory and narrative in the cult of early Anglo-Saxon saints’, Hen and Innes eds., *Uses of the Past*, pp. 29-66 at pp. 42-3. See also Stancliffe, ‘Pastor and Solitary’, pp. 31-3.
names, places and dates, creating an image of a saint far less earthly, less involved in the machinations of a particular time and place.

As well as altering the image of Cuthbert himself, this also eliminated the strong Melrose influence of the anonymous *Vita* and thus focused the cult on Lindisfarne, if only by implication. Many of the tales in the anonymous *Vita* contain contextualising political and temporal information concerning Melrose and the prevalence of miracles from this foundation implies that the cult was initially generated more from Melrose than from Lindisfarne. Thus in Bede’s *Vita*, in which there are still not many miracles located on Lindisfarne, the removal of specific locations serves to shift the geographical emphasis of the cult whilst not fabricating Lindisfarne references.\(^{39}\) By changing the anonymous *Vita* in these three ways, Bede formed an enduring image of Cuthbert. His text became the basis for the veneration of the saint, but the three facets of Bede’s image – gentleness, the ascetic monk-bishop, and Lindisfarne – were all altered by *De miraculis* as it was appended to his *Vita*.

### The Incorrupt Body

Before these changes in the Cuthbert are explored, it should be emphasised that there was one clear similarity between Bede’s *Vita* and *De miraculis*. The most powerful miracle of each work was that of Cuthbert’s incorrupt body. In *De miraculis*, this ultimate proof of sanctity was witnessed in a ceremony which mirrored the opening of Cuthbert’s coffin on Lindisfarne four centuries earlier: the inspection occurred in 1104, 11 years after the saint had been placed in the new cathedral, just as Cuthbert had been translated on Lindisfarne 11 years after his death; the body in 698

---

was ‘just as sound and entire as when it was abandoned by its holy soul’, and the same sweet odour emanated from the coffin in 1104.\textsuperscript{40} This was a powerful statement, that this was the same Cuthbert as had been the famous hermit of Lindisfarne. Indeed, this was a key miracle in most Cuthbertine works, emphasising the importance of continuity in the Church: Reginald’s \textit{Libellus} recounted both exhumations, and both Symeon’s \textit{LDE} and the \textit{Brevis Relatio} summarised the seventh-century translation.\textsuperscript{41}

**The Gentle Saint**

Other than the repeated \textit{topos} of the uncorrupt body, the changes to Cuthbert communicated by \textit{De miraculis} were striking. Bede’s Cuthbert was gentle, his power performed through cures for the worthy and, as in the Durham window, an affinity with nature:

> Now, according to his custom, while the others were resting at night, he would go out alone to pray, and after watching long throughout the dead of night, he would return home just at the hour of common worship; and on a certain night one of the brethren of the same monastery, seeing him go silently out, followed in his footsteps secretly, seeking to discover whither he meant to go and what he intended to do. Cuthbert left the monastery with the spy following him and went down to the sea, above whose shores the monastery was built; going into the deep water until the swelling waves rose as far as his neck and arms, he spent the dark hours of the night watching and singing praises to the sound of the waves. When daybreak was at hand, he went up on to the land and began to pray once more, kneeling on the shore. While he was doing this, there came forth from the depths of the sea two four-footed creatures which are commonly called otters. These, prostrate before him on the sand, began to warm his feet with their breath and sought to dry him with their fur, and when they had finished their ministrations they received his blessing and slipped away into their native waters.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{De mir} ch.18, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i, p. 259: “Ecce!” inquiens, “fratres, hoc corpus iacet his quidem exanime, sed iia sanum et integrum, sicut ea die qua caelestia petens, id sancta reliquerat anima.” Aird discusses the importance of this miracle in the establishment of the new cathedral. ‘Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection’, pp. 19-22.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{LDE} i.11, pp. 54-6; Reginald, \textit{Libellus} chs.12, pp. 16-19 and 40, pp. 84-6; \textit{BR} ch.8, pp. 225-6. See below, p. 207, for a comparison of Reginald’s account of the 1104 with that of \textit{De mir}.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{VCB} ch.10, pp. 188-91: ‘Qui cum more sibi solito quiescentibus nocte caeteris ad orationem solus exiret, et post longas intempestate noctis vigilias tandem instante hora communis sinaxeos domum rediret, quodam nocte unus e fratribus eiusdem monasterii cum egredientem illum silentio cernet, clanculo secutus eius vestigia, qua iret, quique agere vellet dinolescere querebat. At ille egressus monasterio sequente exploratore descendit ad mare, cuius ripae monasterium idem superpositum erat. Ingressusque altitudinem maris, donec ad collium usque et brachia unda tumens assurgert, pervigiles
Sometimes an admonition was involved, but always with a constructive tone: for example, Cuthbert warned the birds not to remove thatch from his hermitage on Farne and they atoned for their actions by bringing him a gift of lard. Cuthbert protected the community implicitly through the reputation derived from these miracles. Occasionally he actively guarded the community, but never with aggression, as when he changed the wind to return the monks’ rafts to shore, silencing the criticism of the pagans: his only words to the common people (vulgaris turba) were “Brethren, what are you doing, cursing those whom you see being carried away even now to destruction? Would it not be more kind to pray to the Lord for their safety rather than to rejoice over their dangers?” Cuthbert was, though, mainly a contemplative figure, leading by example and rarely intervening directly in the monastery or in others’ lives, except to cure. Cuthbert’s healing power featured in over a third of Bede’s chapters; he cured royalty, members of the court and peasants as well as fellow religious figures. The earliest miracles to be appended to Bede’s Vita, two tales of Cuthbert’s posthumous cures from the Historia Ecclesiastica, uphold the image of a gentle man performing acts of mercy.

Cures also played their part in De miraculis, but they are very different to the tales told by Bede, often following a punishment meted out by Cuthbert. In one tale, a belt was stolen from the monastery’s donkey boy: the thief was blinded but regained some sight when he returned the belt. In another, a man mistreated some of the

undisonis in laudibus tenebras noctis exegit. Appropinquante autem diluculo, ascendens in terram denuo coepit in litore flexis genibus orare. Quod dum ageret, venere continuo duo de profundo maris quadrupedia quae vulgo latraeae vocantur. Haec ante illum strata in arena, anhelicu suo pedes eius fouere coeperunt, ac villo satagebant extergere. Completoque ministerio, percepta ab eo benedictione patrias sunt relapsa sub undas’.


VCB ch.3, pp. 162-5: ‘Quid agitis inquiens frater, maledicentes his quos in loetum iam trahi videtis? Nonne melius esset et humanius Dominum pro eorum deprecari salute, quam illorum gaudere periculis?’

Bede, HE iv.31 and 32, pp. 444-8.
brethren and *populus* and fell down as if dead but recovered when the monks prayed for him. Significantly in this example, Cuthbert protected not simply the members of the convent but also the *populus sancti Cuthberti* – the Haliwerfolc – who were an important facet of Cuthbertine power, particularly during translocations.46

The only other cures were associated with the establishment of the new cathedral: Cuthbert healed people injured in the building process and an abbot who helped move the coffin.47 Such tales of injury during church building are a reasonably common *topos* with a common purpose. The eighth-century *Vita sancti Wilfridi* recorded the saint curing a mason who fell from a high pinnacle whilst working on the new church at Hexham so that ‘he who scoffs at all good might not have the joy of victory in this building’; similarly, *De miraculis*’ building miracles confirmed the holiness of the imposing new edifice at Durham.48 Cures in *De miraculis* were thus more overtly involved in the political identity of the Church than were Bede’s. Cuthbert was forcefully presented as the figurehead of a powerful establishment, feared for his aggression as well as venerated for his benevolence.49

Indeed, rather than cure the righteous, in *De miraculis* it was often the case that Cuthbert intervened to inflict harm on those violating his Church. The descriptions were forcefully violent, perhaps none more than Cuthbert’s punishment of Onalafbald who desecrated his land and refuted his holiness:

> As soon as that unhappy man had come to the door, and had placed one foot outside the threshold and the other inside, he was fixed as if by a nail through each foot and, unable to go out or to come back in, he remained there immobile…Countless people assembled there and watched, as many of them his [people] as Christians, so he was tormented for a long time until at

48 Eddius, *Vita sancti Wilfridi*, ch.23, pp. 46-7: ‘ut ne illusor omnis boni in hoc aedificio gaudium victoriae haberet’. Kirby ‘Northumbria in the time of Wilfrid’, p. 4. See also examples of miracles during building listed in Geoffrey of Burton’s *Life and Miracles of St Modwenna*, ch.50, pp. 210-12.
49 This political emphasis is discussed by South in the context of the *HSC*, ‘Changing Images of Sainthood’. David Rollason writes that the image of Cuthbert in the *HSC* is ‘as terrifying and violent as that of any feudal lord of that period’, *Saints and Relics*, p. 207.
last, exclaiming fearfully, he acknowledged publicly the sanctity of the most blessed confessor, and thus he was compelled to give up his most impious soul in that same place.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, Barcwith was struck down for disregarding the law of sanctuary; a Norman soldier who deceived the monks and then stole from the monastery became mad and died, and a horse perished after feeding on monastic land.\textsuperscript{51} An illustrated manuscript of c.1100 vividly depicts these miracles in violent images, visually reinforcing the power of Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{52} As well as giving physical punishment to impious individuals,\textsuperscript{53} Cuthbert attacked desecration on a much grander scale. He guided King Alfred in his famous victory against the Frisians and the Danes who ‘had defiled with a barbarous infection, driving everything Divine and human in every direction by burning, plundering and murdering’.\textsuperscript{54} He opened the ground to swallow the Scots who had plundered south of the Tweed and were fighting Guthred, and he intervened in a war between Malcolm III and William Rufus which had made living conditions in Durham unbearable.\textsuperscript{55}

At the same time he gave positive support to the Community, most forcefully manifested in spectacular biblical miracles. There are two instances of great catches of fish: one was the famous Alfred miracle in which, before the great battle victory, his household in hiding were relieved from deprivation by a miraculous load of fish.

\textsuperscript{50} De mir ch.3, Sym. Op., i, p. 240: ‘Jam miser ille ad ostium venerat, jam alterum intra limen, alterum extra, pedem posuerat, et ibi tanquam clavis per utrumque pedem confixus nec egredi nec regredi valebat, sed immobils prorsus ibi haeret…Ubi autem, concurrente atque spectante populo innumerabili tam suorum quam Christianorum, ita diutius torquebatur, tandem horribiliter exclamans, beatissimi confessoris sanctitatem palam confitebatur, sicque impiam suam animam eodem in loco reddere compellebat.’


\textsuperscript{53} De mir chs. 7, 12, 20, Sym. Op., ii, pp. 333-5, 345-7 and 361-2

\textsuperscript{54} De mir ch.1, Sym. Op., i, pp. 229-30: ‘…omniaque incendiis, rapinis, atque homicidiis, quaquaquavserum exterminantes Divinaaque ut humana, contagione barbarica contaminabant’.

The other took place on Lindisfarne: towards the end of Lent, the monks’ provisions were low and they had been deprived of their tithe from a catch which did not land on monastic property, but miraculously a haul of fish landed for them, providing food for Easter. Lindisfarne was the location for a further biblical miracle - a tale recounting the parting of the sea to enable a safe passage to the island at high tide.\textsuperscript{56} If Bede’s miracles had shown Cuthbert as implicit guardian of the monks, in \textit{De miraculis} he had become the very active protector of the community and their rights, and of those who defended them.\textsuperscript{57}

It is worthy of note that the most forceful miracles of reward and punishment appear in the earlier stages of the collection: indeed, the first seven miracles, all pertaining to the perceived troubled period pre-1083, were all tales of an aggressive protector. The \textit{HSC} was similar in tone to this early part of \textit{De miraculis}, depicting an aggressive Cuthbert; this is hardly surprising as the first four chapters of \textit{De miraculis} are expanded versions of miracles in the \textit{HSC}. The miracle collection related the same tales with much lengthier descriptions and added dialogue, creating a more dramatic portrayal.\textsuperscript{58} South argued that this aggressive presentation of Cuthbert in \textit{HSC} may devalue the earlier \textit{Vitae}: ‘If this evolution did violence to the saint’s earlier persona, so much the worse for now outdated lives’.\textsuperscript{59} However, the fact that these miracles in the \textit{HSC} to which he refers are repeated in \textit{De miraculis}, a text written to accompany Bede’s \textit{Vita}, indicates that they do not outdate Bede’s works. After Bede had established the formative image of Cuthbert, the ensuing texts produced a layered

\textsuperscript{57} Although it is unlikely that King Alfred had any links with the Cuthbertine Church, the miracle involving him shows the mutual support between Cuthbert and the West-Saxon dynasty as a whole, see above, pp. 48-53.
\textsuperscript{58} De mir. chs. 1-4 correspond respectively with \textit{HSC} 14-18, pp. 52-8; 20, pp. 60-2; 23, pp. 68-70; and 33, pp. 68-70. The \textit{De miraculis} chapters are all substantially longer than the corresponding tales in \textit{HSC}, most notably in \textit{De mir.} ch.2 which contains approx. 1300 words, but is recounted in approx. 200 words in \textit{HSC}.
\textsuperscript{59} South, ‘Changing Images of Sainthood’, p. 94.
picture of the saint, using Bede’s image but adding facets appropriate to the needs of the cult. The earlier gentle miracles were necessary; they were the background which allowed Cuthbert to become the protector of later times. After his *virtutes* had been proven in life and soon after his death, he was instilled with the great power to protect his church.

It is interesting that these aggressive miracles were only prominent in the earlier parts of *De miraculis*, and are outweighed by beneficent tales. By contrast, the *LDE* presents more examples of violence than of beneficence, including a group of miracles in which women were punished for entering land sanctified by Cuthbert - a theme entirely absent from *De miraculis*. Juxtaposed with details of the constant monastic presence around Cuthbert’s body, these tales reflect the *LDE*’s concern to communicate the continuity of monasticism in the Community.60 The absence of such miracles from *De miraculis* implies that it was more concerned with conveying Cuthbert’s saintly power in general than the practices of the community.

The cult focus of this miracle collection is emphasised by the fact that, after the earlier aggressive miracles in *De miraculis*, cures become more prevalent in its latter stages: of the ten miracles occurring after 1083 and before the translation, four recount healing, as do the three final miracles after that of the uncorrupt body.61 This increasing prominence of curative miracles was continued by Reginald of Durham in his *Libellus*: Reginald’s miracle collection and *De miraculis* reflected more settled times for the Cuthbertine Church, and aimed to represent Cuthbert’s cult rather than air Church grievances.

The transition from positive to negative thaumaturge was a posthumous one for most saints: in his study of eleventh- and twelfth-century French hagiography,
Sigal calculated 421 posthumous punishment miracles compared with only 49 in vita, illustrating that perhaps a saint’s reputation relied on a positive portrayal of their life on earth.\textsuperscript{62} Furthermore, the return from violent protection to beneficence is in accordance with the patterns in Ward’s broad survey of saints’ changing personas.\textsuperscript{63} However, it seems more pertinent that the changes in Cuthbert were a response to the changing situation of his Church. Aggressive miracles were hardly appropriate to the earthly life of a hermit, and besides, the Lindisfarne Church’s power was relatively unthreatened during Cuthbert’s lifetime compared with the events of the later-eighth century to the late-eleventh. Fewer protective miracles denoted calmer times when threats were not so necessary, and when Reginald recorded Cuthbert’s cures later in the twelfth century, he too was responding just as much to the power of his cult and Church as to the trend to regularise saints’ cults.\textsuperscript{64}

The Monk-Bishop

These images and tales of punishment and protection reflect the second element of Cuthbert’s image established by Bede and changed through De miraculis. Bede’s portrait was of a monk-bishop, a wise pastor who preferred the ascetic life. Cuthbert continued to be the Church’s episcopal model; in Durham Cathedral’s Galilee Chapel, completed c.1175, a wall painting depicts Cuthbert in his mitre, revered in his role as pastor well after the time of De miraculis. The illustration accompanying the Preface of Bede’s Vita in a manuscript of c.1200 contains a similar depiction of Cuthbert as episcopal model.\textsuperscript{65} However, the Cuthbert of De miraculis did not shy

\textsuperscript{62} Sigal, L’Homme et le miracle, pp. 276-282.
\textsuperscript{63} Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{64} See below, ch. 5.
\textsuperscript{65} Both are reproduced and discussed in D. Marner, St Cuthbert. His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham (London, 2000), pp. 29-30, fig.11. BL, Yates Thompson MS 26 (Marner, Life and Cult, p. 58, Plate 1).
away from the secular world. His involvement with royalty and nobility was well attested in the miracle collection, stretching from Cuthbert’s ninth-century connections with Alfred and Guthred, through the tenth-century troubles with Scandinavians, to the eleventh- and twelfth-century dealings with Normans. Certainly Bede’s Cuthbert was connected with royalty, particularly with King Ecgfrith and his sister Ælfflæd, but he forged these connections from the seclusion of his hermitage on Inner Farne. For example, Cuthbert cured Ælfflæd via a linen cincture which he sent from his island; he was persuaded to leave his seclusion to meet with her, but conceded only to go to Coquet Island ‘renowned for its monasteries’, where he prophesied the death of Ecgfrith.66

The dynastic associations of Cuthbert in De miraculis showed him as an overtly political and military force. The West Saxon dynasty was firmly linked with Cuthbert in the Historia de Sancto Cuthberto, and De miraculis expands the most famous of these tales – Alfred’s vision and resulting battle victory – to continue this association.67 Scandinavian leaders were both punished and rewarded: the fate of Onalafbold contrasts with the help given to Guthfrith to counter marauding Scots.68 Again, these were dynastic associations established in the HSC. In the later miracles, and unsurprisingly in this collection compiled post-1066, the majority of Cuthbert’s noble connections were with Normans. The community was protected during William the Conqueror’s ‘harrying of the north’ when Cuthbert provided a safe passage to Lindisfarne for the fleeing congregatio. He also helped the monks against the Northumbrian earls Tostig, whose man tried to violate the law of sanctuary, and

See above, pp. 94-5 for discussion of Cuthbert’s role as episcopal model alongside Aidan, the first bishop of Lindisfarne.
Robert Mowbray, who was captured as punishment for taking land from the convent members. More positive relations with Norman nobility were seen as the court of William Rufus rejoiced at one of Cuthbert’s miracles, and with the Scottish dynasty as the future Alexander I was present for the inspection of Cuthbert’s body. Cuthbert had become a saint directly involved in the political machinations of a powerful Church. His protection of the community and patrimony was worked partly through close association with different secular powers at different times. These links with different dynasties cast the De miraculis Cuthbert as an aggressive diplomat, forming allegiances with whichever secular power could offer the greatest support.

**Saint of Lindisfarne**

The association with kings and nobles from many parts of Britain leads to the third element of the characterisation of Cuthbert. Bede centred Cuthbert’s miracles around Lindisfarne, and this original home of the Church remained important in *De miraculis* but not as the centre of the cult: rather it was a very holy part of the Church’s patrimony, just as it had been the basis of the Church’s identity in the *LDE*. It was mentioned in seven of the twenty-one miracles as a place impossible to violate without repercussions. The power of the sea was particularly evident in these miracles: in addition to the fish provided after the monks were deprived of their tithe, the tide miraculously rose to prevent a man from stealing a horse, and pirates who had stolen a monastic ship were washed ashore on Lindisfarne by a sudden storm. This protected location was also a safe haven for the community fleeing from Norman ravaging, when the high tide subsided and then closed behind the community as it

---

71 See above, ch. 1.
72 See above, pp. 83-5.
carried Cuthbert’s body to safety.\textsuperscript{73} This last miracle communicated clearly the island’s role in the theme of continuity:

It is the island which is called Lindisfarne, which we also recollected above, where, when he [Cuthbert] was in the weakness of this flesh, he was a monk and ruler of the above priory for the assembly of monks, then was raised to the episcopal seat, and where finally at the end of his life he had been buried.\textsuperscript{74}

This tale, and the significance of Lindisfarne in \textit{De miraculis} as a whole, indicates once more the late-eleventh and twelfth-century rehabilitation of Lindisfarne as a cult and Church centre.

Other than the first four chapters, however, (derived from tales written at Chester-le-Street in \textit{HSC}) the focus of most miracles was Durham. Some were based in the area around the Church, on property belonging to the monastery, but more prominent was the emphasis on the new cathedral which began to be built in 1093. This featured in five tales, crowned by the translation and viewing of Cuthbert himself accounting for nearly a quarter of \textit{De miraculis’} pages.\textsuperscript{75} The emphasis on Durham Cathedral, coupled with the climactic miracle of the recent exhumation of Cuthbert’s body there, show that \textit{De miraculis} was concerned with establishing that building as the focus of Church and cult.

The concern to communicate Durham Cathedral’s pre-eminence is also demonstrated via an illustrated manuscript of Bede’s \textit{Vita} of c.1100, particularly


\textit{Lindisfarne} is also mentioned in 2, 4, and 18, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i, pp. 235, 241 and 249.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{De mir.} ch. 6, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i, p. 246: \textit{Est insula quæ Lindisfarnea dicitur, cujus supra quoque meminimus, ubi, cum in hac carnis infirmitate degeret, ipse monachus monachorum cœtui praepositi prioratu prælatus, ac deinde pontificali sede sublimatus, ad postremum quoque, decurso hujus vitae termino, fuerat tumulatus.}

\textit{Symeon} copied much of this miracle in his \textit{LDE} (iii.15, pp. 184-6) but omitted this extract, and a description of the geography of Lindisfarne: ‘This island, with the ebb and flow of the ocean’s tides, can be approached by land twice each day, and often cannot be approached by vehicle unless it is a boat’. (\textit{Hæc quippe insula, recedentibus et accedentibus oceani estibus, bis quoque die adiri valet itinere terreno, totiensque non nisi navali ingreditur vehiculo’}, \textit{Sym. Op.}, i, p. 246. Abou-el-Haj shows that some elements of the cult at Lindisfarne were underrepresented in the early twelfth century, ‘Post-Conquest Appropriation’, p. 184, but in this case, it seems just as likely that \textit{Symeon} did not need to include this information which he had already covered in his work.

when compared with the only other extant illustrated manuscript of Cuthbert’s Life produced a century later. The contrasting emphasis of the illustrations in the two manuscripts reflects how the needs of the cult changed over the course of the twelfth century, a compelling example of the manipulation of a text without even changing its verbal composition. The earlier manuscript contains outline drawings alongside most of Bede’s chapters and it is therefore striking that some key topoi are not illustrated: Cuthbert’s consecration is not depicted, but is represented in three paintings in the later manuscript; his death is also prominent in the paintings of the c.1200 manuscript but omitted from the early twelfth-century illustrations. There are, however, images of Cuthbert’s prophecy of his own death, instructions for his burial and his final dying words, and furthermore, the illustrator was aware of the image topos for a death, demonstrated in his drawing of Aidan’s soul being borne to heaven.

The lack of illustration for these two topoi is conspicuous, but not surprising when placed in context of the time of the Vita’s production. Barbara Abou-El-Haj suggests that Cuthbert’s episcopal role is downplayed at the start of the twelfth century as the new Durham monks did not yet feel stable so soon after displacing the pre-1083 community; in the light of the attitudes towards the episcopate displayed in the LDE, it is possible that this was also a comment on the early twelfth-century bishops. It seems easier to make the case for the understatement of Cuthbert’s death: De miraculis was produced before the 1104 re-exhumation of Cuthbert’s undecayed

---

76 Bodleian, MS University College 165 and British Library, Yates Thompson MS 26.
77 VCB ch.24, pp. 234-9. BL, MS Yates Thompson 26, f.50v, 51r and 53v, reproduced in Marner, Life and Cult, pp. 84-86, plates 27, 28 and 29.
78 Cuthbert’s death and the signalling thereof (VCB chs. 39-40, pp. 282-9) are in BL, MS Yates Thompson 26, f.73r and 74v (Marner, Life and Cult, pp. 97-98, plates 40 and 41). The death-related drawings from Bodleian, Univ. Coll. MS 165 are on pp. 84, 102 and 110; the drawing of Aidan being borne to heaven is on p. 18 (cf. the image of Cuthbert’s death from Yates Thompson 26, f.73r). These are reproduced in Abou-El-Haj, ‘Post-Conquest Appropriation’, p. 184-5 and 187.
79 See above, pp. 114-23.
corpse and so it seems possible that the Durham Church did not want to emphasize that Cuthbert’s power had been founded and established elsewhere. The illustrated *Vita* of c.1100 thus asserted the centrality of Durham by omitting depictions of significant events at Lindisfarne. It also strongly reinforced the power of Cuthbert away from Lindisfarne by depicting all seven of its *De miraculis* miracles. These were chapters 1-7, among the most violent in the collection, and the illustrations, for the punishment of Onalaf bald, Barcwith and a Norman soldier, and the vast waves of blood falling into the *congregatio*’s boat, do not stint on fearsome images. While the late twelfth century saw Durham clearly designated as the home of Cuthbert, the early twelfth-century manuscript was produced by a Durham convent eager to confirm their guardianship over Cuthbert.

The predominance of Durham in *De miraculis* was interspersed with mentions of other locations in the British Isles. The inevitable significance of Scotland to the cult and Church of St Cuthbert, in an area of shifting political borders that did not accord with local identities, is discussed further below: here it is sufficient to note that *De miraculis* demonstrated both the positive and negative relations between Cuthbert and Scotland. The tale of the community’s travels to Whithorn in 882, during their seven years of wandering shows the broad geographical area in which Cuthbert’s Church moved from an early date;\(^80\) in two miracles, the Scottish dynasty causes problems for the Cuthbertine Church when it attacks Lindisfarne’s land and is at war

---

\(^80\) ‘The bishop, the abbot, and the people gathered at the mouth of the river which is called Derwent, for it is easier and more accessible to launch a crossing to Ireland from this seaport. There, a ship was prepared for the crossing, the venerable body of the father was placed on it…’ (‘*Ergo ad ostium fluminis, qui Dirwenta vulgo dicitur, omnes simul, episcopus, abbas, et populus conveniunt. Ab hoc enim maris porta facilior et brevior patet transitus in Hiberniam tendentibus. Ibi navis ad transponendum paratur, venerabile patris corpus imponitur…*’), *De mir* ch. 2, Sym. Op., i, p. 235.
against William Rufus; positive dynastic relations are seen when the future Alexander I’s attends the 1104 exhumation.81

There are several references in De miraculis to the south of England. The Church of Durham is often associated with St Albans through their rivalry over the possession of Tynemouth: the church of St Oswine there was given to the Jarrow monks by Walcher shortly before they relocated to Durham, and confirmed by Walcher’s successor to the earldom of Northumbria, Aubrey, but the next earl, Robert de Mowbray, expelled the Cuthbertine monks and gave the church to Abbot Paul of St Albans. In LDE’s account of these transactions Symeon briefly mentions the punishments that befell Abbot Paul and Earl Robert Mowbray. By contrast, De miraculis provides far more detail on the fate of these two men, describing how the abbot was taken ill at Tynemouth and died soon after, and how Robert Mowbray was taken captive in the church at Tynemouth, was deprived of his possessions and imprisoned for life.82 Here again is evidence of the different intentions of LDE and De miraculis: Symeon was only subtly suggestive of the saint’s role in the fate of the two men, content that the land had been rightfully reclaimed, while the miracle collection was far more concerned with conveying the power of Cuthbert and emphasising its relevance to those outside Durham.

Connections with the south of England in De miraculis were, however, usually of a positive nature. St Alban’s also had amicable relations with the Durham Church, as its Abbot Richard was present at the exhumation of 1104, and was cured of a long-standing injury when he later helped to move Cuthbert.83 Connections between the Cuthbertine Church and unspecified areas south of the Humber reinforce

the notion that Cuthbert was influential far beyond Durham: Turgot and two monks ‘Australium Anglorum in partes devenit’, and a clerk ‘apud Australes Anglos’ was cured at Cuthbert’s tomb. Finally, the bell for the new Cathedral was ordered by Prior Turgot from London. Cuthbert’s cult had grown in the south of England largely through the West Saxon dynasty and later through Cnut. The Historia de Sancto Cuthberto effectively communicates the pre-eminence of this dynastic connection, and a tenth-century manuscript of Cuthbertine material includes a famous miniature featuring Cuthbert and Æthelstan; De miraculis affirmed the connections between southern England and Cuthbert.

The Amorphous Text

Bede’s image of a contemplative monk-bishop, figurehead of Lindisfarne had been recast by De miraculis. This was undoubtedly the same Cuthbert, as the corporeal evidence of the translation and exhumation proved. After all, the intention was not to usurp Bede’s Vita: the eighth-century author was highly significant to Durham in his own right: his bones were placed in Cuthbert’s coffin in eleventh century, and now reside in their own tomb in Durham Cathedral’s Galilee Chapel. By extending Bede’s Vita, De miraculis responded to the changing face of the Cuthbertine Church. Cuthbert, the patron saint of isolated monastic Lindisfarne, influential with little opposition, had to become patron saint of the Church of Durham. He protected this Church, involving himself in the secular world when necessary, and spreading his holy influence far beyond the bounds of Durham. De

86 Rollason, ‘St Cuthbert and Wessex’; Simpson, ‘The King Alfred/St Cuthbert Episode’.
87 See above, p. 100.
miraculis brought the eighth-century hagiography and its saint into a new age. These overall changes to Cuthbert are assessed on the basis of all twenty-one miracles in De miraculis, supported by evidence from other Cuthbertine texts. However, the miracle collection only appeared as all twenty-one chapters in nine of its twenty-seven manuscripts. In fifteen manuscripts, De miraculis was a different permutation of some or all of these twenty-one tales, and in many of these it appeared combined with, or alongside another text: the Brevis Relatio de sancto Cuthberto.\textsuperscript{88} This raises the question of whether we can see such a malleable group of miracles as an entity. Is De miraculis a text in its own right? Does it only exist as an extension to Bede’s Vita? Or as part of a group of texts including the Brevis Relatio? These questions form the basis for the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{88} The remaining one manuscript is in fact a copy of Symeon’s LDE which uses De miraculis chapters instead of Symeon’s version of some miracles. See below.
CHAPTER 4
MANIPULATING CUTHBERT, MANIPULATING TEXTS:
Brevis Relatio de sancto Cuthberto

Introduction

In 1867 the Surtees Society published a collection of works connected with the twelfth-century monk Symeon of Durham, edited by John Hodgson Hinde. Its second appendix was a twelfth-century piece entitled Brevis relatio de Sancto Cuthberto et quomodo corpus eius Dunelmum venerit, et excerpta de vita et miraculis sancti Cuthberti – ‘A brief relation concerning St Cuthbert, and how his body came to Durham, and extracts from the Life and miracles of St Cuthbert’.¹ This is the only publication of the text entitled Brevis Relatio, and it is a text rarely mentioned in discussion of Cuthbertine sources. This relative obscurity must be partly due to the fact that the Brevis Relatio appears in so many guises in various manuscripts: it is difficult to identify, and thus difficult to discuss as a single textual entity. But most medieval texts are at least slightly altered in every manuscript in which they appear, whether it be through scribal error, intentional substitution of a few words, adding a continuation, or providing illustrations.² Every such change creates a new form of a particular text for a specific purpose. When do these changes constitute the creation of a new text?

The published Brevis Relatio follows Cuthbert’s life from his childhood in the 630s to the end of the eleventh century when his body lay at Durham. It relates how he became a monk at Melrose and his subsequent move to Lindisfarne where he became prior. It tells how he became a hermit on Farne and displayed supernatural

² Barbara Abou-el-Haj discusses the contrasting messages of two illustrated versions of Bede’s Vita sancti Cuthberti, one from c.1100 and the other from c.1200, ‘Post-Conquest Appropriation’, pp.196-198.
powers there. Cuthbert’s election to the bishopric of Lindisfarne is described, and his consecration. Then follows his return to Farne in old age, and his death there in 687 after which he was entombed in the church on Lindisfarne, where his uncorrupt body was elevated eleven years later. The tale of Cuthbert then advances to the Danish attacks on Lindisfarne in 793 and in 875 and the Community’s resulting flight from Lindisfarne. The period of wandering with Cuthbert’s body follows, then the settlement at Chester-le-Street in c.883, and then the final translocation of the Church in 995 to Durham. The *Brevis Relatio* then affirms the strengthening of Cuthbert’s cult in Durham, recording the relics which were placed with him and a series of protection miracles. The final chapter leaps both temporally and thematically, returning to Cuthbert’s consecration to list the possessions bestowed upon the saint from the seventh century to the twelfth. The *Brevis Relatio* thus records in a single text the major topoi of Cuthbert’s existence, whether alive or a flexible corpse, from Lindisfarne to his final resting place in Durham, and concludes with a list of major grants to the Cuthbertine Church throughout this period. It is the only single text to provide a continuous story of Cuthbert himself over this formative period in the history of his church.3

**Construction of the Text**

Whilst all the Cuthbertine texts after the first *Vita* used previous Cuthbertine works, the *Brevis Relatio* takes this layering action a step further. It does not simply refer to, or derive tales from, preceding Cuthbertine works: it is compiled entirely from these earlier texts. Hodgson Hinde’s *Brevis Relatio* consists of 38 chapters: 1-8 summarise Bede’s *Life of Cuthbert*; 9-37 are chapters lifted from Symeon’s *LDE* on

---

3 Symeon’s *LDE* of course charts the same period and beyond in much more detail, but writes more about the church than about Cuthbert himself.
the Church of Durham, mostly miracles and events surrounding the movement of Cuthbert’s body; the final chapter listing land granted to Cuthbert was compiled using sources probably including the Historia de sancto Cuthberto, the lost Cronica monasterii Dunelmensis⁴ and again Symeon’s LDE. The Brevis Relatio formed a new layer of the Cuthbertine literary tradition entirely by mining the strata beneath it.

However, this process of forming the Brevis Relatio rarely produced the same results. As Hodgson Hinde’s is the only publication of a work entitled Brevis Relatio, we refer to his version, his choice of thirty-eight chapters, when we use the title Brevis Relatio. And yet these chapters appear in no extant manuscript in this form. Hodgson Hinde used four manuscripts in his edition. Of these, two are closely related in form and content to his 38 chapter Surtees Society version: the British Library Cottonian manuscript contains chapters 1-35 and 38; the Bodleian Laud manuscript records chapters 1-37. The two further manuscripts were not incorporated but simply provided evidence for the footnoted references to peculiarities in the many Brevis Relatio versions.⁵ Hodgson Hinde created a text by amalgamating two manuscripts; a twelfth-century work originating in the nineteenth century. This goes beyond the Urtext concept: seeking the oldest accessible text was not feasible – there are too many variations, and many manuscripts date from the same period of mid- to late-twelfth century. Hodgson Hinde sought to record his personal vision of the complete Brevis Relatio.

There are over twenty extant manuscripts containing some chapters of Hodgson Hinde’s Brevis Relatio; the majority of these bear little or no resemblance to his version. In the discussion that follows, it is Hodgson Hinde’s numbering that is

⁴ Reconstructed in Craster, ‘Red Book’.
⁵ Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 1227 (O.3.55) contains BR chapters as follows: 30, 35, 34, 31-3, 36, 38. Other MSS used by Hodgson Hinde are BL MS Cotton. Nero A.ii, Bodleian, Laud Misc. 491 and BL Cotton. Titus A.xi.
used, but his edition is not to be perceived as the root, the source, of all other versions of *Brevis Relatio*. Rather it is used as a frame of reference, to give some constant to a study of a group of such disparate and yet similar manuscripts. The point here is that the *Brevis Relatio* exists in many different forms, and that none of these seems to override the others. Can one identify what the *Brevis Relatio* is? Can one apply a single title to a diverse range of texts? And when does the *Brevis Relatio* become a different text? In the words of Walter Pohl, ‘What is a variant reading of the same text, and when do differences add up to create a different text?’.

Just as new Cuthbertine texts were written to respond to changing circumstances, various permutations of the *Brevis Relatio* addressed specific issues. Several versions of the *Brevis Relatio* were produced throughout the twelfth century: a time of consolidation following great upheaval in the Church of Durham, but also a period of fluctuating convent-episcopate relations. It is against this backdrop - of settlement in Durham, the 1083 replacement of the ‘clerical’ community, and internal wranglings in the church - that the *Brevis Relatio*’s various forms should be set.

**The Brevis Relatio Alone**

There are two main forms of the *Brevis Relatio* which I am going to compare here. One amalgamates *Brevis Relatio* with *De miraculis*; I shall return to this. The first is that which led Hodgson Hinde to his nineteenth-century creation. This form is composed of chapters in consecutive order from 1 to 30-something: the necessity for vagueness will become apparent. What image of Cuthbert did this *Brevis Relatio* convey? It was mentioned above how the first eight chapters were a much

abbreviated form of Bede’s *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, how they recounted the key topoi of Cuthbert’s life and death. Selecting a specific type of information from Bede’s work, a new picture of Cuthbert was created in the *Brevis Relatio*. He was a pious child whose sanctity was foreseen. His exemplary life as a monk induced a reputation and connections which led him to head the community at Lindisfarne. He sought contemplative solitude and demonstrated miraculous powers against demons. The details of his episcopate were given a prominent position in two chapters. Cuthbert’s death on Farne and entombment on Lindisfarne were recorded without embellishment, as was the discovery of his uncorrupt body eleven years later which completed this section of *Brevis Relatio*.

There follows the series of chapters drawn from Symeon’s *LDE*: many have already been described, but their contents will be reiterated here to build a picture of the *Brevis Relatio*. These chapters were rearranged thematically before being added to the Bedan section. Chapters 9-17, taken from various parts of books two and three of Symeon’s work, recount the travels of the community with Cuthbert’s body. The destruction of the church by Vikings in 793 is described, and the flight from Lindisfarne in 875 as a result of the continuing Danish threat. The attempt to carry the body to Ireland, and two protective Cuthbert miracles at Whithorn associated with the theme of wandering are recorded, followed by the brief stay at Crayke and then the Church’s settlement at Chester-le-Street. A tale of Scottish threat quashed by Cuthbert then appears as a reminder that the community was still in some peril. The travelling theme then continues as the community is shown leaving Chester-le-Street in the face of renewed Viking attacks and arriving at Ripon. The miracle of Cuthbert’s coffin becoming immovable at a place called *Wrdelau*, and the resulting

---

7 *BR* chs. 1-8, pp. 223-6.  
8 *BR* chs. 9-17, pp. 226-7.
settlement at Durham follows: a divine portent that Cuthbert wished to be settled at Durham. The holy presence at Durham is then emphasised by two chapters (18 and 19) concerning the relics which were kept in Cuthbert’s tomb, including those of Bede kept in a separate bag. The recurrent theme of this selection is the period of travelling and the rightful choice of settlement at Durham.

A series of punishment miracles follows, arranged into thematic sub-groups. First are three examples of the holy power of Cuthbert’s church (chapters 20-2). All are concerned with unnamed or insignificant men, perhaps to underline that this power was not exclusive but could affect anyone. They are the punitive tales described above concerned with the LDE: a priest was punished for having sexual intercourse soon after mass, by the sacrament turning black and bitter; an evil man was persuaded to repent at Cuthbert’s church when he was constantly attacked by a serpent; and a man stole coins from Cuthbert’s tomb in his mouth but they immediately turned red hot.

The following two chapters (23-4) show Cuthbert protecting the community against William of Normandy, in juxtaposition to the preceding miracles concerning more obscure figures. Cuthbert prevented fire from damaging the church when William sent Robert Cumin to crush the rebellious Northumbrians. The saint then parted the sea at high tide when the Community was fleeing with his body to Lindisfarne from the ‘harrying of the North’. This return to Lindisfarne echoes the earlier Brevis Relatio theme of travel. Lindisfarne was a safe haven for the community on its final peregrination.

The theme of punishment and protection is continued with several chapters (25-29) involving women. Here, as in the LDE, Cuthbert’s apparent misogyny is
more clearly explained as an attempt to show how pious the guardians of the saint were, even when not in the habit of monks. Punishing women who threatened to violate this piety illustrated Cuthbert’s constant protection over his community. Cuthbert is shown to have severed his monks and their successors from female company in response to a fire at Coldingham, and he then upheld this action by punishing those who threatened to violate it: he afflicted a woman with madness when she avoided muddy potholes in the street by crossing the Durham cemetery, and he inflicted the same punishment on a woman intent on seeing the church’s ornaments. These miracles from Book Two of *LDE* are grouped with two further chapters involving women which appear much later in Symeon’s work: Earl Tostig’s wife gave many gifts to Cuthbert but wanted to see the tomb for herself. She sent her female servant ahead, who was immediately repelled by a violent force. Tostig and his wife repented by giving many gifts to the church.

This final tale involving women links neatly with the following two miracles, also involving the protection of gifts given to the church (chapters 30-1). In one, Earl Cospatrick is chastised by Cuthbert for removing ornaments from the church and is beset by misfortunes and afflictions for the rest of his life. In the other, Bishop Æthelwine (1056-71) attempts to steal treasures from the church, but is blown to Scotland by a sudden storm. He eventually reached southern England with the treasures but was captured by King William and died in jail.

This last tale is also part of the final group of *Brevis Relatio* chapters, loosely associated through their theme of bishops and kings. Two chapters (32-3) unite these key figures: Walcher became bishop in 1072 and instructed the community to observe clerical customs rather than imitating those of monks. A few months later King

12 *BR* pp. 228-9.
William visited Durham on his return from Scotland and, refusing to believe that Cuthbert was kept there, ordered an inspection of the tomb. He was punished for his disbelief when he began to suffer an intolerable burning. Soon after, Ranulf Flambard was sent by William to exact tribute from the people of Northumbria but a fearsome Cuthbert appeared in a dream, castigating Ranulf and striking him with the pastoral staff, after which William of Normandy held Cuthbert in great veneration. This series shows the development of Cuthbert’s relationship with William the Conqueror. It is followed by two chapters (34-5) continuing the episcopal/royal theme, but going back two centuries. The simoniac bishop Sexhelm (pre-948) was punished in a dream very similar to that of Flambard, and Viking leader Halfdan (875) became mad and began to smell intolerably after inflicting cruelty on churches including Cuthbert’s.

This brings the Brevis Relatio to chapter 35, the point at which Hodgson Hinde’s two manuscripts diverged: after chapter 35, the Cottonian manuscript contains a chapter (38) derived from the Historia de sancto Cuthberto and other land related documents, recounting Cuthbert’s admission to the episcopal see and listing a series of land grants from various kings and nobles, giving material affirmation of the image of Cuthbert built through the preceding chapters. The Laud manuscript continues with chapters 36 and 37, one from the beginning and one from the end of Symeon’s LDE. Chapter 36 describes how Cuthbert the bishop was an example to his successors, and includes his prophetic statement, derived from Bede’s Vita, that the Community might move his body if necessary; chapter 37 records the vision of a certain Boso, warning of monks straying from their order and predicting the death of

---

13 BR p. 229.
14 BR p. 229.
15 BR pp. 230-3.
16 BR pp. 229-30; LDE i.10 and iv.10.
bishop William de St Calais. These ostensibly unrelated chapters concluded the Laud manuscript with two key messages: that the travelling with Cuthbert’s body was preordained by the saint himself, and that the replacement of the clerks at Durham with monks was justified. These different endings of the Laud and Cottonian manuscripts therefore give variation to the final note of the *Brevis Relatio*. Does this make them into different texts? Or is the alteration merely a subtle adjustment to the same work?

Essentially, though, the message of the two manuscripts is the same. Cuthbert and the Church had become inextricably linked on Lindisfarne: Cuthbert provided an episcopal and monastic model which remained with the Community in perpetuity, and even during many translocations, his physical presence was constant, confirming the symbiotic relationship. Possession of Cuthbert confirmed the identity of the Church and its powerful roots, and he punished any who threatened to violate this. The text built towards his approval of the Church at Durham: approval of the location was reflected in Cuthbert’s powerful, often fearsome, protection of his cult and church, against kings, bishops, and whoever sought to denigrate the institution; approval of the community was equally significant, and miracles punishing women were a reassurance that the church had always been essentially monastic – that it was simply waiting for the appropriate moment to return to full monastic observance.

This is the image that emerges from the two longest *Brevis Relatio* manuscripts, the first example of a form that the *Brevis Relatio* can take. Many other manuscripts included a shorter version of this form of *Brevis Relatio*. Here, the thematic divisions identified above are significant. They are not artificial groupings: the divisions were used by those copying *Brevis Relatio*. Ending with a particular thematic group placed a specific emphasis on a version of the text. For example, the
fourteenth-century British Library Cottonian manuscript, Titus A.xi, contains *Brevis Relatio* chapters 1-17. This version describes Cuthbert’s monastic and episcopal life and the lengthy journey which eventually led the church to Durham. Chapter 17 is the last in the series of chapters on the theme of travel: this *Brevis Relatio* simply explained and justified why the church moved from Lindisfarne to Durham. The second example is the late-twelfth-century Durham Cathedral Manuscript, A.iv.35, with a *Brevis Relatio* of chapters 1-29. In addition to the travels of the church, this version also conveyed some elements of Cuthbert’s protection. His punishment of the three relatively little known men who violated the church morally or materially was in this manuscript, as was his protection against the dangers of exposing the community to women. The last of the group of women miracles described above (in which Tostig and his wife repented for her misdemeanours) was chapter 29. Just as the very subtle differences between the longer manuscripts conveyed different messages, so these shorter versions changed the emphasis of the *Brevis Relatio*. But did this change of emphasis create a different text? Were these shorter *Breves Relationes* or should they be seen as different textual entities? Does the *Brevis Relatio* simply have many different guises? With the lack of an *urtext*, a particular title can yield a great number of versions formed from the same body of material. If no single one of these can be seen as the original, as the intended form for the *Brevis Relatio*, then surely the multifariousness should be seen as an intrinsic characteristic of the text.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{17}\) There are other manuscripts containing *Brevis Relatio* chapters which do not follow the order of this thirty-some chapter version: for example, a twelfth-century manuscript produced in Durham, Cambridge, Trinity College MS 1227, contains chapters 30-36 and 38 but in a different order. However, for the purposes of this study, the analysis of the *BR*’s forms will be confined to the most common patterns in which the text appears in extant MSS. See table of manuscripts, Appendix 3, p. 260.
If this is indeed one text with many possible guises, what is its overall purpose? Does it have one? It is necessary to look beyond simply what appears in these *Brevis Relatio* examples, and this raises two questions. First, what has been selected and what omitted in the process of compiling the entire, 35-chapter *Brevis Relatio*? And second, which other texts have been compiled in the same manuscripts? Very noticeable are the elements omitted from Bede’s *Vita*. Gone are the tales of a man in harmony with nature, the Cuthbert who communed with otters and gently admonished the birds. There are no tales of healing, of beneficence to the sick and needy. Furthermore, Bede’s account of Cuthbert’s dramatic, almost poetic death, and the great wonder of his uncorrupt body are given prosaic, almost dismissive treatment. The *Brevis Relatio* cut Bede’s *Vita* down to its most pragmatic skeleton, of Cuthbert’s career and geographical movements. It added dating for every event – details which had been omitted by Bede to imbue the *Vita* with a timeless quality. It is highly unlikely that the author of this *Brevis Relatio* section intended to replace Bede’s formative work on Cuthbert; he possibly assumed audience knowledge of the content and tone of Bede’s *Vita*. Indeed, many of the manuscripts in which *Brevis Relatio* appears also contain Bede’s *Vita*. This eight-chapter section simply introduced the earthly role of Cuthbert in the church, and located it on seventh-century Lindisfarne. It had no need for the superfluous detail from Bede of Cuthbert’s thaumaturgical activity.

The reasons for the omissions from Bede’s work may be extrapolated further. The understated miracle of incorruption on Lindisfarne is echoed by the fact that the remaining *Brevis Relatio* chapters do not recount the rediscovery of Cuthbert’s

---

18 The changes made to the anonymous *Vita* are discussed in Stancliffe, ‘Pastor and Solitary’, p.27. On symbolism of the reorganisation see also Berschin, ‘Why did Bede write a second Prose Life?’, p.101.
19 Cambridge, Trinity College MS 1227; Bodleian, MS Digby 59; Bodleian, MS Laud Misc. 491; British Library, MS Additional 35110; Durham, Cathedral Chapter Library MS A.IV.35; Dijon, Bibliothèque Publique MS 657; BL, MS Arundel 332; BL, MS Harleian 4843.
uncorrupt body in 1104. This was a formative moment: it was a miraculous confirmation – a heavenly approval – of the Church’s settlement in Durham and the implantation of monks. But neither was it given a prominent place in Symeon’s LDE, the work from which Brevis Relatio was largely composed.\textsuperscript{20} Was the Brevis Relatio in its 35-chapter form an abbreviated, more amenable form of the LDE? It certainly does not appear in manuscripts with Symeon’s work. The purpose of this form of Brevis Relatio was to extract the pieces of Symeon’s work pertaining specifically to Cuthbert. This would mean that the title Brevis Relatio did not denote a static text but rather represented a concept: that of abbreviating Symeon’s LDE, cutting it down to its Cuthbert-focussed content.

The character of Cuthbert as depicted in the Brevis Relatio can be explained by the use of Symeon’s LDE. Whatever the form of the text, however many chapters, there is no Brevis Relatio manuscript which shows the beneficent Cuthbert of Bede’s Vita. Indeed, it is conceivable that the author of the Relatio did not use Bede’s work itself, but referred instead to the first book of Symeon’s LDE which abbreviated Bede’s Vita. Symeon’s Cuthbert was the active protector of the Church, and this was therefore the image which emerged from all versions of the Brevis Relatio. But this does not mean that the Brevis Relatio compiler sought to record only the violent, punitive, fiercely protective Cuthbert. This gives rise to the second question: which other texts appear in the manuscripts with the Brevis Relatio? And this leads to the second form of Brevis Relatio.

**Brevis Relatio and De miraculis: a different text?**

It was mentioned earlier that Bede’s Vita often occurred in Brevis Relatio manuscripts; perhaps even more significant is the Capitula de miraculis et

\textsuperscript{20} See above, p. 80.
translationibus sancti Cuthberti which appears in all Brevis Relatio manuscripts. De miraculis’ image of Cuthbert is discussed above: a saint who was aggressive when his church faced great difficulties, more gently admonitory in less troubled times, but still as beneficent (if not quite so gentle) as in the seventh century. This image contrasts with the more protective and more temporal Cuthbert of the Brevis Relatio; placing the two texts together gave a broader representation of the saint.

There is clear evidence that the Brevis Relatio was written to partner De miraculis. The Brevis Relatio was written after 1104, after the great exhumation of Cuthbert’s uncorrupt body. It was written about Cuthbert, to chart the saint from his life on earth through his travels to Durham, and yet failed to record the ultimate miracle of incorruption which had occurred in Durham, a miracle that not only reasserted the great holiness of Cuthbert but justified most forcefully the presence of the Church in that place. The Brevis Relatio must have been written to accompany a text which did recount that great event: De miraculis was the only such text of the early twelfth century.

The intrinsic link between Brevis Relatio and De miraculis has been the subject of some confusion. In 1841, Joseph Stevenson published a text from the Bollandists’ Acta Sanctorum which he entitled Historia translationis sancti Cuthberti.21 It began with De miraculis chapters one and two (in part) and ended with some of the final Brevis Relatio chapters. Hodgson Hinde, in the introduction to his edition containing what he perceived to be the true De miraculis and Brevis Relatio, commented on the editor of the Acta sanctorum. He wrote that the manuscript containing both these texts was ‘in a mutilated state, perfect at the beginning and end but defective in the middle, and thus containing the commencement of the

---

Translations [De miraculis] and the conclusion of the Relatio, which he has not unnaturally supposed to be portions of the same work’.\(^{22}\) The Acta sanctorum editor therefore connected these portions together with several pages from Symeon’s LDE.\(^{23}\) This is another example, more extreme than that of Hodgson Hinde, of an Urtext created long after the texts were initially written.

However, there are a number of twelfth-century manuscripts in which parts of the Brevis Relatio are combined with chapters from De miraculis to form a single text. In five manuscripts, the two texts were intertwined, always in the same form: the earliest extant example of this appears in a Laon manuscript, Bibliothèque Publique 163.\(^{24}\) This Laon model interspersed chapters from the miracle collection with thematic groupings from Brevis Relatio.

Here, it becomes significant that De miraculis seems to have been written in three groups, discussed by Colgrave: whilst there are thirteen different forms of De miraculis, miracles 1-7, 8-17 and 18-21 are the units in which the collection generally appears. Each group has a different emphasis that changed the image of Cuthbert in a different way. In its earliest manuscripts, De miraculis was simply the first group – it is difficult to discern how many of these seven miracles were in each manuscript initially, as there are parts missing from several chapters.\(^{25}\) It has been shown how four of these derive from the HSC, adopting that text’s concern with asserting political and land rights.\(^{26}\) The opening line of chapter 5 connects with the previous

---

\(^{22}\) Hodgson Hinde, Symeonis, p.xli.

\(^{23}\) AASS, mens Martii, iii.127-42. The Bollandist arrangement is as follows: De mir 1 and 2 as far as undae; LDE ii.13-20 (substitute for De mir 3 and 4 and BR 25-70); pick up MS at tenera in BR 15 - MS then follows Laon model ie. BR 15-20, 29, De mir 5, BR 21-4, 30-3, De mir 7, part of LDE ii.2, De mir 18-20. The Bollandists were using a MS, now lost, from the collection of Nicholas Belfort. Stevenson, Bedae opera ii. p.285, n.1.

\(^{24}\) Dijon, Bibliothèque Publique MS 574, contains a slightly shorter version.

\(^{25}\) See Fig.1. Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 175 contains simply a small part of ch. 1, while Digby 20 is missing parts of chs. 1, 2 and 5. The other manuscript in this group is Oxford, Bodleian, University College MS 165 – the early twelfth century illustrated Vita and miracles. See above, p. 139.

\(^{26}\) See p.15, n.59.
four miracles - ‘We should not pass over in silence how other miracles from our blessed father also shone in our time’ - intimating that these seven miracles were written together.\textsuperscript{27} This is compounded by the fact that they are all dominated by the same theme of punishment and protection. Including just these miracles at the end of Bede’s \textit{Vita} changed Cuthbert more overtly than any other permutation of \textit{De miraculis}; the final image of Cuthbert in these manuscripts is of a saint safeguarding his community’s rights. This is a useful consideration when attempting to date this first group of miracles. Colgrave argued that they were written between 1083 and 1104, and probably nearer to the earlier date: the writer was a monk of Durham, but there is no evidence of the exhumation taking place before these miracles. But this could be narrowed down further to c.1100. From 1093 the Benedictine convent had been attempting to fully establish and consolidate possession of the land which had been lost by the pre-1083 community.\textsuperscript{28} William Rufus posed some threat as he held the Durham see vacant for three years to 1099 and must have wielded influence during Flambard’s early years (bishop 1099-1128). The convent’s final property acquisition is dated to 1101, offering some stability, but they would benefit from the strongly protective emphasis of the seven miracles prior to this date.\textsuperscript{29}

Chapters 8-17 always appear together, always in the same order. They are a combination of punishment, protection and cures, continuing in a slightly less aggressive vein the theme of the first seven chapters but adding a more recent gentle Cuthbert image to that of Bede’s \textit{Vita}. They showed that Durham property and people were protected, Lindisfarne should not be violated, and that cures were still worked

\textsuperscript{28} Charter 7 of Offler, \textit{Durham Episcopal Charters}, pp.53-58 records William de St Calais’ 1093 grant of liberties and possessions to the Durham monks and prior. It is probably a forgery (pp.58-63) but shows the convent’s efforts to reclaim property and rights.
for the deserving. But while their content is ostensibly diverse, these miracles share
the common underpinning theme of expressing Turgot and his convent’s role in the
miracles, perhaps expressing their influence against that of a potentially encroaching
episcopate. The significance of this concern is clarified by the date of the group’s
production. Miracles 8-17 were probably written after the reign of William Rufus
(1087-1100) but before the death of Turgot in 1115; the fact that they do not allude
in any way to the great 1104 exhumation of Cuthbert implies that they were probably
written before then, consigning the recording of miracles 8-17 to between 1100-1104.
This second group never appeared without miracles 1-7 and at least part of the third
group, miracles 18-21. In the extant manuscripts, the earlier seven chapters had
already underlined Cuthbert’s protection of the convent’s property; the second group
of miracles confirmed this but emphasised the convent’s control over Cuthbert’s cult
and power. Furthermore, by combining the type of miracles of the first group with the
type of the third – mixing aggression with beneficence – miracles 8-17 formed a link
between these two contrasting sections of De miraculis. Importantly, these locally
toned miracles do not appear in the Laon model.

The final group revolves around the miracle of Cuthbert’s exhumation in
1104: its importance is affirmed by the fact that it appears alone in two manuscripts,
and is the only miracle to be included with the powerful miracles 1-6 in another.
This centrepiece of De miraculis was followed by a group of curative miracles: owing
to stylistic links and internal references, there is little doubt that chapters 19 and 20

30 See above, pp. 130-1.
31 The author states in ch.8 that he wishes to relate miracles ‘ex his quæ regnante Guillelmo Juniore
contigerunt’, implying that William Rufus is no longer king. He also states that Turgot is still alive at
the time of writing: ‘Ad hoc egresso, qui nunc usque superest, monasterii praeposito…’. Sym. Op., ii,
p.338, and note a.
32 Chapter 18 appears alone in Bodleian, MS Bodley 514; Cambrai, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 816. In
the latter it is simply appended to Bede’s Vita. In the former, it is tacked on to the end of the
manuscript which is entitled Liber sancte Marie de Jorvalle (ie. Jervaulx). BL, MS Harleian 1924
contains ch.1-6, 18.
were written along with chapter 18. In only one instance is chapter 20 omitted from this trio, and this could be due to manuscript damage.\textsuperscript{33} Miracle 21 has a similar curative theme which would connect it with these final chapters and several manuscripts support this connection, although there are some in which it appears between the second group and chapter 18.\textsuperscript{34} References within the final group intimate that the chapters were written some time after the exhumation: Ralph d’Escures was described as archbishop of Canterbury, and William of Corbeil named as his successor – he was consecrated in 1123.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, criticism of Rannulf Flambard is unlikely to have been recorded in writing until after his episcopate, which ended in 1128. It may seem odd that such a key miracle was not recorded sooner: Arnold postulates that the references to the archbishops of Canterbury could have been a later interpolation, but this cannot be supported by manuscript evidence, and fails to account for the Flambard issue.\textsuperscript{36}

It is possible that there was no need to immediately record the exhumation in writing – oral dissemination could rapidly spread news of such a great miracle – or that another version of the translation tale once existed but is now lost, usurped by the ornate and lengthy \textit{De miraculis} chapter 18. Whatever the case may be, the largely beneficent character of the miracles in this third group supports the notion that they were written some time later than the other miracles of \textit{De miraculis}, after the convent’s difficult first quarter of the twelfth century. This third group of miracles

\textsuperscript{33} Dijon, Bibliothèque Publique MS 574. Is it possible that the solitary chapter 20 in BL, MS Sloane 1772 is the chapter 20 missing from this Dijon MS? The Sloane MS contains the two HE chapters, then a version of BR and a list of apostles and a short liturgical calendar. \textit{De miraculis} ch.20 is on a separate and different piece of vellum, in a different hand to the pieces preceding it, less neat and with markedly larger spaces between lines. It seems to have been bound with the other Cuthbertine texts at a later time.

\textsuperscript{34} Colgrave argued that ch.21 belonged after ch.17 – the bell miracle, he contended, would probably have occurred during the building of the cathedral, i.e. nearer to 1093 than the composition of the third group of miracles.


was written to complete *De miraculis* with a more gentle image of Cuthbert. The only element of protection is the tacit criticism of the episcopate – this was otherwise a far more settled time than the very early twelfth century which had produced the first two sections of *De miraculis*. The final section of the text emulated Bede’s presentation of Cuthbert not only in the very obvious repetition of the uncorrupt body miracle but also in the overriding tone.

The Laon manuscript combining *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio* begins with the first four *De miraculis* chapters in which Cuthbert aggressively protected the Church in the ninth and early tenth centuries: he helped King Alfred at war, struck down the pagan Onalafbald, warned the community with waves of blood not to go to Ireland and opened up the ground to swallow the attacking Scots. The latter two tales were also recorded in the *Brevis Relatio* form described above, but the *De miraculis* versions were chosen for the Laon model as they are far more dramatic. When the *Brevis Relatio* described the marauding Scots, it simply stated (from Symeon’s *LDE*):

Some time later the people of the Scots gathered together an innumerable army, and among other cruel crimes they attacked the monastery of Lindisfarne with ravaging and rapine.\(^{37}\)

By contrast, *De miraculis* gives a far more detailed description:

\[
\text{...the nation of the Scots, having collected together an innumerable army, crossed the river Tweed which is the northern boundary of the land of St Cuthbert, and laid waste to all things by murdering, burning and devastating. They spared no rank, age or sex, but overthrew all like animals, with unheard of and equal cruelty. And doing these things, their cruelty not yet satisfied, they penetrated with the same cruelty the monastery of Lindisfarne, never previously defiled by the presumption of anyone.}^{38}\]

\(^{37}\) *BR* ch.14, p. 226, *LDE* ii.13, pp. 126-7: ‘*Interiecto tempore aliquando gens Scotorum innumerabili exercitu coadunato, inter cetera sue crudelitatis facinora Lindisfarnense monasterium seviens et rapiens invasit*’.

\(^{38}\) *De mir* ch.4, Sym. *Op.*, i, p. 241: ‘*Temproibus itaque non multis postea transactis, gens Scotorum, coadunato innumerabili exercitu, flavium Tuyda, qui terminus aquilonalis est terre sancti Cuthberti, transgreditur, omniaque homicidii, incendiis, atque rapinis depopulatur. Non gradui, non etati, non sexui parcetar, sed velut pecudes pari cunctos et in auditu crudelitate prosternebat. Et, haec agens, nondum suam exsatiavit crudelitatem, quin immo Lindisfarnense monasterium, nullorum presumptione antea temperatum, simili crudelitate pervasit*’.
These tales showed how the community had survived through great troubles, and this was given more force by *De miraculis*’ superior dramatic and emotive effect.

After these tales of aggression, two main groups of *Brevis Relatio* chapters follow: tales of travel and of women. Three punishments of women denote the constant monastic character of Cuthbert’s community through all its troubles. Then the sequence describing the journey to Ripon and then to Durham tells of the end of the turbulent times, together with the affirming accounts of the relics held there. Then follow two more tales involving women: the priest who had sex before mass, and finally the repentance of Tostig and his wife.

This Tostig tale from the *Brevis Relatio* dovetails with a tale from *De miraculis* involving the same earl and the theme of repentance. Tostig was warned of Cuthbert’s power when his soldier, Barcwith, was struck down for violating the church’s sanctuary; as a result, Tostig endowed the church. This leads to the theme of Cuthbert protecting the church and his cult against violation, recorded through eight *Brevis Relatio* chapters. There are the two unnamed men, one who was freed from an indestructible snake when he recognised Cuthbert’s holiness and the other who stole coins from the tomb, and then a series of miracles involving William of Normandy. These are from different sections of the *Brevis Relatio* – chapters 23 and 24 lead into 30 – but they marry well together. William’s men were impeded at Durham; when the king was harrying the north, the community was protected when escaping to Lindisfarne; during this flight earl Cospatrick stole from the church; soon after, Bishop Æthelwine stole from the church but was imprisoned by the king; William was afflicted when he demanded to see Cuthbert’s body; Rannulf Flambard was punished by Cuthbert when King William sent him to exact tribute. This is the final
Brevis Relatio chapter in the Laon model: De miraculis chapter 7 then continues the broad theme of Cuthbert punishing Normans and protecting the church’s property.

The final group of chapters from De miraculis brings the text to a dramatic conclusion. There is the lengthy chapter of Cuthbert’s exhumation in 1104 – the doubts, the uncorrupt body, the relics discovered in the coffin – and then two cures associated with this great event. This powerful miracle of incorruption gave Cuthbert sanction: it confirmed that he was at Durham, that he approved of that location, and that the relatively new monastic community was justified in replacing the clerics. This section about the uncorrupt body confirmed the major points of the text with a sign of holy approval.

Oddly, the manuscripts containing this Laon model all contain an additional chapter before this exhumation section. It is a chapter which seems to have no place in the text - an extract from Symeon’s LDE ii.2, it tells how during the reign of Eadberht and the episcopate of Cynewulf (between c.740 and 758) a certain man of royal stock, named Offa, fled to Cuthbert’s sanctuary but was put to death. Eadberht imprisoned the bishop for this but eventually the dispute calmed. In such a carefully organised text, this chapter appears misplaced. Again, the problem arises that there is no Urtext for this hybrid work. However, a Dijon manuscript may help shed some light on this: it is identical to the Laon model except that it lacks De miraculis 20 and this story of Offa. It seems logical that the hybrid text was never intended to include Symeon’s LDE ii.2, and that this Dijon manuscript could be an example of how the Brevis Relatio-De miraculis hybrid was when first it was compiled, before the seemingly erroneous interpolation of the LDE chapter ii.2.

The hybrid Laon text is therefore a carefully arranged amalgamation of the De miraculis and Brevis Relatio chapters. Bertram Colgrave commented briefly on this
model, saying that it ‘forms a consecutive history of the church down to the translation of St Cuthbert’s body in 1104’.\textsuperscript{39} Certainly the Laon model does record events in a chronological order where a date is distinguishable, but this is not the only criterion for arranging the chapters. Thematic links were also relevant, creating groups of chapters focussed on a particular issue such as the holiness of Cuthbert’s land and possessions or the Norman impact on the church: specific themes were a key consideration for the compiler/s of the Laon model. By combining elements of \textit{De miraculis} with chapters from \textit{Brevis Relatio}, the main themes of each text are united. It seems that the necessity arose for a work which encompassed the range of images and issues from both these texts. From \textit{Brevis Relatio} came the constant monastic nature of the community, the lengthy travels of that community with the saint’s body, the power of the church to withstand external influence, and the powerful, aggressive protection of Cuthbert. From \textit{De miraculis} was added the depth of suffering of the community, the beneficence of Cuthbert, and the most important miracle to confirm the perpetual intrinsicality of Cuthbert to the church: the 1104 exhumation.

One should not, however, see the Laon model primarily as a composite of two texts. \textit{Brevis Relatio} was a composite text itself. Furthermore, \textit{Brevis Relatio} and \textit{De miraculis} were themselves worked into various permutations of themselves: was the Laon model just an extension of these manipulations? Or can it be seen as a text in its own right? It certainly sought to convey a combination of issues different to those seen in any version of \textit{Brevis Relatio} or \textit{De miraculis}. The manuscript analysis of Jean Mabillon, in his counter to the Bollandists’ \textit{Acta sanctorum}, is instructive here. He chose to edit the Laon model rather than recording \textit{De miraculis} and \textit{Brevis

\textsuperscript{39} Colgrave, ‘Post-Bedan Miracles’, p.309.
Relatio as individual works. His example is a cautionary reminder that we should not assume the two published texts to have any more textual integrity than the Laon model.

Indeed, there is no reason to assume that the Laon model was not written before the Brevis Relatio. Its non-De miraculis chapters were all taken from Symeon’s LDE: they could have been compiled into the Laon model before they became part of the Brevis Relatio, and manuscript evidence neither supports nor refutes this. One could conclude that thirty-some chapters of Brevis Relatio were compiled first, giving a summary of the Cuthbertine elements of Symeon’s LDE to illustrate the four-hundred-year journey to Durham and Cuthbert’s constant protection, to accompany De miraculis. A certain manuscript then required a shorter version of Cuthbert’s travels and miracles since Lindisfarne and so the Laon model was compiled. Equally, one could contend that someone decided the normal appendage of De miraculis to Cuthbert’s Vita was insufficient – that it required an account of the body’s journey and of the continuing violent protective element of Cuthbert’s personality, and so these tales were extracted from Symeon’s LDE. Soon after, a compiler wished to use De miraculis in its former state, but to use the idea of accompanying the miracle collection with an account of travel and protection, thus creating the Brevis Relatio. Such speculation, however, seems unnecessary and inconclusive. The Brevis Relatio version and the Laon model discussed have such different purposes and should be viewed as different texts.

40 Mab. AA.SS. iv, 2, 276-302. Mabillon used a MS from Compiègne, now lost.
Geographical variations: different Cuthberts for different places

These different textual manipulations lead back to the theme of the previous chapter, of how Cuthbert, just like his texts, can appear in many guises. The permutations of *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio*, combined in codices with other works, Cuthbertine and other, create images of Cuthbert that vary according to their intended geographical audience. The following, then, takes the complete *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio* model, the Laon manuscript, and a manuscript from south-western England as examples of the ways in which Cuthbertine texts were interwoven for different audiences.

Durham Model

The Durham model unsurprisingly offers the most complete conglomeration of the Cuthbertine texts. An example of this near complete collection is the mid- to late-twelfth century Durham scriptorium manuscript, Oxford Bodleian MS Laud Miscellaneous 491. It contains Bede’s Life of Cuthbert and the appended healing miracles from Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*. Then follow all 21 chapters of *De miraculis* and the *Brevis Relatio* in its longest form of 37 chapters, along with some further extracts from Symeon’s *LDE*. Next comes the preface of Bede’s metrical life of Cuthbert (possibly once the entire *Vita*) and the Lives of Oswald and Aidan (excerpted from Bede’s *HE*) who, with Cuthbert, formed the triumvirate upon which the Lindisfarne Church’s power was based. The manuscript also contains a metrical prayer to Cuthbert, and finally a list of the bishops from Aidan, the first bishop of Lindisfarne (635-51), to Hugh du Puiset (1153-95).

A number of Durham concerns can be extrapolated from this collection of works. Cuthbert is, first and foremost, presented as the foundation on which the
Church of Durham stood. The inclusion of these three entire texts relating to Cuthbert, and a number of other texts integral to his cult, denotes the importance of a long and rich literary tradition to the Cuthbertine community. Furthermore, there is a predominance of local detail that was important to a manuscript which was to remain in Durham. How did Cuthbert emerge from this manuscript containing nearly all the information recorded about him since the seventh century? He was a multi-faceted saint: the Bedan life showed his gentle ascetic roots, his violence was well-attested through centuries when the community required more protection, and their travels with Cuthbert’s body during this time were clearly documented. The stable establishment at Durham was described, along with the affirming rediscovery of Cuthbert’s flexible uncorrupt body. Miracles communicated the continuation of the cult, that Cuthbert was a protector, a monastic figure and, potentially, an attraction for pilgrims.

This multi-faceted image is also conveyed in a contemporary manuscript, also from the Durham scriptorium. British Library MS Additional 35110 contains Bede’s Life of Cuthbert and the 21 De miraculis chapters (in a different order, implying that the collection was composed of several moveable groups). The Brevis Relatio version, whilst not quite as large as that in the previous manuscript, still consisted of 31 chapters. Again this manuscript covers almost every element of Cuthbert depicted since the eighth century; interestingly, though, it omits the most localised group of Brevis Relatio chapters, those pertaining to the punishment of Durham bishops and various kings and nobles. It may be ventured that this working of texts was intended to emphasise Cuthbert’s cult and did not require the distraction of tales concerned with the church’s political life. Indeed, the fact that this manuscript was later sent to
Newcastle implies that such a depiction of Cuthbert was deemed suitable for a non-Durham, but still local audience.  

**Continental Model**

The Continental model dates from the mid- to late-twelfth century and is thus contemporaneous with these Durham models. The Laon manuscript described above was written in Durham for the Abbey of Vauclair (Picardy). Like the Durham manuscripts, it begins with Bede’s *Life of Cuthbert* and the appended miracles from the *Ecclesiastical History*. Then follows the edited, rearranged combination of *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio*, which emphasises punishment by Cuthbert, the settlement at Durham, and the rediscovery of Cuthbert’s incorrupt body in 1104. It is instructive to consider what the Laon manuscript lacks compared with the Durham model. The large section from *De miraculis* that does not appear in the Laon manuscript (chapters 8-17) is concerned largely with local miracles involving the Cuthbertine brethren, and contains the majority of *De miraculis’* beneficent tales. From the *Brevis Relatio*, the opening section summarising Cuthbert’s earthly life, and the many displacements of his Church before its establishment at Durham, does not feature in the manuscript. When compared with the Durham model of Cuthbert, the Laon manuscript emphasises the centrality of Durham by downplaying earlier Church sites. It depicts Cuthbert marked with the ultimate posthumous miracle of incorruption at Durham. He is a fierce protector of property and monasticism, involved far more in the wider world than in the local activities of his community and its locale.  

41 Cf. BL MS Yates Thompson 26 and Durham, Cathedral Chapter Library MS A.IV.35 which contain almost identical versions of the texts. These appear to belong in a group with BL Add. 35110.  
42 Of course, one need not assume from this comparison that *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio* existed as textual entities from which the Laon model was derived. It is feasible that the Laon model predated...
This Laon manuscript represents the Cuthbert image exported by the Durham monks; an image to show the power of Durham but to suit a geographically broad audience, to place Cuthbert in a continental scene of saints' cults. Other inclusions in the Laon manuscript support this: a *Brevis Commemoratio* of Bede and his Lives of Oswald and Aidan show the saintly basis of the Durham Church, while Eadmer’s Life and miracles of Dunstan and Gregory’s *Dialogues* placed Cuthbert’s cult in an English and continental context. Whether or not the intended geographically broad audience for this manuscript included British houses is unclear, but this model’s dissemination across the Continent is compelling evidence for its broad appeal. There are five manuscripts in which *De miraculis* and *Brevis Relatio* appear in the distinctive Laon pattern; all, like the Laon manuscript, contain material pertaining to other saints. Two, both again of the mid- to late-twelfth century, deserve further mention here: Dijon MS 574 was held at Citeaux,43 and a Montpellier manuscript Codex I Tomus Quintus, is part of the great Clairvaux legendary of saints, this volume alone containing material on 34 other saints. Together with the Laon model, these manuscripts show Cistercian enthusiasm on the continent for Cuthbert’s cult in the later twelfth century, obviously part of the great Cistercian drive to accumulate hagiographical material in the twelfth century, but possibly also prompted by Durham’s close connections with Ailred of Rievaulx.44 Furthermore, the Montpellier...
manuscript affirms the significance of Cuthbert outside Durham, within the vast communion of Continental saints.

South-Western English Model

The final Cuthbert model from south-western England appears in the Gotha manuscript I.81. Written in the late fourteenth century, it cannot offer the same invaluable contemporary basis for comparison as do the Durham and Continental models, but it differs immensely from the previous two models and thus offers a valuable contrasting image of Cuthbert.

Bede’s Vita heads the Cuthbert material, followed by only seven other Cuthbert tales. From De miraculis come four chapters (not consecutive, but numbers 4, 6, 8 and 9), of Cuthbert destroying the Scots army in the ninth century, parting the waters for the community’s safe passage to Lindisfarne in 1069, striking down a horse who illegally fed from Cuthbertine land and ending the dispute between Malcolm III of Scotland and William Rufus. From Brevis Relatio come three chapters of punishment to women. The latter selection simply emphasises Cuthbert’s protection of monasticism, but the choice from De miraculis seems to sum up one of that text’s main messages: the protection of land, Community and Durham people over a long period of time. It is striking that probably the most significant note of De miraculis – the rediscovery of Cuthbert’s incorruption in 1104 – does not feature in this Gotha manuscript. It may be that this miracle was initially included, as the final De miraculis miracle is only appears in part, implying that further chapters may have

---


35 This manuscript is described in detail by P. Grosjean, ‘De codice hagiographico Gothano’, Analecta Bollandiana 58 (1940), 90-103; appendix 177-204.
been lost. But even if this is the case, this collection of Cuthbert material is much abridged from the Durham model.

This paring down of posthumous Cuthbertine tales emphasises the importance of Bede’s Life as the stem of Cuthbert’s image. Some notion is added of the importance of maintaining a monastic identity and of Cuthbert’s very far-reaching power, with a conscious omission of superfluous local information. The only additional Cuthbert material is the affirmation of the saint’s relevance to the Durham Church, in the form of the list of bishops from Lindisfarne to Durham. The reason for reducing Cuthbert to a briefly updated version of Bede’s essential *Vita* becomes clear in the context of the rest of the manuscript. It contains 43 lives of saints, grouped as kings, bishops, saints linked with south-west England and Wales (suggesting that the manuscript came from that area),\(^46\) and finally women, queens and abbesses. Cuthbert was not afforded any especial prominence, but he was to be venerated alongside saints associated with the south west, as well as with other bishops.

This final model thus puts Cuthbert in a local context of south-western England, where he had been venerated since the late ninth century. It may tentatively be suggested that the independent development of Cuthbert’s cult outside his Church, as exemplified by the manuscripts emanating from the south west in the tenth century, was to continue, and to influence the depiction in the fourteenth-century Gotha manuscript.

\(^{46}\) Colgrave, *Two Lives*, p.37.
Conclusion

Cuthbert was differently styled from the same three texts for different geographical areas. Starting his hagiographical life as a gentle animal lover inextricably linked with Lindisfarne, Cuthbert became many more things as his cult was appropriated by communities across Britain and the continent, and as his own community changed. These detailed studies cover only a fraction of the representations of Cuthbert: his *Vita* by Bede alone appeared in 38 manuscripts, the anonymous *Vita* in seven, and all these *Vitae* were accompanied by different selections of written material; furthermore, the Durham church continued to change Cuthbert into the late twelfth century and beyond with new texts and reworkings of old. What is clear from this selection of case-studies, however, is that a saint can be many things to many different people; that he can be rooted in one place and in an ostensibly well-defined group of texts, but that these texts and thus the saint can be remodelled according to a wide variety of needs.

To return to the textual focus of this chapter, the *Brevis Relatio* is thus many things, and indeed many more than have been covered here: it is an abbreviation of Symeon’s *LDE*, an account of Cuthbert from his earthly life to his final resting place at Durham, an accompaniment for other texts. And no single one of these incarnations of *Brevis Relatio*, nor indeed of *De miraculis*, can be identified as that text’s original form. This raises two questions: Should one attempt to extract an *Urtext* when there is no evidence that a single incarnation was ever intended? And should one extract a specific literary entity from a series of manuscripts, or use each manuscript as a new text? The context so essential to ascertaining a text’s meaning comes not only from the time and place in which it was produced but also from its textual surroundings. By
possessing a number of malleable texts, the Cuthbertine community was able to change them according to its needs. Cuthbert could change, the path of the community could change, as long as community and saint remained intrinsically linked. They were bound not only by possession of body but also by this textual tradition: by a manipulable body, and by a manipulable corpus of texts.
CHAPTER 5
MODERNISING ST CUTHBERT:
Reginald of Durham’s Libellus de admirandi beati Cuthberti

Introduction

In the second half of the twelfth century, Reginald, a monk of Durham, wrote a lengthy collection of Cuthbert’s miracles: the Libellus de admirandi beati Cuthberti virtutibus.¹ This work crowned a century that had seen Cuthbert’s church grow in power and stability. After upheaval had characterised the Cuthbertine church since the late eighth century, the twelfth century saw the building of the imposing Durham cathedral and castle, and the ornamentation of the church with many riches. The church was led by a sequence of very influential bishops and a thriving monastic community.² This power and prosperity of the twelfth century Durham church was marked by facets of Cuthbert’s cult: an illustrated Bedan Life of Cuthbert was produced in the early years of the century;³ Cuthbert’s uncorrupt body was translated in 1104; several hagiographical works on the cult and church were produced;⁴ and the end of the century was marked with another beautifully illustrated Bedan Life.⁵ The cult and church strengthened together in the twelfth century, and provided the basis for Durham’s power in the ensuing centuries.

The preceding chapters have focussed on texts written in times of transition, of great geographical and personnel change stimulated by threats, encroachment and political alliances. The texts were responding to specific local needs to protect the Cuthbertine lands, to cement the position of a newly established community, and to

---

¹ J. Raine, ed., SS i (1835). I am greatly indebted to Robert Bartlett for generously sharing his notes on this text.
² In particular, see Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, on the building work, and riches acquired by the Church, during the lengthy episcopate of this bishop of Durham (1154-95).
³ Bodleian, MS University College 165. For discussion, see Lawrence-Mathers, Manuscripts in Northumbria, pp. 89-108.
⁴ In particular, De miraculis, LDE and the BR.
restyle Cuthbert for this community. The Libellus displays a clear contrast with these: Reginald was writing in a settled time of established power in a permanent location. His was a work intended to restyle Cuthbert’s cult to suit this stability.

Such a situation led to a secondary contrast between Reginald’s Libellus and the preceding Cuthbertine texts. The stability was conducive to a type of miracle less violent and forceful than those which had proliferated, to varying degrees, in Cuthbertine works from the time of the Historia de sancto Cuthberto:6 in particular, Reginald’s work was rich in miraculous cures. The circumstances conducive to this beneficent depiction allowed Reginald to respond not only to the local needs of the cult but also to the patterns emerging in the cult of the saints as a whole. This chapter will thus analyse Reginald’s Libellus as the text firstly marking the stability of Cuthbert’s cult after years of upheaval and secondly formalising the cult in line with wider developments in the cult of the saints. While the preceding chapters have focussed very closely on specific texts, in this final chapter Reginald’s Libellus provides the basis for a comparison of all the Cuthbertine works, and invites comparison with other saints’ cults to end the thesis with broader contextualisation.

I. THE CONTEXT OF REGINALD’S LIBELLUS

Authorship and dating

6 See above, pp. 138-42.
Reginald was a monk of Durham, at the latest from the 1150s. He resided at Finchale with the hermit Godric for some time and may have spent the last years of his life at Coldingham. Victoria Tudor has argued that he probably died before 1196 on the basis that if he were alive, it would be very surprising that he played no part in the foundation of Finchale priory in that year. Both Finchale and Coldingham were cells of Durham in the twelfth century and this association is reflected in the subjects of Reginald’s writings. According to extant works, he seems to have been the most prolific Durham writer of the twelfth century, producing, in addition to the Libellus, an even more lengthy Vita of Godric of Finchale, a Vita of Oswald and possibly of Æbbe of Coldingham. The Life of Godric has been ranked by Tudor as Reginald’s most important work, due to its length, to Reginald’s immediate connection with Godric, and to the fact that Godric’s life exists in many more extant manuscripts than does the Cuthbert Libellus. However, the number of manuscripts, the intricacy of Reginald’s Cuthbertine miracle collection, and its depiction of Cuthbert outranking Godric’s thaumaturgical power, implies that Durham and Cuthbert were at least as significant to Reginald as Finchale and its saint.

---

7 Reginald mentions his witnessing of several miracles dated to between 1150 and 1154: Libellus ch. 29, pp. 65-6, concerns Bartholomew, a hermit on Farne from 1150 (RS 75, i, p. xli), and states that Stephen (1135-1154) was on the throne; in Libellus ch. 50, p. 104, Reginald is eyewitness to an event of 1152-3. See also ch. 91, pp. 197-201. Victoria Tudor discusses the career and personality of Reginald of Durham in some detail in ‘Reginald of Durham and St Godric of Finchale: a study of a twelfth-century hagiographer and his major subject’ (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Reading, 1979), pp. 58-78. The earlier dating is tentative, based on the detailed obituary written by Reginald on the death of Roger, prior of Durham, in 1149.

8 Tudor discusses the alternative thesis that Reginald could at that time have been resident at Coldingham or in retirement at Durham, but that these alternatives would suggest that he lived to a great age, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 64.

9 According to York Minster MS xvi.i.12, f.16. Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 60.


11 Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’ p. 8. See also pp. 79 and 87.

12 Miracles reflecting Cuthbert’s superiority over Godric are recounted in Libellus ch. 113, pp. 254-5; ch. 124, p. 270; ch. 126, pp. 271-2. Godric’s Vita gives further evidence, as Reginald states that Godric
Reginald’s *Libellus* appears in three manuscripts, and in part in a fourth. In its entire form it consists of 141 chapters. The first twelve of these contain an epistle to Aelred of Rievaulx, to whom the work was dedicated, the customary *excusatio* with humble protestations of authorial inadequacy, a sermon on the tabernacles of the saints and a *prohemium* stating Reginald’s reasons for writing the collection. Here, Reginald explains that he heard tales of Cuthbert’s miracles ‘*nostris temporibus*’, many from Aelred of Rievaulx, and conceived the idea of recording them in a collection. This idea was compounded when Reginald noted the absence of these miracles from other Durham works, and was given further impetus by Aelred’s encouragement. These, Reginald’s own reasons, place emphasis on the prominent personal roles of Aelred of Rievaulx and of Reginald himself in the production of the *Libellus*. There is a cursory nod towards the dearth of miracle records beyond the first decade of the twelfth century, but Reginald offers no further context for his work.

Reginald’s own explanation thus gives a rather isolated, abstract backdrop to the inception of his *Libellus*. Further contextualisation is required to ascertain why such a large and skilfully written miracle collection was compiled in the mid- to late-twelfth century: such context can be gleaned from evidence within the *Libellus*, from a dating of the piece, and from a survey of the history of the church of Durham in that period. Following the introductory 12 chapters, the remaining 129 chapters of the

held Cuthbert in great reverence: *Libellus Godricti*, ch. 58, pp. 135. The theme of competitive sainthood in the *Libellus* is discussed below, pp. 239-48. There is an interesting comparison here with Benedict’s hagiographers, many of whom also had contemporary subjects. See D. Rollason, ‘The Miracles of St Benedict’, pp. 81-84.

13 1.) Durham Cathedral Chapter MS. Hunter 101 (second half of 12th century). The *Libellus* occupies the entire MS and is the basis of the Surtees Society edition. This manuscript is probably an autograph (*Libellus*, p. xiv); on the significance of this, see below, p. 203. 2.) Oxford, Bodleian MS Fairfax 6, ff.43v.-135r. (14th century). Probably copied from the Durham MS. It also contains an abbreviated *Vita Godricti* by Geoffrey of Durham, and Reginald’s Life of Oswald (and the Life of Æbbe, possibly by Reginald). 3.) London, British Library MS Harleian 4843, ff.68r.-155v. (early 16th century). Altered markedly, probably using the Oxford MS, possibly to amend local details (Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 351). 4.) York Minster MS xvi.1.12, ff.16-66 (14th century). Contains the prohemium and 42 chapters from Reginald’s *Libellus*, and parts of *De miraculis* and the *Liber de Ortu sancti Cuthberti*.

14 *Libellus* chs.1 and 2, pp. 1-7. The connections between Durham and Aelred and Rievaulx are discussed below, pp. 232 and 234.
Libellus recount miracles performed by Cuthbert, the vast majority in the second half of the twelfth century but some dating from as early as 875. It is generally accepted that these miracles were written in two main phases. The first phase, to chapter 107, was probably begun in the 1160s as the first reference to the process of recording occurs in a chapter dated to 1165. It was completed before 1167: when Reginald dedicated the work to Aelred of Rievaulx he stated that his patron should read it on completion – Aelred died in 1167. The second phase, chapters 108-141, was conceived after, and possibly on account of, the death of Becket in 1170: there are several references to him, and to Godric of Finchale, who died in the same year. Internal references to William the Lion’s invasions against Henry II, which ended with the Scottish king’s capture in July 1174, are in the past tense and therefore this second phase was completed after this date.\textsuperscript{15}

Explanations for the motivation behind the Libellus have focussed on this latter phase, and this creates two connected problems. First, the threat posed by Becket’s cult has been over-emphasised. Second, this over-emphasis has led to a neglect of the initial reason for the Libellus’ production. The result is that Cuthbert’s cult is seen as a cult in decline, outmoded and outranked. Victoria Tudor, in the only comprehensive study of the Durham author to date, is content to use Reginald’s explanation alone in expressing the original motivation behind the Libellus;\textsuperscript{16} she gives greater regard to historical context when attributing the second phase of miracle chapters to the stimulus of Becket’s cult. She speculated that ‘the rise of the

\textsuperscript{15} For a more detailed discussion of dating, see Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, pp. 91-2. She notes that this first phase could have been begun as early as the 1150s as ch. 29, pp. 65-6, may have been written between 1150 and 1154. The division of the phases is discussed further below, pp. 203-4. Tudor suggests the end of the first phase as ch. 108, pp. 242-5, or ch. 111, pp. 247-8, but both these suggestions fail to take into account the linguistic and thematic groupings in the Libellus: ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 92, ‘Cult in the twelfth century’, p. 449.

\textsuperscript{16} Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 88.
Canterbury cult in particular spelt the end of the peak in Cuthbert’s popularity. This notion of the dwindling cult is echoed by Donald Matthew who remarked that ‘Cuthbert was a saint of a bygone era’, and described the ‘brave and baffled efforts’ of the Durham monks to deal in vain with the ‘new age’ of the twelfth century. Furthermore, Matthew extended this image of decline to encompass the Durham Church as a whole, remarking that ‘Durham had been relegated to the periphery of the powerful new kingdom shaped by the Angevins’.

Such depictions of the impotence of cult and church at the end of the twelfth century are unrepresentative and misleading. They reflect a southern bias among English historians, illustrated in the context of the cult of the saints by David Knowles. He listed the three chief pilgrimage sites in England immediately before 1066 as Bury for St Edmund, Evesham for Egwin and others, and Malmesbury for St Aldhelm, with Ramsey also receiving a substantial number of visitors. Knowles then wrote that, by the second half of the twelfth century, these sites had been largely usurped by Edward the Confessor at Westminster, Wulfstan at Worcester and Thomas at Canterbury. Whilst not denying the importance of these cults, it seems necessary to redress the balance somewhat in Cuthbert and Durham’s favour. A reassessment is required, first of the level of Becket’s cult’s influence on that of Cuthbert, and second of the degree to which Durham was physically and politically marginalised by the formation of the Angevin kingdom. Such a reappraisal leads to the notion that the twelfth century was in fact, for Durham, a period of established power which was to extend far beyond the time of Reginald’s *Libellus*.

The Autonomy of the North

Becket’s cult was undoubtedly a concern of Reginald’s *Libellus* - Cuthbert’s superiority to St Thomas is mentioned in six chapters - but there is no conclusive evidence that the Canterbury cult debased Cuthbert’s popularity.\(^{20}\) It is difficult to gauge the relative popularity of two cults so different in subject, location and age. Popular patronage is impossible to enumerate, and while great crowds are said to have assembled at St Thomas’ shrine, from the time of its opening at Easter 1171, the absence of written evidence for similar gatherings at Cuthbert’s shrine should not be interpreted as an absence of popularity for the Durham saint. Furthermore, Becket’s cult was new and explicitly connected with changes and events at the centre of ecclesiastical and dynastic power in England; numerous *vitae* and miracles were bound to emerge from such a cult. Indeed, that 700 miracles were recorded in fourteen *vitae* within twenty years of Becket’s death implies some urgency to communicate his saintly power.\(^{21}\) By contrast, after Reginald’s great miracle collection had brought Cuthbert’s cult into a stable era, there would have been no need for the Durham community to further represent or, as in the case of Becket justify, the veneration of its saint. Moreover, and in light of this stability after the troubles which had previously been faced by the Cuthbertine church, a saint in Canterbury was unlikely to daunt the custodians of a cult which had flourished since the seventh century.

The fact that Cuthbert’s and Becket’s cults could coexist without noticeably devaluing each other is most clearly explained by their geographical locations, separated by 400 miles. Ronald Finucane mapped the provenance of those affected by


Becket miracles in England, concentrated around Canterbury and dispersed through southern and central England. The dissemination of devotees was markedly thinning into the north of England: only six sites were north of the Humber, and only two of these beyond the Tees.\textsuperscript{22} The dissemination of Reginald’s Cuthbert miracles and recipients makes a striking comparison. Almost mirroring the dissemination of Becket’s cult, locations centred on Durham and were spread liberally between the Humber and the Forth. Some miracles and devotees were located south of the Humber, but with an ever-decreasing concentration. Cuthbert’s and Becket’s spheres of saintly power encroached very little on one another: compelling evidence that they did not threaten, but existed independently.\textsuperscript{23}

Canterbury and Durham are situated at opposite ends of what is now England, but still there remains a tendency to assume that they existed, and exist, wholly in the same political and social sphere of ‘England’. Conversely, moves towards semi-devolved government for North-Eastern England, although rejected in a referendum of November 2004, reflect the current feeling that the northeast has an identity distinct from the rest of England.\textsuperscript{24} This separate identity is rooted in the process of ‘unifying’ England in the mediaeval period: a process which was by no means complete and all-encompassing. Indeed, the lands north of the Humber were by no means within the firm jurisdiction of the English crown. It was not until the Treaty of York in 1237 that Scotland conceded possession of Northumberland, along with Westmorland and Cumberland, to England; even after then, political and military machinations between England and Scotland from the end of the thirteenth century

\textsuperscript{22} Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims}, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{23} See appendix 1, p. 257.
show that this border agreement did not place Northumberland beyond the remit of Scottish influence.\(^{25}\)

This leads to the second consideration, the degree to which Durham was marginalised. In his article expounding the study of Northern history, Jean Le Patourel wrote of northern England as ‘an autonomous political and cultural unit’: it is with this separateness - rather than marginalisation - borne in mind that one should approach the position of Cuthbert’s cult and church.\(^{26}\) Jean Le Patourel’s observations on northern English autonomy were part of a movement of the late twentieth century to remove the mental constraints of current borders and accept a rather more fluid and less centralised notion of identity within Britain. Recent scholarship has done much to recognise the relevance of this to the medieval period. William Kapelle’s study of The Norman Conquest of the North was a pioneering example of the value of regional medieval history. Such work should not lead to a perception of homogeneity in northern England. Rather the distinctness of the north should itself be seen as multifaceted and extending in many directions, north as well as south. Thus, as William Aird showed in St Cuthbert and the Normans, during the Norman period Scotland was just as significant to Durham as was England.\(^{27}\) Whilst this Scottish influence was sometimes militarily destructive, the Durham Church also fostered connections with the Scots,\(^{28}\) and just as Cuthbert’s cult spread southwards through England so its power was also felt in Scotland: to give a quantitative notion of its impact, there are 36 dedications to Cuthbert south of the Forth dating from before the Reformation.\(^{29}\)

---


\(^{27}\) Aird, *St Cuthbert and the Normans* (Woodbridge, 1998).


\(^{29}\) G.W.S. Barrow, ‘The Kings of Scotland and Durham’, *AND*, pp. 311-323 at p. 311.
Cuthbert’s church gives just one example of the heterogeneous power network north of the Humber; the diaspora of Cuthbert’s cult reflected that connections within northern England and southern Scotland to the Forth formed a unit rather more distinct from the jurisdiction of English kings than a border on a map may indicate. As Bartlett puts it, ‘Durham and Dunbar had different lords but were part of the same world’.  

Indeed, this was a political semi-independence which was to extend far beyond the period in question: the thirteenth century saw the apogee of the official separateness of this border region, the distinct customs forged in this period were in evidence throughout the fourteenth century and, whilst nominally working for the English crown, wardens of the marches exercised semi-independence into the fifteenth century.

Durham itself wielded power rooted firmly in a great church: Scammell wrote that ‘The long fingers of Angevin power touched the north at Carlisle, Newcastle and the well-maintained castles of Northumberland, but never pressed too heavily on Durham sede plena’. Far from being on the periphery and at the mercy of two bordering nations, threatened by events at the English political centre, Durham was in fact the heart of its own powerful political unit. This power was evident in all the Cuthbertine texts, whether associated with land, rights, political connections or the influence of the cult itself; the power was given further solidity by settlement at Durham. The earlier twelfth-century Durham works on Cuthbert communicated the need to re-present the saint for a new monastic era after 1083, but they were also representative of a young foundation just establishing itself, particularly in the case of

---

30 Bartlett, England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, p. 78.
Symeon’s *Libellus*. Indeed, the first half of the twelfth century was characterised in Durham by disputes between the increasingly powerful bishops and the convent trying to maintain the degree of material independence given to it by William de St Calais;33 outwith the church, northern England was still the scene of raids and rebellions, whether the Scottish incursions of 1136-9 or unrest due to internal factions in English politics.34

By contrast, the second half of the twelfth century was far more settled for Durham. The episcopate of Bishop Hugh du Puiset (1154-1195) heralded what many have seen to be a second Golden Age for Durham.35 This refers not only to the idealised image of the twelfth-century renaissance but also to the Cuthbertine church re-establishing the glory of seventh- and eighth-century Northumbria. There are problems with such a roseate image: Durham was still a scene of dynastic and noble disputes, such as the rebellion of Henry the Young King with William the Lion against Henry II. Hugh du Puiset himself was associated with the rebels, although with the intention only to protect his people’s land.36 The golden image of the twelfth century may also be tarnished by the immense power that Bishop Hugh forcefully asserted over the Durham convent. Indeed, it was only in the last year of his episcopate that he restored the privileges and possessions that he had taken from the Durham monks.37 However, there was most importantly a pervading sense of stability in Durham in the second half of the twelfth century. This was a time two generations

---

33 For a discussion of Durham’s episcopal/convent relations see the Aird’s excellent chapter on the subject in *Cuthbert and the Normans*, pp. 142-183.
after the implantation of Benedictine monks at Durham. The church had developed a
dual permanence of location and personnel that had evaded it for centuries; this was
visibly expressed by the powerful edifice of the cathedral which was completed in
1133. Furthermore, Durham’s semi-independent power was all the more secure
during an episcopate which was energetic and productive and lasted for nearly half a
century.

Bishop Hugh du Puiset was behind the production of the Boldon Book in
1183, often referred to as the northern Domesday after its inclusion in Henry Ellis’
1816 Domesday edition, but in fact a record of episcopal possessions and revenue,
asserting the Durham Church’s independence from royal control. Architectural
evidence bears striking witness to the splendour and power of the institution under
this bishop: he was responsible for the building of the innovative Galilee Chapel at
the west end of the cathedral, and for rebuilding the imposing castle, as well as a
bridge and a hospital. His biographer, Scammell, describes his taste for ‘opulent
magnificence’, as he adorned the interior of the cathedral with various rich
ornaments. Bishop Hugh also expanded the Durham library with an immense
collection of books, which could only have stimulated further writing in this active
literary community.

Those Cuthbertine works which were produced after Reginald’s Libellus
indicate that Durham’s cult continued steadily, and apparently unhindered, beyond
the twelfth century. The Miracles of St Cuthbert at Farne, written at the start of the
thirteenth century by a Durham monk, is evidence of the strength of Cuthbert’s cult at
this important cell; they are discussed below as a useful contemporary parallel to

38 Boldon Book, D. Austin ed., (Chichester, 1982); Domesday Book, Sir Henry Ellis ed., Record
39 Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, pp. 102-113, describes the material contributions of the bishop to the
church of Durham.
Reginald’s *Libellus*. Around the same time the Durham scriptorium produced its richly illuminated copy of Bede’s *Vita sancti Cuthberti*: a symbol of the continuing power of Cuthbert and writing - the intrinsically linked elements underpinning the power of the church. This construction and scriptorium work of the last decades of the twelfth century is often seen as a desperate flurry to counter the decline of Cuthbert’s cult. However, in the context of the growing political power and independence of Durham, it seems rather that these buildings and books were the product of a stable cult and church, and were to lay the foundations for the continued thriving of cult and church.

**Conforming to a process: the formalisation of the cult of the saints**

This secure environment was congenial to styling Cuthbert as a beneficent saint: of the 129 miracle chapters, only 31 (25%) are punitive, compared with the 52% of punishment miracles in *De miraculis*, and the 51% in *LDE* and 52% in *BR*; furthermore, several of Reginald’s punitive miracles are equally concerned with protecting the community, or end with a remorseful cure. Contemporary writing on Cuthbert - the Farne miracles and the copy of Bede’s *Vita* - conveyed the same beneficent overtones. But this depiction of Cuthbert was not simply due to the conducive local circumstance. It was also a response to the influences and pressures of wider changes in hagiography and sanctity: increasingly, and particularly from the twelfth century, saints’ cults were subjected to a formalised process of validation.

---

40 The text is dated by Craster to post-1199 due to its discussion of a man working on the bridge at Berwick. The bridge required reconstruction after it was carried away in floods in 1199. For a discussion of the Farne miracles see E. Craster, ‘The Miracles of Cuthbert at Farne’ and by the same author ‘Miracles of Farne’. The Farne miracles are used below, pp. 223 and 237.
41 London, BL Yates Thompson MS 26. The surviving miniatures of this manuscript are reproduced, with discussion of the events surrounding its production, in Marner, *Cuthbert in Medieval Durham*.
43 *Libellus* ch. 16, pp. 28-32 is an example of the former; ch. 24, pp. 53-6 an example of the latter. The punitive miracles are discussed further below, pp. 208-14.
This formalisation was a gradual development, of local systems of recognition for saints’ cults being steadily replaced by universally acknowledged procedures.

Formalisation and its resulting patterns were demonstrated in a number of seminal surveys of hagiography and saints’ cults produced in the last quarter of the twentieth century. In particular, the work of Pierre-André Sigal, André Vauchez, Donald Weinstein and Rudolph Bell, and Ronald Finucane used large samples to discern a key patterns and typologies in saints’ cults. Significantly, for this discussion of Reginald’s *Libellus*, they were all using material dating from the eleventh century to the thirteenth (and beyond in the case of Weinstein and Bell). This was the formative period for the canonisation procedure, but whilst the move towards canonisation was an element of the formalisation of saints’ cults, this official papal authorisation is not pertinent to this study: Cuthbert was, after all, never officially canonised. Indeed, at the end of the twelfth century, the overwhelming majority of cults were not officially papally recognised, but rather were subject to this broader notion of formalisation.

There has, however, until the last decade, been a tendency to focus on the increasing role of the papacy in making saints’ cults official from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.44 André Vauchez, in his study of *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (from 1198-1431) did discuss the enduring local role in saints’ cults at the end of the twelfth century in spite of Alexander III’s legal belief that the papacy should be consulted on matters of pronouncing sanctity.45 But his quantitative study, whilst providing an invaluable typology of the later medieval saint, was based predominantly on canonisation records from the period. It thus presented developing
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44 ‘One of the prevailing misconceptions concerning the medieval veneration of saints is an exaggerated view of the role the papacy played in regulating it.’ Aviad Kleinberg, *Prophets in their own Country* (Chicago, 1992), p. 21. For a chronological survey of the history of canonisation see E.W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (Oxford, 1948).

images of sanctity only as part of this papally approved process, despite the fact that there were only 35 cases of papal canonisation in this period.

Weinstein and Bell’s statistical analysis in *Saints and Society* offered a far wider sample, of 864 saints venerated from 1000 to 1700.46 They included among these a number of uncanonised saints, but the procedure by which their 864 were selected again leans heavily, and this time somewhat dubiously, towards papal canonisation. Using the list of saints in Pierre Delooz’s *Sociologie et canonisations*,47 they selected every papally recognised saint but only every other ‘unofficial’ saint. Weinstein and Bell recognised that their sample was not random, but were confident with their method, thus endorsing their curious selection process from a list that was, as Vauchez noted, already distinctly biased towards Italian cults.48

Aviad Kleinberg argued that such wide-ranging surveys as employed by Vauchez and Weinstein and Bell had overemphasised the role of the papacy in recognising and defining sanctity. His critique of their surveys focussed on the inevitable pitfalls of drawing conclusions from such a large body of material.49 Kleinberg’s main concern was to stress the individuality of cults, that a saint is not simply a collection of topoi but is created by a process of interaction with a specific group of people. This individuality is of course an essential consideration: it provides important balance to universal patterns such as that identified by Benedicta Ward.50

The individuality of cults is particularly pertinent in the context of the living saints on

---

46 D. Weinstein and R.M. Bell, *Saints and Society: The Two Worlds of Western Christendom, 1000-1700* (Chicago, 1982).
which Kleinberg’s work focuses, but is also relevant for all cults, underlining the importance of the local and political context of Reginald’s *Libellus*. But a saint’s cult is part of a lengthy tradition and thus its individuality should be married with the demands of this tradition. Indeed, these demands were recognised even in the cults of living saints: Reginald’s *Vita sancti Godrici* is one example of such a text, written partly during Godric’s life but subject to the same conventions and *topoi* as other twelfth-century hagiography.\(^5\) While Kleinberg criticised the papal emphasis of surveys of sanctity, he did so only in the cause of emphasising saintly individuality, thereby underestimating the crucial role played by universal demands in shaping a cult.

Kleinberg did concede that generalisation about saints’ cults was useful when studying literary images of sainthood; he cited Alison Goddard Elliott’s thesis that greater temporal distance from a saint’s lifetime corresponded with increased communication of the writer’s ideals.\(^6\) But it seems strange to attempt to separate the literary historian from the historian of the cult of the saints. Are the demands of the hagiographical genre not the assumed focus of any scholar of the written cult of the saints? Implicit in any characterisation of sanctity derived from written sources is surely the knowledge that it is a literary characterisation. The patterns which emerged in this literary characterisation are striking. They formed the basis of miracle surveys, similar in magnitude to the work of Vauchez and Weinstein and Bell, but using a sample defined by temporal and geographical characteristics rather than canonisation concerns. The works of Sigal and Finucane are notable examples: Sigal used a corpus of over 250 texts from eleventh- and twelfth-century France containing over 5,000

---

\(^5\) Reginald lived with Godric, interviewing him to establish the basis of the *Vita*, and wrote the preliminary stages while Godric was still alive, but the content of the work was concerned with the same type of beneficent miracle seen in the *Libellus*, Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, *SS* 20, p. 19, pp. 315-16.

\(^6\) Kleinberg, *Prophets*, p. 16.
miracles; Finucane studied 3,000 posthumous miracles, mainly from seven English
cults between 1066 and c.1300.\textsuperscript{53} The typologies emerging from their works provide a
notion of universal trends emerging in response to the formalisation of saints’ cults in
western Europe.

There are two main conclusions, pertinent to Reginald’s \textit{Libellus}, to be drawn
from this historiographical discussion. First, surveys drawing a general
characterisation of medieval sainthood show that there were strong trends emerging
in the cult of the saints during the twelfth century. Second, these trends are not in
response to, but parallel with, developments in canonisation. The process of
formalisation was not dependent upon the growth of canonisation: rather both were
derived from a common source – the increasing role of law in the church.

The relationship between canonisation and formalisation derives from the
increasing legal concerns in saints’ cults in line with developments in the western
church as a whole. Richard Southern, describing the ‘Age of Growth’ of the church
from c.1050 to c.1300, wrote that ‘increasingly complex problems demanded more
refined solutions than the old rituals could provide’.\textsuperscript{54} Well-established ‘old rituals’
were not obliterated, but maintained within a growing overarching legal framework,\textsuperscript{55}
personified by the lawyer popes who dominated papal rule from the mid-twelfth to
the end of the thirteenth century. Significantly, the English church was particularly
influenced by these broader ecclesiastical developments.\textsuperscript{56} This legal structure had
inevitable ramifications for the cult of the saints and its accompanying hagiography.

\textsuperscript{53} Sigal, \textit{L’homme et le miracle}, Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims}.
\textsuperscript{54} R. Southern, \textit{Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages} (London, 1970), p. 35.
48-49.
\textsuperscript{56} See C. Duggan’s chapter on the English church ‘From the Conquest to the Death of King John’ in C.
Lawrence, ed. \textit{The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages} (London 1965. 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. Stroud
Thus, by the later twelfth century a formal pattern for the proclamation and depiction of saints was developing. The key to this was the demonstrability of sanctity; the result was hagiography rich in miracles with visible, tangible results, supported by identified witnesses. In the case of Reginald, the verisimilitude was strengthened with extensive, often scientific, detail.

The miracles which reflect these criteria most clearly are cures, and indeed they tended to dominate hagiographical works particularly from the later twelfth century: over half of Sigal’s sample, and 90% of Finucane’s were healing miracles.\textsuperscript{57} The predominance of cures will be discussed further below;\textsuperscript{58} here they give a convenient model for the type of verifiable miracle which emerged with formalisation. A typical account would contain the following criteria: the identification of the sufferer; a description of his or her condition, sometimes unaffected by doctors’ remedies; his visit to the saint’s shrine or associated location; prayers to the saint; the miraculous cure via a relic, a vision, or through an intermediary figure; and finally the expression of thanks accompanied by an offering. Witnesses to the suffering and the cure would be noted. Behind this basic account, there often lay a rigorous investigation process during which medical miracles were verified.\textsuperscript{59}

In accordance with this model, Reginald described the infected hand of the son of Ranulf, poor toll-gatherer and citizen of Durham. The boy was taken to Cuthbert’s tomb where his hand was wrapped in the cloth that had lain with Cuthbert’s body, whereupon the hand was cured. Ranulf was careful to inform the custodian of the saint’s body who would give testimony.\textsuperscript{60} In another miracle, the

\textsuperscript{58} See below, p. 220-7.
\textsuperscript{59} Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims}, pp. 100-103.
\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Libellus} ch. 131, pp. 279-80.
wife of a sheriff of Northumbria was suffering from a minutely described illness of the womb. Medicine failed to help, but she was cured when she invoked Cuthbert at Farne. In a final example, Durham monks were first-hand witnesses to the injury of Wictred by a bell clapper, and to his miraculous recovery (except for a dented head).

By following this model, Reginald was modernising Cuthbert, preparing him not only in accordance with the stability of the Durham church but also in keeping with the enduring and inexorable changes taking place within the western church. Comparison with two other twelfth-century cults underlines that Reginald’s modernisation was part of a wider trend. The three Vitae of Edward the Confessor show a similar progression towards the dominance of cures: the first, produced around 1066, contained far fewer healing miracles than Osbert of Clare’s work of the 1130s, which in turn included fewer cures than Aelred’s version of the 1160s. The medical emphasis of many of Reginald’s Cuthbertine miracles is echoed in the hagiography of Thomas Becket.

Furthermore, the long term importance of Reginald’s modernisation can be demonstrated by comparing his cures with an account of a much more recent saint:

In May 1998, Mrs Besra was suffering from a painful, gigantic tumour in her uterus. Leaving her husband and five children behind in her village, she hobbled into the home for the destitute run by the Missionaries of Charity, Mother Teresa’s order, in the West Bengal town of Patiram. ‘For two months I had severe pain, terrible pain, and I was crying. I was not able to sleep; I could only lay on the left side and I couldn’t stand straight,’ she said.

---

61 Libellus ch. 119, pp. 264-5.
62 Libellus ch. 92, pp. 201-4.
63 The Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster: Attributed to a monk of Saint-Bertin, F. Barlow, ed. and tr., 2nd edn (Oxford, 1992); ‘La vie de S. Édouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare’, ed. Marc Bloch, Analecta Bollandiana, 41 (1923), 5-131; Life of St Edward the Confessor, J. Bertram, ed. and tr. 2nd edn (Southampton, 1997). I am grateful to Joanna Huntington for her sharing her research on Edward the Confessor, and to Brian Briggs for ideas on Osbert of Clare’s Life of Edward the Confessor.
64 On St Thomas’ medical cures see Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 67.
‘The sisters gave me medicine but the pain was still there. I was always praying to Mother Teresa whose picture was on the wall just opposite my bed.’

After several unproductive trips to the hospital, two of the nuns caring for Mrs Besra – sisters Bartholomea and Ann Sevika – decided to take matters into their own hands. On 5 September 1998 – the first anniversary of Mother Teresa’s death – the nun’s tied a silver oval-shaped medallion to Mrs Besra’s stomach using a piece of black thread.

The medallion had been placed on Mother Teresa’s body after her own death. Mrs Besra then fell asleep while the sisters prayed – and wept – holding her stomach. When she woke up the next morning the tumour had miraculously disappeared. ‘My stomach became smaller and smaller,’ Mrs Besra recalled.

‘In three days it was completely all right. I am sure that Mother Teresa made me all right.’ She became well enough to start helping in the garden, and eventually went back to her village.65

Mother Teresa’s miracle echoes all the key characteristics of the model formalised in the late twelfth century and demonstrated by Reginald. The sufferer was named and her ailment described. She made her pilgrimage to the cult centre. She prayed repeatedly to the venerated figure. She was given medical treatment which failed to help. Eventually two members of the religious community acted as mediaries. They used a secondary relic of Mother Teresa, on the anniversary of her death, and it cured the sufferer upon contact with her affected parts. Mrs Besra was able to return to her normal life. The two sisters were named and therefore available as witnesses.

Significantly, such miracle accounts did not appear in earlier Cuthbertine works. They tended from the tenth century to focus on political events. If a healing miracle were recorded, it would not bear these hallmarks of formalisation: in a typical cure in De miraculis, an unspecified man suffered undescribed injuries when he fell under a cart, and was healed by the intercessory prayers of an unspecified monk.66

Reginald’s Libellus was thus shaped to bring Cuthbert’s cult into the new

---

ecclesiastical era marked by the end of the twelfth century. He wrote a text which simultaneously responded to the demands of the western church and of the Durham church itself. It is with this dual demand borne in mind that his miracle collection should be analysed.

II. CONSTRUCTING THE LIBELLUS

Process of Writing

The ways in which these two demands – local and universal - shaped the Libellus can be examined through close analysis of the text's construction and content. The miracle collection was precisely arranged, and not simply according to chronology. The text appears to be a continuous list of 141 chapters but it contains clear internal divisions: the chapters form small groups, each of which focus on a particular theme based either on a person, a place, or a particular type of miracle. The Libellus’ miracles were organised into layers with far more concern for these three themes than for chronology; these layers shed light on the manner of the Libellus’ production, and provide insight into the compilation procedure in the literary genre of miracula more generally.

The initial stage of production involved miracles being recorded, often by a sacrist, in books kept at the tomb of the saint. The sacrist would either write his own eyewitness account of miracles occurring at the tomb itself or record the testimony of a visitor to the shrine, usually the recipient of the miracle or a witness. Reginald’s Libellus contains plentiful evidence for the role of sacrist, specifying that it was a secondary sacrist who was the primary guardian of Cuthbert’s shrine and recorder of

---

67 Tudor again followed Reginald’s own description of the writing process in Libellus ch. 4, pp. 8-11 and chs.6-7, pp. 12-13, which imply an attempt to arrange the chapters according to date, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 88.
68 The process is described by Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, pp. 100-103.
miracles.\textsuperscript{69} These books could then be scrutinised and selections of miracles compiled into a collection. It follows that the author of the collection could cast varying degrees of his own influence on its content, in terms of both selectivity and style.

Whilst the degree of selectivity practised by Reginald is impossible to gauge in the absence of extant altar books, there is evidence in the \textit{Libellus} of his stylistic variations, possibly affected by the sacrist’s notes. Reginald’s works all convey his own verbosity; this convoluted style is so distinctive that it is a key feature in determining whether or not works were written by him,\textsuperscript{70} and it is in clear evidence in the \textit{Libellus}.\textsuperscript{71} But this does not transcend other stylistic idiosyncrasies.

There are clusters of chapters in Reginald’s miracle collection which possess a common stylistic characteristic: their length and complexity, or a grammatical or linguistic usage. These characteristics appear to unite a cluster as a discreet group. For example, consecutive chapters 87 and 88 contain in their headings the use of the gerundive, rarely seen in other headings;\textsuperscript{72} 113, 116, 118 and 119 all use the prefix \textit{aegr}- relating to an illness – again a feature rarely seen elsewhere in Reginald’s \textit{Libellus}.\textsuperscript{73} Thematic similarities within these groupings support the notion that they are discreet: the former pair of chapters recount the fate of a stag, and the latter group are all miracles concerned with healing illnesses, particularly of the stomach.\textsuperscript{74} Particularly distinctive are the groups of chapters defined by their length. Chapters 27-33 are all between two and three printed pages in length, whereas Chapters 34-39

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Libellus} ch. 51, pp. 106-8; ch. 91, pp. 197-201; ch. 125, pp. 270-1; ch. 130, pp. 278-9.
\textsuperscript{70} The medieval community reacted to Reginald’s lengthy style by commissioning shortened versions: the \textit{Vitae} of Godric and Oswald were both written in abbreviated form twice, and extracts were taken from the \textit{Libellus}. Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 68, n.3. The manuscripts in which these abbreviations appear are listed by Tudor in the same work, pp. 324-325.
\textsuperscript{71} Eg. Craster, comparing a miracle that appears in both Reginald’s \textit{Libellus} (ch. 119, pp. 264-5) and in the Farne miracles (ch. 4, pp. 12-13; trans. pp. 99-100), writes that ‘Reginald’s style is more turgid, and he tells the tale with more amplification of medical detail’, Craster, ‘Miracles at Farne’, 6.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Libellus}, pp. 182 and 185.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Libellus}, pp. 254-5, 261-2, 263-4, 264-5.
\textsuperscript{74} Thematic groupings are discussed at greater length below, in sections on miracle categories.
each cover only one page. Again, the content of these chapters corresponds with their groupings, with chapter 34 providing a link as it fits with either group: 27-34 are miracles concerning Farne Island and 35-39 recount Cuthbert’s protection of Durham’s possessions.

All of these groupings – by theme, length or style - imply that Reginald was either borrowing from earlier accounts or that he was himself writing episodically, forming discrete groups, either intentionally or perhaps by writing different sections at different times, adopting a particular style according to his whim on a particular day. Whichever of these conclusions is the case, it appears that the miracle collection was compiled by a layering process, of building group of miracles upon group. Furthermore, the evidence of the probable autograph manuscript, Durham Cathedral Chapter MS Hunter 101, underlines distinctness of many of these sections of the text: while a single scribe produced this manuscript, his ductus varies considerably, and thematically or stylistically grouped chapters often coincide with these changes in ductus. By looking at the small thematic groupings and ascertaining the preoccupations of the text, it is possible to postulate the ways in which local and universal church demands shaped the *Libellus*.

The most obvious aspect of this layering process is the two-phase writing of the *Libellus*: the phases pre- and post- Becket’s martyrdom. It was mentioned above that chapter 107 marks the end of the first period of production. The initial phase must have ended before chapter 112, which refers to the new St Thomas of
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75 *Libellus*, pp. 60-76 and pp. 76-83.
76 For example, the start of the group of miracles from Coupeland (chs. 68-72) begins with a heading in a ductus that differs from that of ch.67, on MS Hunter 101, p. 157. The Coupeland miracles are then followed by a miracle concerned with Norham in the same ductus, before a clear change to much neater, smaller penmanship for a series of miracles concerned with important nobles beginning with ch. 74, MS Hunter 101, p. 174.
Canterbury. Victoria Tudor suggested an approximate end for this pre-St Thomas section, of ‘chapter 110 or so’. This was based on changing patterns of verbal ornamentation, and on the fact that after chapter 110 there were no comparisons between Cuthbert’s miracles and those of other saints. However, a more precise division, with the section after Becket’s death starting from chapter 108, can be supported by the very patterns of verbal ornamentation mentioned by Tudor. Here, chapter headings are the most recognisable guide to Reginald’s construction process: chapters 101-107 are prefaced by particularly lengthy chapter headings, most of them five or six printed lines in length compared with the more usual three or four lines of the rest of the text. This contrasts sharply with the chapters from 108 to 141 which have headings of only two or three lines. The thematic content of the chapters strongly supports this division: chapters 106 and 107 relate tales concerning cellarers and sub-cellarers and the miraculous provision of food and beer, while the following three chapters concern a man named Sproich and contain punitive miracles.

That the *Libellus* was written in two phases, the second partly responding to a clearly defined event, is significant, but not as proof of Cuthbert’s cult being undermined by the new St Thomas. Indeed, the first and second phases differ very little in their emphases, and very few differences can be ascribed to St Thomas’ influence. Rather this two-phase construction is an interesting and clear example of a text developing and changing its purpose during the course of production. By comparing the sections written before and after Becket’s death where relevant, one can assess not only how the Cuthbertine church responded to a rival cult, but also, and moreover, how the pressures of regularisation of cults may have intensified towards the end of the twelfth century.
Themes: Miracle Type

Each of the Cuthbertine works is characterised by particular themes. In accordance with each work’s specific stimuli, these vary between texts, and Reginald’s *Libellus* is no exception. This section will look in turn at the three broad themes: the types of miracle, the people and the locations which featured in Reginald’s work. A comparison of the miracles of Reginald’s *Libellus* with those of earlier Cuthbertine texts illustrates the changing needs of the Durham church, particularly showing how they had changed since the start of the twelfth century. By also comparing Reginald’s miracle tales with the results of the surveys mentioned above, particularly those of Sigal and Finucane, there is also plentiful evidence for the broader western church influence in the *Libellus*.

Cuthbertine works are characterised, and contrasted, most strikingly by the types of miracle that they record.\(^77\) Miracle type is also the theme most conducive to comparison with other cults; a common range of miracle topics forms the repertoire of most saints. This repertoire guided Sigal’s survey, and his main typological groupings (of cure, vision, punishment, protection, prophecy and deliverance from prison) provide the basis for the following analysis of Reginald’s *Libellus*. In the context of Cuthbert’s cult, and heeding Kleinberg’s cautionary reminder concerning the individuality of cults, Sigal’s list requires supplementation. The analysis thus also includes miracle types specific to Cuthbert’s cult, in particular those involving animals, the provision of supplies and the uncorrupt body miracle.

\(^77\) See appendix 2, p. 258. A synopsis and thematic breakdown of each *Libellus* miracle is given in appendix 4, pp. 261-80.
Continuity and change: the incorrupt body miracle

This latter miracle, the ultimate physical proof of Cuthbert’s sanctity, was the one important similarity between all Cuthbertine texts. The early Vitae recorded the initial discovery of Cuthbert’s incorruption: the anonymous hagiographer wrote particularly enthusiastically about his saint’s flexible limbs ‘for his neck and knees were like those of a living man; and when they lifted him from the tomb they could bend him as they wished’, and Bede echoed this and remarked how Cuthbert’s clothes were ‘perfectly new and wondrously bright’. The HSC mentioned the importance of Cuthbert’s body, having referred its audience to the Bedan Vita; Symeon’s LDE made passing reference to the saint’s perfect state, as did the Brevis Relatio. The rediscovery of Cuthbert’s incorruption in 1104 was a focal chapter of De miraculis. Reginald gave this miracle a similarly central position, emphasising in particular the life-like qualities identified in the Vitae:

The limbs...are all firm, pliable, and unimpaired as befits a perfect man; their sinews are flexible, their veins full of moisture and pliable, their flesh agreeably soft; and they show the qualities of a man alive in the flesh, not those of a dead corpse.

Once again, this single element of continuity shone through the Cuthbertine Church’s turbulent and changeable past.

Reginald did, however, make an important change to the story of the 1104 exhumation: he wrote an independent account, detailed and scientific, and scarcely related to that in De miraculis. A comparison of the description of the Abbot of
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79 HSC chs. 9, pp. 48-50, and 13, p. 52; LDE i.11, pp. 54-60; BR ch. 8, pp. 225-6.
81 Libellus ch. 41, pp. 86-7: ‘Membra vero omnia solida, flexuosa, et integra, qualia virum perfectum decent; nervis sinuosa, venis roriferis plicabilia, carnis mollitie suavia, qualia potius, viventem in carne, quam defunctum in corpore, exhibent’. The process of the exhumation is recorded in Libellus chs. 40-43, pp. 84-90.
Seez’s investigation serves to illustrate. *De miraculis*, written soon after 1104, recorded with sensationalism the excitement surrounding the recent exhumation:

The Abbot aforesaid...having unfolded the vestments around the venerable head, raised it a little in both his hands, in the sight of all, and bending it backwards in different directions, found it perfect in all the joints of its neck, and firmly attached to the rest of the body. He next applied his hand to the ear, which he drew backwards and forwards in no gentle manner...Nay holding it by the head, and shaking it as he held it, he so far raised it up that it seemed almost to assume a sitting position in its quiet abode...There were some who could no longer look upon such a scene as this with a fearless gaze, and covering their eyes with their hands, exclaimed, that he, the investigator, insisted upon greater proof of the truth than circumstances called for...after a while, when the pious inquisitor had over and above satisfied himself of the truth of the miracle, he raised his voice in the midst of the assembled multitude, and cried aloud, “My brethren, the body which we have before us is unquestionably dead, but is just as sound and entire as when it was forsaken by its holy soul on its way to the skies”.

The dramatic tone contrasts with Reginald’s account, emotionally detached and resembling a forensic report:

A very finely woven cloth covers and veils his cheeks and face and the whole surface of his venerable head at every point, and because of its exact and careful arrangement its clings so closely that it is as it were glued to the hair, the skin, the temples, and the beard. And in no place and by no art could it be lifted, plucked or raised up from the skin or flesh by ever so little. Nay, not even by the sharpest point of the nails could it at any place be drawn out, unfastened, or separated. Wherefore his nose and eyelids were quite clearly exposed to view within the cloth, but yet the skin below and the more tender flesh underneath could not be seen in full exposure...His nose appeared somewhat aquiline at the highest point, and his chin, as though by a lowering of the bone, was cleft, as one looked upon it, by a double depression. And in this cleft, thus repeated on either side, it was almost possible to find room for the thickness of one’s finger, because the extreme tip of the chin was so deeply indented.

---


83 *Libellus* ch. 41, pp. 86-7: ‘Cuius genus ac faciem, omnemque undique totius venerandi capitis superficiem, pannus subtillissimus operiendo obiegit, qui ita omnibus menbris subpostis distinctissima sollicitudinis arte cohestit, quasi cesaririei, pelli, temporibus, ac barbae, conglutinatus sit. Qui ex nulla parte, alicuius arte, altius aliquantulum a cute vel carne elevari, divelli, vel subrigi, potuit. Sed nec
Any similarities between the *Libellus* and other Cuthbertine works are countered by Reginald’s unique style, which expressed not only his individuality but also the growing scientific demands of his day.

Other than the four exhumation chapters, only a handful of the *Libellus*’ tales were lifted from an earlier text – only three out of the remaining 126 chapters – and these were also completely reworked by Reginald. This contrasts with the usage of existing Cuthbertine writings in earlier Cuthbertine texts: the *HSC* summarised events from Bede’s *Vita* as well as copying extensively from charters held by the church, *De miraculis* recorded embellished versions of miracles from *HSC*, Symeon’s *LDE* used several miracles from *De miraculis*, and *Brevis Relatio* forms were composed mainly of chapters lifted from Symeon’s *LDE*. When Reginald included tales from earlier texts, as he did with tales of the removal of Cuthbert from Lindisfarne, the seven years of wandering and the brief escape to Lindisfarne from the ‘harrying of the North’, he rewrote them, imbued with his own intricate, careful, sometimes scientific style.

**Punishment**

The above chapters aside, the miracles recorded by Reginald were new to the Cuthbertine tradition. This distinction from the preceding Cuthbertine texts makes comparison with them particularly striking and revealing. The clearest contrast

---

*etiam praecutissima extremitate unguium in aliquo loco elicii, expungi, vel saltem sensu quovis perceptibili diduci, prevaluit. Unde nares et oculorum palpebrae interius satis perspicue patebant; sed tamen pellis inferior vel caro teneor desubtus preclari patentes videri non poterant. Sic, asque ad colli compages, omnia capitis officia et sensus hominis officinæ eodem modo operata erant, nec ad earum visus perceptibles aliquo conanime quilibet aditus fuisse patebant. Nasus eius in supremo cardine aliquantulum videbatur obcurvus, et mentum illius, quasi osse inferiori, bicipiti divisione valliculatum erat videntibus. In qua vallicula sic alterutrim geminata, pene digiti transversi quantitas infundi potuit; eo quod menti ipsius extrema summitas tua infossa sit*. Translations of *De miraculis* and *Libellus* chapters relating the 1104 inspection of Cuthbert are given in the introduction to Battiscombe, *Relics*, pp. 99-112.

84 See above, ch. 4, on the concept of using texts to form new literary entities.

85 *Libellus* ch. 12, pp. 16-19; ch. 14, pp. 20-1; ch. 16, pp. 28-32.
between the type of miracle in the *Libellus* and that in the Cuthbertine texts of the tenth century to the early twelfth is that Reginald depicted a far more beneficent Cuthbert. In doing this, the *Libellus* returned to a miracle profile akin to that of Bede’s *Vita*, but with one important exception: the inclusion of punishment miracles. These form a quarter of Reginald’s collection, a large proportion compared with the 10% or so of Sigal’s sample. This type of miracle illustrates the power of the saint, and the danger of disregarding that power. Such punitive tales were generally recorded in response to troubled times: Sigal defined their precise function as ‘to serve to dissuade potential aggressors by showing them the fate which would await them’. In the context of Cuthbert’s cult, punishment miracles were also written after the troubles, to marvel at the survival of a cult.

This dual purpose explains the overwhelming predominance of punishment miracles in the *HSC* and Symeon’s *LDE*. The former was written to protect the property and rights of the Church, the latter to defend the new community, and both reflected gloriously on the ability of Cuthbert’s guardians to survive. But the cause and effect of writing punishment miracles is not so simple. *De miraculis* is contemporary to the *LDE* and accordingly contains many punishment miracles, but many of these are of a very different kind to those in Symeon’s work and for that matter in the *HSC*, whose punishments are on a grand scale, crushing entire armies and killing war-leaders. By comparison, eight of the eleven punishment tales of *De miraculis* are far less violent and less grandiose. For example, the *LDE* contains tales in which Cuthbert violently struck down a disrespectful and land-hungry pagan, and annihilated a Scottish army; *De miraculis*’ typical punishment tale concerns a horse...
who illegally fed on Cuthbert’s land.\textsuperscript{89} This is not to say that \textit{De miraculis} was less powerful. Rather it shows that a distinction should be drawn between these two broad strains of punishment miracle typical to Cuthbert’s cult, a distinction that divides the Cuthbertine works into two main groups.

Here, the two distinct causes of punishment miracle follow the categorisation used by Sigal: the first involved actions against the church’s possessions or people and the second punished sacrilegious actions, against a relic or sacred space.\textsuperscript{90} The former action was usually perpetrated by a recognised political figure, a king or noble, who was punished violently, often killed. This strain of punishment was predominant in \textit{HSC} and \textit{LDE}, texts both written more for the protection of the church as a whole than for the cult of Cuthbert alone; the \textit{Brevis Relatio}, also written with similar concerns, also contains high proportions of this violent type of punishment miracle. The second strain was far less secular, the crime was committed by an unnamed character, and the effects of the punishment were less dramatic. Such miracles emphasise the holiness of Cuthbert more than his secular power. They appear far more in texts focussed specifically on Cuthbert, such as \textit{De miraculis}, written as an appendage to Bede’s \textit{Vita}.

Reginald’s \textit{Libellus} falls into this latter category of texts focussed on Cuthbert: the 32 tales of punishment are significantly all of the second, beneficent strain. Cuthbert is depicted punishing single, often unnamed, local characters; they were chastised for impiety on a small scale and often repented immediately. These miracles illustrate that Cuthbert still reacted to misdemeanours against his holiness, but that there was no call for grand-scale violence.

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{LDE} ii.16, pp. 128-32 and ii.19, p. 140 (also, in slightly different form, \textit{HSC} chs. 23 and 33, pp. 60-2 and 68-70); \textit{De miraculis} ch. 8, Sym. Op. ii, pp. 335-8.
\textsuperscript{90} Sigal, \textit{L’homme et le miracle}, pp. 276-278.
In this combination of punishment and beneficence, Cuthbert’s cult did, to some extent, conform to the pattern of many long-established cults. Here, Benedicta Ward’s pattern, of the shift from merciful miracles to powerful and then back to merciful, is useful if one provides some context. Violent miracles were explained by Sigal as a response to secular lords growing in power as royal authority diminished, their transition to beneficent miracles during the twelfth century is attributed by Ward and others to the growing uniformity in cults. While Cuthbert’s cult has its own independent identity, discussed above in the context of the changing image of the saint, these universal pressures are relevant: the Libellus’ predominance of cures, and punishment miracles entirely of a gentle strain, indicates again that Reginald was developing Cuthbert’s image in line with the uniformity emerging in other western cults.

The type of punishment miracle in Reginald’s Libellus also communicates the specific requirements of Cuthbert’s cult: there were local circumstances which required a more beneficent depiction. A typical example serves to illustrate these needs: that of the punishment of a boy who took a crow that was nesting on the roof of a church dedicated to Cuthbert in Lixtune, Cheshire. He fell from the roof and he could not release from his grip the wooden peg that he had been holding. Doctors were unable to help and so the boy did penance in the church for three days. On the third night, Cuthbert appeared and struck the boy’s fingers against the altar, healing all except the little finger, which remained contracted as a sign of the saint’s power.

---

91 Sigal, ‘Le châtiment divin aux XIe et XIIe siècles’, 52.
92 Ward’s hypothesis is problematic in that it generalises based on only three case studies, and it is therefore not used as a basis for comparison in this current study. Her phases are obviously subject to the environment of the cult. Her pattern does fit her main example, and that is Cuthbert’s cult. Miracles and the Medieval Mind, pp.34 and 62.
93 Libellus ch. 68, pp.138-41.
First, this tale shows that Cuthbert’s power was still being exercised, even in places far from Durham. The dispersion of the cult is discussed further below; here it is sufficient to note that Cuthbert’s saintly power was present in the many locations with which he was associated. His power was also connected with, and manifested through, physical objects. This example used the wooden peg and the altar, but often punishments revolved around Cuthbert’s relics or objects precious to the church. In particular, the group of chapters from 80-82 were concerned with a sacred book, an ivory casket and a bell gilded by Turgot. These and other punishment miracles involving relics often took place in the Durham Church and many involved monks who had easy access to these items: Cuthbert is seen punishing a disrespectful sacrist and the thieving son of a Durham cook for deigning to disregard the power of items associated with Cuthbert.

Second, the example shows that even in a punitive miracle, Cuthbert was beneficent. This is just one of many examples in which Cuthbert responded to repentance with a cure of the punishment he had inflicted, particularly where the sin was not heinous. There are two examples of men who were punished for drinking: a priest’s son became deaf, dumb and blind, and a certain Walter was possessed by a black dog; both were cured with the water used to wash Cuthbert’s clothes. This latter example also showed Cuthbert leaving a sign when he healed: the demon was exorcised, but Walter was left with a large mouth, just as the boy in Lixtune was left with a contracted finger. Significantly, the miracle of Walter was written before Becket’s death and that of the priest’s son was written after; indeed, these two main sections of the Libellus contain similar proportions of punitive miracles. Cuthbert’s

---

94 See below, pp. 237-9
95 Libellus, pp. 165-75.
96 Libellus ch. 27, pp. 60-3; ch. 81, pp. 168-72; ch. 91, pp. 197-201.
97 Libellus ch. 17, pp. 32-37; ch. 112, pp. 248-54.
role as punisher of sin had become an intrinsic part of his identity, and this was not a characteristic that was phased out by cures during the twelfth century.

Moreover, it was not a characteristic that should conflict with his beneficence. Even Bede showed Cuthbert enacting a punishment miracle, detaining monks who disobeyed him ‘so that it may be more evident how obedient we ought to be to holy men, even in those matters about which they seem to give very casual commands’. Bede’s reasoning here is just as pertinent to the Libellus, written around 450 years later, reflecting that, whilst in all of Reginald’s punishment miracles the crime may have appeared small and the punishment sometimes meagre, the message of the text was no less significant than when an army of Scots was swallowed by the earth.

The final important characteristic of the Lixtune miracle is the absence of political figures: a feature common to every one of Reginald’s punitive miracles, and one that contrasts immensely with the punishment of kings, earls and bishops in the HSC, LDE and, to a lesser extent, De miraculis. This dearth of key secular figures, coupled with the absence of great violence and addition of beneficence in punishments, is evidence that there was no great threat to the Cuthbertine Church in Reginald’s time, particularly when compared with the punishment miracles involving key secular figures that appeared in HSC, LDE, De miraculis, and Brevis Relatio. The miracle, quoted above, in which Onalaefald was struck down for desecrating Cuthbert’s land and questioning his power is a good example of this violence: it appeared in HSC, LDE, and De miraculis, communicating the survival of Cuthbert’s Church through dangerous times – dangers that had not entirely disappeared at the time of writing. These texts mentioned many other powerful secular figures

\[98\] VCB ch. 36, pp. 266-7: ‘quo clarius elucescat quantum viris sanctis obtemperandum sit etiam in his quae negligentius imperare videntur’.

punished by Cuthbert: armies of Scots, pagans and Normans and individuals such as William of Normandy, Earl Robert Cumin, and Bishop of Durham Ranulf Flambard.\(^{100}\)

Reginald’s omission of such important figures does not mean that turbulence had departed from the north of England. Indeed, a miracle late in the collection occurred during Henry the Young King’s rebellion against Henry II in 1173, when William the Lion, king of Scots, attacked from the north of England, in support of the young Henry.\(^{101}\) The tale, however, did not refer to any of these dynastic characters, but to an unnamed supporter of Henry II. He spurned the sanctity of Cuthbert and rode his horse into the Church precinct where he was thrown into the mud and later flagellated. This disassociation from the secular politics so heavily ingrained into earlier texts reflected the confidence of the Church by the late twelfth century.\(^{102}\)

**Beneficence: Protection, Provision and Prison Deliverance**

The beneficence and confidence seen in the punishment miracles is supported by the beneficent nature of the remaining three quarters of the *Libellus*’ miracles. These fall into four main categories: those involving cures, animals, provision and protection. These were also the key miracle groups in Bede’s *Vita*, but Reginald’s miracles rarely held the same content. The similarities and differences between Bede’s and Reginald’s miracles will therefore form the basis of much of the following discussion of the *Libellus*.

---

\(^{100}\) *HSC* 10, 32; *De miraculis* chs. 4 and 6; *LDE* ii.13, pp. 120-6; iii.15, pp. 182-8; iii.19, p. 196; iii.20, pp. 196-200.

\(^{101}\) *Libellus* ch. 127, pp. 272-3. These events are described in Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, p. 55.

\(^{102}\) This makes an interesting comparison with St Benedict’s miracles, which display a similar shift in levels of secular detail, Rollason, ‘The Miracles of St Benedict’, pp. 81-84.
Punishment for one party can often mean protection for another. Tales of protection in the *Libellus* thus had similar features to the punishment miracles: Cuthbert protected his churches, their relics and people, with far greater benevolence, less grandeur, and less concern for secular politics than in earlier texts. Indeed, the only tales in the *Libellus* of protection on a grand scale were two miracles of parting waters: once during the Danish attacks of 875 the waters parted as Cuthbert was borne from Lindisfarne to the mainland and again during the harrying of the North in 1069 when the same happened during the flight to Lindisfarne.\textsuperscript{103} The reason for this single example of grand-scale protection lies in the fact that it formed part of a group of chapters that provided context for the rest of the *Libellus*. Chapters 12-16 record miracles dating from before 1083 but included in no other extant text. They focus mainly on the theme of guidance, which had become a feature of Cuthbert’s powers since the church had been threatened as early as the late eighth century. But they were not included simply to update omissions on this theme from previous texts. These chapters linked the *Libellus* with the community’s literary tradition. Indeed, these are the only examples of guidance in the *Libellus*, connecting this opening group of miracles even more clearly with preceding Cuthbertine texts.

This section emphasised the importance of Bede by beginning with Cuthbert’s dying words from the *VCB* that offered prophetic sanction for the movement of his body:

> “You are to know and remember,” he said “that if necessity compels you to choose one of two evils, I would much rather you should take my bones from the tomb, carry them with you and departing from this place dwell wherever God may ordain, than that in any way you should consent to iniquity and put your necks under the yoke of schismatics.”\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{103} *Libellus* ch. 12, pp. 16-19; ch. 16, pp. 28-32. Cf. *De miraculis* ch. 6, *Sym. Op.*, i, pp. 245-7; *LDE* iii.15, pp. 182-8.

\textsuperscript{104} *Libellus* ch. 12, pp. 16-19; *VCB* ch. 39, pp. 284-5: ‘Sciatisque et memoria retineatis, quia si vos unum e duobus adversis eligere necessitas coegerit, mulio plus diligo ut eruentes de tumulo...”
Bede's influence was evident too in other tales of protection focussed mainly around themes of weather and fire: these were far more prevalent in Bede’s *Vita* and Reginald’s *Libellus* than in Sigal’s survey, but scarce, if in evidence at all, in the interim Cuthbertine texts. Just as Cuthbert calmed the sea for stranded sailors in Bede’s work, the control of storms for merchant seamen is a recurrent tale in Reginald’s work, notably in the group of miracles from chapter 30 to 34, all of which are associated with Farne Island.¹⁰⁵ Whilst Bede showed Cuthbert extinguishing fires that threatened town buildings, most of Reginald’s fire miracles involved the protection of Cuthbert’s tomb, relics and vestments: the tale of Cuthbert averting disaster by preventing a burning candle from harming the hangings appears five times, three of these forming a group with another Durham Church miracle.¹⁰⁶

Similarly, tales of miraculous provision were disproportionately high in Bede’s *Vita* and appeared in significant numbers in Reginald’s *Libellus*. Seven of Bede’s 41 miracles showed Cuthbert miraculously providing crops, fish, bread, water, and other staples. Sigal showed that this type of miracle usually appeared in *Vita*,¹⁰⁷ and so it is perhaps unsurprising that Reginald could not compete with Bede’s proportions. However, he did record ten miracles of provision, many of which were remarkably similar to those of Bede, including one in which the spring on Farne, miraculously found in solid rock in Bede’s *Vita*, disappeared in order to drive

tollentesque vobiscum mea ossa recedatis ab his locis, et ubicunque Deus providerit incole maneatis, quam ut ulla ratione consentientes iniquitati⁵.

¹⁰⁵ VCB ch. 11, pp. 192-4; *Libellus*, pp. 67-77. See also *Libellus* ch. 52, pp. 108-9; ch. 75, pp. 154-7; ch. 83, pp. 175-7; and ch. 102, pp. 226-9. The prominence of storm miracles in *Libellus* – 7% compared with the 1% of Sigal’s survey - must be due to the coastal location of Cuthbert’s cult. Sigal, *L’homme et le miracle*, p. 267.

¹⁰⁶ VCB chs. 13 and 14, pp. 198-202; *Libellus* ch. 36, pp. 78-9; ch. 37, pp. 80-1; ch. 39, pp. 82-3 all concern fires in Durham Church, while ch. 38, pp. 81-2 records a monk’s vision in the Church, of former bishops Cuthbert, Aidan, Eadberht and Æthelwold. See also ch. 45, pp. 91-2 and ch. 66, p. 134.

¹⁰⁷ Provision appeared in 29.2% of *in vita* miracles compared with only 5.3% of posthumous. Sigal, *L’homme et le miracle*, p. 272.
marauders away and then flowed again when they left.\textsuperscript{108} Bede’s tales of provision mainly involved nourishment for Cuthbert himself and a small body of monks, but Reginald also recounted many tales in which a large crowd were fed from only a few loaves, fishes or kegs.\textsuperscript{109} Many of these miracles occurred on Cuthbert’s feast day, exemplifying once more how the cult had adapted the Bedan image of Cuthbert, in this case to suit the popularity and pilgrimage of the late twelfth century.

Miracles of protection and provision showed Reginald loosely conforming to Bede’s typology, but adapting Cuthbert according to identifiable needs of the cult. A further type of beneficent miracle serves to illustrate the changes made to Cuthbert according to wider developments in the saints’ cults. Deliverance from imprisonment, a miracle type completely absent from Bede’s \textit{Vita}, became part of Cuthbert’s miracle repertoire with a sole chapter in \textit{De miraculis}, but was a far more prominent feature in Reginald’s collection. This type of miracle had two guises in the \textit{Libellus}: Cuthbert released the innocent or faithful from incarceration, or removed iron bindings from penitents. Again, thematic groupings were made, as in chapters 93-95.\textsuperscript{110} Prison deliverance rarely appeared \textit{in vita},\textsuperscript{111} but the absence from Bede’s work and prominence in Reginald’s is better explained by the demands of their respective eras. Sigal noted that social context influenced the number of prisoners and thus affected the number of deliverances. He compared the anarchic eleventh century in France with the comparatively peaceful twelfth: during the former period, 15\% of his miracle sample were prison deliverances, during the latter period, only 9\%.\textsuperscript{112} Bede’s time

\textsuperscript{108} VCB ch. 18, pp. 216-220; \textit{Libellus} ch. 29, pp. 65-6.
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Libellus} ch. 21, pp. 44-7; ch. 22, pp. 47-50; ch. 34, pp76-7; ch. 64, pp126-30; chs.106-107, pp. 236-42.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Libellus}, pp. 205-12.
\textsuperscript{111} Sigal recorded only 5 \textit{in vita} prison deliverances, compared with 154 posthumous cases, \textit{L’homme et le miracle}, p. 269.
\textsuperscript{112} Sigal, \textit{L’homme et le miracle}, p. 269, n.11.
was that of Golden Age Northumbria, peaceful at least for Cuthbert’s Church. It would follow that Cuthbertine texts of the troubled tenth and eleventh centuries should have yielded a wealth of prison deliverance miracles for Cuthbert, rather than this feature not appearing fully until the calmer twelfth century. It could be argued that Cuthbert’s cult had more pressing concerns related directly to the survival of the church in the tenth and eleventh centuries. By the late twelfth century, when troubles still continued in the north of England, confidence and stability of Cuthbert’s cult meant that it focussed less on its own survival and more on the help Cuthbert could offer to others. Furthermore, this gave scope for Cuthbert’s cult to respond to the greater beneficence emerging in many saints’ cults at the time.

**Beneficence: Animals and Cures**

In the above categories of protection, provision and prison deliverance, Cuthbert’s thaumaturgical profile was rooted in Bede, but often heavily manipulated for late twelfth-century needs. The categories of cures and animal miracles held more parallels with Bede’s depiction but still differed immensely in style. These categories offer an interesting comparative study. Cures are scarce and animal miracles non-existent in texts written between Bede’s and Reginald’s; animal miracles were a Cuthbertine speciality, relatively infrequent in other cults particularly by the twelfth century, whereas cures were by far the most prominent miracle type in twelfth century saints’ cults.

---

113 It is significant to compare Cuthbert with his contemporary Wilfrid, whose cult was far more troubled and who could not be imprisoned himself on account of his saintly powers, Eddius Stephanus, *Vita Wilfridi*, ch. 38, p. 76.

114 Miracles involving animals were derived from early Christian *Vitae*, such as that of Antony, and from the Celtic tradition. They do not appear as a category in any of the above mentioned surveys of miracles and saints.
Animal miracles are often connected with the Celtic hagiography, and its associated tradition in the north of England: there were several northern English and Celtic works in twelfth-century Durham’s library which would have been available to Reginald. More specifically, animal tales reflected a gentle and caring affinity with nature depicted by Bede, and intentionally alluded to by Reginald. Bede showed Cuthbert providing food for his horse and having food provided by an eagle. The saint was memorably warmed by the breath and fur of otters after he had spent the night praying in the North Sea. In a pair of miracles, Cuthbert drove ravens from his crops on Farne and then received a gift of lard from the repentent birds. This final miracle was closely echoed by Reginald: Ælric, a hermit on Farne, gave wax to a poor man but the gift was snatched by a crow. When Ælric invoked Cuthbert, the wax was returned.

Reginald’s other animal miracles were concerned particularly with protection, as in the case of the crow in the Lixtune miracle above, or in the three miracles concerning a stag whose sanctuary was violated. They also featured birds, in particular Eider ducks who had by this time become closely associated with Cuthbert. Reginald did make subtle changes to Bede’s depiction of Cuthbert’s affinity with animals, but more striking is the fact that he returned Cuthbert to his eighth-century specialism; the enduring importance of this revived specialism is

---

116 VCB ch. 5, pp. 168-72; ch. 10, pp. 188-90; ch. 12, pp. 194-6.
117 VCB ch. 19, pp. 220-2; ch. 20, pp. 222-4; Libellus ch. 78, pp. 162-3.
118 Libellus ch. 26, pp. 57-60; ch. 27, pp. 60-3; ch. 68, pp. 138-41; ch. 72, pp. 147-8; ch. 73, pp. 148-51; ch. 85, p. 179; ch. 86, pp. 180-2; ch. 109, pp. 245-6; ch. 111, pp. 247-8; ch. 133, pp. 281-2; ch. 139, pp. 188-9.
119 Reginald gives a lengthy description of these birds in Libellus ch. 27, pp. 60-3. See also ch. 111, pp. 247-8. The fourteenth-century screen behind the High Altar in Durham Cathedral depicted Eider ducks, based on a painting by a Newcastle artist commissioned by the monks of Durham as a model in 1380. A mural painted in 1856 by William Bell Scott at Wallington Hall near Morpeth depicts Cuthbert with Eiders at his side – the association thus continued for many centuries.
attested to by the three tales of bird protection in the post-1170 section of the
Libellus.\footnote{Libellus ch. 111, pp. 247-8; ch. 133, pp. 281-2; ch. 139, pp. 288-9.}

In contrast to these particularly Cuthbertine animal miracles, we turn finally to
the universally dominant cures. Reginald may also have intended to mimic Bede in
recording an almost identical proportion of cures.\footnote{39% of the miracles in Bede’s
Vita and 38% of those in Reginald’s Libellus were cures.} But allusion to Bede’s Cuthbert
should only be seen alongside contemporary twelfth-century influences, both locally
and in the western church, which increased the prominence of cures in the Libellus.
Cures were discussed above, as an example of the investigable and verifiable miracle
that became necessary with growing legal demands in the church. Furthermore, the
great number of healing miracles is also representative of the return to a beneficent
Cuthbert in the settled era of the Libellus. This final miracle type is thus the mainstay
of the twin aims of the Libellus: modernisation for local and universal church
climates. But what of the cures in their own right? How do they relate to cures
recorded elsewhere? What do they add to the above profile of Reginald’s Libellus?

Pilgrimage, often associated with healing, reached its heyday in the twelfth
and thirteenth centuries; indeed, evidence for pilgrimage to Cuthbert’s cult centres
was clear in the Libellus.\footnote{Eg. Libellus ch. 48, pp. 98-101; ch. 125, pp. 270-1. J. Sumption, Pilgrimage: An Image of
Mediaeval Religion (London, 1975), p. 160. See also Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, pp. 39-55.} As pilgrimage grew, cures were increasingly sought from
saints, and were written down to encourage further patronage. Thus, Sigal, and
particularly Finucane, recorded an overwhelming predominance of healing miracles
in their surveys. It is true that the Libellus contained nowhere near the 90% of healing
miracles in Finucane’s study of twelfth-century English cults, and Tudor remarks that
Cuthbert’s cult was relatively late in reintroducing cures, compared with the cults of
Edmund and Æthelthryth. But the degree to which a cult concurs with general trends is dependent on the trends specific to that cult. Hence the 38% of chapters in the *Libellus* recording cures contrasts with the proportions in *LDE* (13%) and *De miraculis* (28%), and even more strikingly with the single cure of *HSC* and absence of cures in *Brevis Relatio*.

Reginald’s *Libellus* corresponded with scholarly as well as typological trends. The predominance of healing miracles by the late twelfth century was a response to immense developments in western medicine in the preceding century. During this period, classical medical literature preserved in the Muslim world was translated into Latin, notably by Constantine the African at Monte Cassino, and became widely disseminated throughout western Europe. This influx of texts influenced all forms of medical writing, including of course the cures recounted in miracle records.

Durham’s Library possessed a rich selection of this newly available body of medical writing. In particular the collection given by *Magister Herebertus medicus* in the twelfth century included formative works from the great centres of medical learning – Reginald of Montpelier’s *Consilia* and Roger of Salerno’s *Surgery* – as well as translations by Constantine the African.

With this body of material available in later twelfth-century Durham, the healing miracles in the *Libellus* were very different to those recorded in other

---

123 Tudor, ‘Cult in the twelfth century’, p. 456. She goes on to suggest that this lateness was due to the complacency of the Durham monks who were stirred up eventually by the death of Becket.
124 I am indebted to Iona McCleery for discussion on increasing medicalisation of miracles, and to Simone Macdougall for her fascinating insights.
125 Tudor calculated the twelfth-century Durham library held 45 books on natural science and medicine, and remarked that this was an unusual collection, comprising 6% of the library’s total possessions, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 36.
Cuthbertine texts in style and content. Reginald included technical information, as was seen in his account of the inspection of Cuthbert’s body in 1104.\(^{127}\) He often described ailments in minute detail, as a comparison with the *De miraculis* demonstrates. In a miracle typical of cures in *De miraculis*, a clerk from the south of England was afflicted with a chronic fever which no doctor was able to cure. When eventually he became desperate he went to Durham where he was cured upon praying at Cuthbert’s tomb.\(^{128}\) The complete lack of medical detail here is particularly striking when compared with one of Reginald’s most descriptive cures. He recounted the tale ‘Concerning the tumour of a certain pauper which by some is called *bonum malagnum* and by others *silvestre apostema*, suffered around the inner parts of his thigh and groin’, describing the ailment in detail before telling how the cloth of Cuthbert was held over the affected parts to cure it.\(^{129}\)

It has been suggested that Reginald’s confidence with medical cases indicates some professional experience. Tudor argues that his knowledge of technical names of ailments, coupled with statements made in the *Vita Godrici* ‘on the strength of medical authority’, show that Reginald may have been a doctor.\(^{130}\) Certainly Reginald recorded more medical detail than his contemporary, the author of the Farne miracles, in a cure which both authors recounted.\(^{131}\) But it does not necessarily follow that Reginald was a medical man. We return here to the construction of the *Libellus* by layering numerous small groups of miracles, probably recorded in a book at the tomb and then compiled by Reginald. Although all of the *Libellus*’ miracles recorded

\(^{127}\) See above, p. 207.


\(^{129}\) *Libellus* ch. 101, pp. 224-5. ‘*De tumore*? cujusdam pauperis, qui *bonum malagnum proprium*, quod ab aliis vero *silvestre apostema*, dicitur, circa intestina femoris et inguinis patuerat; quomodo panno *Beati Cuthberti superadhibito eadem die crepuerit, et in proximo momento perfectae salutis restitutas fuert*’. The edition requires emending here as it gives no subject.


more medical information than other Cuthbertine texts, only certain groups contained
the degree of detail seen in the miracle above. For example, chapters 99 and 100
preceded the example of the poor boy with a tumour, mentioned above, with intricate
descriptions of an illness of the womb and a crippling knee injury; chapter 113 gave a
far more simple account of the symptoms, without technical language, of a man’s
unnamed disease. With such varying degrees of medical terminology, it therefore
seems possible that Reginald was appropriating the technical knowledge of others,
possibly sacrists, who made the initial miracle record at the tomb.

This system of compiling the miracle collection, of arranging groups of
miracles written down by others, meant that the Libellus covered a variety of
different medical interests. Many saints were renowned for curing a specific type of
ailment, for example St Foy is associated with infertility, St Fiacre with haemorrhoids
and syphilis. Reginald’s Cuthbert does not seem to have specialised in any
particular type of cure. Nor does he fit the profile drawn by Sigal, in which a third of
healing miracles were concerned with paralysis, and which showed great proportions
of eye and ear afflictions. Cuthbert’s cures were diverse and evenly distributed: he
performed five cures in each category, of those suffering from paralysis, demonic
possession and injuries due to accidents. There are six examples of him curing
digestive ailments, and the sequence of three chapters from 117 to 119 suggests that

---

133 This would correspond with Tudor’s suggestion that the sacrist would have some medical expertise
in order to help the sick who visited the tomb, although it disagrees with her specific suggestion that
the sacrist could have been Reginald. ‘Reginald and Godric’, pp. 65-6 and p. 179.
134 Pamela Sheingorn ed. and tr., The Book of Sainte Foy (Pennsylvania, 1995), pp. 16, 84-5, 154;
Miraculi beati Fiacri, J. Dubois, ed., Un sanctuaire monastique au moyen age: St-Fiacre-en-Brie
135 Sigal, L’homme et le miracle, p. 256.
136 For examples of paralysis see Libellus ch. 48, pp. 98-101; ch. 62, pp. 122-3; ch. 100, pp. 222-3; ch.
108, pp. 242-5; ch. 140, pp. 289-90; demonic possession – ch. 17, pp. 32-7; ch. 44, pp. 90-1; ch. 98,
217-9; ch. 122, pp. 268-9; ch. 124, p. 270; injury through accident – ch. 68, pp. 138-41; ch. 92, pp.
201-4; ch. 103, pp. 229-31; ch. 104, pp. 232-4; ch. 128, pp. 273-5.
this was of particular interest to one miracle recorder. He only cured one case of a
man who was deaf, dumb and blind, and three cases of blindness. In addition to
these, Cuthbert cured leprosy, headaches, gout, facial disfigurement, haemorrhages
and toothache.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLAINT</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
<th>COMPLAINT</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paralysis</td>
<td>48, 62, 100, 108, 140</td>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestive</td>
<td>53, 117, 118, 119, 125, 138</td>
<td>Dumb/deaf/blind</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonic</td>
<td>17, 44, 98, 122, 124</td>
<td>Dumb</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental injury</td>
<td>68, 92, 103, 104, 128</td>
<td>Haemorrhage</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>24, 53, 121, 123</td>
<td>Gout</td>
<td>96, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfigurement</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td>97, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womb</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Toothache</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumour</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Leprosy</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cures were performed by a variety of means: at Cuthbert’s shrine, elsewhere in the Durham Church, at his cell on Farne, with a relic of Cuthbert far from Durham, or via a vision. Significantly, all of these except the latter involved physical contact with a place or object associated with the saint. Bede’s *Vita* set the precedent for this pattern. Cuthbert himself predicted the ‘influx of fugitives’ suggesting that the brethren ‘will be put to much trouble on account of the presence of my body’. The four posthumous miracles recorded by Bede were respectively worked at Cuthbert’s tomb on Lindisfarne, via water used to wash his body, with his shoes, and at his cell on Farne. Bede’s *Vita* both prepared the cult for pilgrimages and set down how Cuthbert’s posthumous thaumaturgical power would be manifested.

---

139 *Libellus* ch. 97, pp. 215-7; ch. 102, pp. 226-9; ch. 96, pp. 212-5; ch. 105, pp. 234-6; ch. 69, pp. 141-2; ch. 25, p. 56; ch. 130, pp. 278-80.
140 Illiteracy is included here as it is presented as a spiritual ailment in the *Libellus*, as it often is in medieval miracles tales.
141 The means was often dictated by the location and identity of the sufferer: these factors will be discussed below in terms of all the miracles.
142 *VCB* ch. 37, pp. 278-9: ‘…atque ideo de praesentia corporis mei multum tolerare laborem’.
143 *VCB* ch. 41, pp. 288-90; chs.44-6, pp. 296-306.
After Bede’s *Vita* and until Reginald’s *Libellus*, very few cures appear in Cuthbertine texts, and those that did were closely associated with the workings of Cuthbert’s church, not with pilgrims to Durham; most were worked through the agency of a Cuthbertine monk or performed on someone involved in building the great church at Durham.\(^{144}\) Cures in Reginald’s *Libellus* did return to the cult scene laid down by Bede’s words. Cuthbert cured those who visited his tomb, or in one case spent the night under it, or those who attended services in honour of him in the Durham church.\(^{145}\) He healed visitors to Farne island, including a pair of miracles which dealt with the ailments of a husband and wife.\(^{146}\) Finally, Cuthbert’s curative powers were worked through relics. One miracle in particular mirrored closely a tale related in the eighth-century *Vita*. Bede’s chapter heading reads ‘How a lotion made from the soil on to which the water used to wash Cuthbert’s body had been poured was used to cure a demonic boy’; nearly 500 years later Reginald wrote about ‘How a certain man filled with an aggravated spirit was instantly freed, watched by many people, when he drank from the washing water of St Cuthbert’s relics in the Church’.\(^{147}\) Whilst this miracle took place in the Durham church, relics were often a useful means to perform cures far from Durham. Pieces of cloth, removed from the coffin in 1104, were used in many miracles, such as the group of six cures in chapters 96-101. The first of these told how the cloth was sent to the south of England, the latter five all involved the agency of a Durham monk named Alan who was travelling north of Durham, exemplifying the role of Cuthbert’s monks as his agents. While the means of performing cures corresponded with Bede’s basis for posthumous miracles,


\(^{145}\) *Libellus* ch. 48, pp. 98-101; ch. 112, pp. 248-54. See also p. 226, n. 148, on ch. 48, concerning the service for the translation of Cuthbert.

\(^{146}\) *Libellus* chs. 118 and 119, pp. 263-5.

\(^{147}\) *VCB* ch. 41, pp. 288-90; *Libellus* ch. 44, pp. 90-1: ‘Qualiter quidam, spiritu acerbo repletus, potu lavacri Reliquiarum Sancti Cuthberti in eadem Ecclesia, multis videntibus, sit statim liberatus’.
the further details within these chapters show growing dedication to Cuthbert. Reginald’s accounts of cures reflect the increasing popularity of pilgrimage, both in Durham and as a wider concept in the church as a whole.

The diverse range of cures, as well as feasts, deliverance from prison, and pilgrimage, stimulated a wide array of offerings. Like the detailed healing miracles, this was a facet of Cuthbert’s cult not recorded in earlier texts. It was an important element of the growing pilgrimage trend, and Reginald’s written record of such offerings provides a further example of how the regularisation of cults was influencing his Libellus. Some gifts, such as the ring from Richard fitz Roger or the gold given by the Norwich cellarer, were of great material value and offerings could therefore be a useful source of income for the monks. Other offerings had far less monetary value, but were appropriate to the cure that had been performed. Thus a crippled man gave the stools that he had used for walking, a man who was stabbed with a lance took a wax model of the weapon to Durham, and a knight cured of toothache offered the rotten piece of tooth. Appropriate gifts were also given in response to deliverance from prison: men freed by Cuthbert from wrongful imprisonment offered their fetters and chains. Gifts did not, however, have to be relevant to the miracle: a woman who miraculously regained her sight fetched a stone from the river to help with the building of the church, and another woman cured of yliaca passio gave an altar cloth. These were tokens of dedication, signalling the

---

148 Libellus ch. 48, pp. 98-101, tells how during a service for the translation of Cuthbert, the faithful took their offerings to Bishop William de Ste Barbe: ‘…after the Gospel reading had been given, each of [Cuthbert’s] faithful had placed votive offerings in the hands of the bishop…’ (‘prolata lectione evangelica, quique fidelium suorum vota cum oblationibus munerum, iuxta morem in manus Pontificis deposuissent’).


150 Libellus ch. 48, pp. 98-101; ch. 128, pp. 273-5; ch. 130, 278-9. The gift of wax was a common one. For discussion of many types of votive, see Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, pp. 96-9.

151 Libellus chs. 46, pp. 92-4; ch. 49, pp. 101-4; ch. 93, pp. 205-8.

152 Libellus ch. 119, pp. 264-5; ch. 121, pp. 266-8. The term yliaca passio literally translates as pain in the side of the body between hip and groin but is a specific term for a gynaecological ailment in
efficacy of Cuthbert’s thaumaturgical power as well as the piety of the donor. Emphasising this expression of power, Cuthbert protected offerings fiercely, just as he safeguarded the people and possessions associated with him.153

Cures, and their trappings, in the *Libellus* showed the main features of Reginald’s Cuthbert. He operated in all areas of society and was associated with a vast array of miracle types. Many tales referred back to previous texts, but Reginald introduced key features such as pilgrimage and medicalisation. The miracle types in the *Libellus* exemplified in Reginald’s Cuthbert the affirming retrospective glance towards Bede’s beneficent saint, perceived through a lens of radical modernisation.

**Themes: People**

The diversity of miracle type is echoed in the wide variety of people and places featured in the *Libellus*, far wider than in any other Cuthbertine text. Indeed, particularly in the context of cures, the type of person and the location could have a marked influence on the style of miracle.

Reginald’s Cuthbert was involved with people from many different social groups: rich and poor, male and female, lay and religious, but in varying degrees. Reginald referred to the laity with disdain on several occasions,154 but many of Cuthbert’s miracles were performed on laypeople. This is particularly apparent when the *Libellus* is compared with *De miraculis*, in which sixteen of the twenty-one miracles involved the Cuthbertine Community or other monks, and another two were cures worked on people who helped to build the cathedral in Durham. Symeon’s *LDE* similarly related many miracles involving the Community, particularly bishops, and

---

153 *Libellus* ch. 35, pp. 77-8; ch. 71, pp. 145-6.
154 *Libellus* chs. 47, pp. 94-8; 76, pp. 158-60; 89, pp. 188-93. Tudor discusses this, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 72.
otherwise told of high-ranking members of the nobility, as did the HSC. By contrast, in the Libellus, the laity ranged from the poorman begging for alms\textsuperscript{155} to the merchant seamen struck by storms – sea traders were particularly well-represented in the Libellus, appearing in nine of Reginald’s chapters.\textsuperscript{156} Children, absent from Cuthbertine works since Bede, made a notable appearance in the Libellus although not necessarily in a Bedan tone, as in the case of a young boy who was killed by a rampaging stag when his noble father incited it.\textsuperscript{157} There were royal officials such as sheriffs,\textsuperscript{158} and numerous unidentified nobles.\textsuperscript{159}

There were named characters, often featuring in several chapters, and this raises again the significance of the groupings of miracles. A series of four chapters recounted miracles associated with the nobleman Richard fitz Roger, whose ancestors had founded the church dedicated to Cuthbert at Lytham;\textsuperscript{160} it is logical to suggest that a noble family who had long shown dedication to Cuthbert might expect a place in Reginald’s important miracle collection. A group of three miracles told of a man named Sproich, a poor builder employed by the almoner of Durham, showing that, in the age of pilgrimage, favour could be shown to any pious devotee regardless of social status.\textsuperscript{161}

All social groups described above were given similar representation by Reginald. By contrast, there was a marked absence of dynastic figures, in keeping with the Libellus’ lack of emphasis on secular politics. In a rare tale involving royalty, it was notably not King David of Scotland, or his queen Maud who were touched by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{155} Libellus ch. 77, pp. 160-2.
\item\textsuperscript{156} Libellus chs. 23, pp. 50-3; 28, pp. 63-5; 30-34, pp. 67-76; 97, pp. 215-7.
\item\textsuperscript{157} Libellus ch. 87, pp. 182-5. Chs. 68, pp. 138-41; 70, pp. 142-5; 101, pp. 224-5; and 135, pp. 283-4 also involved children.
\item\textsuperscript{158} Libellus chs. 49, pp. 101-4; 93, pp. 205-8; and 118, pp. 263-4.
\item\textsuperscript{159} Eg. The ‘noble leper’ of Libellus ch. 19, pp. 37-41.
\item\textsuperscript{160} Libellus chs. 132-135, pp. 280-4.
\item\textsuperscript{161} Libellus chs. 108-110, pp. 242-7. See below, pp. 244-5 on Cuthbert’s cooperation with other saints.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Cuthbert’s power, but the chambermaid Helisend who was punished for entering Cuthbert’s church disguised as a man.162

This tale of Helisend is an example of the claimed misogyny which has been widely, and to some extent unfairly, attributed to Cuthbert.163 Women were generally afforded a far more prominent and fortunate role in the *Libellus* than in the *LDE*, the only other Cuthbertine work to mention women at any length. In the *LDE*, women were depicted in a series of punishment miracles as they violated the exclusively male environment extending around Cuthbert, and this was shown above to be an effort to preserve the monastic environment to which Cuthbert was dedicated, not a permanent and all-encompassing disassociation from women.164 Thus it should not be surprising that in the *Libellus*, many women were cured by Cuthbert. Care was taken in the *Libellus* to ensure that the message of a physical monastic environment continued to be conveyed, and women who respected this were treated with the same favour as men who revered Cuthbert. Thus a crippled woman who appealed to Cuthbert at Farne went as near to the church as women were allowed and was healed there. Another woman who visited Farne was cured when her offering was placed on the altar by a monk, while she remained at the appropriate distance.165

Women were significant throughout the *Libellus*, but notably even more prominent in the post-1170 phase. This is significant as one of the very few marked differences between the two main phases of the *Libellus*’ production. It implies that Reginald was attempting to prove Cuthbert’s predominance over the local saint Godric of Finchale, renowned for curing women, who died in the same year as

162 *Libellus* ch. 74, pp. 151-4.
163 See V. Tudor, ‘Misogyny of Saint Cuthbert’.
164 *LDE* ii.7-9, pp. 104-10. See above, pp. 105-6.
165 *Libellus* chs. 62, pp. 122-3; and 119, pp. 264-5.
Thomas Becket. Many miracles involving women in the post-1170 phase of the Libellus occurred away from Durham, where the restrictions surrounding Cuthbert’s body did not apply. Also in this section of the Libellus appear several tales in which women were cured at the west door of Durham Cathedral, a location not previously mentioned, and it is possible that the community was promoting this site as a pseudo-shrine for healing women in an effort to rival Godric.

This inclusion of women, along with other significant changes from previous texts – such as the number of miracles involving maritime traders and the lack of royalty – shows that, in Reginald’s depiction at least, Cuthbert’s following was changing. The number and range of lay devotees in the Libellus show that, whether or not Cuthbert had previously had the same lay following, the literary tradition was prepared to represent it to reflect an age of pilgrimage.

Religious

Laypeople were the recipients of Cuthbert’s power significantly more than the religious. The miracle mentioned above, in which a woman, unable to approach Cuthbert’s altar on Farne, gave her offering to a brother, is just one of many examples of miracles worked through the agency of a monk. This was a common theme in miracles which took place far from Durham, as well as where the recipient of Cuthbert’s powers could not reach the tomb. But monks and other religious were far less often on the receiving end of Cuthbert’s miracles than in earlier texts,

166 See below, pp.242-4 for discussion of Cuthbert’s claimed rivalry with Godric.
167 Libellus chs. 121-124, pp. 266-70. This location was also the site of the Galilee Chapel, also known as the Lady Chapel. See below, pp. 236-7, on Reginald’s introduction of new sites of veneration. The addition of the Galilee chapel to the cathedral was made after the initial attempt at a Lady Chapel collapsed – a portent that it should not be so close to Cuthbert’s shrine.
emphasising the notion that Reginald was depicting a pilgrimage cult. As with the laity, the religious in the Libellus fall into a wide range of categories, with certain monastic roles appearing frequently, and with a sizeable number of religious from outside Durham feeling Cuthbert’s power.

Paralleling the Libellus’ lack of higher secular nobility, Reginald’s miracle collection lacked the episcopal involvement seen in De miraculis and Symeon’s LDE. The few miracles at the beginning of the Libellus outlining the community’s hardships before the twelfth century did contain two miracles in which Bishop Eardwulf was directly involved. This is hardly surprising given that these preliminary miracle chapters related to events depicted in De miraculis and LDE, in which Bishop Eardwulf was eulogised for his guiding role. But even these were interspersed with two miracles involving the brethren alone which are unique to the Libellus: one in which a cleric remaining on Lindisfarne became invisible so that the Danes could not capture him, and the other in which a coffin bearer who stole cheese during a time of famine was turned into a fox.

Several chapters in the Libellus are concerned with unnamed monks: brethren who showed unusually strong veneration for Cuthbert were often shown favour in his miracles, such as a monk who often slept in the church near to Cuthbert’s shrine. His dedication was given divine approval one night when he received a vision of Cuthbert and other former bishops, Aidan, Eadberht and Æthelwold. Members of the Community, just like any other subject of the Libellus, could be punished, as in the above example of the thieving coffin bearer turned into a fox.

---

168 Libellus chs. 12, pp. 16-19 and 14, pp. 20-1. Symeon wrote that Eardwulf was ‘a man who always stood by Cuthbert everywhere in prosperity as well as in adversity’ (‘vir ubique in prosperis et adversis sancto Cuthberto adherens’), LDE ii.13, pp. 124-5. See also De miraculis chs. 2 and 3, Sym. Op. i, pp. 234-40.
169 Libellus chs. 13, pp. 19-20; and 15, pp. 22-8.
170 Libellus ch. 38, pp. 81-2.
Three specific Durham monastic positions were particularly well-represented by Reginald: those of cellarer, the brethren on Farne and Lindisfarne and, far more than the other positions, the sacrist. Reginald explained how the role of the sacrist was to care for the ornaments of the cathedral and, in the case of the secondary sacrist, to look after Cuthbert’s body and relics.\textsuperscript{171} The prominence of Durham sacrists is therefore hardly surprising: Cuthbert alerted sacrists to extinguish fires in several miracles, and warned them to prevent the violation of his relics and possessions.\textsuperscript{172} But a further reason for this prominence in the \textit{Libellus} lies in the model sacrist of the early eleventh century, Elfred Westou. Reginald told how this was the monk who collected many relics, including those of Bede. He wrote how Elfred cared for Cuthbert, tenderly brushing his hair – and keeping a few strands to display their fire-retardant properties. He also told how, when a weasel had nested in Cuthbert’s tomb, Elfred was informed by Cuthbert in a vision to remove it without harm.\textsuperscript{173} But more important perhaps than Elfred’s care for Cuthbert, Reginald told how he was the grandfather of Aelred of Rievaulx, to whom the \textit{Libellus} was dedicated.\textsuperscript{174}

The other monastic positions, of cellarer and guardians of Farne and Lindisfarne, were given prominence due to their importance for the growing cult of Cuthbert. Cuthbert ensured that cellarers could fulfil their duty to provide for brethren and visitors when stocks were low, or when a large group of worshippers was assembled. A pair of consecutive miracles described Cuthbert helping different cellarers. In the first, several unexpected guests arrived after mass but there were no provisions as the suppliers were at a fair in Thirsk. While the cellarer and his deputy,

\textsuperscript{172} Eg. \textit{Libellus} chs. 36 and 37, pp. 78-81; 80, pp. 165-8.
\textsuperscript{173} \textit{Libellus} chs. 16, pp. 28-32; and 26, pp. 57-60.
\textsuperscript{174} See above, pp. 90-1 on Elfred.
the carefully described Uctred, became desperate, a pack horse arrived with six salmon of unusual size, and a number of other fish. In the second miracle, another cellarer and sub-cellarer duo, Elfred and Paulinus, were said to have been very efficient with stocks, but they had only a single beer measure remaining. Elfred told the dapifer Swanus that the beer should only be given to monks, but in his absence a poor man begged for some and Paulinus insisted on distributing beer to everyone; miraculously there was sufficient to last for eighteen days.

The monks of Farne and Lindisfarne, charged with perpetuating Cuthbert’s cult in these important locations, were frequently mentioned in the *Libellus*. In two cases, Cuthbert provided food as he did for the cellarer at Durham. Edward the monk, who re-established a church on Lindisfarne, first had insufficient beer to give to crowds bringing stones and then ran out of bread on Cuthbert’s feast: on both occasions, Cuthbert was invoked at his *tumba*, the location where his coffin had lain on Lindisfarne, and he responded with plentiful supplies.¹⁷⁵ Miracles involving Farne’s monks intimated a smaller scale cult there than on Lindisfarne, unsurprising as the island was preserved as a very small ascetic community, just as it had been in Cuthbert’s day.¹⁷⁶ To this end, the miracles often reflected Bedan tones, many of the Farne miracles concerning simply the hermit and his servants. Ælric the hermit was mentioned in several miracles: he was informed that one of Cuthbert’s birds had been eaten, and was also the monk who mimicked Cuthbert by chastising the crows who stole wax.¹⁷⁷ The Farne hermit Bartholomew was also mentioned several times in the *Libellus*. He lived on Farne with Ælric and was therefore involved in miracles with him, but he was also seen as an agent of Cuthbert, for example praying with a

¹⁷⁵ *Libellus* chs. 21 and 22, pp. 44-50.
¹⁷⁶ The community was composed of only two monks, referred to as the brethren in the Farne miracles, ch. 10, p. 17; Craster, ‘Miracles at Farne’, 6.
¹⁷⁷ *Libellus* chs. 27, pp. 60-3; and 78, pp. 162-3. Ælric also appears in ch. 28, pp. 63-5.
crippled woman who had gone as near to the church as was permitted.\textsuperscript{178} The monks of Lindisfarne and Farne managed Cuthbert’s cult according to the pilgrimage demands of their individual locations.

Finally, many of the religious in the \textit{Libellus} came from outside the main cult centres of Durham, Lindisfarne and Farne. Aelred of Rievaulx is the most obvious example. It was mentioned above how he was the grandson of the revered sacrist Elfred Westou, and Reginald stated that he was the source for many miracles, and he was also involved directly in one tale in which he was composing a poem in honour of Cuthbert and, when a storm struck the ship on which he was travelling with other Cistercian abbots, his completion of the poem made the storm abate.\textsuperscript{179} Aelred’s veneration of Cuthbert is perhaps best substantiated by his own work, \textit{On the Saints of Hexham}, in which he showed Hexham being protected by Cuthbert and Wilfrid – two of northern England’s greatest saints.\textsuperscript{180}

Monks from other monasteries also invoked Cuthbert. The Abbot of Grimsby suggested invoking Cuthbert during a storm at sea when prayers to Peter and Paul had failed: he was perhaps aware of Cuthbert’s growing reputation for guarding seamen.\textsuperscript{181} Also pertinent to Cuthbert’s cult, but this time with reference to the more distant past, the Abbot and brothers of Furness had land violently taken from them but failed to win favour at the king’s court or in Rome. When they built an altar to Cuthbert, probably knowing of his great and victorious struggles to maintain landed

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Libellus} chs. 29 and 30, pp. 65-9, name Bartholomew and Ælric together. There are other tales which simply mention Farne brethren and could mean these same two men. Bartholomew’s miracle with the crippled woman is in ch. 62, pp. 122-3. On Bartholomew’s cult, see also Geoffrey of Coldingham, \textit{Vita Bartolomei}, Sym. Op., i, pp. 295-325.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Libellus} ch. 83, pp. 175-7.


\textsuperscript{181} \textit{Libellus} ch. 52, pp. 108-9. See below, pp. 246-7, for the significance of comparing Cuthbert with other saints.
power, their case was finally heard favourably. Such dedication to Cuthbert from outwith the realms of his cult centres shows that he had become renowned for certain specialisms, throughout the wide dissemination of his cult.

**Themes: Places**

Many of the religious in the *Libellus* were connected in some way with secondary centres of Cuthbert’s cult. They provide a useful guide to the places with which the cult had become associated by the time of Reginald’s *Libellus*.

First, though, it is necessary to remark upon the three main Cuthbertine centres of Durham, Lindisfarne and Farne. Durham had been strongly depicted as the focus of Cuthbert’s cult in Symeon’s *LDE, De miraculis* and notably in *Brevis Relatio* forms which were preoccupied with a sense of place. In all these texts Durham’s centrality was marked by the 1104 rediscovery of Cuthbert’s uncorrupt body, and inevitably Reginald’s *Libellus* underlined this key miracle. But Durham had become far more than the location of this flexible corpse by the late twelfth century. The *Libellus* also showed Durham to be a pilgrimage centre, attracting the faithful and the sick from all around. Miracles could occur anywhere in the church, notably during services, and also took place outside the church, in its other buildings or in the wider town. But particular locations in the cathedral became significant in the post-1170 phase of the *Libellus*. The shrine was inevitably the scene of many miracles throughout the miracle collection, the stated site of sixteen miracles, but was named as the location for cures particularly in this latter stage of the collection. In this same

---

182 *Libellus* ch. 55, pp. 112-4.
183 There are a few examples of miracles in the Durham church in *De miraculis* (eg. chs. 19 and 20, *Sym. Op*. ii, pp. 359-62), but none of these are pilgrim miracles.
185 Eg. *Libellus* chs. 24, pp. 53-6; 50, pp. 104-6; 61, pp. 121-2; and 81, pp. 168-72.
section, the west door became a focus for women. Particularly in the later twelfth century, Reginald seems to have wanted to emphasise the specific places in which Cuthbert was most powerful.

Lindisfarne was mentioned in a similar vein: the Cuthbertine centre there had only recently been revitalised by the above mentioned Edward the Monk, and thus required some publicity. Previous texts mentioned Lindisfarne as the historical home of the Church, and safe haven, and this identity was continued in the *Libellus*: to the previous accounts of the troubled community it added a tale of a miraculously invisible cleric spying on the violent Danes. But the *Libellus* showed Lindisfarne far more as a centre for worshipping Cuthbert. The miracle above in which food was provided for crowds on Cuthbert’s feast shows that this was a cult centre attracting many devotees. Significantly though, the miracles involving Lindisfarne appeared in the earlier stages of the *Libellus*. There were six of them in the first twelve miracle chapters, but then only one more, a tale of a man fleeing from persecution. Lindisfarne was once more presented as the safe haven: a sign that it was not a great pilgrimage site, whether through choice or through the comparative popularity of the other cult centres.

The more ascetic centre on Farne meant that it was not the scene of large gatherings in honour of Cuthbert. And yet Reginald was particularly enthusiastic in recording Farne miracles, recounting seventeen there. These either involved stricken sailors - accidental pilgrims – or individual devotees seeking a cure. While the majority of people seeking a cure went to Durham, it seems logical that an ailing

---

186 Eg. *Libellus* chs. 116, pp. 261-2; 130 and 131, pp. 278-80; and chs. 121-124, pp. 266-270. See above, p. 230.
187 See above, p. 233.
188 *Libellus* ch. 13, pp. 19-20.
189 *Libellus* ch. 22, pp. 47-50.
190 *Libellus* ch. 105, pp. 234-6.
person with easier access to Farne would go there for Cuthbert’s assistance. Of course, Geoffrey of Durham’s *Vita Bartolomei* and the anonymous collection of Farne miracles, both written around the end of the twelfth century, would have enhanced the reputation of Farne as a cult centre, and provide evidence that Farne was a thriving cult centre, inspiring the production of hagiography which would in turn encourage pilgrims.

The dissemination of Cuthbert’s cult beyond the locale of Durham, Farne and Lindisfarne, was dependent upon three factors: the use of relics, the dedication of local churches and St Cuthbert’s feast day. Durham monks sometimes carried a relic with them and this could be used to give relief to the sick far from Durham. This was the case in a double cure which took place in Mitford, 25 miles north of Durham, in which a travelling Durham monk used a piece of the cloth removed from Cuthbert’s tomb in 1104 to convey the saint’s power. Cuthbert’s relics were carried with more intention to publicly spread the cult in the series of miracles involving Alan, a monk of Durham: ‘[Bishop Hugh du Puiset] had sent away to preach a certain brother of the church named Alan, with some clerks, and he had instructed that they be given a sizeable piece from the cloth of the blessed Cuthbert, and other relics’. Alan travelled around south-eastern Scotland, curing people in Perth, Dunfermline and Haddington in Lothian with the aid of Cuthbert’s relics, and publicly displaying them in a procession on St Margaret’s Day in Dunfermline.

---

192 *Libellus* chs. 118 and 119, pp. 263-5. See also ch. 102, pp. 226-9 in which a man suffering from a head ailment is conveniently driven to Farne by a storm.

193 These are bound with Reginald’s *Libellus* in British Library MS Harleian 4843. The Farne miracle collection mentions many locations very close to the island. See Craster, ‘Miracles at Farne’, 6.

194 *Libellus* ch. 53, pp. 109-11. Mitford is situated approx. two miles west of Morpeth.

195 *Libellus* ch. 97, pp. 215-7: ‘Unde fratrem quendam ecclesiae, Alanum nomine, cum clericis in praelectione direxerat, et non modicum de Beati Cuthberti panno particulum eis cum caeteris reliquiariis portionibus datur praeceperat’.

196 *Libellus* chs. 97-101, 215-25. See below for the significance of this involvement in Margaret’s procession.
In addition to this intentional cult dissemination through parading relics, permanent centres of worship for Cuthbert were established throughout northern England and southern Scotland. Miracles at these centres appear in groups in the *Libellus*, and are often written in a common style, implying that they had been written at the centre in question and then the record had been sent to Durham for Reginald’s compilation. One such group was based at the church of Lixtune in Cheshire where five miracles were recorded, including the above example of the boy who fell from the church roof.\textsuperscript{197} The group of miracles includes punishment for stealing offerings and protection for birds, showing that Cuthbert’s cult kept facets of its own identity as it spread.\textsuperscript{198}

Two other centres of worship were significant in the *Libellus* for their miracles which occurred around Cuthbert’s feast days. Aelred of Rievaulx related two miracles in Kirkcudbright, one of which was said to have taken place on St Cuthbert’s Day 1164. Three miracles were recorded at a church dedicated to Cuthbert in Lothian, the series involving a stag whose sanctuary in the churchyard was violated. Two of these happened during the period of Cuthbert’s feast.\textsuperscript{199} It seems that in the absence of relics, the feast day could provide a suitable focus for miracles, as was the case with the miraculous provision of food on Lindisfarne.

The *Libellus* shows that Cuthbert’s cult was widely disseminated, whether through church dedications, locations of miracles or provenance of devotees. It was shown earlier how this compared with the dissemination of Thomas Becket’s cult, and Finucane’s other mapped case studies, of Godric of Finchale and Thomas Cantilupe also give an interesting basis for comparison. Cantilupe’s miracles centred

\textsuperscript{197} See above, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{198} Two other churches dedicated to Cuthbert appeared in series of miracles: the church of Lytham in Lancashire, and Slitrig in Teviotdale.
\textsuperscript{199} *Libellus* chs. 86 and 87, pp. 180-2.
very much on Hereford, with a few scattered further afield into Kent, Hampshire, Somerset, Devon and the midlands.\textsuperscript{200} The dissemination of Cuthbert’s miracles is broad by comparison, particularly in terms of the concentrations of miracles far from Durham. Godric’s cult was even more localised than Thomas Cantilupe’s, with the vast majority of miracles occurring at Finchale, and to people from the immediate vicinity.\textsuperscript{201} It seems that Cuthbert of the \textit{Libellus}, at least in the geographical extent of his miracles, was a particularly popular saint of the late twelfth century.

\textbf{Competitive sainthood?}

The wide dissemination of Cuthbert’s cult raises the question of how powerful Cuthbert was perceived to be. Thus far the notion of the modernised Cuthbert of the \textit{Libellus} has been constructed by comparison with previous incarnations of himself, and with typologies and patterns from other saints’ cults. But how was Cuthbert compared with other saints in Reginald’s time? What does this tell us about his cult and its place among those of other saints?

It has been argued that Reginald’s comparison of Cuthbert with other saints, particularly Godric of Finchale and Thomas of Canterbury, is evidence of a desperate attempt to buttress Cuthbert’s waning popularity.\textsuperscript{202} But Reginald discussed many saints, and not simply in a competitive context: they also co-operated with Cuthbert, were compared with him, and provided his heritage. The role of other saints in the \textit{Libellus} did not tacitly undermine Cuthbert’s power; it showed the range of Cuthbert’s saintly associations, and offers an insight into the increasingly complex network of saints’ cults.

\textsuperscript{200} Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims}, pp. 184-185 show maps of Cantilupe’s cult. See also the discussion of this cult, pp. 173-188.
\textsuperscript{201} Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims}, pp. 166-169.
\textsuperscript{202} Tudor, ‘Cult in the Twelfth century’, p. 459.
The obvious case with which to begin is that of Thomas Becket, the saint whose martyrdom fell between the two main phases of the *Libellus*. He is believed to have heralded the end of Cuthbert’s popularity in England, but it has been argued above that Cuthbert’s cult was thriving at the end of the twelfth century, resting confidently on the laurels of a strong church. What role, then, did St Thomas play in the *Libellus*? Certainly he featured in the chapters written after 1170, but the perception of St Thomas as a threat to Cuthbert has arisen from placing too much emphasis on him in this second phase of the *Libellus*.

Instead, Thomas’ relationship to Cuthbert should be seen in the context of Cuthbert’s other contemporary saints. Indeed, these were framed conveniently in the *Libellus*. In the pre-1170 phase, Reginald wrote of a noble leper from southern England who called upon the three most excellent English saints to cure him: ‘And thus he took counsel by offering to the blessed Cuthbert, and to the saint King Edmund, and to the glorious queen Aethelthryth; and by thus lighting three candles of the same width and length to their honour, he wished to prove from the merits of which saint he should hope for an agreeable cure’. After 1170, Reginald told how the friends of a woman suffering from gout and lumbago similarly sought the agency of one of the three principal English saints by drawing lots, but this time they were Cuthbert, Edmund and Thomas. Seen in this context, could it not be then that the introduction of Thomas into the *Libellus* was an element of updating the text? The martyrdom may have been the specific stimulus for this second phase of the *Libellus*, but this does not mean that Thomas’ cult posed a threat. Nowhere is it suggested,

---

203 *Libellus* ch. 19, pp. 37–41: ‘Beato itaque Cuthberto, et sancto Regi Ædmundo, et gloriósae regínæ Ætheldríthæ, voti sui propositum deliberavit; tribusque candelis eiusdem mensuræ et longitudinis ad ipsorum honorem accensis, ita experiri voluit, de cujus sanctorum meritis sperare posset optate remedium salutis’.

204 *Libellus* ch. 115, pp. 260–1. The pre-1170 trio are particularly interesting when compared with Knowles’ chosen principle English saints, Edmund, Egwin and Aldhelm. See above, p. 186.
either, that Edmund or Æthelthryth posed a threat to Cuthbert. Indeed, in the very early section of the Libellus contextualising Cuthbert’s cult with background from the Anglo-Saxon period, Reginald described the martyrdom of Edmund amongst tales of plunder and hardship: a description likely to provoke sympathy for Edmund and associate it with the troubles of Cuthbert.  

Needless to say, in the two contests between trios of English saints, Cuthbert was the victor. This is indicative of the confidence underlying Cuthbert’s cult: a confidence that marks Cuthbert’s status alongside other saints with whom he competed, and suggests in some cases an arrogant presumption of superiority. Cuthbert’s relics were carried at the head of the procession on St Margaret’s feast day at Dunfermline. Whether a mark of rank-pulling or a gesture made to any visiting relics, this episode reflected Cuthbert’s standing as well as his association with Margaret’s cult and southern Scotland, in which Turgot must have been the common factor. There is of course clear evidence for strong links between the Durham Church and the Scottish dynasty: the Durham Liber Vitae includes Scottish kings, Malcolm III laid the foundation stone of the new Cathedral in 1093 and Alexander, the future king of Scots, was present at the 1104 exhumation of Cuthbert’s body.

Competition on a far higher plane came in a miracle in which, when an appeal to saints Peter and Paul failed, an invocation of Cuthbert calmed the storm. Was this an arrogant overriding of key biblical saints? Or a sign that a saint’s specialisations should be respected? This event took place in the North Sea near to Northumbria, and

205 Libellus ch. 15, pp. 22-8.
206 In the tale involving Edmund and Æthelthryth, Cuthbert’s pre-eminence was emphatically stated to be on account of his flexibility.
207 Tudor comments upon this that ‘one might be forgiven for believing that some confusion existed in Reginald’s mind between his patron and the Almighty’, ‘Cult in the twelfth century’, p. 452.
Cuthbert was thus the local saint and had displayed some proficiency in performing maritime miracles.\textsuperscript{210} Furthermore, this could have been a local comment referring to the monasteries dedicated to Peter and Paul at Wearmouth and Jarrow, over which Cuthbert’s church held precedence.\textsuperscript{211}

The local cult climate was the key to Cuthbert’s relationship to St Godric of Finchale in the \textit{Libellus}. Godric died in 1170, the same year as Becket; his hermitage and later shrine were at Finchale, less than 5 miles from Durham. Could this new nearby shrine have posed a threat to Cuthbert’s 500 year old cult? Tudor hypothesised that the Durham monks fostered Godric’s living cult, commissioned Reginald to write a \textit{Vita} in the early 1160s, but realised soon after Godric’s death that his cult was a threat to Cuthbert’s. She suggested that they decided to counterbalance Godric’s growing reputation with additional miracles in the \textit{Libellus}. On the four \textit{Libellus} miracles in which Cuthbert outstripped Godric’s power, Tudor wrote: ‘it is as though Reginald had been reprimanded and was now making amends’.\textsuperscript{212}

This suggestion, though, discredits somewhat the ability of the Durham monks to assess and manage their cults, implying a haphazard reactionary system. Such a system seems unlikely in a powerful church with a strong literary tradition, just as it seems unlikely that Reginald swung almost schizophrenically between the two cults, or that this ‘foremost Durham hagiographer’ and powerful member of the community was entirely at the mercy of a group of ad hoc Durham monks.\textsuperscript{213} Rather it appears that Cuthbert and Godric’s cults were depicted as very separate, that Reginald wrote to promote both cults associated with Durham, but that Cuthbert’s was ultimately and

\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Libellus} ch. 52, pp. 108-9.
\textsuperscript{211} This should be seen particularly in the context of the 1083 monastic implantation at Durham which was brought from Wearmouth and Jarrow, newly refounded under Bishop Walcher of Durham.
\textsuperscript{212} Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, pp. 83-85 and n.3 on p. 85.
\textsuperscript{213} Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 58. Victoria Tudor herself discusses the many important positions held by Reginald, comparing him to Walter Daniel pp. 65-67.
inevitably the most important of the two. Cuthbert’s role at Finchale, Godric’s cult
centre, implies that he was consistently put forward as the greater saint. There were
once in the north transept of the church two adjacent altars, dedicated to Cuthbert and
to Godric. The prominent placement of Cuthbert in a church essentially dedicated to
Godric implies that the greater Durham saint was a constant presence, working with
but probably overshadowing Godric.

In order to maintain the separateness of their cults, Cuthbert and Godric
required distinct identities. It is probable that for this reason Godric became the
champion of women. His cult was on the doorstep of a thriving pilgrimage shrine, but
one which could not welcome women at its tomb; it is therefore logical that women
should seek help from Godric with whom they could have more immediate contact.214
While this distinct identity separated Godric from Cuthbert’s sphere of influence, it
still remained necessary to demonstrate which saint had been afforded the greatest
divine favour. Cuthbert was shown to be dominant by curing two men whose appeals
to Godric had failed.215 Moreover, Godric did not have the monopoly on female
pilgrims, as Cuthbert was also the focus of female veneration. Cuthbert’s superiority
to Godric was shown particularly as he diverted potential Finchale visitors. For
example, a woman, plagued by a demon striking her and trying to throw her into the
fire, set out for the tomb of Godric. Passing through Thorpe en route, she had a vision
telling her that she would be cured before she reached Finchale. Thus the bells on the
Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary attracted the woman to Durham where she
prostrated herself at the West wall and arose cured.

This tale exemplifies a second element of Cuthbert’s associations with other
saints, and one that is portrayed only rarely in earlier texts: Cuthbert is often shown in

214 See, for example, the clutch of miracles involving women: Vita Godrici chs. 196, pp. 448-9; 199,
the *Libellus* co-operating with another saint. His miracles involving women often required the agency of the Virgin Mary; importantly, many of these occurred at the west wall of the cathedral, where the Galilee or Lady Chapel stands, and where there was once an altar dedicated to the Virgin Mary, flanked on either side by wall-paintings of Cuthbert and Oswald. Mary’s feast day was prominent in many other Cuthbert miracles not associated with women. As well as showing Cuthbert’s ability to liaise with other holy figures, these examples illustrated the growth of the Marian cult in the twelfth century, and the importance of this to Durham. Her cult’s importance to Durham is further demonstrated by the cathedral library’s large body of Marian material including the *Miracula de Sancta Maria* mentioned in the twelfth-century manuscript catalogue. Whilst none of the other Cuthbertine texts mention cooperation with Mary, it is interesting to note that Cuthbert’s wooden coffin dating from very soon after his death depicts the Virgin, the earliest extant image of Mary from Anglo-Saxon England.

In most other examples of Cuthbert’s co-operation with saints, he is clearly shown with the upper hand. He had the last word in a miracle worked with St Laurence: a girl’s hand was paralysed by Laurence when she failed to respect his feast day, but was cured by Cuthbert when she visited the local church dedicated to him. Brendan’s co-operation with Cuthbert involved him deferring to Cuthbert’s superior power. In this case it was explained that the prisoner was from Brancepeth.

---

218 *SS* vii, p. 4. There were two further collections containing Marian material, including three miracle collections, now contained in Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 359 and Durham Cathedral MS. B.IV.10 (numbering 115 and 118 on Mynors’ list), Tudor, ‘Reginald and Godric’, p. 48.
and had primarily invoked Brendan as he was the patron saint of the church there. Brendan, recognising his inferiority to Cuthbert, advised the prisoner that Cuthbert would set him free. But perhaps the most mismatched, possibly arrogant, example of co-operation occurs in the tale of a penitent who was bound with iron around his waist and both arms. He went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem where the belt dropped off through the agency of Jesus. He visited Limoges next, where St Leonard caused the manacle on his right arm to fall off. The penitent finally went to Durham where it remained for Cuthbert to remove the final manacle, implying Cuthbert’s pre-eminence not only over Leonard, patron of prisoners, but also over Jesus.

The third form of Cuthbert’s interaction with other saints is less provocative than his competitive and co-operative relations. Since Bede’s Vita Cuthbert was not compared with other saints, until Reginald’s Libellus in which Cuthbert is compared to a wide variety of holy men. In the Libellus this provides not only allusions to other cults but also to the comparisons which had been begun in the early Vitae. Bede compared Cuthbert with St Martin of Tours, the monk-bishop role model, and with St Antony and St Benedict in a pair of consecutive miracles concerning the chastisement of birds. Reginald repeated the allusion to Benedict, this time in the cure of a man who had been injured by his horse: ‘In this way the blessed Cuthbert is compared with St Benedict, when he restored a fallen capisterium [vessel for

---

221 Libellus ch. 48, pp. 98-101.
222 Leonard was probably a hermit, but his association with prisoners arose from his role in the freeing of crusader Bohemund from a Muslim prison in 1103. A. Poncelet, ‘Boémond et S. Léonard’, Analecta Bollandiana, 31 (1912), 24-44.
223 The allusion to Martin was made by Bede’s writing of a verse and prose Life of Cuthbert, mirroring the verse and prose Lives of St Martin. On this see Thacker, ‘Lindisfarne and the origins of the cult, p. 118.
224 VCB chs. 18 and 19, pp. 216-23; Gregory, Dialogues ii.5; Vita Antonii ch. 25, both in White, Early Christian Lives, pp. 173-4 and p. 25.
cleansing corn] to its former completeness, and he repaired it by applying the power of his will’.\footnote{Libellus ch. 103, pp. 229-31: In hoc opere beatus Cuthbertus sancto Benedicto consimilatur, ubi descissum capisterium pristina integritate restituit, et pro voluntatis suae arbitrio recompaginando consolidavit’. This is ostensibly an odd choice of miracle, comparing the mending of a vessel with Cuthbert’s healing of a pious man. It does, however, refer to the first chapter of the \textit{Vita Benedicti}, expressing Reginald’s familiarity with that text, PL 66, cols. 0128A-B. Furthermore, this comparison with Benedict is a fine example of Reginald’s verbosity and convoluted, often obscure latin: the PL contains very few instances of the word capisterium (translated as sieve by White, \textit{Early Christian Lives}, p. 166, but rendered here as by Lewis and Short); it contains even fewer instances of derivatives of recompaginere – only five, the most significant to the context of Reginald being the occurrence in William of Malmesbury’s \textit{Gesta Pontificum}, Book Three, on Northumbria, PL 179, col. 1572B.}

Having shown Cuthbert’s supremacy over Peter and Paul, Reginald also compared Cuthbert to these two apostolic saints, notably in miracles which were relevant to their biblical depictions and the cults which developed from these. In a miracle in which Cuthbert saved sailors from a storm he was compared with the shipwrecked apostle Paul.\footnote{Libellus ch. 75, pp. 154-7. Acts 27:27-44. Paul is also mentioned in ch. 104, pp. 232-4.} Peter, the key holder, was mentioned when keys were miraculously found in the mouth of a fish – a tale which also mentioned Jonah - and in a miracle of deliverance from prison: ‘Here the Blessed Cuthbert imitated in action and power that miracle performed for the blessed apostle Peter by an angel, in which he delivered the blessed Peter bound in prison, when the cell door of the prison was shut, and restored the free man for the good of the holy church’.\footnote{Libellus ch. 20, pp. 41-4: Hic Beatus Cuthbertus illud in Beato Petro apostolo miraculum ab Angelo factum opere et virtute est imitatus, ubi Beatum Petrum in carcere ligatum clausam janeus carceris eripuit et solutum ecclesiae sanctae consolationi restituit’. See also ch. 73, pp. 148-51. Peter is also compared with Cuthbert in a cure (ch. 70, pp. 142-5).}

Finally, and particularly strikingly, a group of five chapters compared Cuthbert with St Nicholas.\footnote{Libellus chs. 27, pp. 60-3; 29, pp. 65-6; 30, pp. 67-9; 31, pp. 70-2; 32, pp. 72-4. Nicholas is also mentioned in ch. 71, pp. 145-6.} This group told of maritime miracles around Farne, an allusion to the three sailors that Nicholas saved off the coast of Turkey.\footnote{D. Farmer, \textit{Dictionary of Saints} (Oxford, 1978. 3\textsuperscript{rd} edn 1992), p. 355.} The association with Nicholas was not simply due to Cuthbert performing similar miracles for sailors. There appears to have been a local following for Nicholas, expressed
some years after the *Libellus* when he received a dedication in the Chapel of the Nine Altars, built in 1242 behind the High Altar and Cuthbert’s tomb in Durham Cathedral.

There is a further group of saints mentioned in the *Libellus* who had far closer connections with Durham. Aidan, Oswald and Bede, who were formative in the establishment of Cuthbert’s church and cult, represent the final type of Cuthbert’s saintly associations. Aidan and Oswald, the founders of the church on Lindisfarne in 635, are two obvious members of this group. Thus Aidan was referred to with Cuthbert, along with other former bishops Eadberht and Æthelwold, appearing to a brother in a vision. This immediately preceded a group of miracles describing the 1104 exhumation of Cuthbert’s body, in which the head of Oswald was left in the coffin, and indeed was still there when the tomb was opened in 1827. Oswald also played a part in a miracle when his altar was instrumental in capturing a thief.

The chapters which discussed Cuthbert’s 1104 exhumation also referred to the other relics which had been kept in the coffin. They were deemed by the inspectors to be responsible for the dirt and moisture in the tomb, not quite worthy of being held with the body of Cuthbert. These were the relics which had been collected by Elfred Westou in the 1020s; his actions were described in Symeon’s *LDE*, and more briefly in the *Libellus*, both of which placed emphasis on the acquisition of Bede’s relics.

It is significant, then, that when the relics held in Cuthbert’s coffin were criticised for inducing decay, the remains of Bede were not mentioned, even though they were still in Cuthbert’s coffin at that time. This is hardly surprising though; Bede was, after
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230 *Libellus* ch. 38, pp. 81-2.
231 *Libellus* ch. 42, pp. 87-9. An account of this is given by J. Raine, *Saint Cuthbert; with an account of the state in which his remains were found upon the opening of his tomb in Durham Cathedral, in 1827* (Durham, 1828), and summarised in Battiscombe, *Relics*, pp. 2-20.
232 *Libellus* ch. 80, pp. 165-8.
233 *LDE* iii.7, pp. 160-6; *Libellus* ch. 16, pp. 28-32.
234 They were only removed when Bede’s separate shrine was created in the Galilee Chapel during Hugh du Puiset’s episcopate, *LDE* Continuation: variant section, *LDE* p. 323.
all, the third important figure in the foundation of Cuthbert’s church and cult. Bede’s association with Cuthbert was evident from the start of the Libellus, and the numerous allusions to his VCB have been discussed above. But Reginald did not simply wish to compare the Libellus with the Vita, but also to compare Bede himself with Cuthbert. The most obvious example of this is the miracle involving a knight who, unable to learn his psalms, was compared with Bede who was similarly afflicted as a young monk. The knight was depicted visiting the tomb of Cuthbert: he asked ‘where St Cuthbert, namely, in what shrine or reliquary he and the venerable Bede had their special place of rest’, and he was cured there. The Libellus referred to Bede in a similar way to that in which it linked Cuthbert with Oswald and Aidan. These three men were responsible in various ways for the establishment of what became known as Cuthbert’s church.

Conclusion

Reginald’s Libellus was the product of a church and cult confident in its own sphere of power. The stability of the later twelfth century demanded that Cuthbert’s image be updated. Conveniently, this updating for local needs also allowed Reginald to show Cuthbert’s cult as modernised in accordance with the Western Church as a whole, to show a more beneficent saint performing miracles with a more substantiable and scientific basis than in works of previous centuries. The tales compiled by Reginald represented the vibrancy of Cuthbert’s cult: the popularity with pilgrims, the widespread geographical extent in northern England and southern Scotland, and the

---

235 Libellus ch. 76, pp. 158-60: ‘in qua theca vel feretro ipse vel venerabilis Beda specialiter haberent’.
236 See above, pp. 85-7.
patronage, and thus deep connections with secular and ecclesiastical elite, that still continued, 500 years after Cuthbert’s death.
EPILOGUE: CUTHBERT THE NORTHERN SAINT

Reginald’s *Libellus* is one major literary part of the stage at which Cuthbert’s cult and Church reached their apotheosis, half a millennium after the death of Cuthbert, with the magisterial building programme and great ornamentation of the church under Hugh du Puiset, the augmentation of the library, and of course the twelfth-century surge in literary production including the works of Durham authors Symeon, Lawrence and Reginald. This thesis has shown, through the Cuthbertine literature of the ninth to the twelfth century, the balance of change and continuity that maintained Cuthbert’s cult and Church through these 500 years.

Studied individually, these Cuthbertine texts illustrate literary responses to the ever-changing demands of specific times, through the expression of property, rights and dynastic connections, the communication of the Church and community identity, and the manipulations of the saint’s image. Together, they represent the continuity that was essential to the Church and cult’s survival, through communicating the perpetual presence of Cuthbert and his attendant Community, and through the texts’ very own individual characteristics; and they reflect the flexibility and manipulability of medieval literature. Beyond the confines of Cuthbertine historiography, these texts form an interesting case-study of the development of the hagiographical genre over a long and formative period, culminating in the formalisation of saints’ cults and the associated twelfth-century renaissance.

But by ending this thesis with Reginald of Durham at the end of the twelfth century it is not my intention to imply that Cuthbert’s cult then began a decline towards obscurity; rather it had developed and changed according to its geographical and political environment, and at the end of the twelfth century was occupying a
strong position in a complex cultural, social, ecclesiastical and political network centred on northern England and southern Scotland. This network is particularly well-exemplified by saints’ cults, including those of Kentigern, Ninian, David and Æbbe, as well as that of Cuthbert; by the end of the twelfth century, Cuthbert’s cult, through the work of Reginald and other means was being firmly identified with this vibrant northern British setting, in which it continued to thrive.

Reginald’s *Libellus*’ evidence for Cuthbert’s cult in southern Scotland can be supplemented by Mackinlay’s record of church dedications to Cuthbert. He lists locations in Galloway, Teviotdale, Berwickshire, Lothian, and Ayrshire, totalling thirty-six pre-reformation dedications; significantly, a large proportion of these appear to date from the churches’ foundation in the twelfth century, demonstrating the popularity of Cuthbert in southern Scotland at that time. Other Northumbrian saints were patrons of Scottish churches, notably Aidan and Oswald, founders of Cuthbert’s Church, and Æbbe, sister of Oswald and abbess of Coldingham in Berwickshire. While Coldingham was a cell of Durham after its reconstruction in 1090, it was built by Edgar, son of Malcolm Canmore and Margaret, and dedicated by him to Cuthbert and Æbbe along with the Virgin Mary. In these church dedications one begins to see the complex links between Northumbrian saints and southern Scotland.

Textual connections enrich, and complicate, this picture further. In her recent work on manuscripts in eleventh- and twelfth-century Northumbria, Anne Lawrence-Mathers illustrated the intrinsic role of the Cistercians in the literary connections between cults in Northumbria and southern Scotland. Robert Bartlett, also

---

1 See above, pp. 237-8.
expounding the Cistercian influence, showed how this network of cults also encompassed northern Ireland. This complex interweaving of ecclesiastical institutions, authors, texts and saints spanned Cistercian houses and beyond, from Rievaulx to Melrose, Cumbria to County Down, and incorporated the episcopal seats of Glasgow, Durham and Armagh. Saints such as Kentigern, Ninian, Patrick, Brigit transcended borders as their miracles were recorded by men such as Laurence of Durham, Aelred of Rievaulx and Jocelin of Furness.

To return to the Cuthbert of the late twelfth century, there is most evidence of the ties within northern England and southern Scotland, with a tantalising hint of association with Ireland. Here, I will offer just a few glimpses of this northern saintly network pertinent to Cuthbert. Beginning with one of the most active protagonists, Aelred of Rievaulx was a steward of David I of Scotland before he became a Cistercian monk in the 1130s. He wrote a Life of Ninian, dedicated to the Bishop of Whithorn, which incidentally was the site of the ninth-century Cuthbert miracle, in which his wandering coffin-bearers were prevented from carrying his body to Ireland. Aelred’s eulogy of David I is often found in manuscripts with his *Genealogica regum Anglorum*, dedicated to David, which recounted the miracle in which Cuthbert came to the aid of Alfred the Great. Most significantly, Aelred could claim a direct link with Cuthbert: he was the great-grandson of Ælfred Westou, revered sacrist of Durham renowned for his close personal attention to the saint’s
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6 Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogica regum Anglorum*, PL 195, cols. 711-38. The Alfred/Cuthbert miracle appears at PL 195, col. 720; it is a version of the miracle that appears in *HSC* and *De mir*. Anselm Hoste’s survey of manuscripts concerning Aelred shows the eulogy of David appearing alongside the *Genealogica regum Anglorum* in five of the nineteen GRA manuscripts: London, BL MS Harley 3846; BL MS Cotton. Vespasian D. XI; Cambridge, Trinity College MS 1421; Oxford, Bodleian MS James 22; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 13.445, Anselm Hoste, *Bibliotheca Aelrediana* (Bruges, 1962), pp. 111-4. However, this list requires some emendation as there are certainly more occasions on which these two texts appear together. I am very grateful to Joanna Huntington for her invaluable help on this subject.
uncorrupt body. Aelred of Rievaulx’s predilection for Cuthbert must have resulted from his descent, emphasised by Reginald, and was expressed in his treatise *On the saints of Hexham*, and in his active role in the production of Reginald’s *Libellus*, as its patron, dedicatee, subject of a miracle, and source for several others (including a pair from Kirkcudbright in Galloway) and it was he to whom Reginald dedicated the work.

Another great twelfth-century Cistercian author, Jocelin of Furness, wrote a Life of Waltheof of Melrose, friend of Aelred of Rievaulx and stepson of David I. Interestingly, this Life appears in a fifteenth-century Dunfermline manuscript (now in Madrid) which also contains hagiographic material on Margaret: a thirteenth-century miracle collection, and the early twelfth-century *Vita* by the stalwart Prior of Durham (and later Bishop of St Andrews) Turgot. Returning to Jocelin of Furness, his most famous work - a Life of Kentigern - was written towards the end of the twelfth century (dedicated to Jocelin, Bishop of Glasgow 1170/4-99, formerly abbot of Melrose). Jocelin wrote to modernise Kentigern for the revived bishopric of Glasgow - this supplanted a previous attempt at modernisation of Kentigern’s *Vita* which was written in the mid-twelfth century for Bishop Herbert of Glasgow (1147-64). The Herbertian Life now only partially survives, but its remaining fragment does give a tempting reference to a connection with Durham: the author in his prologue writes

---

10 R. Bartlett, ed. and tr., *The Miracles of Saint Æbbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland*, pp. xxxi-xxxviii discusses this MS (Madrid, Bibliotheca del Palacio Real, II.2097).
that he, a *clericus* of St Kentigern is writing ‘just as Symeon, monk of Durham, wrote a history about his saint Cuthbert‘.\(^{12}\)

Reginald himself was not just focussed on Durham saints Cuthbert and Godric. He also wrote a Life of St Oswald, who we have seen was the subject of church dedications in Scotland, and possibly that of St Æbbe, royal Northumbrian saint and patron of the late-eleventh century Scottish royal house at Coldingham. Furthermore, Reginald recounted in his *Libellus* a connection between Cuthbert and Margaret, when Cuthbert’s relics were taken to Lothian, Perth and Dunfermline by Alan, a monk of Durham, and were permitted by the inmates of Dunfermline to be carried in a procession on St Margaret’s Day, implying cooperation between institutions and between saints, cemented by St Margaret’s gift of an ornate Gospel Book to the Durham monks.\(^{13}\)

It remains to mention the curious *Libellus de nativitate* (or *de ortu sancti Cuthberti*), the so-called ‘Irish Life’: a text apparently unrelated to the historical Cuthbert, ascribing Irish origins to him, but in fact, as Thomas Clancy has shown composed of a combination of Irish and Scottish sources.\(^{14}\) It has been suggested by Richard Sharpe that this ‘Irish Life’ was the work of Reginald of Durham,\(^{15}\) but this, as Clancy has pointed out, seems unlikely on three counts: first, Reginald’s great Cuthbert miracle collection made much of the Lindisfarne roots of the community, but did not put forth any Irish or Scottish origin for Cuthbert. Second, the ‘Irish Life’ did not mention Cuthbert in the context of Durham, Lindisfarne, or anywhere else in Northumbria – it is unlikely that Reginald would not even have made mention of the

\(^{12}\)  *quemadmodum Symeon monachus olim Dunelmensis de sancto suo Cuthberto historiam contexuit ita et ego qualemcumque, clericus sancti Kentigerni...proat potul devote composui*, *Vita Kentigermi auctore ignoto*, p. 243. I am grateful to Betty Knott-Sharpe for bringing this to my attention.

\(^{13}\)  *Libellus* ch. 98, pp. 217-9.


\(^{15}\)  Sharpe, ‘Were the Irish annals known to a twelfth-century Northumbrian writer?’.
final resting place of Cuthbert. Finally, the style of Reginald, so carefully crafted, as well as idiosyncratically verbose, in his other works, is certainly not congruent with that of the ‘Irish Life’. Indeed, suggesting that Reginald was the author of this text gives a rather too Durham-centric representation of Cuthbert’s late-twelfth century cult. Rather than see the ‘Irish Life’ as evidence of Durham spreading its powerful net, it seems more pertinent to read it as the product of a vibrant cult producing literature far beyond the realms of Durham.

Indeed, Reginald’s *Libellus* itself provides evidence for the competent writing of Cuthbert stories across northern England and southern Scotland, particularly where Cuthbert was a local patron. It was argued above that stylistically and thematically discrete groups of miracles in Reginald’s *Libellus* are often also united by their provenance, implying that they may have been written at those local centres and then sent to Reginald.  

There are many such groups of miracles: here it suffices to mention three, from Slitrig in Teviotdale, Haddington in Lothian and Lytham in Lancashire; the latter’s location on the north-west coast of England is temptingly close to north Wales and the Irish Sea.

The strength of Cuthbert’s cult in the late-twelfth-century, within its northern setting, is evident in the highly decorated *Life of Cuthbert* in Yates Thompson MS 26, in Reginald’s *Libellus*, and in works such as the *Libellus de nativitate*, and in the late-twelfth- or early-thirteenth century *Life of Cuthbert* in Leonine verse. The cult’s continuing vibrancy is evident in the ensuing centuries: the manuscript production that continued in Durham and elsewhere; the production of new Cuthbertine

---

19 For example, insular and continental manuscripts of Bede’s *Vita sancti Cuthberti* are listed in Colgrave, *Two Lives*, pp. 20-39.
hagiography such as the fifteenth-century verse life of Cuthbert;\textsuperscript{20} the window in York Minster of the same period; the fifteenth-century paintings in Carlisle cathedral stalls (to give only a few examples).\textsuperscript{21} A banner of St Cuthbert was frequently used in battle, increasingly during the later medieval period and after, such as at Neville’s Cross (1346), at Flodden Field (1513), and during the ‘Pilgrimage of Grace’ (1536);\textsuperscript{22} according to R.B. Dobson, it was by the end of the middle ages the most popular ensign in England.\textsuperscript{23} Yet again, Cuthbert’s cult had changed to suit current events, responding to the military requirements of the strong northern English forces; his local and militaristic persona was in evidence most recently in 1942, when a Luftwaffe air-strike on the north of England was prevented from harming Durham by a shroud of fog attributed to St Cuthbert. Even more recently, in the campaigns for devolved government in the north east of England, Cuthbert was still maintained as a symbol of distinctive identity of that region.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} The life of St Cuthbert in English verse, c. A.D. 1450, from the original manuscript in the library at Castle Howard, J.T. Fowler, ed., S5 87 (1891).
\item \textsuperscript{21} These were copied from the c.1200 illustrated manuscript of Bede’s Vita B. Colgrave, ‘The Saint Cuthbert Paintings on the Carlisle Cathedral Stalls’, Burlington Magazine 73 (1938), 16-21. See also V. Tudor, ‘St Cuthbert and Cumbria’, TCWAAS 84 (1984), p. 74.
\item \textsuperscript{23} R.B. Dobson, Durham Priory, 1400-1450 (Cambridge, 1973), p. 27.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Peter Hetherington, ‘Geordies look to saint for inspiration’, The Guardian, June 16, 2004.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
MAP TO SHOW THE LOCATIONS OF MIRACLES, PROVENANCE OF DEVOTEES AND LOCATION OF CUTHBERT Dedications IN REGINALD OF DURHAM’S *LIBELLUS*
**TABLE COMPARING THE MIRACLE PROFILE OF CUTHBERTINE TEXTS**

(Actual numbers of miracles are on left; percentages are given on the right)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Total miracles</th>
<th>VCB</th>
<th>HSC</th>
<th>LDE</th>
<th>De m</th>
<th>BR</th>
<th>Laon MS</th>
<th>Reg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCORRUPTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPHECY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNITIVE – minor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNITIVE – major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTION - weather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISON DELIVERANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of curing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIC AT TOMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIC ELSEWHERE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISION TO CURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDISFARNE (excl. VCB)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARNE (excl. VCB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRINE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSEWHERE IN CHURCH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM (OUTWITH CH)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CUTH CHURCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING/QUEEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count1</td>
<td>Count2</td>
<td>Count3</td>
<td>Count4</td>
<td>Count5</td>
<td>Count6</td>
<td>Count7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTHBERTINE MONK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RELIG. FIGURE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POORMAN/WOMAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOBLE (and servants of)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS REF</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>Other Cuth. Works</td>
<td>De mir and BR</td>
<td>Addns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, Biblio.Publique 574</td>
<td>Pre-1171</td>
<td>VCB; Bede Hist.Eccl. iv.31&amp;32.</td>
<td>As Laon MS without LDE ii.2 and De mir 20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity Coll. 1227, (O.3.55)</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-17, 21, 18-20, LDE iii.3; BR30, 35, 34, 31-3, 36, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Sloane 1772.</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 20; BR1-11,25-7,12-20,28,21-4,30-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Bodleian, Digby 59 (1660)</td>
<td>Late C12</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 4, 1-3; 5-7, 18-20; BR25-7, 18-20, 28, 21-4, 30-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Bodleian, Laud Misc.491 (1093)</td>
<td>1153x98</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21; BR 1-37</td>
<td>LDE extracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Additional 35110</td>
<td>Late C12</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-17, 21, 18-20 BR 1-29, 37, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Yates Thompson 26</td>
<td>Late C12</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21 LDE iii.3 (See Trinity Coll 1227) BR 30, 37, 38</td>
<td>LDE extracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, Cath Chap Lib. A.IV.35</td>
<td>Late C12</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21 BR 1-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, Lib. of Sch. of Medicine Codex 1, Thom. Quin.</td>
<td>Late C12</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels, Bollandist Lib. 353</td>
<td>Late C12/ Early C13</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, Biblio Pub 657</td>
<td>Early C13</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21 LDE iii.3 (See Trinity Coll 1227) BR 1-34, 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Arundel 332</td>
<td>C13</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21 LDE iii.3 (See Trinity Coll 1227) BR 1-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican,Cod Reg lat483</td>
<td>C13</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotha, Herzogliche Bibl 1.81</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 4, 6, 8, 9 BR 25-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Cott. Titus A.ii</td>
<td>C14/15</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td>As for Laon MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library Harleian 4843</td>
<td>Early C16</td>
<td>VCB HE iv.31&amp;32</td>
<td>De mir 1-21 LDE iii.3 (See Trinity Coll 1227) BR 1-34, 38</td>
<td>LDE extracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A Table of the Miracle Chapters in Reginald of Durham's Libellus de Admirandis Beati Cuthberti Virtutibus

*NB. Italics denote a date deduced from the content of the miracle or a person similarly deduced, unless otherwise stated. Brackets around people denote witnesses/sources. Brackets around places denote mentioned locales not involved directly in miracle. A place in **bold** denotes pilgrimage, to receive miracle or give thanks.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PEOPLE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SAINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Protect/guide Sea</td>
<td>Eardulf</td>
<td>Lindisfarne</td>
<td>Moses, Aaron, Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Protect Cleric Lindisfarne</td>
<td>Eilaf, Moses, Aaron, Joshua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>875-83</td>
<td>No miracle</td>
<td>Eardulf</td>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>Edmund (martyrdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>875-83</td>
<td>Vision/protect Punishment Invoked Remorse</td>
<td>Ingvar &amp; Ubba Eilaf, 4th bearer desc = Tod – Fox.</td>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>Edmund (martyrdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>Punitive Protect/guide Tide</td>
<td>Nobleman Elfred, desc of Tod (Ælred of Riev)</td>
<td>Durham Lindisfarne</td>
<td>Bede (relics) Other relics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1133-41</td>
<td>Punitive (demon) Invoke Cure/demon</td>
<td>Bishop Geoffrey Walter of Killoe Aldred sacristan (Thurold, now monk)</td>
<td>Nr Durham (Killoe – 4 m)</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1133-41</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>pre-1083</td>
<td>Vision Cure/leper</td>
<td>Noble southerner (Thurold, told by pre-1083 canons)</td>
<td>S. England Durham Ch</td>
<td>Æthelthryth Edmund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Malcolm III imprisons a man who is bound in iron in Berwick Castle. He prays, Cuthbert leads him out and to Norham where the iron collar is hung. The miracle is likened to Peter.</td>
<td>1058-93</td>
<td>Malcolm III, Berwick, Norham</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Edward, <em>officialis</em> of Durham on Lindisfarne, sees crowds bringing stones (as the local stone is not good). Gives thanks at Cuthbert’s <em>tumba</em> then gets <em>dapifer</em> Edred to prepare food/drink but only a little beer. Edward asks for help at <em>tumba</em> and the small amount of beer is never exhausted until someone becomes drunk.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward the monk, Lindisfarne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Feast of St Cuthbert – Edward is entertaining crowds but bread runs out so he goes to the <em>tumba</em> and Cuthbert provides huge supplies of bread.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward the monk, Lindisfarne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Traders lose their rudder in a storm. Cuthbert appears and uses his pastoral staff as a rudder to guide them to Lindisfarne.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lindisfarne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A hunting horn is to be sold at the fair in Durham for Cuthbert’s feast. Two men hatch a plan involving falsely swearing on Cuthbert. He loses his sight but regains it when prays in Cuthbert’s church.</td>
<td>1115-20s</td>
<td>Robert Nostell – prior Scone, St As, Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A brother goes to Lincoln finds the son of the man he stays with almost dead from a haemorrhage. Medicine won’t work but he prays to Cuthbert and is cured.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Elfred Westou cares for Cuthbert – his hair clippings glow in fire. A hole in the tomb is overlooked and Elfred goes away. A weasel nests there and Cuthbert instructs Elfred to return but won’t let him harm the weasel which is miraculously tame.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aelric is away from Farne and his servant Leving eats one of the tame birds. He scatters the bones and feathers, but Aelric finds them at the church door on his return. Leving confesses and does penance. Birds named specially are listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farne</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>In the time of Aelric ships are driven to Farne. Aelric receives them well but a sailor steals a whetstone. Favourable winds allow all ships except that of the thief to depart until the stone is returned. A comparison is drawn with Jonah.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>King Øystein of Norway &amp; the Isles goes to England – he plunders the coast and eventually goes to Farne where he eats sheep and takes food and building supplies. The fountain of St Cuthbert dries up when</td>
<td>1150x54 (in Stephen’s)</td>
<td>K. Øystein of Nor (Bartholomew &amp; Aelwin post-1150)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Characters/Places</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>English sailors preparing to trade overseas are driven by a storm to Frisian land. The wind prevents the Frisians from approaching and the crew sleep, except the helmsman who is the brother of the archdeacon of Lothian and Thurold of Lindisfarne. Cuthbert appears and guides them to Farne where Bartholomew and Aelwin are. A sick man on board dies and is buried on Wedume, the nearest island to Farne, as Cuthbert predicts.</td>
<td>Post-1150</td>
<td>Protect, guide, Prophecy, Storm</td>
<td>Frisia Farne (Lindisfarne, Lothian, Berwick)</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sailors are driven to the island and detained for many days. Cuthbert appears at night; some of the women in the party can see him and others not. He inspects piles of fish, especially those of the church’s brothers, and re-enters church. Fair weather next day lets them depart.</td>
<td>Protect, Storm</td>
<td>Sailors Bros of Island</td>
<td>Farne (men from Berwick, Bamburgh, London, Lindisfarne)</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sailors from England encounter a storm approaching Farne. A crewmember climbs the mast but falls in the sea. The crew invoke Cuthbert and he saves the man and the ship. The man hurries to the church to give thanks.</td>
<td>Invoke, Protect/save, Storm</td>
<td>Sailors Ælbricht from Durham (Our brothers)</td>
<td>Farne (Norway)</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Two ships are saved from a wreck at Farne and led to land, and their goods are found.</td>
<td>Our time</td>
<td>Save/Storm (Brothers)</td>
<td>Farne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fishermen stranded on Farne receive flour from brothers. It never diminishes.</td>
<td>Provide</td>
<td>Fishermen (Brothers)</td>
<td>Farne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A priest in Durham cathedral tries to steal a coin offered on the ivory casket containing Cuthbert’s relics. He is unable to do so, and becomes a monk.</td>
<td>Protect/theft, Relics</td>
<td>Priest of Durham</td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The sacrist in charge of vessels and cloths in Durham cathedral leaves a candle burning where they are stored. Cuthbert alerts him in a dream.</td>
<td>Protect chu/fire Vision</td>
<td>Sacrist</td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The sacrist sleeping on a bed stuffed with straw, with the curtains, vestments etc above him is alerted in a dream to extinguish the candle.</td>
<td>Protect chu/fire Vision</td>
<td>Sacrist</td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A brother asleep in the church sees bishops at night – Cuthbert, Aidan, Eadberht and Æthelwold.</td>
<td>Vision (episc)</td>
<td>Brother Adean, Eadberht, Æthelwold</td>
<td>Aidan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Durham is attacked and the relics of Cuthbert are threatened. During a</td>
<td>Protect relics/fire</td>
<td>Standard bearer</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fire the standard of Cuthbert is threatened, but neither it nor its bearer get burned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Translation of Cuthbert</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– body smells sweet and appears dry and new. Pliant Silk from under him seems like new but has decayed under other saints. Part of the tomb under other relics is dirty and moist. The casket is cleaned and holy ashes put in vessels. A waxed wooden board is placed at the base of the coffin, and Cuthbert placed on this. Other relics have endangered but not damaged Cuthbert.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>INCORRUPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Turgot, subprio r Aldwin; sacrist Leofwine. Wiking. Godwine. Osbert; archdeacons Henry and William Havegrim; Algar, later prior; Symeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relics of other Sts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Vestments worn by Cuthbert (description in present tense). Description of face. Touch the flesh. Described in detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>More incorrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Episcopal robes. Again, described in detail. The cloth is removed and the coffin closed with Oswald’s head inside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Flexible body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oswald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The coffin – its carvings and decoration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A pious young man is possessed in Durham Cathedral. The spirit is driven away by water in which Cuthbert’s relics were washed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cure/demoniac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(several brothers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A man whose prayers to Cuthbert have been answered offers a candle that starts a fire at the foot of the tomb, but it miraculously does not harm the hangings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect tomb/fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A man in the Durham area has false charges brought against him by someone who wants his land. He is put in prison and invokes Brendan and Cuthbert. Brendan appears to him on three nights; on the third, he leads him to the prison gates and tells him that Cuthbert is more powerful. Cuthbert leads him away to hide for two days, after which he goes to the church in Durham where he offers his fetters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brancepeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brendan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A Durham monk gives an architect friend (working for Hugh du Puiset) some of Cuthbert’s cloth. He carries it in a silk container which he drops one day. It is found by a French cleric who doubts Cuthbert’s sanctity and tests the relic in fire but it does not burn. He confesses to the architect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1153x95</td>
<td>Protect/relic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh du Puiset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French cleric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Reginald, and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A crippled man from Steintune on Tyne is cured in the service for Cuthbert’s transl. The faithful bring their offerings to William de Ste Barbe – the crippled man brings his stools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1143x52</td>
<td>Cure/lame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Steintune)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>In the time of William de Ste Barbe, Sheriff Osbern wrongfully imprisons a man who invokes Cuthbert and his chains fall off. Osbern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1143x52</td>
<td>Invoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>is angry and orders stronger chains, which fall off immediately. Osbern orders the chains to be offered to Cuthbert. He witnesses the miracle (see 93).</td>
<td>Offer fetters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Roger de Conyers accuses William Walleis and Orm Anglicus of plunder and imprisons them in a tower in Durham. They invoke Cuthbert and he breaks down the doors and takes them to the church and alerts the servants inside. The men give thanks.</td>
<td>Invoke Free Thanks</td>
<td>Roger de Conyers William Walleis Orm Anglicus Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Brother Romanus the sacrist usually stays by Cuthbert’s tomb at night. He goes to the dormitory to relieve himself, and subprior Henry locks him in by accident. Cuthbert rouses Henry in a dream to let Romanus out.</td>
<td>(Minor freeing) Dream</td>
<td>Sacrist Romanus Subprior Henry Durham Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cardinal subdeacon Stephen, legate of Pope Alexander, is returning from Norway and encounters a storm. Everyone prays to Peter and Paul but to no avail. The Abbot of Grimsby suggests invoking Cuthbert, which works. The cardinal and companions go to Durham to give thanks, offering a <em>palla</em> on the altar. They tell brothers.</td>
<td>Invoke Protect/storm Offer <em>palla</em>.</td>
<td>Cardinal Stephen Pope Alexander (Norway) Durham Ch Peter/Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A minister travelling with brother of Durham suffers from anal bleeding and dysentry. One day, when in Mitford, a young man begs for help for his blind mother. They take a piece of Cuthbert’s cloth and dip it in water: the cloth will not get wet. The minister is cured by drinking water, and the woman regains her sight when her eyes are bathed.</td>
<td>Curex2/blind,dysentry Cloth/water Woman</td>
<td>Bro Silvanus Minister Udardus Blind woman Mitford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Additions to the story of the cloth of Cuthbert which would not burn and glowed gold after being put in fire. The cloth is kept in a copy of <em>VCB</em> hung around the monk’s neck. The builder works for Hugh du Puiset at Norham and goes away to Berwick. The architect is called Ricardus Ingeniator. (cf. ch.47)</td>
<td>Protect/relic Fire Cloth [47]</td>
<td>Hugh du Puiset Ricardus Ingeniator Durham (Norham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>In the time of Henry II, land is violently taken from the Abbot &amp; brothers of Furness. They bring their case to the king’s court and then to Rome but in vain. The Abbot suggests invoking Cuthbert. They build an altar to him and at the next hearing of the king’s court everything is found in their favour, they recover the land and the Abbot comes to Durham to give thanks.</td>
<td>Invoke Protect/land Thanks</td>
<td>Henry II Abbot Johannes &amp; brothers of Furness Furness (Rome) Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A thief tries to steal a horse that the Abbot of Furness is preparing for the journey but it miraculously will not move.</td>
<td>Protect/theft</td>
<td>Abbot of Furness Furness (Durham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>A man from Norham perjures himself on a cross made from Cuthbert’s table. His right eye falls out and he is killed in the duel. Suanus saw this and told ‘us’.</td>
<td>Punitive Blind/death</td>
<td>(Suanus, presbyter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Two brethren of Durham are ministering to the church on Farne. One Christmas Eve, after Mass, a shining figure in episcopal robes enters the church and performs mass. The priest then cannot celebrate mass. A monk saw this.</td>
<td>Vision (episcopal)</td>
<td>Brethren (monk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bishop Hugh plans to go to Lindisfarne. Three nights before he arrives a Deacon (cleric of Durham church) is awakened by a noise at night. Two figures require candles for Cuthbert to celebrate mass. The Deacon gives keys to the armaria and robed figures enter the church, and an episcopal figure celebrates mass. They head for the church of St Mary. Next day the candles are burnt a hand’s length.</td>
<td>Vision (episcopal)</td>
<td>Hugh du Puiset Deacon (Durham cleric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A murderer flees to Cuthbert’s sanctuary. His friends find him, enter the monastery precinct and tell him to seek refuge at the tomb. He prays to Cuthbert. Pursuers enter the church and attack him at the altar of the Holy Cross and inflict apparently mortal wounds. Monks drag him outside but then bring him back for fear of attack. He recovers.</td>
<td>Sanctuary violate</td>
<td>Invoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>The man guilty of this attack cannot find his way out of Durham and is imprisoned underground.</td>
<td>Punitive/prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The mother of a noble is badly crippled. She decides to appeal to Cuthbert and go to Farne. She goes as near to the church as women are allowed and prays with the brothers. She is cured and offers her cane. Bartholomew told of this.</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Invoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>A sacrist of Norwich cathedral, devoted to Cuthbert, falls ill and, presumed dead, is prepared for burial. Cuthbert revives him; two Durham brothers hear the story in Norwich. The Norwich cellarer offers gold on altar at Durham.</td>
<td>Cure/dead</td>
<td>Sacrist and cellarer, Norwich (brothers of Durham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Every St Cuthbert’s day, a priest in Ardene, Nottinghamshire, feeds the poor. One year, despite pestilence, the priest is still generous, but this stimulates excesses in others. He decides to hold the feast and, finding a small amount of grain, makes a few loaves of bread but they feed a huge crowd. (Told by priest, according to 65).</td>
<td>Cuthbert day</td>
<td>Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>At the same time and place, people are ravaging and the inhabitants of Ardene hide. Brigands break church gates and take livestock. The Cuthbert’s feast</td>
<td>Protect/plunder</td>
<td>Priest of Notts Praedones ravage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest dissuades them from entering church – they go to island and eat and drink. The priest tells <em>rustici</em>, who attack the men, who are trampled by animals and kill each other (Cuthbert adds thunder and earthquake noises). Property is returned to its owners and the church. Told by a priest in Durham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(day 8)</td>
<td>Rustici (Priest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A devotee leaves a candle burning at the tomb but it does not harm hangings (cf. 45).</td>
<td>Protect/fire</td>
<td>Devotee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Men plundering north in the reign of the most pious Stephen. They take cattle at Normanton. A brother of Durham invokes Cuthbert and pursues men having had only a few dumplings for supper. The men have fled and the castle drawbridge is up, so he spends the night in a monastery and next day is refused help by <em>castellarius</em>. He encounters the chief rustler Julian who gallops away scorning Cuthbert, but is killed by a lance to the heart by someone he argued with over dice (like killing of emperor Julian).</td>
<td>1135x54 (Steph’s reign)</td>
<td>Invoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Start of a series of miracles in Coupeland. A boy takes a crow nesting on the roof of a church dedicated to Cuthbert in Lixtune (where no-one knows of his powers). He falls and the wooden peg he was holding cannot be released from his grip. Doctors cannot help. Eventually he does three days penitence in the church. Cuthbert appears on the third night and bangs the boy’s fingers against the altar, healing all but the little finger which remains bent as a sign. The priest and parish hear and give thanks at tomb.</td>
<td>Drs fail</td>
<td>Penance ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A rich man near Lixtune is cured of a disfigured face by Cuthbert in the church at night. The tale is told to the priest.</td>
<td>Cure/church</td>
<td>Rich man (Priest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>A man’s good only son seems near death. His father orders him to be taken to Cuthbert’s church on a bier. Cuthbert appears at night and cures him. Likened to Peter.</td>
<td>Cure/church</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>A man trying to steal a spear (given as an offering) from the cemetery adheres to it. The priest, owner, etc. find him there. He does penance.</td>
<td>Punitive/theft</td>
<td>Penance/church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The priest of Lixtune sees animals eating church crops. The dapifer is sent to impound them but en route through the churchyard he catches a sparrow but then cannot leave the churchyard. The priest finds him, frees bird and makes him do penance. This was heard in 1165 when priest tolds the miracles of the last five chapters and gave thanks at</td>
<td>Heard in 1165</td>
<td>Punitive (trap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>In Norham a boy called Haldene is afraid of the punishment he faces at a school held in a church of Cuthbert (Mundingdene where Scots were swallowed is nearby). He throws the key of the church into the Tweed and that evening the priest cannot open the church. Cuthbert appears in a vision and tells him to go to Pedwell and buy the first fish they catch. It is a huge salmon which has the key in its mouth. Likened to Jonah.</td>
<td>Punitive Vision Protect (key) Schoolboy Priest (Scots)</td>
<td>Norham Pedwell/Tweed (Mundingdene/Scot of HSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>David k of Scots marries Maud and returns home via Durham. Maud enters the church but does not go beyond the limit for women. Helisand, her chambermaid, is proud of her virginity, and disguises herself as a man and enters the church but can go no further. Cuthbert appears to Bernard the sacrist who ejects her. She is confused but eventually becomes nun at Elvstow near Bedford, forever in fear of Cuthbert.</td>
<td>Vision Punitive Woman Repent</td>
<td>David k of Scots Wife Maud Helisend ch’maid Bernard sacrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After David m. Maud.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham ch Elvstow nr Bedford (southern England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Roger, prior of Durham wants to get marble for Cuthbert’s church floor. He gets a pilgrim, Harpin a knight of Thornley, to bring some after his pilgrimage to Rome. He returns with the marble in his arms but a storm arises on the voyage home, and the horse must be thrown in sea. They reach land and Harpin reproaches Cuthbert. Bystanders mock but the horse swims ashore after 2 days and Harpin brings the marble to Durham, where it remains.</td>
<td>Reproach Protect/storm</td>
<td>Roger, prior Durham Harpin knight of Thornley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1137/8-48/9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham ch (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>A knight called Robert of St Martin becomes monk at Durham in the time of William de Ste Barbe but he cannot learn psalms etc and is vexed. He is compared with Bede. He visits Cuthbert’s &amp; Bede’s tombs and reproaches Cuthbert, throwing a book under his shrine. When he goes back to fetch it he is able to read it. (There are picture’s of Cuthbert in the book). ‘We’ heard about this.</td>
<td>Reproach Cure /read</td>
<td>Knight Robert St Martin William Ste Barbe Bede (we)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1143x52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham ch/tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Robert often prays at Cuthbert’s tomb and one day is mistaken by a poor man for the secretarius, and is begged for alms. Robert prays to Cuthbert and a coin appears on the pavimentum, which he gives to the poor man. ‘We’ hear about this, also from Robert.</td>
<td>Provide/alms</td>
<td>Knight Robert St Martin Poor man (we)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The hermit Ælric on Farne is asked by a poor man for wax for an offering at his wife’s churching as she has recently given birth. Ælric gives the wax but a crow snatches it. He reproaches Cuthbert and</td>
<td>Reproach Provide/wax Animal</td>
<td>Ælric hermit Poor man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>A penitent is bound with iron around his waist and two manacles. On pilgrimage the belt falls off at Jerusalem, the manacle on his right arm at Limoges. He comes to Cuthbert’s tomb to ask for help and the left manacle falls off. ‘We’ witness this.</td>
<td>Penitent</td>
<td>Invoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A poor man, avaricious at the sight of Durham’s treasures displayed by Benedict the sacrist, conceals himself in the church and approaches Cuthbert’s altar. He steals an ivory casket and thinks he has concealed himself but is infact in the middle of the pavement. Reginald falls over the man, who is driven to the altar of Oswald. The secretarius recovers the casket, which miraculously has been immoveable from the man’s breast. The sacrist reports this at Cuthbert’s altar.</td>
<td>Punitive/theft</td>
<td>Poor man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Robert, son of Wlmer the cook, becomes a thief. He steals dishes etc from the monks’ refectory and tries to take a bell gilded by Turgot but he cannot reach it. He gives up but is soon caught for other thefts and condemned to be hanged. He confesses.</td>
<td>Punitive/theft</td>
<td>Wlmer, cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>In 1165 a poor man comes to Durham to thieve, entering the church with a group of nobles arranging a funeral for a matron from Moorsley. He remains after they are asleep and steals a book from the pulpit and hides. The monks cannot find the book but Cuthbert tells the monk Ambrose where the thief is. He is found, hides again but is found, whipped, and banished from the bishopric.</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Punitive/theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Aelred of Rievaulx is journeying to Cistercium, composing a poem in honour of Cuthbert. On his return with other Cistercian abbots a storm arises but when he completes the poem better weather allows him to cross to England. This is told by Aelred.</td>
<td>Protect/storm</td>
<td>Aelred of Rievaulx Cist Abbots (Aelred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1164 Aelred goes to the land of the picts and is at Kirkcudbright at the feast of Cuthbert. A penitent comes in an iron bond made from his own weapon, He prays to Cuthbert and the bond is released. (cf. 94).</td>
<td>1164 Cuthbert day</td>
<td>Penitent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>In Kirkcudbright a bull is offered to Cuthbert. It is released in Cuthbert’s churchyard, against the advice of older and wiser clerics. One clerk baits the bull, and it goeses the clerk.</td>
<td>Punitive/injury</td>
<td>Clerks (Aelred – see 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>In 1165, Robert fitz Philip is hunting with dogs in Lothian after Cuthbert’s translation feast, and finds a stag which takes refuge in the yard of Cuthbert’s church. The dogs cannot be forced to get the stag.</td>
<td>Cuthbert feast</td>
<td>Protect/sanct Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The stag is tame and people assemble. A man incites another to attack the stag, which is not violent until the man blasphemes against Cuthbert, at which point it goes wild and kills the inciter’s son. The stag leaves the churchyard and is killed by its original pursuers, but when they hear about the child’s death they leave it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuthbert feast</td>
<td>Punitive/death</td>
<td>Blasphemer Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanct</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>The stag’s body, left in a field over winter, has its horns removed by a craftsman but they pour with blood. He cannot clean the blood off and is afraid to be seen as a murderer or poacher so he takes the stag home and hides it. The walls of his house stream with blood the next day and he confesses. This is like Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. It was heard by Aelred who was at Melrose with the Abbot, and was told by Robert, son of Philip the knight, who had married the Abbot’s niece.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abbot of Melrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert son of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip the knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>In ‘temporibus nostris’. Much architectural and bell detail. One night, Æilric, an old fat monk, is sitting at the foot of bell rope, but will not move as the monk tries to ring it. He pulls very hard and it falls where Æilric had been a second before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our time</td>
<td>Protect fr injury</td>
<td>Æilric (old monk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faminus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>In the time of Stephen, Roger Paveie const of Thirsk attacks Durham. Poor people drive flocks to churchyard but William Sergeant’s horse is too slow so he and his flocks are captured. He is put in the stock at Thirsk and asks Cuthbert for help as he had previously worked on Cuthbert’s buildings. Cuthbert strikes Roger ill and, in the guise of a pilgrim, warns him to release William, but Roger cannot get his lord to release him. A man suffused with light appears to William and says he will be his fidejussor. At the same time, Robert Eivile is passing through Thirsk and hears from Walter Eivile that Roger is near death and that Cuthbert has appeared to him to say he will be fidejussor. Robert Eivile releases William to Roger, who frees him. William told the monks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1135x54</td>
<td>Protect/sanct</td>
<td>King Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steph’s reign</td>
<td>Punitive/ill</td>
<td>Roger Paveie,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoke</td>
<td>constable of Thirsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visions</td>
<td>William Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Robert Eivile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Eivile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>In the time of Bishop Hugh du Puiset, William Archbishop of York visits Durham and is shown valuable relics including a book of St Cuthbert, put in the orb by Benedict the sacrist. John the sacrist has never seen it before and wants to touch it but dares not approach. One quiet day, he rushes to the casket without washing his hands, fasting, or putting on sacral robes, and takes the book out. He returns the book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1153x4</td>
<td>Punitive/ill</td>
<td>John sacrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hugh – Bish</td>
<td>Protect/relic</td>
<td>Hugh du Puiset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1153-95; William A’b of Y</td>
<td>Confess</td>
<td>William A’b of Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1141-7 &amp; 1153-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benedict sacrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subprior Alan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but is struck with pains and shivering. He confesses to subprior Alan and recovers after a night in the infirmary. ‘We’ heard and saw (ie. Reginald was a monk by 1153/4).

| 92 | At Whitsun, monks decorate the church. Young men pull the bells but a clapper falls and a youth called Wictred has his skull broken (detail of architecture and bells). A funeral is prepared, but Wictred recovers with a dented head but unimpaired senses. | Whitsun | Cure/skull | Wictred, Dur youth | Durham |

| 93 | In the time of William de Ste Barbe, Robert, brother of sheriff Osbern is attacked. Nobleman Ralph fitz William suspects William miller of Thorp, who is imprisoned in chains. He prays to Cuthbert and the chains are broken but Ralph does not believe it is miracle and ties him in chains again. The third time the chains are broken is Cuthbert’s day. Ralph is told and William is released by Osbern, and the chains given to Cuthbert. Many in Durham witness this (see 49). | Cuthbert day | Invoke Free x3 Offer chains | Robert, brother of sheriff Osbern Ralph fitz William William miller in Thorp (Many in Durham) | Thorp Durham |

| 94 | A pilgrim/penitent who killed a kinsman wears a girdle around his waist made of the offending sword, and it eats into his body. He comes to Durham at Easter time during the episcopate of Hugh du Puiset, and he prays and the band falls off. Many brothers saw this (see 84). | Easter 1153x95 | Penitent Pray Free | Penitent Hugh du Puiset (Brothers) | Durham |

| 95 | Christian, the Durham mint master, rents a mine of the bishop. He finds a person thought to have found treasure which should belong to the bishop and sheriff and others imprison him with heavy chains in the castle, hoping for a share. He invokes Cuthbert and walks free with the chains. Famulus hear of this. | | | |

| 96 | Richard resigns the deanship at Waltham to be Durham monk. He is a sacrist. He cuts a piece from Cuthbert’s robes and sends it to his sisters who are nuns at Chesthunt, near Waltham. A relation, a clerk called Robert, has gout and seeks heavenly help. A boat takes him to the nuns who dunk the cloth in the cup of St Edith. It will not get wet, but Robert drinks the water and is cured in three days. He gives thanks at Durham. Bros H and W confirmed this. | Relic sent Cloth/water Cure/gout Thanks | Richard dean Walth, sacrist Durham Agnes/Edith nuns Clerk Robert (Bros H & W) | Waltham Chesthunt Durham St Edith |

| 97 | Bishop Hugh sends a monk Alan to Perth with relics. A merchant named Robert has headaches. Alan tells him about cloth in which Cuthbert was wrapped, but that he must fast first. After mass the following day, the cloth is put on Robert’s head and he is cured in 1153x95. | Relic sent Cloth Cure/head | Hugh du Puiset Alan monk Merchant Rob | Perth Scotland |
The monk Alan is at Dunfermline on feast of St Margaret. The Dunfermline brothers allow Cuthbert’s relics to be carried ahead of Margaret, and many ornaments are given to Cuthbert. Alan brings forth the relics after mass, and a local demoniac drinks water after the cloth has been dipped in it. The following day, Alan goes to St Andrews. Alan and companions are the source (and for 97 too).

| 98 | The monk Alan is at Dunfermline on feast of St Margaret. The Dunfermline brothers allow Cuthbert’s relics to be carried ahead of Margaret, and many ornaments are given to Cuthbert. Alan brings forth the relics after mass, and a local demoniac drinks water after the cloth has been dipped in it. The following day, Alan goes to St Andrews. Alan and companions are the source (and for 97 too). | 1153x95 | Relics | Alan monk Dunfermline (St Andrews) | St Margaret |

Countess Ada [mother of Malcolm IV and William the Lion] gives much to Cuthbert including Haddington. She is sick on a litter there and cannot get up when Cuthbert’s relics are brought in. She is accused of irreverence and is refused water in which the relics have been dipped, but she explains to Alan that she has an illness of the womb (much detail is given). Her knight goes to Durham to pray, entrusted with her vow and 4 coins. While he is en route she is cured.

| 99 | Countess Ada [mother of Malcolm IV and William the Lion] gives much to Cuthbert including Haddington. She is sick on a litter there and cannot get up when Cuthbert’s relics are brought in. She is accused of irreverence and is refused water in which the relics have been dipped, but she explains to Alan that she has an illness of the womb (much detail is given). Her knight goes to Durham to pray, entrusted with her vow and 4 coins. While he is en route she is cured. | Pre-1178 (Ada d.) | Relics/water Woman Invoke Cure/womb | Countess Ada/Scot Durham | Dunfermline |

Poor parents bring their son, suffering from a tumour around the inner parts of his thigh and groin, to Alan at Haddington. He is cured after the superimposition of cloth.

| 100 | Poor parents bring their son, suffering from a tumour around the inner parts of his thigh and groin, to Alan at Haddington. He is cured after the superimposition of cloth. | Pre-1178 | Cloth Cure/lame | Countess Ada Alan Haddington |

A man in Dunbar, who helps the poor and has rent remitted by Earl Cospatrick, is suffering from a head ailment. His sons purchase a ship in Newcastle and he goes to fetch it but a storm drives him to Farne where Cuthbert tells the brothers of his needs. Cuthbert appears to the man in the guesthouse (that he built with an angel) and tells the man to rest his head where he himself used to. He is cured. The brothers see this.

| 101 | A man in Dunbar, who helps the poor and has rent remitted by Earl Cospatrick, is suffering from a head ailment. His sons purchase a ship in Newcastle and he goes to fetch it but a storm drives him to Farne where Cuthbert tells the brothers of his needs. Cuthbert appears to the man in the guesthouse (that he built with an angel) and tells the man to rest his head where he himself used to. He is cured. The brothers see this. | 1138-66 earl | Storm Vision Cure/head | Dunbar man Bros on Farne (Dunbar) (Newcastle) Farne |

Brother John is in charge of monastery’s external affairs. On his return from Newcastle, the men in his retinue race their horses. John’s horse bolts and falls crushing John’s testicle. He is half-dead, and his testicle is swollen to the size of a pot. Remedies fail but he invokes Cuthbert and bends a penny to offer at Farne. He is cured and tells the tale.

| 103 | Brother John is in charge of monastery’s external affairs. On his return from Newcastle, the men in his retinue race their horses. John’s horse bolts and falls crushing John’s testicle. He is half-dead, and his testicle is swollen to the size of a pot. Remedies fail but he invokes Cuthbert and bends a penny to offer at Farne. He is cured and tells the tale. | Medicine fail Invoke Cure/testicle | John, external affs St Benedict (Newcastle) Farne |

A guard in the bishop’s castle falls from the battlements when drunk. Cuthbert appears and tells the man to abstain, and he is healed.

| 104 | A guard in the bishop’s castle falls from the battlements when drunk. Cuthbert appears and tells the man to abstain, and he is healed. | Vision/warn Cure/fall | Castle guard Widow Holiard Durham castle St Paul |
because he recruited people to get stones for Cuthbert’s church. Cuthbert appears to a widow named Holiard in a vision, to get the guard Hereward to get incense from the sacristan Asketinus, to tell of Cuthbert’s protection. A man told the tale.

| 105 | The Lord of Middleton, Northumbria, is harassing his tenants, particularly a poor man, a devotee of Cuthbert, who is slightly richer than the others. Cuthbert appears and tells the poor man to go to Lindisfarne. The lord pursues him and bars the way across the sands. The man’s wife tells him that it is safer to go to Lothian, but he refuses to go. The man and his people walk with cattle through their enemies, unrecognised, like Jesus, and he lives the rest of his life on Lindisfarne. An ox is offered to Cuthbert. The monks hear of this (cf. 13 and 141). |
| 106 | An example of Cuthbert providing generously to those who are generous. Uctred, the sub-cellarer, is described. The cellarer is desperate when guests arrive after mass and there are no provisions because the suppliers are at a fair in Thirsk, but a pack horse arrives with 6 salmon and other fish. A brother tells the tale. |
| 107 | Elfred and Paulinus, cellarer and sub-cellarer, are efficient but have only a single beer measure left. Elfred commands the dapifer Swanus to give it only to monks but in his absence, a poor man begs for beer and Paulinus insists on distributing it to all; miraculously there is enough for eighteen days. Paulinus, later the subprior told this story often. |
| 108 | A poor, pious man called Sproich, employed by Almoner of Durham to build bridges over Tyne at Bellingham, has a daughter named Ede who is making a dress on the eve of St Laurence’s day and is warned by her mother to stop. She continues and her left hand becomes paralysed. They take her to the local church dedicated to Cuthbert, give her water from the well and spend the night in the church. Cuthbert appears and touches her hand, which relaxes slightly. It is cured when, as the priest Samuel suggests, she repeats the Lords Prayer and an invocation nine times. Cuthbert and Laurence cooperate here. The Priest and the village witness. |

| 109 | Ede marries and the bailiff of earl, (the name Eilaf is written in Punitive/paralyse) |

<p>| 108 | 10th Aug (St L’s Day) | Woman Punitive/paralyse Cure/water Vision/touch Invoke Cure | Almoner Durham Poor build Sproich Dau Ede Priest Samuel (Priest/Spr/vills) | Bellingham Ch St Laurence |
| 105 | Vision/guide Disguise | Lord of Middleton Poor man | Lindisfarne (Middleton, N’br) (Lothian) | |
| 106 | Temp. istis Provide/food (fish) | Cellarer Sub-cell Uctred Prior | (Thirsk) Durham | |
| 107 | Provide/beer | Cellarer Elfred Sub-cell Paulinus Dapifer Swanus Poor man (Paul, then subpr) | Durham | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Margin of MS Hunter 101), demands a donation. Sproich refuses, thinking it is against the law, but a cow is taken by force and stabled in a house in Wark (belonging to Elsi according to the margin). Sproich says Cuthbert will act, and lightning destroys the house except for the barn with the cow.</th>
<th>Lightning</th>
<th>Sproich Elsi (house) Eilaf bailiff</th>
<th>Wark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Walter of Flanders, in same town, steals Sproich’s axe, which was given to him by the Almoner of Durham to help with building. Walter mocks but then the axe head falls onto his companion’s head, and he brains himself with the handle.</td>
<td>Theft Punitive/injury</td>
<td>Walter of Flanders Sproich (Almoner) Bellingham (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Bartholomew on Farne has a tame bird, but it is killed by a hawk when Bartholomew is on a neighbouring island. The hawk is punished by not being allowed to leave. (cf. V.Bart, AASS pp.718-9, Sym. Op. i, p.311).</td>
<td>Punitive/bird</td>
<td>Bartholomew Farne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>A noble son of a priest in Norway is educated in the court of Inge and in a monastery at Steingrave. He goes out drinking, sleeps for two days and wakes with a wobbly head having had a strange dream. His parents seclude him for a year and he loses his speech, hearing and voice. They make him travel with his brother, putting their faith in the saints. They travel to Denmark, Iceland, Frisia etc. a marginal note adds the Scottish islands). After six years, they consult the bishop in Norway. It is only a year after Becket’s death. The bishop advises casting lots to see whether to appeal to Thomas, Edmund or Cuthbert. The sick youth and his brother go to Durham, stay at the hospitale and visit the tomb the next day and the brother speaks to the custos. Prayers are made and the next day the youth can see a little. He spends the night under Cuthbert’s tomb, Cuthbert appears and strikes him with his staff, and the boy can hear (on the day of the Holy Cross). The following night, Cuthbert appears and the boy can speak. It happens in 1172.</td>
<td>Feast of Holy Cross 1172 Punitive/deaf-dumb-blind. Prayers Cure, three-stage Tomb Vision</td>
<td>Noble son priest Bro cleric Norw bish custos (Crt Inge I) (monast Steingrave) (Den,Icel,Fris) (Scot islands) Norway Durham</td>
<td>Thomas Edmund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ernald, from Newton near Durham, is struck with a disease. He visits Godric’s tomb twice but in vain. He is cured on 12th Sept in the Church in Durham.</td>
<td>12th Sept Cure/church</td>
<td>Ernald fr Newton Subprior Newton nr Dur Finchale Durham ch</td>
<td>Godric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>A youth, the son of Roger Fulger, a Cumbrian knight, goes to learn the art of war with Robert de Brus. He falls ill at Newcastle, just before Easter, and is possessed. Thomas appears to the youth’s</td>
<td>Wed 14 June (1172) Vision (Tho&amp;Cuthbert) Cure/possessed</td>
<td>Rog Fulger Cumb kn Youth son Rob de Brus monks (Cumbria) Newcastle Hart</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
servant (and is described minutely), saying the youth should go to him or Cuthbert but the servant says it is too far so the youth relapses. He sees himself prostrate in front of Cuthbert’s tomb with four demons trying to drag him outside. He hides under the tomb and pleas with Cuthbert. A voice replies that he brought the demons in with him. The demons quieten and, from under the tomb, the sick man sees Cuthbert in a window. The man says Cuthbert should drive the demons away – Cuthbert shows him how to and they slink away. The man awakes cured, and goes from Hart to Durham, where he tells the monks and visits Cuthbert’s tomb.

| 115 | A noble woman (Agnes is written in margin) is bled frequently, but something goes wrong. She is half-dead from gout and lumbago. Three friends draw lots to see if they should seek help from Edmund, Thomas or Cuthbert. Cuthbert wins. Her body improves and she rides to Durham to tell the monks, and is cured as she touches the threshold of St Mary’s Church. | Cure/gout&lumb Woman | Noble woman Her 3 friends | Durham (St Mary Ch) Thomas Edmund (Mary) |
| 116 | A cleric, in the service of Becket and then the Archbishop of York, is ill with vomiting, blood-loss and gummed eyes. He goes to Thomas’ tomb at Canterbury and prays for fifteen days. He is not cured as he is not purged of all his sins. He falls asleep at the tomb and Thomas tells him to go to Cuthbert. The man protests saying Thomas is the greatest, but Thomas says he has benefited from him but must seek Cuthbert’s help. The cleric goes to Durham on the vigil of the Ascension with the bishop [Archbishop?] and is cured at Cuthbert’s tomb. He tells this to the chaplain of the bishop. | Vigil Ascen Pray Vision (Thos) Cure/vomit etc | Cleric (Beck & A’b Y) (Chapl of b Durham) | Canterbury (York) Durham tomb Thomas |
| 117 | A Durham monk visits Farne and collects dust ground from a stone miraculously transported by Cuthbert for his house. The dust cures a servant suffering from stomach flux at a home where they are staying. | Dust Cure/stomach | Durham Monk Servant | Farne ‘a home’ |
| 118 | A sheriff of Northumbria suffering from gut problems cannot be helped by Doctors. He makes a vow to Cuthbert, goes to Farne, makes an offering, cries and is cured. | Drs not help Offer Cure/gut | Sheriff N’bria (Drs) | Farne |
| 119 | That sheriff’s wife suffers with yliaca passion (of which there is a detailed description). It is cauterised with twisted horse hair, but her condition worsens. She has an inflamed intestine. Eventually, she follows her husband’s example and is carried to Farne. She goes as far | Woman Offer towel Cure/intestine | Wife sheriff Monk | Farne |
as women may and offers an altar towel and is cured when the brother places it on the altar.

| 120 | A monk dwelling on Farne, obstructed by his feelings, loses his voice but recovers it on invoking Cuthbert, (cf. 76). | Invoke Cure/speech | Monk Farne Farne |
| 121 | A blind woman cannot afford a guide. A vision tells her to flee to the stone cross in Cuthbert’s cemetery. She kisses it and runs into the church. Two men carry her from the church, and she exclaims that she has violated the church, but the red-haired man says he is Cuthbert, tells her to take the halfpenny she has hidden in her wall, buy two candles, offer one to John the Baptist and the other to him at Finchale. They take her from the North to the West door, tell her to look up and she sees a crucifix with blood flowing from Christ’s wounds. She wakes and tells all, and offers candles but is still blind. She goes to church on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary and sees a crucifix in same spot with Cuthbert interceding. She begs passers-by to pray. She recovers sight and brings a stone from river for building Church. | Assump BVM Woman Visions Offer candle Vision Pray Cure Offer stone | Woman poor Passers by Durham: Cemet West door Finchale John Bapt BVM (Finchale) |
| 122 | A youth from the other side of the Wear is attacked by demons on the vigil of Christmas. The demons carry him to other kingdoms. He hears of the cure of the praying woman and goes to same spot [at the west door], throws himself down, offers a candle, and is cured [incomplete]. | Vigil xmas Cure/possessed Youth Other sideWear Durham W door |
| 123 | A woman named Osanna, from Foxton [Sedgefield] is blind in one eye for five years. She goes to the West door, falls, sleeps and is cured. | Woman Cure/blind Woman (Osanna) Foxton (Sedgefield) Durham W door |
| 124 | A woman from Brompton is plagued by a demon striking her and trying to toss her into fire. She heads for tomb of Godric at Finchale and en route, at Thorpe, has a vision saying she will be cured before reaching there. Attracted by the bells on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, she goes to the West wall, prostrates herself and arises cured. | Ass BVM Woman Vision Cure/possessed Woman (Brompton) (Finchale) Thorpe Durham W door BVM Godric |
| 125 | A boy from Berwick in Lothian hears of Cuthbert’s miracles and sets out for his tomb. Struck by dysentery en route, he is cured when he reaches the tomb. He gives thanks and tells the sacrist. | Pilgr Cure/dysentery Thanks Boy fr Berwick (Sacrist) Berwick, Loth Durham/tomb |
| 126 | A man from Rudby falls ill after hearing of his brother’s death around FeastBVM Cured/poison Man fr Rudby Rudby (Cleve) Thomas |
the feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary [8th Sep]. He recovers at the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary [15th Aug] and visits Thomas’ shrine. Around Easter, poison enters veins so he goes to Godric’s tomb but is not cured so returns to Durham where he enters the church, vomits poison and is cured.

127 William the Lion, helping Henry the Young King against Henry II, attacks northern England. The princes of South travel north to stop this. Many commend themselves to Cuthbert, dismounting and disarming before entering the precinct. One man mocks Cuthbert and rides up to the church. His horse falls and throws him into the mud. He is brought to the tomb to apologise and is flagellated.

128 A knight named John de Burdun is appointed by his lord, the Custodian of Castle Donnington. Nobles siding with either Henry II or Henry the Young King are fighting. A plundering party from Leicester castle is attacked by the half-armed garrison at Donnington. John de Burdun pursues fleeing Leicester men but one turns, killing John’s horse and wounding him in the leg with lance. He then receives three wounds to the belly. He is taken home but his life is despaired of. He invokes Cuthbert, sees a wax lance and is cured. He brings the lance to Durham and tells the monks.

129 William the Lion lays waste around Carlisle and people flee. Refugees build straw huts in the churchyard, and hide goods in the church of Cuthbert in Plumbland, Cumbria, including a rich miles called Cospatrick, son of Ulf, who puts money there. Christian enters church with forged keys and steals the money but cannot leave the churchyard. He hides the money in a straw hut but is unable to take out more than a penny. After several days, he tries to spend this in the tavern but the woman rejects it as a coin of the king of Scots. A youth from Cospatrick’s household recognises the coin, tells his lord who checks and notices that money is missing. Christian, the thief, is seized and confesses, but is spared hanging on the plea of Cospatrick, as the parson of the church is Christian’s brother-in-law. Many bring valuables to Cuthbert’s churches.

130 A knight named Ranulf de Capella has toothache. Medicine does no good so he implores Cuthbert at his tomb, touching it with his bad
<p>| 131 | Ranulf, a poor toll-gatherer, and citizen of Durham, has a son with an infected hand. He brings his son to the tomb, the hand is wrapped in Cuthbert’s cloth, and he is cured. He brings a candle as an offering and tells all the custodians. | Cure/toothache | Offer/rotten tooth | Ranulf toll gatherer | Durham/tomb |
| 132 | The Church of Cuthbert at Lytham, Lancashire, founded by ancestors of the knight Richard fitz Roger, is site of many miracles. Richard’s servant Vineth is guilty of an offence and is punished when Cuthbert touches his chin, causing swelling, which is then cured in church by Cuthbert. | Punititive/? | Cure/facial swell | Kn Richard f Rog Servant Vineth | Ch Lytham, Lancs |
| 133 | An officer of Richard fitz Roger is walking in the churchyard at Lytham and finds a sparrow on the ruins of the old altar. He takes the bird but then miraculously cannot leave the churchyard until he returns it. | Punititive/trap | Protect/Bird | Officer of Rich f R Ch Lytham |
| 134 | Richard fitz Roger is presumed to be dying and is carried to Cuthbert’s church by friends and his household. As soon as he is carried in, he recovers. He gives thanks at Durham. | Cure/death | Thanks | Richard f Roger Friends/household | Ch Lytham Durham |
| 135 | Richard fitz Roger’s two-year-old son recovered from mortal sickness after being taken to the church. Richard offers a gold ring at Cuthbert’s tomb. | Cure/death | Offer/ring | Richard f Roger 2 yr old son | Lytham Ch Durham/tomb |
| 136 | Many churches are dedicated to Cuthbert including Slitrig in Teviotdale, a dependency of Cavers (nr Hawick) whose patron Dolfin reports many miracles there. On St Cuthbert’s Day, many gather in the chapel there which has stone walls but has lost its roof. A storm blows up and everyone crowds into the chapel. Snow falls all around but not in the chapel. | Cuthbert day | Protect/storm | (Dolfin) People of Slitrig | Slitrig, Teviot Cavers (nr Hawick) |
| 137 | At another celebration of Cuthbert’s day at Slitrig, two women called Seigiva and Rosfritha from Hawick are present. The candle goes out but another appears. | Cuthbert day | Provide/candle | 2 Women (Dolfin) | Slitrig Hawick |
| 138 | Dolfin’s mother is afflicted by swelling for seventeen yrs. She is brought to Cuthbert’s chapel where he appears, pierces her belly with his staff, releases the poison and cures her. The woman is still alive and is the dairymaid for the Abbot of Jedworth. | Vision/staff | Cure/swelling | Dolfin’s mother Abbot Jedworth (Dolfin) | Slitrig Jedworth |
| 139 | A poor widow near Slitrig keeps sheep but cannot afford a shepherd. | Protect/attack | Woman w sheep | Slitrig |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>A large pack of wolves pursues her sheep, and they shelter in the enclosure of Cuthbert’s chapel. The wolves can go no further and the sheep are emboldened to attack. Likened to David.</td>
<td>Sheep/wolves</td>
<td>(Dolfin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A woman of Raperslaw is crippled from birth and brought to Cuthbert’s chapel. She spends the night there and is cured, although marks of her contraction remain. She offers a sheep to God and Cuthbert, which Dolfin accepts.</td>
<td>Cure/cripble</td>
<td>Woman of Rap. Dolfin Slitrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>William, king of Scots depopulates the north. Hugh Flamang leaves his wealth in Malton, Yorkshire, and flees to Teviotdale in Lothian. He wants to recover his wealth but is afraid to return to Malton. He spends the night in Cuthbert’s chapel to seek counsel. Cuthbert appears to him, tells him to take moss from the stone basin outside the chapel and he will be safe. He takes the moss from the basin, goes to Malton and is not recognised by his enemies. He returns to Teviotdale and thanks Cuthbert, and tells Dolfin, (see 13&amp;105).</td>
<td>Protect Disguise</td>
<td>Will k of Scots Hugh Flamang (Dolfin) Malton, Yorks Teviotdale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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