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In twelfth-century northern England, the historical imagination was dominated by the region’s most powerful and most popular saint. Both the bishops of Durham and the priors of the Benedictine convent attached to Durham cathedral drew on St. Cuthbert’s renowned history and well-established authority to underline their own spiritual legitimacy. Involvement with the saint’s cult was not limited to the ecclesiastical elite or the monks of the cathedral convent, however. Throughout the twelfth century, lay interest in the religious life dramatically increased, and saints’ cults were a popular focus of lay religious energy. Reginald of Durham’s *Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus*, compiled in the 1160s and 70s, provides a richly detailed glimpse of this period when the saint’s miracle working powers were claimed by religious and laity alike. Much scholarly attention has already been paid to the increasing prevalence of pilgrimage to Cuthbert’s shrine in the twelfth century. Pilgrims who visited Durham generally sought miraculous cures for illnesses or injuries, and as we would expect there is a higher proportion of stories about healing miracles in the *Libellus* than in earlier works of Cuthbertine hagiography. But pilgrims were not the only laity who became involved in St. Cuthbert’s cult in the twelfth century. In addition to stories of miraculous healing, Reginald’s *Libellus* contains accounts of the saint arbitrating the conflicts of lay inhabitants of the bishopric of Durham. My research examines these often overlooked “miracles of justice” in order to provide a fuller picture of lay interaction with St. Cuthbert in twelfth-century Durham. I analyze miracle stories involving freeing from false imprisonment; protection of lay interests; and punishment of immoral behavior in order to explore how and why members of every social strata increasingly claimed the patronage of the saint in order to mediate secular conflict. What emerges is a clearer portrait of a distinctive local political and social culture underlined by communal association with St. Cuthbert.
### Abbreviations

**AND**  

**ASC**  

**Cult and Community**  

**De miraculis**  

**DEC**  

**FPD**  
*Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis*, Surtees Society vol. 58 (Durham, 1892).

**HE**  

**Libellus de exordio**  

**VCA**  
*Vita sancti Cuthberti auctore anonymo*: text and transl. in Bertram Colgrave, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert* (Cambridge, 1940).

**HSC**  
*Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*: text and transl. ed. by Ted Johnson South (Cambridge, 2002).

**VCM**  

**VCP**  
Medieval hagiography, or writing about the cult of the saints, has only recently emerged as a source of serious historical inquiry. The genre is hyperbolically reverent, often formal to the point of stylistic rigidity, and its central premise – that its subjects have the ability to actively and conspicuously interfere in the lives of ordinary people - can often seem strange, even alien, to modern sensibilities. Until recently historians were reluctant to rely on hagiographical writings as historical sources, off-put by their dealing with “superstitious” subjects rather than the more rational material that is more easily adapted into historical narrative. As Bedan scholar Bertram Colgrave lamented, “how is it that one [Bede] who is supposed to be our greatest medieval historian can spend so much of his time telling wonder stories?”

For decades, hagiography remained the domain almost exclusively of the Bollandists, an association of Jesuit scholars whose compilations of records about the saints were, although encyclopedic, still driven more by faith than by scholarly inquiry. Academic interest in the cult of the saints did not take off until the last decades of the twentieth century, when there emerged a new willingness to explore alternative methods of recovering historical discourse. Since then, medieval historians have almost universally recognized that hagiography can be uniquely revealing as a source of medieval religious belief and practice. If the full potential for the expansion of understanding promised by medieval hagiography has not yet been realized, it is still true that the questions asked of hagiography have become increasingly nuanced as historians become conscious of both the inherent limitations and the unique promises offered by the genre. Historical inquiries into hagiography have yielded deep new understandings of the experience of

---

1 B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, eds., *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), xxxv. Though he provides an answer to his own rhetorical questioning – that writers like Bede truly believed in the supernatural elements of their religion, and thus should not be looked down on – Colgrave still comes across as truly perplexed by Bede’s preoccupation in the miraculous: “how can a historian expect to be taken seriously who tells [such a] fantastic story?”

medieval religion by subjects both ecclesiastical and lay.

The hagiography of medieval England is particularly rich with historical value. Writing about the saints, produced in both Latin and Old English, was popular throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. Until the Norman Conquest in 1066, most hagiographical writing in England took the form of saints’ lives (vitae) or martyrdom stories (passiones). After the Conquest, however, a new hagiographic genre quickly rose to prominence. Miracle collections eschewed the narrative format of the earlier genres in favor of a more eclectically organized compilation of stories about the posthumous miracles worked by their subjects. The burst in popularity of the miracle collection was both rapid and widespread. According to Rachel Koopmans, the first Anglo-Norman miracle collections appeared in the late eleventh century. By 1240, Anglo-Norman monks had already compiled more than two-dozen collections about the posthumous works of their saintly patrons. Over the course of the twelfth century, collections were written at almost every major shrine in England, as well as at many minor and newly emerging shrines.

Among those saints whose miraculous works were catalogued in the post-Conquest period was St. Cuthbert. Patron saint of the north of England and one of the most popular and most powerful saints to emerge from the Anglo-Saxon period, Cuthbert’s body and cult were settled at the cathedral city of Durham. Reginald of Durham, a member of the monastic community there, wrote his miracle collection, the Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti

---

5 Thus we see collections for SS. Swithin, Aethelthryth, and Edmund, as well as William of Norwich, Thomas Becket, and Gilbert of Sempringham.
virtutibus (Libellus), in the 1160s and 70s. Containing 141 chapters, Reginald’s Libellus is an exuberant celebration of St. Cuthbert’s prowess as well as a detailed portrait of his cult and community in the late twelfth century. Despite the wealth of detail it offers, the Libellus has very rarely been an object of historical inquiry.

Michael Lapidge and R.C. Love dismissed the work as “rather hectic,” and Ronald Finucane did not consider it worth including in his statistical survey of high medieval English miracle collections.

The Libellus thus remains a largely untapped source of detail about the cult and community of the bishopric of Durham in the late twelfth century. Reginald’s collection is particularly useful for what it can tell us about the expanding ability of members of the laity to interact with the cult of the saints. The collection contains miracle stories reported not merely by members of Durham’s convent, but also stories experienced and recounted by members of the community who were not officially affiliated with the cult. By analyzing the types of miracle stories told about St. Cuthbert by the laity, we can gain a more complete picture of the ways that members of all levels of society conceived of and interacted with sanctity.

Some historical attention has already been paid to Cuthbert’s increasingly common role in the twelfth century as a supernatural healer. Stories of miraculous healing reflect both the interest of pilgrims afflicted with illness or malady in seeking out Cuthbert’s curative abilities, as

---

6 Or, the “Small book of the admirable virtues of the blessed Cuthbert.”
8 Lapidge and Love, 262.
well as the desire of the administrators of the cult to collect stories indicative of his sanctity. But Cuthbert’s abilities did not lie merely in the realm of the medicinal. The laity also told stories to Reginald about conflicts between neighbors that the saint had averted, thefts he had recompensed, and wrongful judicial procedures he had righted. Cuthbert was viewed as an arbiter of justice as well as a healer.

This paper will examine Reginald’s “miracles of justice” in order to more fully illuminate the experiences of the laity who became involved with Cuthbert’s cult in the twelfth century. The first part of the paper will outline a brief history of Cuthbert’s cult and hagiography, illustrating the important relationship between historical context and hagiographical content. As we will see, in contrast to earlier periods of crisis, the twelfth century in Durham was a century of prosperity. When Cuthbert’s cult settled at Durham and the reputation of its patron saint grew, the interest of the laity in accessing Cuthbert’s patronage expanded rapidly. Lay involvement in the cult will be explored more thoroughly in part two of the paper, which will break down the various kinds of miracles of justice that appear in Reginald’s Libellus in order to explore more closely what they can reveal about lay conceptions and uses of Cuthbert’s sanctity. Miracles in which prisoners were freed, the morally corrupt were punished, and the devout were protected often also contain details about the social contexts in which such issues arose. Part three of the paper will address this social context more thoroughly, exploring parallels between lay participation in the cult, communal identity, and systems of justice in the bishopric of Durham and in England more widely. What emerges is a picture of twelfth century Durham in which the increasing involvement of members of the community in the cult of St. Cuthbert paralleled, and in some cases informed, a strong sense of local identity in Durham.

---

A Brief History of Cuthbertine Hagiography

Although by the twelfth century Cuthbert’s cult was situated in Durham, it had originated about 140 miles to the north at the island monastery of Lindisfarne. A major site of the reconversion of Northumbria during the reign of King Oswald (604-642), Lindisfarne was one of the North’s most powerful ecclesiastical centers in the early Anglo-Saxon period. Cuthbert was a monk at Lindisfarne during this “golden age” and was renowned for his eremitic lifestyle on the tiny deserted island of Farne. His fame grew, and in 684 he was reluctantly elevated to the bishopric of Lindisfarne, a position he held for two years.¹¹ Cuthbert died shortly after stepping down from the bishopric and was immediately venerated as a saint by the monks of Lindisfarne.

We are fortunate to have three sources from this early period that provide us with an awareness of the inception of St. Cuthbert’s cult. An anonymous monk of Lindisfarne composed a vita of the saint sometime between 699 and 705, which Bede reworked into his own prose life sometime before 721.¹² The third source is Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum (HE), completed in 735, which contains much of the same information as his vita in abbreviated form.¹³ From these works we know not only the broad details of Cuthbert’s life, but also the style of his cult after his death. In keeping with his personality as a monk, a bishop, and a hermit, in the early years of his cult St. Cuthbert was portrayed as a benevolent benefactor. He was credited with a number of healing miracles worked at the site of his tomb and was portrayed as a supernatural protector, particularly of animals, for which he had a special affinity both during his

¹¹ As Bede notes, Cuthbert was actually originally elevated to the episcopate at Hexham, which had been vacated after its previous bishop Tunberht was deposed; however, Cuthbert switched sees with his former abbot and bishop, Eata, to gain the see at Lindisfarne. See HE, IV.28.
¹² Bede also wrote a metrical vitae of St. Cuthbert, but because it is very closely based on the VCP and contains no unique material, it is not being considered separately here. Bertram Colgrave, ed. Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940).
Cuthbert’s beneficent reputation faded somewhat in the centuries that followed. From the mid-ninth century to the early eleventh century the community of St. Cuthbert faced a period of crisis. Repeated Viking attacks on Lindisfarne forced the monks to flee their monastery, carrying Cuthbert’s body with them. The earliest extant post-Lindisfarne source is an anonymously composed work known as the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto* (HSC). The themes and contents of the HSC reflect the very real difficulties faced by the community in the years after the flight from Lindisfarne, as well as the still formidable authority ascribed to St. Cuthbert even while homeless.

The intention of the compiler of the HSC was to protect the community’s landholdings from appropriation by the North’s numerous petty kings and lords. He did so by explicitly linking land claims to miracles worked by the saint. Cuthbert’s miracles in the HSC were no longer the beneficent miracles of his Lindisfarne days; instead, they were vengeful, violent miracles that underlined the saint’s authority and, by extension, the authority of his community. Most of the vengeance miracles of the HSC follow a basic narrative pattern: a local power will attempt to appropriate a piece of land; the community will invoke the saint to protect their lands; and the saint will violently remove the threat. A single example will suffice: when Halfdan, king of the Danes, entered the Tyne river and widely ravaged the countryside, “the wrath of God and the holy confessor fell upon him.” Halfdan began to smell so badly that his army drove him out into exile, and he was never seen again.

---


15 The “History of St. Cuthbert” is edited and translated by Ted Johnson South (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002). Although we are unable to precisely date the HSC, most historians argue that it was a product of the mid-tenth century, added to in stages rather than composed at a single time. See South, 27-35.

After years of wandering, the *congregatio* settled St. Cuthbert’s body and cult first at the small town of Chester-le-Street, and then at Durham sometime in the late tenth century. After the Norman Conquest several decades later, the bishopric and the cult were brought under the leadership of a new Norman administration despite initial resistance in the North to Norman integration. In 1083, William of St. Calais, bishop of Durham, dismissed the *congregatio* of secular clerks that had carried Cuthbert’s body from Lindisfarne and founded a Benedictine monastic community to replace them. This new convent was to be attached to the cathedral and to oversee St. Cuthbert’s cult. Shortly after the foundation of the new monastic community in 1092, Bishop William ordered the old cathedral to be demolished and a new structure to be built in its place.

Our primary source for this period is the *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunelmensis, ecclesie* (*Libellus de exordio*), usually attributed to Symeon of Durham and composed in the period between 1104-1107 x 1115. The Norman Conquest and subsequent restructuring of the episcopal administration had made the last two decades of the eleventh century an important turning point for both the bishopric of Durham and the cult of St. Cuthbert. It was important for Symeon to create a sense of continuity between the convent community recently introduced by Bishop William and the *congregatio* of clerks who had attended

---

17 The term first appears in *HSC* and will be used here to distinguish the community of secular clerks that accompanied the body on its seven-year wanderings from the Benedictine community of monks founded at the cathedral in 1083.
20 Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio*, xlii. The *Libellus de exordio* (“Book of the foundation and course of this church of Durham”) was previously referred to by historians as the *Historia Dunelmensis ecclesie* (“History of the church of Durham”).
Cuthbert’s body for almost two centuries. Symeon did so by predicating the spiritual authority of both bishop and convent on St. Cuthbert’s prestigious history and authority. For Symeon, the “venerable church” of Durham, the new site of Cuthbert’s tomb, was the same church founded by the Anglo-Saxon martyr King Oswald:

“although for various reasons this church [Lindisfarne] 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.”

At the heart of Symeon’s origin story of the cult and bishopric at Durham was the powerful and authoritative saint who imbued his patrons with spiritual legitimacy. The saintly authority that Symeon ascribed to Cuthbert in the immediate post-Conquest period was largely the same style of authority that we saw in the HSC. The Libellus de exordio, like that earlier work, contains many stories of vengeance and protection miraculously enforced by the saint. Cuthbert was the foundational symbol of the bishopric, and as such he was at the heart of Durham’s historical imagination throughout the Middle Ages.

Reginald of Durham: Cuthbert in the Twelfth Century

By the time Reginald composed his Libellus in the 1160s and 70s, the Benedictine community of monks had settled into their convent and into their role as protectors of St. Cuthbert’s earthly

---

21 Libellus de exordio, I.1. “licet enim causis existentibus alibi quam ab ipso sit locata, nichilominus tamen stabilitate fidei, dignitate quoque et auctoritate cathedre pontificalis, statu etiam monachice habititionis que ab ipso rege et Aidano pontifice ibidem institute est, ipsa eadem ecclesiae Deo auctore fundata permanent.” Translation is David Rollason’s.
22 See below, pages 47-48.
23 For example, see Symeon, Libellus de exordio, II.7, 8, 9, 14, 16, and 19.
remains and posthumous reputation. Although Reginald tells us little of his own life, we know from the dating of several miracles in his collection that he had become a member of the community at Durham by no later than the mid-1150s\textsuperscript{24} and that he likely died in the years before the beginning of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{25} He is sometimes referred to as Reginald of Coldingham, suggesting he had a connection to that monastery. In his collection of the miracles of St. Godric, Reginald tells us that he had spent several years living with that saint at Finchdale as well.\textsuperscript{26} The Libellus was written during Reginald’s time at Durham. He began compiling stories in the 1150s or 1160s and had finished the first phase of collection – likely spanning the first 107 chapters\textsuperscript{27} - by 1167.\textsuperscript{28} He completed the work with the addition of chapters 108-141 several years later, no earlier than 1174.\textsuperscript{29} In its completed form, the Libellus contains 141 chapters, all comparatively short. Each chapter tells the story of a single miracle worked by the saint. While some chapters are grouped by theme, site, or date, each story was ostensibly discrete and could stand on its own as a particular example of the saint’s thaumaturgical prowess. Reginald’s material represents an original contribution to the corpus of Cuthbertine writings. Each of Reginald’s stories is a new, unique composition rather than a reworking of earlier

\textsuperscript{24} Many of the miracles he claims to have witnessed firsthand were dated to King Stephen’s reign (1135-54).

\textsuperscript{25} Victoria Tudor argues that if Reginald had been alive during the founding of the priory at Finchdale in 1196, it would be very surprising he didn’t attend given his close ties with the house there. Victoria Tudor, “Reginald of Durham and St Godric of Finchdale: A Study of a Twelfth-Century Hagiography and his Major Subject,” Unpublished PhD Thesis (University of Reading, 1979).

\textsuperscript{26} See Tudor’s PhD thesis, ibid., for greater detail about Reginald’s life.

\textsuperscript{27} Sally Crumplin argues that the two phases of composition are divided between chapters 107 and 108 on the basis of changing patterns of verbal orientation. Although chapter 112 is the first to mention Thomas Becket (who was martyred in 1170), Crumplin groups miracles 101-7 together on the basis that they all have highly verbose, verbally ornamented chapter headings, which contrast with the chapter headings of miracles 108 onwards. See Sally Crumplin, “Rewriting History in the Cult of St. Cuthbert,” 203-4.

\textsuperscript{28} In the introduction to his work Reginald dedicated his collection to Abbot Aelred of Riveaulx, who died in 1167.

\textsuperscript{29} The second half of composition was begun after the martyrdom of Thomas Becket in 1170 and was completed no earlier than 1174, the year in which Henry II captured King William the Lion of Scotland. Reginald refers to William’s invasions in the past tense.
Reginald’s time at Durham coincided with a period of prosperity and power for the bishopric and convent at Durham. Bishop Hugh du Puiset (1154-1195), whose episcopate encompassed Reginald’s career, was for the most part a capable administrator and a strong advocate for his bishopric whose forty-two-year tenure meant that the see was not disturbed by sudden changes of leadership. If as a major magnate of the king he was perhaps more interested in political wrangling than pastoral care, Hugh nevertheless patronized multiple cultural projects during his years in office. His crowning achievement was the construction of the Galilee chapel in Durham Cathedral, which was highly innovative in architectural terms when it was first constructed. The literary arts also flourished at Durham during the twelfth century. Bishop William of St. Calais, Hugh’s predecessor, donated at least forty-six volumes to the library, while a mid-twelfth century book list contains details about more than four hundred volumes held by the library. The lavishly illuminated volume of Bede’s prose life of St. Cuthbert, produced at Durham sometime in the twelfth century, provides material evidence of

---

31 As G.V. Scammell writes, the cathedral chapter “was then at the height of its literary and intellectual distinction, magnificently housed in one of the most superb churches of western Christendom, and endowed with the enormous prestige of the name of Cuthbert and the wealth of a patrimony containing the best part of the one-time kingdom of Northumbria.” G.V. Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, Bishop of Durham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 92.
32 Although in his political career Hugh did experience conflict with King Henry II when he was suspected of supporting the revolt of the Young King Henry’s in 1173, as well as with William de Mandeville, with whom he initially shared the position of justiciar before being pushed out in 1190. See Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, chapter 2.
33 Hugh, a member of the house of Blois, was a nephew of King Stephen and Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester. Scammell tracks his involvement in Plantagenet politics in detail in Hugh du Puiset, chapter 2.
34 Ibid., 112-113. Hugh also oversaw several construction projects in the city itself, including the construction of the New Bridge, now Elvet Bridge and the rebuilding of Durham Castle, which had been heavily destroyed by fire early in his episcopate. Ibid., 111.
the vast resources of Durham’s scriptorium. Hugh himself patronized at least one writer, the chronicler Roger of Howden, while bishop of Durham. The twelfth century would have therefore been a highly germane time for Reginald to find support his collection, or for such a work to be commissioned by a powerful bishop like Hugh du Puysct.

While the HSC was compiled during a period of crisis and the Libellus de exordio during a period of transition, Reginald’s Libellus, in contrast, was composed during a period of stability and prosperity. No longer was the saint called on to protect contested lands. Victoria Tudor and Sally Crumplin have emphasized the decline of Cuthbert’s reputation for vengeance and violence in the twelfth century as the necessity of active saintly protection diminished. Instead Tudor and Crumplin emphasize the presence in the Libellus of a type of miracle that reflects the more settled nature of the cult in the twelfth century. The healing miracle, which had not appeared with any frequency in the HSC or the Libellus de exordio, is a beneficent miracle type that contrasts with Cuthbert’s earlier acts of violence. Crumplin sees in Reginald’s healing miracles the effect of increasingly formalized canonization procedures on the desire of the cult’s administrators to bring their saint in line with current modes of sanctity. Other historians, most notably Ronald Finucane, have analyzed healing miracles – common to English miracle collections in the twelfth century – as a symptom of the increasing popularity of pilgrimage in that period. Healing miracles were most often worked for pilgrims who traveled to the saints’ shrines seeking a supernatural answer for their maladies. Pilgrimage promised increases in both profit and prestige for the administrators of cults, who were increasingly eager to attract the laity

---

36 The origin and provenance of Oxford, University College MS 165 is unknown and still debated, although Lawrence-Mathers makes a very strong case for its creation at Durham. Ibid., 89-108.
37 Scammell, Hugh du Puysct, 146-8.
39 Cumplin, “Rewriting History,” 197-201. According to Cumplin, “the key to this [canonization] was the demonstrability of sanctity; the result was hagiography rich in miracles with visible, tangible results.”
40 Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims.
to their shrines. In England, pilgrims flocked to popular national shrines such as that of St.
Edmund of Bury and Thomas Becket at Canterbury, while further abroad, Pope Urban II first
called Christians to a martial pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1095.41

The pilgrims who prayed for healing at saints’ shrines were primarily members of the
laity who were not in any official way affiliated with the cult. The twelfth century was in fact a
period of rapidly increasing interest on the part of members of the laity in their own spirituality
and religious identity.42 The Church increasingly sought to engage the laity on a wider scale even
while remaining cautious about the incursion of the illiterati into sacred spaces.43 As the
popularity of pilgrimage indicates, the cult of the saints was a frequent lens through which lay
religious interest was focused. Reginald’s Libellus reflects this trend. While the miracle stories
recorded in earlier centuries were peopled almost exclusively by members of the congregatio or
of the convent, roughly 70% of the stories in Reginald’s Libellus involve participants who were
not in any official way affiliated with the cult.44 The work done by historians such as Tudor and
Crumplin has already highlighted the importance of pilgrimage in boosting lay interest in
Cuthbert’s cult throughout the high medieval period. But the stories of miraculous healing only
comprise about one-third of the chapters of Reginald’s Libellus.45 Among the many remaining
chapters are those telling another kind of story. These are stories about miracles involving acts of
vengeance and protection, punishment and conflict resolution. They too are important evidence

41 Colin Morris points out that crusaders “almost invariably saw themselves as pilgrims,” and that some
crusade chroniclers, including Albert of Aachen, structured their accounts of the crusades around a
Becket to Bunyan, edited by Colin Morris and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2002), 1-2.
42 André Vauchez, The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices (Notre
Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), chapter 2.
43 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
of lay participation in the cult, but until now they have been largely overlooked by Cuthbertine historians.

Stories of saintly justice in the *Libellus* are similar to but distinct from the earlier “stories of vengeance” that characterized the *HSC* and the *Libellus de exordio*. While earlier miracles of vengeance were worked to protect the *congregatio* from acquisitive secular powers, Reginald’s stories, in contrast, very often involved the local laity as both subject and perpetrator. The themes of the later miracles reflect this shift. Reginald’s miracles deal with a wide range of mundane issues that would have been at the heart of the laity’s concerns: issues of pillaging, petty theft, dowry, land ownership, and poaching all make an appearance in the *Libellus*. These stories are generally connected in that they deal with issues of justice. They suggest that Cuthbert was invoked by the laity not only as a supernatural healer, but also as an arbitrator of conflict. By performing a close reading of these so-called miracles of justice, we can gain a fuller picture of the ways that the laity conceived of and utilized Cuthbert’s sacred authority in the twelfth century, as well as the ways that the religious administrators of the cult began to involve the laity in acts of devotion and miracle-recording at this time.

**Miracles of Freeing, Miracles of Protection, and Miracles of Vengeance**

In order to more easily explore the various themes and circumstances of the wide variety of miracles of justice in Reginald’s *Libellus*, I have divided the stories into three general categories, including miracles of freeing, miracles of punitive protection, and miracles of vengeance. While these categories are of course artificially imposed, they can nevertheless greatly abet our task of seeking cohesive meaning in an otherwise chaotic setting.

As we explore each of the three categories, the focus will remain on the major
participants in each case; the issues that inform the miracle; and how each individual story is reflective of the local social context. Several broad themes will emerge from this analysis. We will see that Cuthbert’s patronage as an arbiter of justice was accessed throughout the twelfth century by all levels of lay society, but was most frequently drawn on by minor landholders. Local parish churches will appear both as boundaries of sacred space in which miracles could be worked, and as loosely connected networks through which information about the saint was diffused. Finally, as we will see, interaction between the laity and the cult was not one-sided, but existed in a sort of “sacred economy” in which both sides had responsibilities toward and expectations of the other. The laity of the bishopric of Durham increasingly drew on this sacred economy in the twelfth century to negotiate their personal problems as well to address their spiritual needs.

**Freeing Miracles**

In chapter 49 of the *Libellus* Reginald declares that “bonds of iron do not bruise or constrain those devoted to St. Cuthbert.” He backs up his confident statement with the evidence of seven miracles that tell the stories of people who were wrongfully imprisoned and who, after continuous prayer and invocation to St. Cuthbert, were miraculously freed from prison by the saint. Righting wrongs is hardly an unusual role for a saint, and freeing the wrongly imprisoned is a standard hagiographical trope. But stories of freeing in the *Libellus* go beyond conventional claims to righteousness and contain details about the real contexts behind their standardized
hagiographical veneer. Six of the seven freeing miracles can be dated to Reginald’s own lifetime. In these stories we get a glimpse not only of the perpetrators of false incarceration – many of whom are public officials who also appear in contemporary records – but also of the local landowners who made up the majority of the victims. Each of the freed prisoners in these stories were laymen, and their stories of miraculous freedom were underwritten by more mundane conflicts that reflect their secular interests. These kinds of miracles therefore provide strong evidence that by the twelfth century certain segments of lay society had begun to treat Cuthbert as a patron and as a procurer of justice in a wide range of circumstances.

Each of the perpetrators of wrongful imprisonment in Reginald’s freeing miracles are local officials, servants either of the king or of the bishop. Several of these figures also appear in records from the period, broadening our contextual knowledge of the situation. In chapter 49, the perpetrator of wrongful imprisonment is a high sheriff of Durham named Osbert who also appears as a witness in many of the episcopal charters from the period.48 A nephew of Bishop Ranulf Flambard (1099-1028), Osbert was referred to in charters as both “my nephew” (nepoti meo) and as “sheriff” (uicecomite); unfortunately, these charters are difficult to date, so we cannot form a confident estimation of the beginning of his career beyond a terminus post quem of 1122.49 Osbert’s career as sheriff appeared to continue after the death of his uncle, and his last appearance in the charters is c. 1148-9.50 Although Osbert was guilty of wrongfully imprisoning an innocent man to prison, Reginald’s overall assessment of his job performance was in fact

49 The first reference to Osbert as sheriff is unfortunately difficult to date, but H.S. Offler narrows the potential range down to 1122-28. DEC, 87-8.
50 DEC, no. 39.
quite positive. In Reginald’s view, Osbert was simply too efficient an enforcer of the law. 51
Reginald writes that Osbert was scrupulous about arresting wrongdoers, whether common or
noble, and that during his time in office crime almost completely disappeared from the
bishopric. 52 Due to his zeal, an unfortunate mistake was made, but once St. Cuthbert had made
the mistake clear, the sheriff released the wrongly accused man and even informed the convent at
Durham about the miracle. 53 Osbert’s continuing closeness with the cult is further suggested by
the fact that in 1146 he bequeathed the church at Middleham to the monks of the Durham
convent. 54

Reginald does not similarly spare the reputation of the perpetrator in chapter 50, whose
career also overlapped with his own. Roger Conyers was the son of a prominent local magnate
by the same name. 55 Bishop William de St. Barbara appointed the younger Roger Conyers as
locum tenens of the see of Durham for the period following his death in 1152, granting him the
office of constable of Durham and custody of the keep of Durham castle. 56 As Reginald tells us,
Roger took advantage of the dearth of episcopal oversight after William’s death to plunder the

51 Reginald, Libellus, chapter 49: “Nam injuriam facientibus, judicii querelam, pupilli et advenae
querimoniam justiciar medeari satagebat, aequum aquarenes, suspecta discutienis, recta pro intellectibus
exsequens, vindictam pro viribus exercens…Dei nutu, justi etiam in hac vita sine criminis conscientia
aterrim permittuntur.” “For he hurried to rectify injuries through his labors, to resolve grievances in court,
to resolve the complaints of locals and foreigners with justice; striving for what is right, striking down
suspects, shrewdly seeking out what is right, exercising vengeance with strength…with God’s permission,
even the just, who lived lives free of complicity in criminal activities, were allowed to be worn down.”
52 Ibid.: “Quo terrore, malivoli infraenati, maligni mansuetudinem simulat, et rapinae saevitiam
represse, et furandi audiatiam coeperant sub caeca cordis latebris sepelire.” “Due to fear, the ill-
intended were bridled, and spitefully imitating peace, they began to repress the cruelty of plunder and to
lock up the effrontery of pillage in the dark shadows of their heart.”
53 Ibid.: “Qui utrasque bajulans humeris, multo stipate agmine, Sancti Cuthberti mangnalia protestantibus
ad pii Confessoris sepulcrum processit, ipsasque, cum multa devotionis exultation, ibidem ad hujus
miraculi testimonium obtulit.” “Bearing both [of his fetters] on his shoulders, he headed for the
54 DEC, no. 35.
55 Roger Conyers the elder appears as a witness in a number of episcopal charters and appears to have
been enfeoffed with a large number of properties by Bishop Ranulf Flambard (1099-1128). After Ranulf’s
death, Roger Conyers appears to have held the same office of locum tenens that his son would hold a
generation later. See DEC, 77-8.
56 Ibid., no. 41.
region under his protection. While Reginald stresses the lawlessness of the waning years of Stephen’s reign throughout England in general, he suggests that the problems were particularly severe in the bishopric of Durham, where “Roger exercised his authority freely, completely disregarding the evidence of those who censured him.” Roger used his authority to “oppress the powerless under his yoke and redirect many [of the resources] of those subjected to his dominion to his own gain as it pleased him.” Two of those who experienced persecution at his hands were the yeomen Orm Anglicus and William Walleis, whom Roger came across in a forest and wrongly accused of poaching. He imprisoned them in Durham castle without a trial, where they surely would have faced death if Cuthbert had not answered their prayers for deliverance.

The amount of local detail in most of Reginald’s freeing miracles suggests that they are more than stock hagiographical stories. In addition to providing us with a more colorful glimpse into the careers of several local officials active in the bishopric of Durham during Reginald’s lifetime, the freeing miracles can also provide a general portrait of the supplicants who claimed to have experienced the miraculous liberation of the saint. Most of the victims of false imprisonment in the *Libellus* came from a similar social background. All were laymen and most were minor landholders in the bishopric: Reginald writes that the unidentified subject of chapter 46 “held a small parcel of land free from all service,” while he records that William Seargant, a
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57 Reginald, *Libellus*, chapter 50: “ca nimirum tempestate, raptores lata strage Angliam depopulaverant, et unusquisque invidus alterius persecutor, et oppressor, et aemulus, facile inveniri potuerat. Nam de jure nichil stabat; lex ad potentioris velle parebat; subire erat judicium, cui non erat subventionis auxilium.” “Without doubt, during that tempestuous time robbers violently pillaged England far and wide, and every malevolent persecutor of another, and every oppressor, and every rival, could easily be found.”

58 Ibid.: “eo igitur licentia potentiae voluntaria exercuit, quo correptoris argumentum penitus ignorant.”

59 Ibid.: “impotes subjugando oppressit, et ad sui dominii libitum multa subjiciendo inflexit.”

60 Ibid., chapter 90.

61 Ibid., chapter 46: “qui modicum agrorum partem ab omni servitute pene liberam habuit.”
landholder from Harburne, had “forty cows and a hundred sheep.” Reginald claims that William and Orm, the victims of Roger Conyers, had entered the forest in which they were apprehended in order to herd their cows.

When the victims of incarceration are unidentified, Reginald routinely stresses their poverty. More than anything this seems to be a hagiographical commonplace, as Reginald always takes the opportunity to expound on the saintly virtue of aiding the poor or to praise the special piety of those who are “rich in faith but poor in wealth.” It is also possible that the subjects of some freeing miracles did in fact belong to the lower levels of lay society, but that Reginald was for some reason disinclined to record the personal details of the impoverished. Whatever the reason, the discrepancy between the recorded social situations of the identified and the unidentified victims of false imprisonment raises the interesting question, which will be further explored in part three of this paper, of which strata of lay society were able to claim Cuthbert’s patronage.

The central conflicts in the freeing narratives reflect the concerns of the lay landowners who are the stories’ subjects. Each freeing miracle involves a secular, rather than a spiritual, conflict. Chapter 50 was instigated by an accusation of poaching and chapter 93 by a charge of assault. Land ownership could also start a conflict requiring the intercession of the saint, such as in chapter 46, in which a rival slanders the unnamed supplicant in order to claim the land he
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62 Ibid., chapter 90: “Willielmus, Sergeant cognomento, exstitit, qui cum bobus xl’a et centum ovibus de agris ad cymiterium, quod est in Sedberuie, quam citius potuit, properavit.” “There was a man named William Seargant, who hurried to the cemetery in Sedbury as quickly as possible with his forty cows and hundred sheep.”

63 Ibid., chapter 50: “veprium inter opaca venatum quaereret, accidit ut duos errantes per saltus nemorum obviam compersisset, quos vel bestarium ibi jugulum quaerere.” “While [Roger] was hunting among dark thorn-bushes, it so happened that he found two men wandering through the thick pathless forest who were actually seeking to yoke their animals.”

64 Ibid., chapter 46, “fide quidem dives sed divitiis pauper.”

65 See pages 35-6 below.
would have forfeited had the accusations not been rebutted. William Seargant was a victim of pillaging; he was driving his livestock towards safety at the church at Sadberge when he was apprehended by Roger Paveie. Finally, in chapter 95, the unidentified victim had discovered a trove of treasure, causing the mint master of Durham to attempt blackmail by imprisoning him in Durham castle.

Chapter 90 provides a useful example of the often explicitly legal overtones miracles of freeing could contain. After being captured and placed in the stocks by Roger Paveie, constable of Thirsk, William Sergeant used the patronage of the saint as leverage to negotiate a power struggle among a hierarchy of local authorities. After his capture, William prayed for help to Cuthbert, who “struck Roger Paveie with a serious illness.” Cuthbert then appeared to Roger and warned him that “you will never be able to fully heal from this illness unless you have first strived to restore the servant of the blessed Cuthbert to him.” However, Roger’s lord Robert Eiville, master of the castle, forbade William’s release and restitution.

As Roger languished with illness, Cuthbert appeared to William Sergeant and promised to help him litigate his freedom: “Cuthbert, to whom you often pray, and to whom you used to give your obedience by leaving rich offerings at his church, does not now wish to disappoint you. Rather he will be your fidejussor.” Shortly after Cuthbert promised to act as William’s surety in
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66 Reginald, Libellus, chapter 46: “cui quidam aemuli ipsius, objectis falso querelis, conanti sunt terram simul et armenta praeripere.” “He had certain rivals who tried to seize both his land and his livestock by throwing out false accusations.”
67 Ibid., chapter 90.
68 Ibid., chapter 95: “Hic quondam miserum forti tu repperit, de quo fama vulgaverat quod thesaurum aliquem reperierit, et penes se in occulto detinuerit.” “In Durham he once came by chance upon a poor man who people said had discovered some treasure and was secretly hiding it for himself.”
69 Ibid.: “Igitur Beatus Cuthbertus, solitae pietatis non oblitus, statim Cnostabularium illum, Roger Paveie, gravi infirmitate percussit.”
70 Ibid.: “Nec unquam tu ab hae infirmitate poteris convalescere, nisi prius Beato Cuthberto servum suum entiaris restitutere.”
71 Ibid.: “Sed Cuthbertus, quem saepius invocasti, et cui quondam in operibus ecclesiae suae servitutis obsequium impendisti, nunc tibi deficie noluit, sed fidejussor tui.”
the case of a trial, Robert Eiville, Roger’s lord, passed through Thirsk. When he heard that Roger was near death and that Cuthbert had promised to be William’s fidejussor, Robert agreed to release William. As soon as William was freed, Roger’s illness was cured.

William Seargant claimed the patronage of the saint as his fidejussor based on his previous knowledge of Cuthbert’s reputation and abilities. He had internalized the idea that Cuthbert’s patronage could be used to negotiate a difficult situation in which he was being denied access to the proper channels of justice. In addition, William’s claim would not have been effective in earning him his freedom if Roger Paveie and Robert Eiville did not have the impression that it would be unwise to contradict Cuthbert’s authority.

Whether they gained their freedom by declaring Cuthbert’s patronage, like William Seargant, or whether they saw some retroactive advantage in claiming that the saint had played a part in their exoneration, by the twelfth century local laymen had begun to associate St. Cuthbert with the ability to intervene in secular affairs. His was an increasingly common voice in the administration of justice. As we will see, Reginald’s miracles of justice suggest not only the issues negotiated through association with Cuthbert’s cult, but also common channels through which miracles were claimed and reported.

**Punitive Protective Miracles**

From the ninth century onwards, Cuthbert had gained a reputation as a particularly vengeful saint who was violently protective of his community. Despite the saint’s increasing tendency towards beneficent miracles in Reginald’s Libellus, and despite Victoria Tudor’s claim that Cuthbert’s severe side revealed itself far less frequently in the Libellus than in earlier works, Cuthbert does in fact appear to have retained his strict reputation throughout the twelfth century. In the Libellus
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Reginald records over thirty stories about punitive miracles.\textsuperscript{73} These acts of vengeance were no longer intended to secure Durham’s claim to patrimonial estates. Instead, as with the freeing miracles, they involved the laity in large proportion and were thus often focused on common lay concerns. Whereas punitive miracles worked for the benefit of the convent always took place at the cathedral, miracles worked for the protection of the laity indicate the extent to which Cuthbert’s cult had become diffused among the north of England by the twelfth century. Though lay miracles often took place far from cult centers, many were clustered at small parish churches throughout the bishopric of Durham and beyond, suggesting the importance of sacred space in the miracle narrative as well as a primary channel through which oral stories about Cuthbert’s reputation were circulated.

Reginald’s stories of vengeance can be roughly divided into those that have a protective component and those that are purely vengeful. The former category, comprised of about twenty-three chapters, clearly displays Cuthbert’s protective power. Cuthbert’s mode of protection in the \textit{Libellus} is almost purely reactive. He retroactively punished injuries against his “protectees,” rather than preemptively preventing the injury from occurring.\textsuperscript{74} Reginald’s \textit{Libellus} leaves the reader with the impression that Cuthbert was not hesitant to use considerable force to avenge wrongs done to his devotees. Punishment meted out in the \textit{Libellus} ranges from humiliation to disfigurement and even death, though the latter penalty was generally reserved for the morally bankrupt.

Roughly half of the punitive protective miracles in the \textit{Libellus} involve the participation of the Durham cathedral convent. The majority of these miracles deal with instances of theft,

\textsuperscript{73} Crumplin, “Rewriting History,” 258.
\textsuperscript{74} T.B. Lambert, “Some Approaches to Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages,” in \textit{Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages}, ed. by T.B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009), 1-18. As Lambert writes, “it is the penalty that underwrites the efficacy of the protection, not any direct use of force.”
echoing the earlier protection miracles worked to preserve community property. The religious appear both as perpetrators and as victims of theft. In chapter 35, a priest in Durham cathedral attempted to steal a penny from Cuthbert’s altar. He adhered to the altar cloth and was unable to move until he confessed and repented. In chapter 56, an unidentified man attempted to steal the abbot of Furness’s horse, but, as in chapter 35, the would-be thief stuck to the horse and was unable to carry out the theft. Narratives of punishment for theft are fairly generic in the *Libellus*, as are the consequences. When convent members are overcome by covetousness, adhesion to the desired object is a common punishment that is rescinded only with confession and penance.75

As we would expect, the protective miracles worked for the benefit of the convent community all take place at Durham cathedral. The stories involving the laity, however, were much more widely diffused throughout the bishopric of Durham. Devotion to the saint had spread broadly throughout the north of England by the twelfth century. Tudor calculates that of 118 miracle narratives in the *Libellus*, only 54 take place in the city of Durham itself.76

Reginald’s punitive protective miracles are particularly illustrative of the geographical diffusion of identification with the cult. Four stories took place at Lindisfarne, which by the 1120s had acquired a cell of monks attracted to the site of Cuthbert’s original hermitage and to the promise of an ascetic life similar to the one the saint had led four centuries ago.77 The Cistercian monks of Furness Abbey in Cumbria venerated St. Cuthbert, contributing two miracles to Reginald’s collection.78 Miracles also took place at six parish churches in the north of England and
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75 See Reginald, *Libellus*, chapter 35, 56.
77 The cell at Lindisfarne was refounded by a monk named Edward in 1093 or 1094. *Libellus*, chapter 21: “unde et novam ecclesiam in Beati Cuthberti honorem infra praedictam insulam a fundamentis erexit.” “On this site on the previously mentioned island, from the old foundations, he raised a new church dedicated to the honor of St. Cuthbert.” See also Offler, *DEC*, pg. 93, who suggests that Edward was the monk of Durham whose name appears in the *Liber Vitae*.
southwestern Scotland: Ardene in Warwickshire; Lixtune in Chesire; Kirkudbright in Scotland; Billingham in Northumberland; Plumland in Cumbria; and Lytham in Lancashire.\textsuperscript{79} These parish churches were only some of many dedicated to St. Cuthbert by the end of the twelfth century, and as we will see, local churches played an important role in spreading the veneration of the saint.\textsuperscript{80}

Churches provided convenient spatial boundaries for the rapidly expanding sense of sacred space associated with the saint. Sacred space is an important element of the medieval cult of saints because the saints’ bodies and relics represented a physical point of connection between heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{81} Like other cults of its time, the cult at Durham had acted out the spatial primacy of the body and tomb by performing a translation ceremony in 1104. Cuthbert’s body was moved from the old church into the newly constructed cathedral, both affirming the significance of his remains and confirming his bodily incorruption.\textsuperscript{82} The translation ceremony was given secular as well as spiritual weight by the attendance of soon-to-become King Alexander I of Scotland.\textsuperscript{83}

Because the cathedral was the site of Cuthbert’s tomb after 1104, it served as the primary demarcation of the sacred space associated with Cuthbert’s cult. Like many contemporary cathedrals and churches, Durham cathedral served as a sanctuary that offered refuge to convicted criminals. The nested zones of fines for breach of sanctuary indicate how sanctity increased with proximity to the tomb: fines were lowest within a vaguely defined radius surrounding the church,

\textsuperscript{79} Reginald, \textit{Libellus}, chapters 65; 68, 71, and 72; 85; 110; 129; and 133; respectively.
\textsuperscript{80} A.H. Thompson, “The MS list of Churches Dedicated to St Cuthbert,” \textit{Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeology Society of Durham and Northumbria}, 1\textsuperscript{st} series 7 (1934-6).
\textsuperscript{81} Vauchez, \textit{The Laity in the Middle Ages}, 88.
\textsuperscript{82} Reginald devotes several chapters in the \textit{Libellus} to Cuthbert’s incorruption, reporting that the saint’s body was as fresh in 1104 as it had been upon the day of his death in the seventh century. See \textit{Libellus}, chapter 40-3.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{De miraculis}, chapter 7.
and they increased as one entered the walls of the church, then again as one entered the choir. Someone who broke sanctuary at the altar or at Cuthbert’s shrine forfeited their life.

Chapters 60 and 61 of the *Libellus* illustrate the power of St. Cuthbert’s protection within his sanctuary as well as the severity of his vengeance when that sanctuary was violated. Reginald tells the story of a murderer who fled to Cuthbert’s tomb in the cathedral to seek sanctuary. While he was praying there, two relatives of his victim came upon him and broke Cuthbert’s sanctuary: “continually striking him about the head, they gave him eleven very serious wounds, each one of which could have brought death to any living thing.” The monks were shocked and angered by the violence of the attack, and although they believed he would die, Cuthbert healed the mortally wounded criminal, whom he then pardoned. The men who violated the sanctuary did not escape unpunished. One of the perpetrators, apprehended in a village near Durham, was thrown into prison where he was “tortured with a horribly conceived sort of death.”

The parish churches at Ardene, Lixtune, Kirkcudbright, Plumbland, and Lytham served as boundaries of the sacred space associated with St. Cuthbert in much the same way that the cathedral at Durham did. The churches and churchyards acted as smaller sanctuaries at which victims of pillage could seek refuge. In chapters 65, 90, 129, and 141 we have examples of local laity like William Sergeant driving their livestock towards the safety of the churchyards. In chapter 65, pillagers broke into the churchyard where the locals’ livestock were being held, violating Cuthbert’s sanctity in order to pray upon his devotees. Like the violator of sanctuary in

---

87 Ibid.
chapter 61, the pillagers were killed for their infraction. “Soon, excited from all of this [confusion] and roused from their torpor, some leapt into the middle of the fire, others swam across the river; many, rising up against each other and thinking that they were mutual enemies, killed each other by piercing them with their swords. Thus, within the space of an hour, not one of them was still living.”

The local laity and their livestock were not the only beneficiaries of Cuthbert’s protection within the bounds of the church. Throughout the Middle Ages, Cuthbert was uniquely associated with animals. In perhaps the most famous story told about the saint, two sea otters attended to him after he spent a night in prayer half-submerged in the sea. After his death, animals that entered Cuthbert’s churchyards received his protection in the same way as the people who took refuge there. There are seven stories in the Libellus that involve vengeance for injuries caused to animals under Cuthbert’s protection, and Reginald records one chapter in which a hawk itself was punished for harming another bird within the churchyard.

While the cathedral at Durham and the parish churches dedicated to St. Cuthbert throughout the north of England provided clear spatial demarcations of Cuthbert’s protective power, identification with and veneration of the saint was not limited to these areas and in fact seems to have been widespread throughout the bishopric of Durham. Two of the most intriguing punitive protective miracles in the Libellus are interesting precisely because of their mundanity. They do not take place at a church or involve the disruption of sacred space. The issues at stake
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89 Ibid., chapter 65: “Unde mox excite, et stuporis nimietate confuse alii in mediis ignibus insiliebant, alii per aqueae alveos enatabant, nonnulli contra seipso insurgent et hostium cuneos esse putantes mutuo alternis confossi gladiis interibant. Ita igitur infra unius horae spatium, nec quidem unus superfuit.”
91 Reginald, *Libellus*, chapters 68, 72, 83, 87, 88, 111, 133, and 139.
92 Ibid., chapters 68, 72, 83, 87, 88, 111, and 133.
93 Ibid., chapter 111.
are commonplace and at first glance do not seem to logically relate to St. Cuthbert or his cult. Instead, chapters 109 and 110 illustrate the sense of a close personal relationship that a local layman, Sproich, felt towards the saint. Reginald tells us that Sproich was a poor but pious laborer who worked on the bridges over the Tyne at Billingham in Northumberland. When Sproich’s daughter Ede was betrothed, a local bailiff demanded a donation (donativum) from her family. Sproich refused, saying that such a donation was against the law, and in his anger the bailiff stole one of Sproich’s cows. Sproich prayed to Cuthbert for assistance: “Because I am weak, holy confessor Cuthbert, and you pity and aid all those who pray to you, exact swift revenge for the injury I suffered today…bring forth the quick punishment of your fury on that place where my cow is hidden.” Cuthbert answered Sproich’s prayer by striking the bailiff’s house and barn with lightning. The cow was unharmed as the barn burned down around it.

Chapter 110, which also involves Sproich, gives an example of a conflict between two laymen negotiated by the saint. An inhabitant of Billingham named Walter of Flanders stole an axe belonging to Sproich. Once again Sproich prayed to Cuthbert for vindication and again Cuthbert answered his prayer. He appeared before one of Walter’s friends, dropped the axe on the man’s head, and killed him. Walter understood the message and quickly returned the axe to its rightful owner, “and the great glory of St. Cuthbert was made unmistakably clear to all.”

Sproich’s two miracles of vengeance are a long way from the accounts of ruined kings and tides of battle turned in the HSC and Libellus de exordio. At stake is not Cuthbert’s patrimonial land or the fate of the convent, but rather the extortion of a local official and the theft
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94 Ibid., chapter 108.
95 Ibid., chapter 109: “Quia ego non valeo, Sanctus Confessor Domini Cuthbertus, qui omnibus se invocantibus subvenit et miseretur, ipse hodie meae injuriae ультor festinus efficiatur…et in loco, quo vaccam meam praecuzzerit, celerem vindictam tui furoris effunde.”
96 Ibid., chapter 110: “Securis itaque illa domino suo statim reddita est, et magnifica Beati Cuthberti gloria cunctis manifestius perlata est.”
of a hand tool. Although they appear mundane, Sproich’s miracles in fact reflect the close personal relationship he felt with the saint as well as the kinds of justice he expected Cuthbert to mediate. Though both the audience and patrons of Cuthbert’s cult had shifted by the twelfth century, the sense of vengeance associated with the saint had not. His vengeance was merely manifested in new ways that reflected the new significance of the laity in the cult. The final category of justice miracles we will consider, which encompasses those miracles of vengeance that lack a protective component, further illustrates the relationship that had developed between the cult, St. Cuthbert, and his lay devotees by the end of the twelfth century.

_Vengeful Miracles_

In the _Libellus_ Cuthbert worked punitive miracles not merely to protect his patrons, but also to punish them. The laity were the primary participants in vengeful miracles, as they were in the two categories previously explored. Again, through a close reading of this category we are able to discern the concerns of the laity who were involved in vengeful miracles. The basic structure of the vengeance narrative allows us to more closely examine the relationship that existed between the saint and the devotee. When Cuthbert enacted miraculous vengeance without the instigation of his patrons, he did so either to punish egregious offenders of God’s law or secular laws, or to rebuke otherwise pious devotees who had strayed from the path of morality. However, when Cuthbert punished an otherwise devout patron by causing them bodily harm, he would often heal their miraculously inflicted ailment after they had shown proper penitence. While Cuthbert exacted payment for wrongs, he also recognized moral reformation. In rare occasions, laypeople rebuked the saint himself when he failed to fulfill his obligations. Reginald’s vengeance miracles therefore provide a useful illustration of the mutual “sacred economy” that
existed between saint and devotee in the twelfth century.

Punitive miracles often involved the saint’s interference in the workings of the justice system. For example, the stories in chapters 24 and 57 were instigated by instances of perjury. Chapter 24 involves two laymen, one the servant of a northern nobleman and the other a young friend, who were visiting the fair at Durham in the hopes of selling a hunting horn. They concocted a scheme whereby one, pretending to be a traveler passing through the town, would extol the quality of the hunting horn in the hopes of driving up its price. The plot involved falsely swearing on St. Cuthbert, which, as Reginald warns his reader, “raises God’s anger and offended indignation.” Predictably, the perjurer was punished for his offense. He went blind and did not regain his sight until he prayed in Cuthbert’s church. Reginald writes that the story took place during his lifetime (modernis temporibus), and that it was reported to him by the intended victim of the offenders’ scheme, Prior Robert of Nostell.

Chapter 57 also deals with perjury and is particularly interesting because it provides an example of the judicial practice of ordeal by combat. The subject of the story is unidentified but was said to come from the small vill of Norham. Being accused and in fact guilty of committing a crime, the man nevertheless professed his innocence to a secular tribunal (seculari judicio) and was committed to purgation by combat. Reginald tells us that it was “common practice at that time” to make a profession of innocence upon a cross before undergoing the ordeal.

Unfortunately for the accused criminal, he made his profession upon a relic of the saint, a cross at the church at Norham that had been carved from a table where Cuthbert had eaten his meals.
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97 Ibid., chapter 24: “Dei iram et suae indignationis offensam incurrit.”
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., chapter 57: “Seculari judicio praeordinante, praefinitum est quondam in regione de Northam, quasi se expiaturum ab impetito crimine, certamina dira committere.” “Ordained by a secular tribunal, a certain man in the region of Northam was decided to be committed to an ill-omened combat, as though to atone for his accused crime.”
100 Ibid.: “de more caeteris hactenus usitatio.”
while living as a hermit on Farne. The criminal made his perjured oath on the relic, and “at once his right eye, propelled by divine justice, fell to the floor.”

Undeterred by this inauspicious sign or the fact that he was no longer able to clearly see where he was going, he proceeded to his trial, which took place at a vill called Midhop. There Cuthbert worked his justice. The perjurer’s opponent “pierced him through with the sharp point of his lance, and he did not give him a favorable wound, for, struck by that blow, he breathed out his life.”

Reginald reports that Suanus, a priest at Fishwick, was responsible for relating the story to the monks at Durham.

As these stories of perjury and vengeance suggest, Cuthbert acted not only as a protector of his community, but also as a moderator of moral behavior. His punishment for impious acts could be either fatal or redemptive. Although both perjurers committed the same offense, only one was given the chance to repent, though it is true that the criminal’s moral scorecard was weighted more heavily against him by his previous wrongdoing. In fact, more acts of saintly punishment in the *Libellus* ended in penitence than death, particularly when the offenders were devotees of the saint. In chapter 108, Ede, daughter of Sproich, continued to sew a dress on the eve of St. Lawrence’s feast day despite the warnings of her mother. Ede was punished for laboring on a holy day when the fingers on her left hand became contracted and paralyzed. In search of a cure, her parents took her to the local church at Billingham, which was dedicated to St. Cuthbert. Ede drank the water from the well there and, while spending the night in the church, she was visited by the saint himself, who touched her hand. As Reginald writes, “her hand was in this way completely cured from all its pain and weakness.”

Cuthbert similarly punished and then forgave the sins of a devotee in chapter 17. Walter,
who was a parishioner of Kellow during the episcopate of William Rufus (1133-1140), spent one evening drinking with the local priest. On his walk home, a demon disguised as a large black dog approached him and jumped into his mouth, taking possession of him. Walter’s brother took him to the cathedral at Durham to seek a cure. Although the sacristan Alred suggested several herbal remedies, none of these treatments was successful. Finally the Durham monks decided to give Walter a few drops of the water used to wash Cuthbert’s body during the translation of 1104 to drink. The washing water was effective in exorcising the demon, and Walter was cured. Similarly, in chapter 112, a Norwegian nobleman who suffered blindness, deafness, and muteness after a night of imbibing was cured only after spending three night at Cuthbert’s tomb. On each night, the bishop appeared to him and cured one of his maladies, and on the fourth day, the Invention of the Holy Cross, he was completely cured. The cured man then related his story to the large group of people gathered in the church for the celebration of the holy day: “led in front of the people, he told them in the tongue of the Romans about his series of maladies and cures.”

As these examples suggest, many stories in which a devotee of the saint was punished for immoral behavior often have a healing element as well as a vengeful element. Their healing narratives are very similar to the stories told about miraculous cures worked for pilgrims. Proximity to the saint’s tomb, his relics, or to the sacred space within a church is important for the working of the healing miracle. As in many other healing narratives, the recipients of cures for miraculously inflicted maladies often remained physically marked in some way after they
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Ibid., chapter 112: “In die itaque sollemni inventionis Sanctae Crucis, conflucentibus populis, cappa indutus in choro ecclesiae cum ipso cantore ante gradus, “Kyrieleyson” celebrius decantavit; et postmodum productus coram populo, ipse lingua Romana, quam quondam didicerat, omne infirmitatis suae seriem et curationis, exponebat.” “Therefore on the sacred day of the discovery of the Holy Cross, with the people gathering together, he wore a cloak and, in position before the cantor in the choir of the church, he chanted the Kyrie Eleison; and afterwards, led in front of the people, he told them in the tongue of the Romans, which he had once learned, about his series of maladies and cures.” Reginald records that the miracle took place in the year 1172.
were healed. In chapter 17, after Walter’s demon was exorcised, his mouth, where the demon entered, “was always stretched more widely than is customarily seen in other men.” In chapter 68, the fingers of a young boy who attempted to take a crow from the yard of Cuthbert’s church in Lixtune were bent around a wooden peg he was holding. When he was cured, his little finger remained bent as a sign of his breach of Cuthbert’s authority (*pro signo suae temeritatis*).

Reginald’s vengeance stories were therefore often neither purely harmful nor purely beneficent miracles. Instead they involved a dialogue between the saint and patron in which moral shortcomings were negotiated. Rather than dividing these stories along a dichotomy of harmful or helpful, punitive or protective, it is often more useful for us to consider the relationship between the saint and the community as a sort of sacred economy in which both parties had mutual responsibilities towards the other. When these responsibilities were met, both sides benefited; but when one side was lax in their duties, they were susceptible to punishment. Patrons of the cult venerated the saint with prayer, votive offerings, commemoration of certain days, and occasional pilgrimage to his tomb. In return they could call on the protective powers of the saint, on his healing abilities, or on his ability as an arbitrator of personal conflicts or as a moderator of difficult legal situations. When they overstepped the bounds of morality or in some way offended the saint, Cuthbert retaliated; but in most cases, this punishment was rescinded once sufficient penitence had been demonstrated.

Devotees could also rebuke the saint if they felt he had failed in his obligations towards them. Chapters 75, 76, and 78 in the *Libellus* contain accounts of lay reproach of the saint. In chapter 75, a knight named Harpin of Thornley was approaching the shore of England in a ship.
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105 Ibid., chapter 17: “Semper tamen et adhuc etiam in viventi atque superstite oris latitudo diffusius protenditur quam in alio hominum videri consuetudinis habeatur.” “However, even until now, the width of his mouth while living was always stretched more widely than is customarily seen in other men.”

106 Ibid., chapter 68.
when a storm arose. As the ship, weighed down with marble intended for the floor of the cathedral, tossed in the violent waves, Harpin was forced to throw his horse overboard to prevent the ship from sinking. When he reached the shore, Harpin rebuked Cuthbert for having failed to calm the sea, a responsibility the saint had fulfilled in several earlier chapters: “behold, bearing the burden of your stone, I drowned my horse in the sea; you have returned me, trusting in you alone as a protector, from being a knight to being a footman.”107 Two days later, Harpin’s horse swam ashore, perfectly healthy. Though examples of saintly rebuke are few in the Libellus, they indicate the reciprocal nature of the relationship between the saintly patron and his devotees. The obligations between the two parties were not one-sided, but ran both ways.

Lay interaction with St. Cuthbert within this “sacred economy” was largely a product of the twelfth century. Stories involving miracles worked for the laity were very sparse even in Symeon of Durham’s chronicle, written in the first decade of the twelfth century. By the 1160s and 1170s, however, roughly half of the stories in Reginald’s Libellus were focused on the interests of the lay community.108 Wider shifts in English hagiographic themes, as well as local historical trends, can go some way to explaining the drastic shift in hagiographical content over the course of a century. But we have not yet fully explored the situation of the lay community itself throughout the period under consideration. Why might non-religious members of the community have considered it increasingly useful to ally themselves with a well-known saint? How did knowledge of Cuthbert’s prowess become so widely diffused? And what implications might widespread knowledge of and interaction with the saint have on how local community was defined and negotiated?

107 Ibid., chapter 75: “Ecce enim equum meum, tui lapidis exportatorem onerarium, jam mari suffocasti; et in te solo protectore confidentem de equite peditem reddidisti.”
St. Cuthbert, the Haliwerfolc, and Local Community in the Bishopric of Durham

Having examined individual stories of lay interaction with St. Cuthbert in Reginald’s *Libellus*, it is useful to now take a broader look at the saint’s role as a lay patron within the bishopric of Durham. Cuthbert’s lay patrons were not a geographically nor a socially homogenous group. The sites at which miracle stories in Reginald’s *Libellus* occurred suggest that in the twelfth century devotion to St. Cuthbert remained a primarily northern phenomenon.\(^{109}\) However, long distances separated areas of inhabitance within the bishopric of Durham. A vill in the south of the bishopric would not have had contact with – or even likely awareness of – another small vill along the Scottish border. Participation in Cuthbert’s cult was therefore diffused within a large region. Similarly, lay devotion to the saint spanned social strata. Robert fitz Roger, a local knight who patronized the convent community and eventually became a monk at Durham,\(^{110}\) did not have much in common with Sproich, the bridge builder from the town of Billingham. Yet both men had essentially the same expectations of the saint in terms of miracle working abilities and both viewed his patronage as an important tool of conflict negotiation. Where did this commonly held idea come from, and how had it become so pervasive by the twelfth century?

St. Cuthbert was at the heart of the historical imagination of the bishopric of Durham. He was the city’s founding father, in both a mythological and a real sense. Symeon of Durham recorded the popular legend about the settlement of the city by the *congregatio* in the tenth century and the subsequent growth of the town around the church they built. According to Symeon, when the *congregatio* left Chester-le-Street, they intended to return to Lindisfarne and
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\(^{109}\) Fewer than ten lay supplicants in the *Libellus* live south of the Humber or outside of England. A series of miracles takes place at Lixtune, in Cheshire – see *Libellus*, chapter 68-72; a noble leper generically associated with the south of England is cured at Cuthbert’s tomb – see *Libellus*, chapter 19; and three additional supplicants come from Lincoln, Norwich, Waltham, and Norway. See *Libellus*, chapters 25, 63, 96, and 112, respectively.

so headed north. When they reached the small peninsular hill that would become the site of Durham castle and cathedral, however, they were physically unable to move Cuthbert’s coffin any further, and realized that they had reached the site where they needed to make their new home.\textsuperscript{111} The site of the future city was likely uninhabited when the \textit{congregatio} arrived, or was very sparsely populated.\textsuperscript{112} The city quickly grew up around the twin edifices of the castle and the church.\textsuperscript{113} Uhtred, heir to the earldom of Northumberland, showed a particular interest in abetting the construction of the Durham’s defensibly well-situated castle, suggesting that the \textit{congregatio}’s motivations for choosing that particular site may have been as political as they were supernatural.\textsuperscript{114} However, it was the administrative needs of the cathedral that led to the growth of a large, cleric-staffed bureaucracy within the city, and it was on land gifted by the convent that the town’s large market was founded.\textsuperscript{115}

Inhabitants of the bishopric of Durham were frequently known throughout the medieval period as the Haliwerfolc, or “people of the saint.”\textsuperscript{116} However, gauging any sense of communal identity in the twelfth century, whether predicated on identification with the saint or otherwise, is unfortunately nearly impossible. The vast majority of the population did not leave any written evidence of their sense of their place within a community. The term “Haliwerfolc” was used by political and ecclesiastical elites to refer to both the community and the territory within the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{111} Symeon of Durham, \textit{Libellus de exordio}, III.1.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Although Symeon gives the impression that the site of the future city was uninhabited when the \textit{congregatio} first arrived, as Margaret Bonney shows, it is difficult to know whether this was necessarily the case. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle suggests that there was some sort of ecclesiastical center existent at Elvet in the eighth century, though whether it survived the Viking onslaught is impossible to know. Margaret Bonney, \textit{Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords 1250-1540} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 13; and \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}
\item \textsuperscript{113} According to Symeon, the first non-\textit{congregatio} inhabitants of Durham first appeared in order to help construct the churchn chapter \textit{Libellus de exordio}, III.2.
\item \textsuperscript{114} Bonney, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{116} On the difficulty of defining the term, see Holford and Stringer, 39-40. For contemporary uses of the term, see Reginald, \textit{Libellus}, chapter 90; \textit{DEC}, no. 10, 11, 12, 13, etc.
\end{itemize}
bishopric of Durham, but whether the term was known and used among the people it referred to is beyond our knowledge. We can, however, examine how St. Cuthbert’s renowned history was invoked in connection with various institutions in the bishopric of Durham in order to form a more confident speculation about where local knowledge of the saint’s character and abilities came from.

The Haliwerfolc

The stories in Reginald’s *Libellus* indicate that people from every level of lay society had become involved in Cuthbert’s cult by the twelfth century. Either end of the social spectrum could call on the saint’s patronage, as chapter 77 indicates. The story involves a *pauper*, begging for alms at Durham cathedral, who approached a devout local knight (*miles*) named Robert fitz Roger, whom he mistook for the *secretarius*. Robert prayed to the saint to provide some sort of alms, and at once a coin appeared on the pavement, which he gave to the beggar. Lower-class and non-noble laity appear in other miracle stories as well. Sproich the bridge-builder obviously felt a close enough relationship with the saint that he contributed three stories to the *Libellus*. Merchants were also common claimants of the saint’s beneficence, particularly when threatened by storms at sea.

The most common lay participants in the miracle stories of the *Libellus* were, however, landholders. As we have already seen, most of the recipients of freeing miracles were landholders and the circumstances of their incarceration often involved land coveted by a local official. The frequency with which pillage appears in protective miracles suggests its

118 Ibid., chapters 108-110.
119 Ibid., chapters 23, 30-33.
120 See pages 17-18 above.
significance to the lay devotees who sought to protect their livestock by driving them to
churchyards. ¹²¹ Several of Reginald’s stories also suggest that some local nobles and officials
maintained a relationship with the convent and cult, whether for spiritual reasons or otherwise.
Sheriff Osbert, who appeared in chapters 49 and 93, granted the church of Middleham to the
cathedral convent. ¹²² Similarly, Robert fitz Roger founded a church at Lytham that he dedicated
to St. Cuthbert and granted to the prior and convent of Durham, and which Reginald claims was
the site of multiple miracles. ¹²³

Local parish churches formed the center of religious life for most of the Haliwerfolc. As
we saw above, the boundaries of parish churches formed essential sacred spaces at which the
saint’s miracles were frequently worked, suggesting the connection in the minds of the laity
between their churches and the powers of the saint. ¹²⁴ The churches are also where formal
devotion to the saint took place. Christopher Hohler, investigating church services used at
Durham for the worship of St. Cuthbert during the post-Conquest period, was able to find a
multitude of services, some of which were used for daily prayer by the monks, others of which
were used for weekly votive masses, and one that was used during Cuthbert’s annual festival. ¹²⁵
Reginald provides a description of a local celebration of Cuthbert’s festival (March 20) at the
church at Slitrig in Scotland. According to him, the local priests always held a large celebration
in honor of the saint’s festival, when, “for the day of blessed Cuthbert, many people came
together in that place, and lit candles they had brought with them along the walls of the church in

¹²² *DEC*, no. 35.
¹²⁴ See pages 30-33 above.
their devotion, and said prayers.”¹²⁶ The celebration at Slitrig lasted for eight days, during which locals of all ages participated in nighttime vigils and singing.

Jean Scammell estimates that in the twelfth century there were over 150 parish churches in the bishopric referred to in writing, and that there had likely been many more in addition to these.¹²⁷ Roughly half of these churches were owned by the religious - either the bishop of Durham, the cathedral convent, or another local monastic house.¹²⁸ The role of the priory or the cathedral in managing parish churches, even those they owned, would have nevertheless been slight. At most the bishop occasionally appeared as a mediator in disputes over the rights to tithes and dues from local churches.¹²⁹ The large number of local churches in and around the bishopric of Durham would have therefore formed a very loose network, often disrupted by distance, remoteness, or local interest.

Nevertheless, involvement with the cult of St. Cuthbert was a voluntary association widespread throughout the bishopric and the north of England. As we have seen, it provided the laity throughout the region with a “negotiating community” through which to settle disputes, dispute injustices or claim legitimacy.¹³⁰ Orally transmitted personal stories about interactions with the cult and benefices received from the saint likely permeated the north of England.¹³¹ These stories would have been told and retold at churches and other public locations and, as the existence of Reginald’s *Libellus* attests to, they often made their way to the cathedral and convent. Just as importantly, the monks considered the laity an important enough part of the cult

¹²⁶ Reginald of Durham *Libellus*, chapter 136: “propter diem Beati Cuthberti, illo convenientibus multis in unum, multi infra capellae parietes accensis luminaribus secum pro devote allatis, orationibus vacabant.”
¹²⁸ Ibid., 97., Scammell calculates that approximately forty belonged to Durham, fourteen to Tynemouth, six to Carlisle, two to St. Mary’s, and two to Hexham.
¹²⁹ Ibid., 119-20.
¹³⁰ Yarrow, 13-23.
¹³¹ Koopmans, chapter 1.
that they felt it necessary to record their stories, which were poorly represented in existent Cuthbertine writings, for posterity.

In Reginald’s *Libellus* we glimpse the result of an increasing tendency on the part of the Haliwerfolc, in all levels of society, to see the working of the saint in their own lives. Cuthbert’s reputation for vengeance, punishment, and the arbitration of conflict was well established, and not surprisingly it was these themes that often appeared in the laity’s stories. As we have seen, however, Cuthbert’s vengeful character did not remain static throughout the medieval period. Reasons for claiming his patronage, and the ways in which his authority was enforced, changed with the times. In the twelfth century, Cuthbert’s history and authority were increasingly claimed as support for the establishment of local judicial powers. As we shall see, the increasing frequency of justice miracles paralleled the growth of local jurisdictional rights, and both phenomena were predicated on the saint’s authority.

*The Liberty of Durham*

The lord bishops of Durham were simultaneously ecclesiastical administrators of the bishopric and major magnates of the king. The ecclesiastical seat at Durham had originated within the *congregatio* that settled there in the tenth century, and throughout the medieval period the bishops continued to draw on their connection to the original *congregatio* as source of legitimacy. In documents and charters recording the bishops’ political ambitions, the see’s relationship to the prestigious history of the saint is often referenced as a source of temporal as well as spiritual authority. Nowhere is this strategy clearer than in the bishops’ gradual accumulation of local judicial liberties. Over the course of several centuries, the lord bishops
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132 See pages 7-8 above.

133 Reference to the saint in episcopal charters was a common practice throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. For example, *DEC*, no. 7, 9, 12, 14, etc.
consolidated their claims to jurisdictional immunity from the king’s courts. The formal recognition of these rights in 1295, when the bishopric gained the title of a County Palatinate, distinguished Durham as the most powerful of medieval England’s many franchises.\textsuperscript{134}

By 1302, the franchisal rights of the bishopric of Durham had become so extensive that Bishop Antony Bek could claim that “there are two kings in England, namely, the lord king of England wearing a crown as a symbol of his regality, and the lord bishop of Durham, wearing a mitre in place of a crown as symbol of his regality in the diocese of Durham.”\textsuperscript{135} Since the mid-twentieth century, historians have continued to debate the actual extent of the lord bishops’ rights and exemptions. Mid-century historians, most notably Jean Scammell, argued for the limitations of franchisal liberties and stressed the increasingly centralized control of the crown.\textsuperscript{136} More recent historians have leaned in the other direction. M.L. Holford and Keith Stringer have questioned characterizations of the medieval English “state” as monolithic, instead emphasizing the distinctiveness of local governmental and judicial systems within the broader framework of the crown’s rule.\textsuperscript{137} Christian Liddy has likewise stressed the strength of the local community in the bishopric of Durham and the importance of judicial liberties, as well as identification with St. Cuthbert, in shaping the sense of community.\textsuperscript{138}

It can be particularly difficult to analyze the extent of local jurisdiction in twelfth-century Durham. Formal codification of the bishoprics’ specific rights did not appear until the end of the
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thirteenth century, and until then liberties were more customary than official. Bishop Hugh du Puiset, capable administrator and politician that he was, won important concessions from the crown that helped define the extent of the bishopric’s later rights. Though he claimed these concessions in the name of St. Cuthbert, they were primarily the result of his own political abilities and ambitions. Durham had been free of comital interference since 1095, when Robert de Mowbray, earl of Northumberland, forfeited his lands and titles after rebelling against King William II, but in 1189 Bishop Hugh purchased the earldom for himself. He administered Northumberland until 1194. In 1189 Hugh extended the episcopal lordship of the bishops of Durham to the wapentake of Sadberg, which he purchased from the crown. In addition to extending the rights associated with his office, Hugh also effectively limited the authority of the king within the bishopric. The king’s justices only visited Durham once, in 1166, and that visitation only took place with the bishop’s consent. The bishop had his own court where he was able to hear pleas of the crown and which was in later centuries fairly well utilized by the local inhabitants of the bishopric. Durham residents rarely appeared in the court rolls of Henry II and Richard, however, because rolls of the Durham county courts did not appear until the early fifteenth century, our knowledge of the courts’ popularity in the twelfth century will remain unable to ascertain.

With the exception of the wapentake of Sadberg, the lands that formed the liberty of Durham were well defined by the beginning of Hugh’s episcopate. The rivers Tees and Tyne formed definitive northern and southern boundaries for the bishopric of Durham. According to
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141 Holford and Stringer, 21.
142 Scammell, Hugh du Puiset, 191.
143 Ibid.
144 Holford and Stringer, 59.
historical legend, the land between Tees and Tyne had originally been jointly granted to the
congregatio by Guthred, Viking king of York, and Alfred the Great of Wessex.¹⁴⁵ Both of these
men were indebted to Cuthbert for miracles he had worked in their favor. According to the HSC,
Guthred was a former slave who was raised to the kingship upon instructions given by St.
Cuthbert in a vision.¹⁴⁶ Alfred also reportedly had had a vision of the saint, which inspired him to
victory at Ethandune the next morning.¹⁴⁷ In fact, the accumulation of the lands that would come
to form the bishopric of Durham was a lengthy and gradual process. The HSC, which is our
primary source regarding this process, intersperses formal records of landholding with
hagiographical material. It records the development of historically apocryphal stories about St.
Cuthbert’s role in gaining and defending land for his community.¹⁴⁸

The HSC therefore reflects an early association between the lands held by the
congregatio and the authority of the saint whose remains the clerics protected. As we have seen,
miracles in the HSC that defended claims to landholdings were often vengeful, and violently or
even fatally so. These are some of the earliest examples of Cuthbert’s growing reputation as a
powerful saint whom the wise were careful not to cross. Symeon, in his chronicle, drew on and
expanded this characterization of the vengeful saint. He made claims for the exemptions of the
bishopric from the king’s authority that were predicated on the saint’s authority. Symeon wrote
his chronicle between 1104 and 1107, and his recollections of the brutally destructive Norman

¹⁴⁵ The HSC and the Libellus de exordio only record the grant made by Guthrum of the land between the
Wear and the Tyne; the accretion of the land between Tees and Wear appears to have been more
piecemeal in reality. See Holford and Stringer, 45. For the references to Guthrum’s grant, see HSC,
chapter 13 and Libellus de exordio, II.13.
¹⁴⁶ HSC., chapter 13. The HSC appears to be the earliest source of the legend that Cuthbert appeared to
Alfred before his famous victory. The story of Alfred’s vision is repeated in later sources, including the
Libellus de exordio (II.10); the Miracula sancti Cuthberti (miracle 1); and the Historia regum (I.76 and
III.96). William of Malmesbury also repeats a version of the story.
¹⁴⁷ Ibid., chapter 16. Although the author refers to a victory won by Alfred at an unidentified location
called Assadune, this was apparently a mistake and we can assume the author meant Ethandune.
¹⁴⁸ See page 6 above.
conquest of the North a generation earlier provide vivid examples of the saint’s support of his community against the authority of King William I. Symeon claimed that Cuthbert had interceded in 1069, when William’s army, marching north to Durham, was forced to retreat at Allerton due to a thick fog called down by the saint.\footnote{Symeon of Durham, \textit{Libellus de exordio}, III.15.} The threat posed by the advancing army, however, caused the community of St. Cuthbert to take flight to Lindisfarne with the saint’s body in tow. Cuthbert eased their passage when he pulled back the tide so that the group, which included many “of the weaker sex and of tender age,” could reach the island.\footnote{Ibid.}

Symeon records several stories in which St. Cuthbert rebuffed the attempts of King William to extend his authority in the bishopric after his subjugation of the North. In 1172 William stopped in Durham while returning south from his campaign in Scotland. The king expressed doubt as to whether Cuthbert’s incorrupt body lay in the church at Durham and in his anger threatened the lives of “the most noble and most senior” of the bishops and abbots attending him if his suspicions were proved correct.\footnote{Ibid., III.19.} However, the king “was not permitted to harm the people because God prohibited him from doing so,” and Cuthbert struck him with a debilitating fever.\footnote{Ibid.: “populum Deo prohibento ledere non permittebatur.” Translation is David Rollason’s.} William fled the city at a gallop, not easing his pace until he had passed over the Tyne. The next story Symeon tells is very similarly themed. When William sent a tax collector named Ranulf to collect customs in the bishopric, Cuthbert appeared to the man in a dream, struck him with his crosier, and “rebuked him with episcopal authority and with a threatening countenance that he should have dared to have come there to afflict his people.”\footnote{Ibid., III.20. “auctoritate pontificali et uultu minaci increpauit, quod illuc ad populum suum affligendum ausus fuerit uenire.” Translation is David Rollason’s.}

As stories about the saint’s vengeance spread, so too did the idea that Cuthbert was a
characteristically – and violently – protective saint. Cuthbert quickly developed a reputation for authority, and the bishops of Durham were not hesitant to frequently draw on his reputation to legitimate their consolidation of liberties for their see. This is the same saintly authority that the laity in Reginald’s *Libellus* invoked when they called on the saint to settle a dispute, or overturn their unlawful imprisonment, or punish someone who has done them wrong. Written and oral records of the invocation of Cuthbert’s authority proliferated in the twelfth century, both among the political elites and the lower classes. In this way, the growth of franchisal rights in the bishopric of Durham paralleled, if not affected, the increasing popularity of stories about miracles of justice. Both phenomena are clear indications that by the twelfth century, the patronage of the saint was no longer the exclusive claim of the monks of the convent. Just as the Haliwerfolc were the people of the saint, Cuthbert had become a saint of the people.

**Conclusion**

Like the bishopric of Durham’s jurisdictional liberties, Cuthbert’s reputation as an arbiter of justice seem to have been largely unique in twelfth-century England. While miracle stories involving the laity were committed to writing with increasing frequency throughout the century, miracles of justice were relatively rare outside of Durham. Almost all of the miracles worked by St. Etheldreda for the laity were miracles of healing. Thomas of Monmouth, in his *Life and Miracles of William of Norwich*, recorded several freeing miracles and vengeance miracles. The majority of William’s miracles were, however, standard healing narratives. In his early twelfth-century history of the miracles of St. Edmund of Bury, Hermann claims that the
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154 Koopmans, chapter 1.
saint interfered in the legal disputes between Abbot Baldwin and Bishop Herfast; however, this judicial involvement was internal to the cult, rather than claimed by the laity.\textsuperscript{157} Finally, Thomas Becket’s cult at Canterbury was famous primarily for its popularity with pilgrims, most of whom sought cures. While St. Thomas’s many biographers did record a few justice miracles,\textsuperscript{158} most of the emphasis was placed on his exceptional healing abilities.

Cuthbert’s hagiographers, including Reginald, seem assured in their saint’s primacy north of the Humber. Even in the increasingly competitive atmosphere of twelfth-century English sanctity, Reginald appears unconcerned by potential competition between Cuthbert and other popular saints of the time.\textsuperscript{159} Although Reginald often compared Cuthbert’s miracle-working abilities to those of other English saints, his comparison was always confident and never defensive.\textsuperscript{160} The \textit{Libellus} was not composed as an attempted justification for the saint’s continued relevance, as some historians have suggested.\textsuperscript{161}

Instead, Reginald’s work, like so many of the English miracle collections of the high medieval period, appears to reflect a genuine desire on the part of their monastic compilers to record in writing as many miracles worked by their patrons as possible. Osbern of Canterbury,

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{157} Yarrow, \textit{Saints and their Communities}, chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{159} Thomas Becket, who would obviously have provided the most strenuous competition for any English saint, was martyred in 1170, after the composition of all but the final chapters of Reginald’s \textit{Libellus}. Chapters 108-141 of the \textit{Libellus}, apparently added after 1170, potentially illustrate Becket’s impact on English hagiography in that they almost exclusively contain healing miracles and make several references to the cult at Canterbury.
\textsuperscript{160} For example, see Reginald, \textit{Libellus}, chapters 19, 46, 112-16, 124, and 126.
\textsuperscript{161} Though Tudor confirms Cuthbert’s dominance throughout the twelfth century, she suggests that “the rise of the Canterbury cult in particular spelt the end of the peak in Cuthbert’s popularity.” Dominic Marner is more negative, calling Cuthbert “a saint of a bygone era” and stating that the Durham monks, baffled by the “new age” of the twelfth century, struggled to keep up with the other English cults. Tudor, \textit{“The Cult of St Cuthbert in the Twelfth Century,”} 467; Dominic Marner, \textit{St. Cuthbert: His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham} (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2000).
\end{small}
writing in the 1090s, described the miracles of St. Dunstan as “those things that ought to be written.” Reginald expressed a similar motivation in the letter he wrote to his patron, Abbot Aelred of Rievaulx, about his collection of the stories in the *Libellus*: “I know to often bring back to you those [stories] from the innumerable multitude which, when I have unrolled the histories of the church of Durham, I have proved were not written down due to the carelessness of negligence.” In many cases, these previously unrecorded stories proved to be those experienced and recalled by the laity. Reginald accorded the voices of the non-religious more space than any previous Cuthbertine hagiographer. The stories he wished to be remembered were not merely those that came from within the convent or cathedral. Reginald, and perhaps by extension the priory, wanted their patron to be known as a saint of the people.

It is in order to illuminate this important aspect of the *Libellus* that we have undertaken a close reading of Reginald’s often-overlooked miracles of justice. While the collection’s extensive corpus of healing miracles is useful for illuminating the experiences of pilgrims, miracles of justice allow us to examine the ways in which the common people of the bishopric of Durham interacted with the cult and the saint, incorporating aspects of his miracle-working abilities into their everyday lives. Cuthbert was portrayed not only as a healer, but also as a protector, an arbitrator, a legal surety and a judge of morality. When he strikes a servant so hard in the face that his chin is pushed up into his head, or when he causes the walls of a man’s house to stream with blood in order to punish him for the slaughter of a protected stag, we are forcibly reminded of the saint’s long and violent history, and that his particular brand of
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162 Koopmans, 79: “eorum quae scribenda sunt.”
163 Reginald, *Libellus*, chapter 2: “de quorum innumerabili multitudine vos quaedam multociens retulisse cognovimus, quae, revolutis Dunelmensis Ecclesiae historiis, ex sola negligentiae incuria non fuisse descripta comprobavimus.”
164 Ibid., chapter 132.
165 Ibid., chapter 88.
vengeance was cultivated in order to protect a community constantly under threat. In the *Libellus*, however, we can see that Cuthbert’s vengeful side had been appropriated, redefined, and put to use by a much broader segment of society who rightfully had become known as the “people of the saint.”
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