SAINT MARGARET, QUEEN OF THE SCOTS:
HER LIFE AND MEMORY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF MEDIEVAL STUDIES
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
Catherine Keene

January 2011
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................ III
LIST OF GENEALOGY TABLES ....................................................................................... IV

INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1

METHOD ................................................................. 2
Her life ........................................................................... 3
Her Cult ......................................................................... 5

SOURCES ........................................................................ 6
Hungarian Context .................................................. 6
Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Context .............. 7
Scottish Context ......................................................... 11
Vita .............................................................................. 13
Vita: Manuscript Tradition ........................................... 15
Vita: Author .................................................................. 20
Other Hagiographic Sources ...................................... 21

STRUCTURE ........................................................................ 22

PART ONE: MARGARET’S BACKGROUND .................................................................. 24

I.1. A NOBLE AND UNKNOWABLE LINEAGE .............................................................. 24
Paternal Heritage .......................................................... 24
Maternal Heritage .......................................................... 33

I.2. THE HUNGARIAN CONTEXT .............................................................................. 44
Models of Sanctity, Piety and Monasticism ...................... 44
International Society .......................................................... 50
Models of Queenship ...................................................... 53
Family Position ................................................................. 58

I.3. THE ANGLO-SAXON PRINCESS ................................................................. 60
Court Position ................................................................. 60
Margaret’s Position .......................................................... 69
Queenship and Reginal Piety .............................................. 76
Sanctity ........................................................................ 82
Margaret’s Future ................................................................. 87

PART TWO: MARGARET’S LIFE .............................................................................. 93

II.1. THE KING’S CONSORT ................................................................. 93
Monastic or Marital Preference ............................................. 96
Malcolm’s Character ......................................................... 100
A Possible Planned Marriage .............................................. 102
Flight to Scotland ............................................................. 104
Malcolm’s Previous Marriage ............................................. 112
Malcolm’s Motivations ...................................................... 117

II.2. THE QUEEN OF SCOTS .............................................................................. 125
Historical Context ............................................................. 125
Peace-Weaver ................................................................. 132
Dynastic Progenetrix ......................................................... 135
Matriarch ........................................................................ 139
Mistress of the Court ......................................................... 142
Patron of the Church ......................................................... 149

II.3. PIOUS PRACTICES .............................................................................. 169
Reginal Piety ................................................................. 169
Margaret’s Model of Reginal Piety ..................................................................................176
Eternal Life ..................................................................................................................193

PART THREE: MARGARET’S CULT .............................................................................199

III.1. THE VITA ........................................................................................................200
Hagiographic Study ..................................................................................................200
Structure ....................................................................................................................201
Sources .......................................................................................................................203
Turgot’s Perception of Margaret ...............................................................................204
Turgot’s Purpose ........................................................................................................214
Hagiographic Accounts in Chronicles ....................................................................219

Comparative Textual Analysis .....................................................................................221
The Dunfermline Vita and Aelred of Rievaulx ..........................................................221
Cotton and Dunfermline Manuscript Versions of the Vita .........................................226
Genealogy .................................................................................................................226
Portrayal of Malcolm..................................................................................................233
Scottish Audience ......................................................................................................247
Relationship to Twelfth-century Developments Regarding Margaret’s Cult ..........248
Language Error! Bookmark not defined.

III.2. NURSED BY SAINTS .....................................................................................252
Filial Devotion ............................................................................................................252
St Cuthbert as Dynastic Saint ...................................................................................262

III.3. A DYNASTIC SAINT .....................................................................................269
Evidence of Twelfth-Century Recognition of Margaret’s Sanctity ............................269
Twelfth Century Hagiographic Context ..................................................................273
Twelfth-Century Political Context ...........................................................................280

III.4. A CANONIZED SAINT ....................................................................................290
Evidence for Margaret’s Canonization ....................................................................290
The Nature of Her Sanctity .......................................................................................301

CONCLUSION .........................................................................................................326

APPENDIX ..............................................................................................................332
Translation of the Dunfermline Vita, Madrid Biblioteca del Palacio Real, II. 2097, fos. 1r-17v ..................................................................................................................332
Genealogy Charts ......................................................................................................427
BIBLIOGRAPHY .......................................................................................................432
Acknowledgments

This project would never have started without the endorsement and encouragement of Professors Bonnie Wheeler and Jeremy Adams of Southern Methodist University, both of whom have graciously remained a guiding presence throughout the past ten years. I am deeply grateful to my dissertation supervisor, Professor Gábor Klaniczay, who took a chance by allowing me to attend university in Budapest while raising my children in Texas. It was a tricky enterprise, and he was supportive and imaginative in managing this project across a vast distance. I am also greatly indebted to the detailed insights of my readers, Professors Attila Bárány, Robert Bartlett, and József Laszlovszky. Many people were generous with their time and knowledge during a research trip to Scotland, particularly Professor David Broun, Mrs. Margaret Dean, Mrs. Joanna Milne, Dr. Alice Taylor, Professor Simon Taylor, and Professor Alex Woolf. I have been fortunate to have understanding and supportive friends and colleagues throughout. I am most indebted, however, to my patient children, and to my husband, my partner in all adventures.
List of Genealogy Tables

Margaret’s Descendants (1058-1286)

The Rulers of the Kingdom of the Scots (943-1097)

The Slavic Theory of Agatha’s Ancestry

The Salian Theory of Agatha’s Ancestry
Introduction

Margaret, the other Queen of Scots, is a noteworthy historical figure of the eleventh century (c.1045/6-93), who has not yet been the subject of a critical biography. The facts of her life, absent embellishments or interpretation, can be sketched out in a few brief sentences. Her father was the Anglo-Saxon prince, Edward, who had been exiled as an infant after the death of his father, King Edmund Ironside (1016), and the succession of the Danish conqueror, King Cnut (1016-1035). Edward journeyed to the kingdom of Hungary, where he married a woman named Agatha and had three children: Margaret, Christina, and Edgar. In 1057, Edward the Exile, as he has come to be known, returned to England with his family as the acknowledged heir to the Anglo-Saxon throne of the childless Edward the Confessor (1042-1066). He died within days of landing in England, however, and any hope that his son would assume the throne was firmly quashed by the Norman conquest of England in 1066. Margaret and her family fled to the Kingdom of the Scots, where Margaret married King Malcolm III. The couple had eight children who survived to adulthood, of whom three became kings of Scotland in succession and one became Queen of England as wife to King Henry I. Margaret died in 1093, within three days of the deaths of both her husband and her eldest son. She was buried at the Church of the Holy Trinity, which she had founded on the occasion of her marriage. The Church would later become Dunfermline Abbey, where a cult developed around her tomb. In the mid-thirteenth century she was the subject of a canonization process by Pope Innocent IV.

This brief, factual recounting tells us little, however, about the nature of Margaret’s queenship and piety, leaving gaps which have been filled with assumptions and speculation, since scholars as well as nature abhor a vacuum. Twentieth-century popular biographies by Cowan (1911), Barnett (1926), Henderson-Howatt (1948), and Wilson (1993) have tended to present an unquestioning view of her Vita, which, while certainly central to her story, does not provide a nuanced perspective of all the ebb and
flow of her world. The result is that she remains a little-understood figure, with widely differing and confusing assessments of her influence. Historians of medieval Scotland assert that she was responsible for reforming the aberrant practices of an old “Celtic Church” and supplanting “Gaelic” customs with “Norman.” Conversely, “she initiated no reforms in the administration or organization of the church” and “concerned herself only with trivial matters.” In matters of queenship and rule, the assertion that Margaret was instrumental in initiating and implementing reforms “may well be questioned in ecclesiastical affairs and is without supporting evidence in secular.” On the other hand, Margaret is portrayed as “a strong-willed, severe and ascetic colonial incomer, who found uncivilized and barbaric practices everywhere and everywhere reformed and improved them.” She is interpreted as both and neither, everything and nothing, a historical tabula rasa. This study proposes to bridge the gap between what is known about Margaret and what has been surmised in order to provide a more accurate understanding of her life and early cult.

**Method**

Margaret’s life and cult are inextricably intertwined; it is not possible to study one adequately without taking into consideration the other. The first part of this study will therefore reflect on Margaret’s background, the second will concentrate on her lifetime, and the third will focus on the early development of her cult from her death in 1093 until her canonization in 1249. It is an examination of the forces which influenced both her life and evolving perceptions of her sanctity, proposing to accomplish both through comparative and contextual analyses.

---


Her life

Biography has sometimes been thought to have been discredited as a serious course of historiographic inquiry, in part by the positivist orientation of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians. Nevertheless, as the editors of a collection of essays in honor of the noted historian and biographer Frank Barlow have observed, interest in biographical study has remained a constant, with its primary focus remaining the great men of history. Recently, notable scholars have successfully studied the lives of saints and women, both of whom have been more typically challenged by the hagiographical bias of sources in the first case, and limited sources in the second. Frank Barlow, György Györffy, and Jacques Le Goff studied men who were both kings and saints, such Edward the Confessor, King St Stephen, and St Louis respectively. Pauline Stafford considered the queens of eleventh-century England, Emma and Edith.

The first two portions of the study attempt to meet the dual challenge of studying a queen who would later be considered a saint. By placing Margaret in the context of her time, we will be able to assess those points of reference, those models of behavior, which were available to her, and which might have influenced her. Mary Carruthers argues that even in the Middle Ages a person formed an idea of their self based on textual examples, to which I would add living models of behavior. These memories, written and real, fashioned an individual’s experience, forming a reservoir from which they construed their individual behavior. As Carruthers observes:

A modern woman would be very uncomfortable to think that she was facing the world with a “self” constructed out of bits and pieces of great authors of the past, yet I think in large part that is exactly what a medieval self or character was. Saying this does not, I think, exclude a conception of individuality, for every person had domesticated and familiarized these

---

communes loci, these pieces of the public memory.¹⁰

Even a medieval queen approached her position with a “‘self’ constructed out of bits and pieces” of authors and the examples of predecessors. These points of reference are the “the roles and structures” to which Pauline Stafford refers in her biographies of the two eleventh-century English queens, Emma and Edith. She contextualizes source material, determining if its claims were likely or even possible given societal, cultural and political structures, and evaluates behavior in terms of expected roles.¹¹ Similarly, in his biography of Peter Abelard, M. T. Clanchy observes that “all societies stereotype people and expect them to perform fixed roles and, conversely, each individual searches for the role which will win him most esteem.”¹² While I am not necessarily convinced that all people are motivated to maximize their self worth, Clanchy’s point remains valid; people were (and are) expected to operate in society according to certain prescribed models of behavior. Margaret’s awareness and knowledge of the precedent set by both previous and contemporary queens and saints therefore warrant closer examination.

An essential step in establishing this context is the comparison of source material. Barbara Yorke, for example, argues with specific regard to the study of Anglo-Saxon female saints’ lives that biographical tidbits can be teased out of hagiographical sources by triangulating the source material.¹³ If the information given in a vita is corroborated by other sources, then it can reasonably be assumed to possess an element of truth. Such a comparative approach also allows for the identification of significant gaps – aspects of Margaret’s Vita or chronicle accounts relative to her life which do not agree – which can then be scrutinized, allowing the veracity and relevance of sources to be evaluated and assessed.

Let me be clear, however, that this study does not seek to determine Margaret’s intention or agency. I am not arguing that she purposefully chose to act like Queen Edith

or St Radegund, but that these models were available as points of reference to her and that certain actions of hers, as recorded by her hagiographer and chroniclers, suggest that she assimilated “bits and pieces” of them. Only by comparing varied examples across geographic and cultural divides can we reach an informed assessment of how Margaret might have constructed an image of her “self,” her queenship, and her piety.

Her Cult

The memory of a saint evolved through an active process of communication between those by whom it was promoted, protected, and received. In this case, Margaret’s descendants, the monks and suppliants at her shrine at Dunfermline Abbey, and the papacy all participated in a constructive dialogue moderated within a vibrant community of saints. The political use of saints’ cults by both secular and ecclesiastical authorities has been the subject of multiple studies in recent years. Kinship with a saint was employed to bolster the legitimacy of a competing dynastic branch and the Church might use the cult of a saintly bishop to counter royal authority. Similarly, a saint’s shrine or relic could prove to be a potent, not to mention lucrative, tool for the church and community. Finally, vitae and miracle accounts reveal a great deal about the saint’s audience, providing historians with information regarding suppliants’ social status, gender, and maladies, for example. As David Rollason summarizes, rather than

14 Aviad Kleinberg, Prophets in Their Own Country: Living Saints and the Making of Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Heffernan, Sacred Biography.
providing discrete historical data, “hagiography is most useful for telling us why particular people at a particular time were regarded as saints, and thus for giving us some insight into the attitudes and priorities of the hagiographer and his audience, i.e. for analyzing and defining the concept of sanctity.”\textsuperscript{17} The most important point, however, is that the evolving perception of a saint was the result of a dynamic dialogue between all these groups.

In this evaluation of Margaret’s cult, a comparative and contextual approach will again be used. The cultural, political, and hagiographic contexts will be studied at each stage of the early development of her cult to consider who might have been acting and why. Margaret’s cult will be studied by comparing the ways in which she was presented in various versions of her \textit{Vita}, her miracle collection, and chronicle accounts.

\section*{Sources}

One of the challenges of studying a woman whose life and cult span cultures and centuries is the sheer volume of potentially valuable sources. Hungary, Anglo-Saxon England, the Anglo-Norman world, and Scotland each had its own historiographic tradition. The following is an evaluation of some of the more pertinent materials, with consideration given to additional material as needed within the paper.

\subsection*{Hungarian Context}

The early \textit{vitae} of St Stephen offer a glimpse into eleventh-century Hungary. The \textit{Legenda maior} of St Stephen was probably composed prior to his canonization in 1083 and the \textit{Legenda minor} toward the end of the eleventh century or the first decade of the twelfth.\textsuperscript{18} These two then served as sources for the \textit{Vita} written by Bishop Hartvic at the beginning of the twelfth century, which soon became the most commonly known

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
The history of medieval Hungary is further chronicled in the thirteenth-century *Gesta Hungarorum*, which is most valuable for our purposes for its incorporation of elements of earlier sources, including an eleventh-century history. The wealth of secondary literature written in Magyar has unfortunately remained beyond my reach, but much has been translated into or is available in other languages, most notably the biographies of King Saint Stephen by György Györffy and Marie-Madeleine de Cevins.

**Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Context**

The English chronicles provide a wealth of material, much of it recorded by people who knew Margaret indirectly either through her children or through others who had come into contact with her during her lifetime. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is really a number of disparate but complexly-connected manuscripts consisting of largely contemporary annals in the vernacular. The D version of the Chronicle is particularly

---


22 Unless otherwise stated, all references are to *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A Revised Edition*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, David C. Douglas and Susie I. Tucker (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1961). This edition is particularly useful because it offers parallel translations of the various versions. The oldest manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 173, known as the Parker or ‘A’ manuscript, was written in a single hand up to the entry in 891. The manuscript was then housed at Winchester where it was continued in a series of hands until it was moved at some point in the eleventh century to Christ Church, Canterbury. The B and C manuscripts, British Library Cotton Tiberius A.i and Cotton Tiberius B.i, are closely linked, both demonstrating a connection to Abingdon, although by the eleventh century the B version was probably at Christ Church Canterbury. British Library Cotton Tiberius B.iv and Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 636, known as the D and E versions, are also related, both deriving from a now lost northern chronicle. The complete transcriptions of the original manuscripts will be available online on the
concerned with the court of the Kingdom of the Scots, containing an interpolation probably derived from an early version of Margaret’s *Vita*.  

Other nearly contemporary works were composed by authors who had access to details of Margaret’s life through their acquaintance with people who either knew or knew of her. The Anglo-Norman Benedictine monk, William of Malmesbury (1095-1143), was a generally reliable historian, if prone to self-serving exaggeration when arguing the importance of monastic institutions. In a prefatory letter to the *Gesta regum Anglorum* addressed to King David, William asks that the king forward the work to his niece, Margaret’s grand-daughter, Empress Matilda of England, daughter of Queen Edith/Matilda who originally commissioned the work.  

This letter is supplemented by one to the Empress Matilda and another to her half brother, Robert of Gloucester who supported her cause. We might therefore infer that the author had a degree of familiarity with Margaret’s family.

---

23 For the supposition that the entry in 1067 is derived from a version of Margaret’s *vita* see Whitelock, Introduction, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, xvi. The D version’s interest in Margaret’s family is also noted in *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A Collaborative Edition*, vol. 6, ed. Cubbin, lxxiv.


The Chronicle of John of Worcester was probably commissioned c. 1095 by Wulfstan of Worcester, edited and added to by a monk named John, and completed c. 1143. It began as a world chronicle, based on the work of Marianus Scotus (completed 1076) and increasingly focused on English history, drawing on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Bede, among other sources, and later including Eadmer’s *Historia Novorum*, the Norman annals and works by William of Malmesbury. The work often cited documents and texts verbatim. A tentative point of contact with Margaret’s family is the fact that Ealdred, at that time Bishop of Worcester, was charged with retrieving Margaret’s family from Hungary. In general, it tends to favor a pro-English point of view, but on the whole it is historically factual.

Orderic Vitalis (1075- c. 1142), an Anglo-Norman monk at St Évroul in Normandy, wrote a history that avoids the unmitigated pro-Norman bias of some other chroniclers. In 1115 he visited England, spending time at Thorney and Worcester, where he had access to the above-mentioned Worcester chronicle. He also spent about five weeks at Crowland Abbey, the burial place of David’s father-in-law, Earl Waltheof of Northumbria, who was considered by many to be the Anglo-Saxon embodiment of resistance to the Norman conquerors. Orderic includes an account of the earl’s life in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which might say something about his inclinations.

Symeon was a monk whose residence at Durham coincided with Turgot’s tenure as prior (1087-1109). He compiled a history, *Historia Regum*, from a variety of sources (Kentish and Northumbrian annals, Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*, Asser’s *Life of King Alfred*, extracts from William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum*, the Worcester

---


27 For more information on the text, see the introduction in each volume of John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk.


30 For his time spent in England see Gransden, *Historical Writing*, 152.

chronicle, among others), which he edited and expanded with some of his own material. His work is of value to this study for his biography of Turgot, Margaret’s hagiographer, and his uniquely abhorrent description of King Malcolm.

The historical account written by Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, was largely completed by 1130 but continued to 1154. He relied primarily on Bede and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and his work was later accessed by Robert of Torigny and Roger of Howden for their chronicles. The modern editor of Henry’s work surmises that he also employed local vernacular oral tradition for certain stories, including two that are very similar to versions included in the Dunfermline Vita, namely the battle between Edmund Ironside and Cnut, and the death of Earl Godwin. It is worth noting that in Henry’s lifetime, the earldom of Huntingdon was held by the Scottish royal family, and it is therefore possible that these ballads or sagas were a common source.

The tentacular connections between Aelred of Rievaulx and Margaret’s family make him an important witness. He was born about 1110 in Hexham and spent his youth at the court of Margaret’s son, David I (1124-53), serving as his steward for a while, and befriending David’s stepson, St Waltheof of Melrose. In 1134 he left court and entered the Cistercian monastery of Rievaulx in Yorkshire, where he was elected abbot in 1147 and remained until his death in 1167. His work and his interests evidently remained centered on Scotland and northern England and one version of Margaret’s Vita, the Dunfermline Vita, includes parallels to three of his texts, the Lament for David, King of the Scots (1153), the Genealogia Regum Anglorum (1154), and The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor (1162-1163).

---


34 Greenway, Introduction, Historia Anglorum, cv-cvi. For a more detailed analysis of these stories as they relate to Margaret’s Vita see below.

35 For more background on Aelred see his biography, written almost immediately following his death by a close acquaintance: The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx by Walter Daniel, translated from the Latin with introduction and notes by Maurice Powicke (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). Aelred’s life and biography are given thoughtful consideration by Marsha Dutton in the introduction to this work.

Two points should be emphasized here. First, these sources are complexly inter-related, which makes the discrepancies between them regarding Margaret particularly relevant to this study. For example, John of Worcester influenced Orderic Vitalis’s *Ecclesiastical History* and Durham’s *Historia Regum* and in turn drew upon William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum*. Second, these authors all had connections with Margaret’s family, or to people and places closely connected to it.

**Scottish Context**

Although the source material for the history of the Kingdom of the Scots might be less plentiful, it is no less informative. The *Prophecy of Berchán* is a verse history of the great lords of Ireland and Scotland from the ninth to the eleventh century written in the Scots vernacular, Gaelic. It also includes the “Scottish Poem” or *Duan Albanach*, which was composed in Scotland probably for the court of Malcolm III. *The Scottish Chronicle* records early Scottish history beginning in Dunkeld in the mid-nineth century during the reign of Kenneth I (842-58) and ending c. 973 during the reign of Kenneth II (971-95). It was written primarily in Latin with a few Gaelic phrases and it provides helpful insight into the role and function of the Scottish king. A compendium of early Scottish charters contains only one witnessed by Margaret and Malcolm, but is instructive in studying the reigns of their descendants. It is complemented by a new series entitled *Regesta Regum Scotorum, 1153-1424*, which is an edited collection of charters by reign, each with a helpful introduction. Alan O. Anderson has assembled a

---


40 Archibald C. Lawrie, *Early Scottish Charters Prior to AD 1153* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905).

41 The pertinent volumes for this study are: *Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I King of Scots, 1124-53, and of His Son Henry Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*, ed. G.W.S. Barrow (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999); *Acts of Malcolm IV, King of Scots 1153-1165, Together with Scottish Royal Acts*
collection of references to events in Scotland that were recorded by non-Scottish sources. The first compilation focuses on the record provided by English chroniclers, and the second includes entries primarily in the Norse and Irish annals. While both works leave understandable gaps that must be filled in by using other sources, they serve as a good starting point. John of Fordun, a fourteenth-century priest thought to be from Aberdeen, compiled a history of the Scots. His work was closely followed by Walter Bower, the abbot of Inchcolm situated in the Firth of Forth near Dunfermline (1385-1449), which makes the copiously edited and explicated edition of Bower’s chronicle extremely pertinent to this study. Both John of Fordun and Walter Bower clearly had access to a version of Margaret’s Vita. The Chronicle of Melrose is an important witness to events between the mid-twelfth and late-thirteenth centuries, especially so because of the abbey’s historical association with the Scottish royal family: an attempt had been made to refound it in 1076 by Bishop Walcher of Durham through Turgot, Margaret’s hagiographer and later prior of Durham; it was founded by David I in 1136 as a daughter house of Rievaulx; and one of its first abbots was St Waltho, step-son of David.

In addition to the chronicles and secondary sources other material has been identified when possible. Textiles in existence today indicate the type of detailed, rich embroidery which Margaret and her ladies might have provided for the church.


45 For more on the context in which the chronicle was written see Dauvit Broun, “Melrose Abbey and its World,” in The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition, Volume I: Introduction and Facsimile Edition, Scottish History Society, Sixth Series (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 1-12. This volume, containing essays and a DVD reproduction of the manuscript, is the first of three planned volumes. The Latin transcription and an English translation are planned for volumes two and three. Unless otherwise noted, the edition cited is Chronica de Mailros, e codice unico in Bibliotheca Cottoniana servato, ed. Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club, 1835).
Architectural analysis demonstrates an affinity between Margaret’s foundation at Dunfermline and that of Durham Cathedral. Unfortunately, images of Margaret which reflect the varied and changing perception of her as dynast, saint, and queen throughout the centuries are not relevant to this study, as the earliest depiction dates to a prayerbook of the fifteenth century.

Vita

The most important source for a history of Margaret remains, of course, her Vita written between 1100 and 1107 by a Benedictine monk named Turgot. In the past, the empirical value of these legends, or vitae, has been viewed with considerable skepticism by historians. Hippolyte Delehaye, for example, cites the hagiographer’s typical use of pious plagiarism, belief in the incredible, inattention to detail, and reliance on simplified tropes. In recent decades, however, the utility of hagiographic sources has been explored with considerable results.

Hagiographers themselves typically undertake extreme care to underscore the veracity of their accounts. The chances that Margaret’s Vita adheres more to the truth than hagiolatrous imagination are increased by the fact that it was written shortly after her death, by her spiritual adviser, at the request of her daughter, within living memory of those who knew her. Both the author and the intended audience, therefore, were witnesses to Margaret’s life. Furthermore, Turgot is honest in portraying aspects of Margaret’s behavior of which he, as a Benedictine monk and reformer, would have been critical; he openly admits to Margaret’s predilection for finery and condemns her ascetic fasting. In short, Turgot might have been prone to exaggeration but not outright

51 For a similar observation regarding the likely veracity of an account that is at odds with the hagiographer’s intent see Barbara Yorke, “‘Carriers of the Truth’: Writing the Biographies of Anglo-Saxon
invention. However, even exaggerated hyperbole reflects a hagiographic truth. Thomas Heffernan observes that to the medieval mind the presence of the divine in everyday life was very real, and to ignore that fact leads to a distortive and misleading interpretation of the hagiographic sources:

What is pertinent for our discussion is that within such a philosophical system in which an invisible umbilical cord, as it were, yokes the divine force and the created, there is an utter lack of intellectual and emotional polarization between the ideal and the real, between the unseen and the seen. They are points along an epistemological continuum – with the world of the unseen requiring the eye of faith and that of the seen requiring physical sight.

Felice Lifshitz emphasizes this point when she advises that a positivist critique is anachronistic when applied to the genre of hagiography, inasmuch as it involves applying a standard of measurement first employed by Enlightenment scholars to twelfth-century thinking. For people in the Middle Ages, then, hagiography reflected a truth, perhaps not one that can withstand twenty-first century empirical standards, but a truth that nevertheless reflects on their understanding of their subjects. Turgot, therefore, portrayed Margaret according to a saintly ideal which, in his perception, she exemplified, within a long-established tradition of saintly lives. We do not need to believe that Margaret’s face became flushed in death, but animated coloring of a saintly corpse is such a hagiographic commonplace that we might instead infer that the author intends to convey the truth of her saintly death rather than the fact of her appearance. We might not believe the extent of Margaret’s fasting anymore than we believe the St Zoerard-Andrew

Female Saints,” in Writing Medieval Biography, 56.


53 Heffernan, Sacred Biography, 69.


55 The proliferation of recent studies employing hagiographic accounts as source material attests to this new assessment of their historiographic relevance. For example Ronald Finucane studies medieval English society as revealed by miracle accounts in Miracles and Pilgrims. Samantha Kahn Herrick studies the intersection of hagiography and secular power in Imagining the Sacred Past: Hagiography and Power in Early Normandy, Harvard Historical Studies, 156 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Cecilia Gaposchkin analyzes liturgical sources in The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Crusades and Sanctity in the Later Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).
survived on forty nuts during the forty days of Lent, but the truth of her asceticism is more important to the author than the fact of her eating habits.  

The question remains as to whether the *Vita* is more reflective of Margaret’s actual behavior or the author’s idealized interpretation. The fact that Margaret chose to favor Turgot, that her daughter selected him to write Margaret’s *Vita*, and that Margaret’s son then made him bishop of St Andrews implies at least some congruence in Margaret’s understanding of herself, her children’s understanding of their mother, and how she was presented posthumously. However, the answer is complicated. The *Vita* is an example of sacred writing, intended to influence and instruct by depicting models of saintly behavior. Thomas Heffernan advises that the work itself becomes imbued with holy meaning:

Sacred biography is not sacred scripture. However, if they both partake of inspiration, then we ought to consider that Augustine’s remarks that ‘these words were not written by human industry, but were poured forth by divine intelligence’ were undoubtedly believed to apply to these texts as well as to Scripture.  

The risk here is to assume that Margaret’s behavior was modeled on previous *Vitae*, which is then reflected in her own *Vita*, thereby getting hopelessly entangled in increasingly concentric arguments. This is precisely where the comparative and contextual approach described above becomes so essential. For example, significant differences in the surviving versions of Margaret’s *Vita*, all drawn from a single exemplar written by Turgot, perhaps later abbreviated or expanded, mark the evolution of her cult that is in itself of historical relevance.

**Vita: Manuscript Tradition**

The *Vita* of St Margaret exists in three manuscript versions, and one copy of a now lost manuscript. The version found in British Library, Cotton Tiberius Diii (hereafter Cotton manuscript) was probably written toward the end of the twelfth century. Until recently it was assumed that the manuscript dated to the mid-thirteenth

---

56 *Legenda SS. Zoerardi et Benedict*, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, 2.358.
57 Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, 36.
58 British Library, Cotton Tiberius Diii, fos. 179v-186r; printed in *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea*, ed. Hinde, 234-54. The portions of this text that are analogous to the Dunfermline *Vita* are
century based in part on a reference in the *incipit* to the translation of Margaret’s relics, which occurred in 1250 following her canonization in 1249. However, we now know that the *incipit* is referring to an earlier translation of Margaret’s relics in 1180 as described in the newly-translated and edited edition of her miracle collection.

Furthermore, the script and decoration of the manuscript suggest a late twelfth-century date for the composition. The *Vita* is included as part of a collection of saints’ lives, preceded by *The Passion of the Holy Martyrs Primus and Felicianus* and followed by the *Life of St Ninian* by Aelred of Rievaulx. The manuscript was damaged in the fire of 1731 but has been painstakingly restored, and remains largely legible. It has been transcribed and edited by James Raine and is printed in J. Hodgson Hinde’s edition of the work of Symeon of Durham. A second manuscript of an unknown date, now lost, identified only as *Ms Valcellensi*, identifying it with the Cistercian abbey of Vaucelles in northern France, has been edited by the Bollandists and printed in the *Acta Sanctorum* (hereafter AASS) and Pinkerton’s late eighteenth-century *Vitae Antiquae sanctorum*. This AASS

---


61 J. Hodgson Hinde describes the manuscript as “folio on vellum, in double columns, of the latter part of the twelfth century,” in *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea*, ed. Hinde, iivi. This twelfth-century date is confirmed by Julian Harrison in “The Mortuary Roll of Turgot of Durham (d. 1115),” *Scriptorium* 58:1 (2004): 68.


63 Discussed by Hinde in *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea*, ed. Hinde, lviii and printed in the same edition, 234-54.

version and the Cotton manuscript are almost identical. In the appendix to this study, the Dunfermline Vita is compared to the printed edition of the Cotton Vita, remarking on any differences between the Acta Sanctorum edition and the Cotton manuscript in the footnotes.

The British Library houses another, shorter manuscript version of the Vita, Cotton Tiberius E.i (hereafter Ei manuscript), which comprises four folio pages, ending with a list of Margaret’s descendants down to the fourteenth century. Although this manuscript is thus outside the parameters of this study, it is worth mentioning in order to complete the picture. The abbreviated Vita was included by John of Tynemouth in his compilation of one hundred and fifty-six brief lives, which dates to the mid-fourteenth century, and the surviving manuscript version was produced at St. Alban’s before 1396.65 Toward the end of the fifteenth century this collection was reorganized alphabetically rather than according to festival date and revised, including the omission of Margaret’s genealogy. It is commonly attributed to John Capgrave, an Augustinian friar.66 Another edition of this collection of saints’ lives was printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1516, and again with further amendments by Laurentius Surius, a German Carthusian, in the later sixteenth century.67

The appendix to this work includes the transcription and translation of a little-studied version of the Vita, which survives uniquely in a manuscript in Madrid (Madrid,
Biblioteca Real II 2097 fos. 1v – 17v). The manuscript was compiled at Dunfermline Abbey during the reign of James III (1460-88) and consists of the Vita, a historical account, the miracle collection, and Jocelin of Furness’s Life of St Waltheof of Melrose (d. 1159).\(^68\) It was probably acquired by a Count of Gondomar, who had been the Spanish ambassador to the court of James VI and I from 1613 to 1618, and remained in the comital library in Valladolid, as witnessed by the Spanish Cistercian Angel Manrique sometime between 1626 and 1642. The entire family collection was given to the Spanish royal library in 1807.\(^69\) This compilation has only recently begun to claim the attention of notable historians. D.E.R. Watt was prompted to analyze the manuscript while researching his new edition of Walter Bower’s Scotichronicon because either the manuscript itself or texts incorporated into the manuscript served as a source for the fifteenth-century abbot of Inchcolm.\(^70\) Robert Bartlett considers it within the context of his translation of the sole surviving collection of Margaret’s miracles, contained within the compilation.\(^71\) He reasons that the collection was composed in the mid-thirteenth century, perhaps in preparation for Margaret’s canonization process, since the recorded miracles date from 1180 to 1263.\(^72\) Historiographical analysis of Scottish chronicles has led Dauvit Broun to conclude that an exemplar of the Vita and the historical accounts (known collectively as the Dunfermline Chronicle) was probably written during the reign of Alexander III (1249-1286), perhaps soon after his succession, based on his observation that the royal history from that time up to James III is very succinct when compared to the earlier accounts.\(^73\) An exemplar of the Dunfermline Chronicle in turn might have served as a source for the compiler of the Gesta Annalia I, which was completed by 1285

\(^{68}\) Watt surmises that the monks at Dunfermline periodically copied and updated older versions of these works which they kept in their library. Watt, Scotichronicon, 3.xvii-xviii. It is commonly agreed that the manuscript as it currently exists was compiled before the end of the reign of King James III, as mentioned above, since the king list ends before his death in 1488. Dunfermline manuscript, fo. 25v; Watt, Scotichronicon, 3.xvii-xviii; Bartlett, Miracles, xxxi-xxxiv; Alice Taylor, “Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland: the Dunfermline Compilation,” Historical Research 83:220 (May 2010): 229.

\(^{69}\) Bartlett, Miracles, xxxi-xxxvii. See also Watt, Scotichronicon, 3.xvii-xix; Dauvit Broun, The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the 12th and 13th Centuries (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), 196.

\(^{70}\) Watt, Scotichronicon, 3.xvii-xviii.

\(^{71}\) Bartlett, Miracles, 70-145.

\(^{72}\) Bartlett, The Miracles, xxxiv-xxxv.

\(^{73}\) Broun, The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots, 196.
and used by John of Fordun as a source for his *Scotichronicon*. Alice Taylor has published a detailed analysis of these first components of the manuscript, the *Vita* and historical accounts, the latter of which she divides into the Dunfermline Continuations and the Dunfermline Chronicle, arguing that taken together, these portions of the manuscript serve as political propaganda, stressing the Anglo-Saxon heritage of the kings of Scotland in an effort to gain the formal rites of coronation and unction as Christian kings, and that they were compiled by a single author, whom she refers to as the Dunfermline Continuator, probably between 1245 and 1285.

The date of the composition of the exemplar of the *Vita* in the Dunfermline manuscript remains uncertain. The text bears marked similarities to Aelred of Rievaulx’s *Genealogia Regum Anglorum*, which was composed c. 1153-1154 for Duke Henry, the future Henry II of England (1154-1189). D.E.R. Watt believes that Aelred “apparently knew [the Dunfermline *Vita*] in this version,” and that it served as “one of the principal sources of his *Genealogia*.” It is equally possible that the Dunfermline *Vita* borrows from Aelred. Alice Taylor postulates two stages for the composition of the *Vita* as it currently exists in the Dunfermline manuscript. First, the material from Aelred’s *Genealogia*, including the details of Margaret and Malcolm’s marriage, was added and expanded sometime between the composition of Aelred’s work in 1154 and the *terminus ante quem* of the Dunfermline Manuscript in 1285. Second, the account of Earl Godwin’s death, which is derived from Aelred’s Life of Saint Edward, was added by the Dunfermline Continuator between 1249 and 1285. The relationship between Aelred’s works and the Dunfermline *Vita* is considered in more detail in Part 3, Chapter 1.

The original *Vita* was composed between 1100 and 1107. The *terminus post quem* is indicated by the fact that it is addressed to Edith/Matilda as queen, after her marriage to Henry I of England in 1100. The *terminus ante quem* is suggested by the

---

75 Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 228-52.
comment in the Cotton manuscript that the *Vita* was written during the reign of King Edgar, who ruled from 1097 to 1107.\textsuperscript{78} The text and its evolution are the subject of further inquiry in the first chapter of Part 3.

**Vita: Author**

The author of the *Vita* was almost certainly a Benedictine monk named Turgot.\textsuperscript{79} The *incipit* of the Dunfermline *Vita* identifies the author as Bishop Turgot and the next line refers to him as “*Turgotus sancti cutberti servus*,” a servant of St Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{80} The AASS edition states that the author is “*Theodricus servorum S. Cuthberti servus*,” or prior of Durham, an elaboration of the Cotton manuscript, in which the author is referred to simply as “*T servorum S. cuthberti servus*.” It appears that the author’s obviously Nordic name was Christianized in the first instance and abbreviated in the second.\textsuperscript{81} He is often referred to as Margaret’s confessor, but that particular role was more likely to have been assumed by the priest who witnessed her death.\textsuperscript{82} J. Hodgson Hinde argues

\textsuperscript{78} Diii, chapter 13.


\textsuperscript{80} The Dunfermline *Vita* is transcribed and translated in the appendix to this work. Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 1ra: *Incipit epistola turgoti episcopi quam transmisit mathilde regine anglorum.*

\textsuperscript{81} The name “Turgot,” loosely translated into “Thor god,” was perhaps considered by later transcribers as a less than suitable moniker for a Christian monk. Theodricus would therefore be a natural Christian substitute with its parallel Greek “Theo” meaning God. There are numerous instances in which Theodricus is substituted for a more native name. For example Thierry, the twelfth-century author of a history of kings of Norway, is identified as “Theodricus monachus” in *De antiquitate regum norwagiensium*, in *Monumenta Historica Norvegiae*. Yet the name Turgot as well as others that referenced the god Thor remained popular. The first bishop of Skara in Sweden was named Turgot (Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, ed. B. Schmeidler, MGH SRG (Hanover and Leipzig, 1917), 2.58; more recent edition ed. W. Trillmich, *Quellen des 9. und 11. Jahrhunderts zur Geschichte der Hamburgischen Kirche und des Reiches (AQ XI)*, Darmstadt, 1961, 135-503. For names containing reference to Thor see Robert Bartlett, “From paganism to Christianity in medieval Europe,” in *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy*, ed. Nora Berend (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 54-5.

\textsuperscript{82} Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 15vb.
plausibly that Turgot was instead a close friend and confidante, perhaps her chaplain.  

Turgot had a long and multi-faceted career which at times bordered on the epic. According to his contemporary, Symeon of Durham, he was an Anglo-Saxon nobleman by birth and a *clericus* by training, who had escaped from Lincoln castle where he was being held by the Normans and fled to the Norwegian court of King Olaf Kyrre (1067-1093). There he prospered under the patronage of the Norwegian king, but was shipwrecked on his return to England, losing his accumulated wealth and barely escaping with his life. This traumatic experience prompted him to turn to religion. On the advice of Bishop Walcher of Durham he joined Prior Aldwin at the newly re-founded monastery of Jarrow. The two then journeyed to Melrose with the intent of refounding that monastery also, but they fell afoul of King Malcolm when they refused to profess fealty to the Scottish king, and Walcher recalled them rather than risk a confrontation. Walcher then sent Turgot to Wearmouth where he adopted the monastic habit. He was elected Prior of Durham in 1087, where he then exercised almost episcopal power. In 1107, at the request of King Alexander of Scotland, he was made bishop of St Andrews. There he quarreled with both the Archbishop of York over the question of St Andrews’ subjection and with King Alexander over his proposed retirement to Rome. He eventually surrendered his office and journeyed to Durham where he died in 1115. As a mark of respect, he was buried at Durham in the chapter house where he was flanked on the south by the body of bishop Walcher (d. 1080) and on the north by bishop William of St Carileph (d. 1096). In 1284 his remains were elevated. He seems to have been an intellectually energetic, persuasive, but not always diplomatic, force.

**Other Hagiographic Sources**

In addition to Margaret’s *Vita*, in all its various forms, numerous other sources relate directly to her life and cult. The sole surviving collection of Margaret’s miracle accounts has been edited and translated for the first time by Robert Bartlett, which

---

85 He was not invested until 1109.
includes a record of an otherwise unknown translation of Margaret’s relics in 1180.87
The records of the canonization inquiry have been lost, but trace accounts have been
collected and published in the Acta Sanctorum.88 Supplementing such written records,
Dunfermline Abbey stands as monumental evidence of the development of Margaret’s
cult.

Structure
This analysis of potential source material is made both more complicated and
more fruitful by the fact that Margaret’s world – the context in which she lived –
spanned geographic and cultural thresholds, from newly Christianized Hungary, to the
waning years of the once-great Anglo-Saxon kingdom of England, through the Norman
Conquest, to the emerging northern kingdom of the Scots. It also bridged historiographic
chasms, which have tended to compartmentalize studies artificially. For example, both
the Christianization of Hungary under King Stephen and the Norman Conquest of
England are often treated as events of such singular significance that historical analyses
divide their focus on the periods before and after the event, necessarily distorting any
historiographic view. This study is therefore structured chronologically rather than
thematically, allowing a more detailed historiographic analysis of defined contexts.

The study is divided into three parts. The first part orients Margaret in the broad
background of her early years before she enters the public record. Chapter 1 discusses
her heritage in terms of familial expectations and roles by exploring both her paternal and
obscure maternal heritage. Chapters 2 and 3 consider the situation in early eleventh-
century Hungary and the last years of Anglo-Saxon England, paying particular attention
to the multi-faceted expressions of piety and queenship which might have served as
models for Margaret. In Hungary, Greek and Latin, coenobitic and eremitic traditions
coexisted while the function of the queen remained early in its evolution. In contrast, a
richly-documented tradition of both queenship and female sanctity existed in Anglo-
Saxon England. The second part focuses on Margaret’s life as she begins to enter the
public record. Chapter 1 dissects the events surrounding the flight of Margaret’s family

87 Bartlett, Miracles, xli-xlil and 92-95.
88 See Part 3, Chapter 4.
to Scotland and her marriage to Malcolm. The following two chapters are organized thematically, on her model both of queenship in chapter two and of piety in Chapter 3. The third part of the study examines the development of her cult, from her death to her canonization, taking into consideration the political and hagiographic milieux. Chapter 1 begins with the analysis of Turgot’s hypothetical original text, and then considers the distinctions between the Cotton and Dunfermline *Vitae* as illustrative of different interpretations of her memory. Chapter 2 focuses on the early establishment of her cult, from her death to that of her youngest child in 1153. Events surrounding the translation of her relics in 1180 are the focus of the next chapter. The final chapter considers the question of whether Margaret received papal recognition of her sanctity, the canonization process itself, and the context in which it occurred.

* * * * *

Margaret remains an oft-cited yet little-understood historical figure. The purpose of this study is to analyze her life and early cult in an effort to come to a more accurate understanding of who she was and how she was remembered. It incorporates a broad array of sources in terms of both time and place, from the early-eleventh to the mid-thirteenth century, spanning cultures and kingdoms in recognition of cultural, economic, and dynastic affiliations. Her world was shaped by expectations and models from Nordic, Kievan, Hungarian, Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and Scottish traditions, and all the expectations and admonitions which they pressed upon her. Likewise, her cult evolved within interconnected dynastic, political, ecclesiastical, and papal agendas.
Part One: Margaret’s Background

Margaret encountered her earliest models of behavior before she enters the historical record. The first chapter will consider her ancestry, those inherited roles and perspectives that would have bracketed her experiences. The next two chapters evaluate the context in which she would have lived in Hungary and Anglo-Saxon England, with particular focus on models of queenship and sanctity.

I.1. A NOBLE AND UNKNOWABLE LINEAGE

The parameters of Margaret’s life were defined in part by her status at birth. Her father, the son of a crowned king of England, had been sent into exile as an infant. Her maternal ancestry is less clear given the conflicting assertions made by contemporary sources, but this ambiguity is in itself revealing. Together, this Anglo-Saxon prince and a woman from the shadows of history provided the foundational context for Margaret’s world.

Paternal Heritage

After five hundred years of uninterrupted rule, the ancient royal house of Wessex was viciously pruned to two exiled infants. Margaret’s father, Edward, and his brother Edmund were the only sons of Edmund Ironside, who had been named king by the magnates in and around London after the death of his father, Aethelraed, on 23 April 1016.¹ The kingdom which Edmund inherited had suffered years of serial invasions by Scandinavian armies, and was currently divided in its loyalties between the Anglo-Saxon monarchy and the prospect of peace promised by a settlement with the invaders.

Although Edmund is extolled by the chroniclers for his valiant defense of the kingdom, which had earned him the sobriquet “Ironside,” nevertheless a war-weary representative

assembly met at Southampton and pledged fealty to Cnut, the younger son of the recently deceased Danish king Swein Forkbeard, in return for his promise of good government. The two forces, the English under Edmund and the Scandinavian under Cnut, were well-matched and, rather than continuing to ravage the kingdom, the two contenders reached an uneasy truce at a meeting on the island of Olney in the Severn River, whereby Edmund ruled England south of the Thames in addition to East Anglia, Essex, and London, while Cnut held dominion over the northern reaches of the realm. The kingdom was divided, as it had been during the reign of kings Eadwig and Eadgar in the previous century, and with the same threat to any hope of long-term stability. Tellingly, and perhaps in tacit recognition of this untenable position, no provisions were made for subsequent inheritance. Instead, as Cnut was to claim later, there was an understanding that whoever should outlive the other would inherit the realm in its entirety, which made Edmund’s sudden and unexpected death, so fortunate for the ambitious Cnut, highly suspect.

Edmund Ironside died on St Andrew’s Day, 30 November 1016, having ruled as King of England for only seven months. His swift demise left his widow, Ealdgyth, with two infant sons, Edmund and Edward, potential heirs to the English throne. There is no mention of her natal family, from whom she might have expected to receive support. The sources identify her only as the widow of Sigeferth who, in conjunction with his brother Morcar, had been the lord of the Seven Boroughs. Her first marriage had ended

---

3 Although Freeman asserts that there must have been a tacit recognition of the status of Edmund’s children as aethelings, or throne-worthy heirs. Freeman, A History of the Norman Conquest, 1.267.
4 For further consideration of the manner of Edmund’s death, see Part 3, Chapter 1 and the Dunfermline Vita, fos. 5rb-vb.
5 Gabriel Ronay asserts that she was a daughter of King Olaf of Sweden by his concubine Aedla of Vendland (The Lost King of England, 193, chap. 7, n. 2) but gives no reference. The chroniclers (William of Malmesbury; John of Worcester) and historians identify her simply as the widow of Sigeferth. For example, Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 1.251-52; Judith Elaine Abbott, Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England, 954-1066: Holy and Unholy Alliances (Unpub. Diss. University of Connecticut, 1989), 295). I would only add that her royal Swedish heritage is unlikely since it would have brought her husband little in terms of immediate practical advantages.
6 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1015. Only John of Worcester names her as Aldgyth, while William of Malmesbury refers to her as “a lady of distinguished lineage” (spectabilis nobilitatis femina). John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1015; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 2.179. Stenton noted that the territory probably included the five Danish boroughs.
abruptly with the murder of the two brothers at a Witan hosted by Eadric Streona, Ealdorman of Mercia and son-in-law of King Aethelraed. Suspicions regarding the king’s complicity in the crime were validated by the degree of opportunism evident in his subsequent actions; he imprisoned Ealdgyth at Malmesbury and confiscated all the property to which she was entitled after the death of her husband. Some time between the Feast of the Assumption on 15 August and the Nativity of St. Mary on 8 September, Edmund Ironside traveled to Malmesbury and married Ealdgyth against the protests of his father.\(^7\) He now possessed the lordship of the strategically situated Seven Boroughs, providing him with a base of power and sufficient resources to wage his war against Cnut either with or without the support of his diminished father.\(^8\) The romantically-inclined twelfth-century chronicler William of Malmesbury claims that, beyond any practical advantages that the marriage may have brought with it, Edmund had fallen in love at first sight.\(^9\)

Whatever the initial motivation, the fact remained that at the time of her second husband’s death Ealdgyth had given birth to at least one son, Edward, and possibly a second, Edmund, although there is some confusion regarding the second child. Ealdgyth and Edmund Ironside were married 15 August 1015 at the earliest, meaning that the earliest possible date of birth for the first son would be May 1016, leaving just enough time for a second child to be conceived before his father’s death in November 1016.\(^10\)

---


\(^{9}\) William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, 2.179: *…visam concupivit, concupitae communionem habuit …*

\(^{10}\) John of Worcester specifies that they were married before the Feast of the Assumption, whereas the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1015 states only that they were married before the Feast of St Mary, 8 September. Abbott contends that the children were probably twins born no earlier than August 1016 assuming that Edmund would have postponed consummation of marriage for at least three months in order to avoid any debate regarding paternity. The children were exiled by July 1017, leaving little time for a second birth. John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1015; Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1015; Abbott, *Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England*, 317-18.
However, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records the exile of only one child, Edward.\textsuperscript{11} William of Malmesbury identifies two children, but seems to confuse the second one with the brother of Edmund Ironside, naming him Eadwig.\textsuperscript{12} Only the Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, Aelred of Rievaulx, and John of Worcester identify the two sons of Edmund Ironside as Edward and Edmund, and the latter does so immediately after the account of the death of the \textit{aetheling} Eadwig, brother of Edmund.\textsuperscript{13} The existence of this phantom sibling is not central to this study but is only mentioned here to avoid confusion in later references.

Ealdgyth then disappears entirely from the historical record.\textsuperscript{14} The position of her two infant sons was, however, precarious, as was made pointedly clear by the dismal fates of other contenders for Cnut’s newly-won and forcefully-held throne. Edmund Ironside’s brother, Eadwig the \textit{aetheling}, was formally denied any claim to the throne at the Witan assembled by Cnut in London in 1016-17, a ruling which Cnut then enforced in the extreme by first declaring Eadwig an outlaw and finally ordering his assassination.\textsuperscript{15} The following year witnessed the execution of several high-ranking English noblemen who might have posed a threat to Cnut’s Danish rule: Aethelweard, the son of Aethelmær the Great; Brihtric, the son of Aelfheah of Devonshire, and Northman, the son of

\textsuperscript{11} Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1057.
\textsuperscript{13} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 6ra; Aelred of Rievaulx, \textit{Genealogia}, PL 195:733; John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1017. It is also possible that the second son, Edmund, has been conflated with a non blood relative with whom he became associated in his youth. One remote possibility is Eymund of \textit{Eymundar þástir Hringssonar} (“The Tale of Eymund Hringsson”), a story included in the lives of Olaf Tryggvason (d. 1000) and St Olaf Haraldsson (d. 1130) as told in the late fourteenth-century Flateyjarbók, reflecting historical events. This Eymund, or Edmund, was exiled from Norway or Sweden, and became a Varangian mercenary in the employ of the future King Jaroslav of Kiev. Edward the Exile would have been about 20 years old at the time Jaroslav secured the Kievan throne in 1036 so an association between Eymund and Edward is chronologically possible. Eymund and Edward the Exile could have been related through the common practice of fosterage while both were in Kiev. Just as William of Malmesbury mistakenly identified Edward’s uncle, the \textit{aetheling} Eadwig, as his brother, so John of Worcester could have mistaken a foster brother for a uterine brother. For the saga see \textit{Flateyjarbók}, ed. Guðbrandur Vigfusson and C. R. Unger, 3 vols. (Christiania [Oslo] 1860-1868), 2.118-34. For the use of the tale as historically reliable information on Scandinavian mercenaries in Kievan Rus’ see for example: Samuel Hazzard Cross, “Jaroslav the Wise in Norse Tradition,” \textit{Speculum} 4 (1929): 177-97; Adolf Stender-Petersen, “Jaroslav und die Varáger,” \textit{Varangica} (Aarhus 1953): 115-38; Julius Forssmann, \textit{Skandinavische Spuren in der altRussischen Sprache und Dichtung} (Munich: Kitzinger in Kommission, 1967), 37-40; H. R. Ellis Davidson, \textit{The Viking Road to Byzantium} (London, 1976), 158-63; Robert Cook, “Russian History, Icelandic Story, and Byzantine Strategy in Eymndar þástir Hringssonar,” \textit{Viator} 17 (1986): 65-89.
\textsuperscript{14} Although she remains obscure, a well-informed reconstruction of her life is provided by Abbott, \textit{Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England}, 286-331.
\textsuperscript{15} Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1017; John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1017. William of Malmesbury mentions only that Eadwig was driven into exile on Cnut’s orders and died in hiding. William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.180
Ealdorman Leofwine.\textsuperscript{16} This same Gemot witnessed the execution of the traitor Eadric Streona, who, according to some accounts, was implicated in the death of Edmund Ironside and is generally viewed with disdain for his inability to remain loyal to either Aethelraed, Edmund Ironside, or Cnut.\textsuperscript{17} More importantly, his execution must be seen as part of a larger plan by Cnut to rid himself of the sons-in-law of Aethelraed, each of whom could be viewed as a possible threat. Eadric had married Eadgyth, the daughter of Aethelraed and his first wife, Aelfgifu.\textsuperscript{18} Other sons-in-law of Æthelraed were eliminated in one way or another: Aethelstan died in battle in 1010; Ulfcytel, Ealdorman of East Anglia, suffered a similar fate in 1016; and Uhtred, Earl of Northumbria, was treacherously murdered while paying homage to Cnut in 1016.\textsuperscript{19} Even the new husband of Eadric Streona’s widow, Thorkill the Tall, a close retainer of Cnut’s, came under suspicion and was driven into exile.\textsuperscript{20} Aethelraed’s two remaining sons, Edward and Alfred, remained safely in Normandy, their situation complicated because Cnut had married their mother, Aethelraed’s second wife and widow, Emma.\textsuperscript{21}

The fact that Margaret’s father survived Cnut’s extermination intrigued the chroniclers, prompting them to offer varied and conflicting explanations, but where some degree of consensus exists it is possible to posit a probable course of events. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that Cnut had banished Edward to Hungary, with no mention of


\textsuperscript{17} John of Worcester states that he was killed at Cnut’s command, his body thrown over the city wall, and then left unburied. William of Malmesbury claims that he was strangled in the chamber and his corpse tossed out the window into the Thames. John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1017; William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.181.


\textsuperscript{19} On Aethelstan see Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, C, s.a. 1010, and page 90, n. 4 where Whitelock notes that he could have been the brother of Aethelraed’s first wife rather than his son-in-law, but the point remains the same. See also John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1010. For Ulfcytel and Uhtred see Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, C, s.a. 1016; John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1016.

\textsuperscript{20} In 1021 he was outlawed by Cnut. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, C, s.a. 1021. See also Freeman, \textit{The History of the Norman Conquest of England}, 1.255, 278-9.

a brother or an intervening sojourn in Sweden.\(^{22}\) According to William of Malmesbury, Edward and his brother “Eadwig” were sent to the king of the Swedes to be put to death. The king, however, took pity on the children and sent them to be raised in Hungary.\(^{23}\) The Dunfermline *Vita* account is similar, reporting that Cnut, “fearing to strike the sons of Edmund for the shame of it, sent them to his relative, the king of the Swedes, as though for raising, but more probably for killing,” but the king took pity on them and sent them to be fostered in Hungary as was proper.\(^{24}\) Aelred of Rievaulx provides a very similar, slightly abbreviated account.\(^{25}\) John of Worcester blames Eadric Streona for urging Cnut to murder the children, but Cnut, reluctant to be implicated in their deaths, sent them to Sweden to be murdered by the king, who balked at the idea and instead sent them to Hungary.\(^{26}\)

Denmark rather than Sweden is the destination given in a more elaborate account related by Geffrei Gaimar in his *Estoire des Engleis*, written in the French vernacular in the first half of the twelfth-century in northern England. Gaimar was aware of the chronicles of Symeon of Durham, John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon, and like Henry probably used a northern recension of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and oral accounts.\(^{27}\) The *Estoire des Engleis*, however, is a highly romanticized history of England, written for the entertainment of the secular aristocracy rather than an ecclesiastical or a monastic audience, and was therefore more interested in courtly concerns, such as romantic love and questions of honor and probity. The story of the exile of Edmund’s boys serves as an example of such a proto-romantic approach to the

---

\(^{22}\) Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1057.

\(^{23}\) William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, s.a. 1016: *Filius eius Edwius et Eduardus, missi ad regem Sweuorum ut perimerentur, sed, miseratione eius conservati, Honorum regem petierunt …*

\(^{24}\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 5vb: *Ac filios edmundi ferire pre pudore metuens, ad regem sivanorum socerum suum transmisit quasi alendos, sed pocius interficiendos. Rex autem sivanorum nobilium puerrorum [mir]atus [iniu]stam miseriam, convertit se ad [misericordiam] et ad regem hungariorum eos destinavit fovendos alendos, in hiis eos decebat informandos et instruendos.*


telling of history. Gaimar reports that Cnut, following the urging of his new queen, Emma, opted to send the boys overseas. A Danish nobleman by the name of Walgar took pity on the two infants, and whisked them away to the relative safety of his homeland. There they remained until a restoration plot in 1028 spurred Emma, always a convenient scapegoat, to call for the children’s final elimination by urging Cnut to send a letter calling for their murder.28 Walgar, acting on a tip from a fellow Dane, a member of Cnut’s war council who had heard the plan to have the princes murdered, left Denmark with his young charges. For the purposes of this study, the important point is that all these accounts, while differing on the details, agree that Margaret’s grandfather spent time at a Scandinavian court.29

It is also highly probable that the brothers spent some time in Kiev. Gaimar claims that Walgar and his young charges landed in Kievan Rus’, actually the city of Gardimbre, within sight of Hungary.30 Adam of Bremen, writing in the second half of the eleventh century, locates the princes in Russia.31 The relevance of his insight is increased by virtue of his personal association with both Svein Estrithson, the nephew of Cnut, and Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, in addition to the missionary and administrative focus of the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen on the lands of Scandinavia and northwestern

28Gaimar, Estoire des Engleis, ed. Short, 244-49. For a discussion of foreign queens as scapegoats, see János M. Bak “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary,” Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King’s College London, April 1995. ed. Anne Duggan (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1997) 223-233; and Pauline Stafford, Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King’s Wife in the Early Middle Ages (London and Washington: Leicester University Press, 1998). Fictional queens were also employed as scapegoats. See, for example, my article “‘Cherchez Eufeme’: The Evil Queen in Le Roman de Silence,” Arthuriana 14.3 (Fall 2004): 3-22.

29 Gabriel Ronay asserts without supporting citations that no less than fourteen nearly-contemporary Anglo-Norman chronicles report that the aethelings sought and received sanctuary in Sweden. Ronay, The Lost King of England, 37-42.

30 Gaimar, Estoire des Engleis, ed. Short, 249. The rest of Gaimar’s brief story of Margaret’s ancestors is fraught with inaccuracies, but is considered here because it serves as the central support for Gabriel Ronay’s somewhat conjectural assessment of events in his biographical study of Margaret’s father. See Ronay, The Lost King of England.

Russia. The *Leges Edouardi Confessoris*, written in the twelfth century, likewise claims that the boys spent time in Russia.

These sources agree that the brothers settled for a time in Russia, the plausibility of which is enhanced in two ways. First, dynastic connections, both a natural outgrowth of and a catalyst for cultural exchange, had strengthened relations. King Jaroslav of Kiev had married Ingergerde, daughter of King Olaf of Sweden, and she had been given the town of Gardorika as part of her dower, the town which Gaimar identifies as Gardimbre, the destination of Walgar and his two youthful charges. Secondly, the Scandinavian countries were linked by conquest, trade, and culture to Novgorod and Kiev in much the same way that they were connected to the Danelaw in England. Years of military and economic cross-pollination had bred familiarity. Frequent contact is attested to by a wealth of English coins sprinkled along the route from Denmark to Rus’ which began to appear in the late tenth century, but whose number increased sharply during the early years of Cnut’s reign (1017-35). Not coincidentally, this movement of coinage mirrors the peregrinations of the many royal refugees fleeing Cnut’s predations. Ronay surmises that the *aethelings* arrived in Rus’ in 1028, at about the same time as Olaf II of Norway, the future St Olaf, and his son Magnus, the latter of whom was brought up as one of Jaroslav’s retainers. Likewise, Harald Hardrāđa of Norway sought and was granted

---


34 “St Olaf’s Saga,” in Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*, trans. Lee M. Hollander (1964, Austin: University of Texas, 2002), 342-43. See also Henrik Birnbaum, “Yaroslav’s Varangian Connection,” *Scando-slavica* 24 (1978): 5-25. Ronay’s argument that Ealdgyth was the half-sister of Ingergerde, if substantiated, would add credence to this Kievan connection. Ronay, *The Lost King of England*, 52-57. It should also be noted that Jaroslav’s mother was probably Scandinavian.


37 Ronay, *The Lost King of England* 52-53. For the flight of Olaf and Magnus to Rus’ see Snorri Sturluson,
sanctuary, becoming a trusted member of Jaroslav’s inner circle, a “chieftain of the men charged with the defence of that country.” These exiled princes would have found a common bond in their shared dislike, distrust, if not outright hatred of Cnut, the man who had caused their violent dislocation. This court of royal exiles was eventually augmented by three others, the sons of Vazul, a kinsman of King Stephen of Hungary, about whom we will hear more in the next chapter.

Jaroslav’s court was, therefore, a sort of limbo for exiled royalty: Olaf, Magnus, Harold Hardråda, Vazul’s sons, and the brothers, Edmund and Edward. Each would realize their ambitions to some degree: Olaf would die trying to reclaim his throne but his son Magnus would succeed; Harold would marry Jaroslav’s daughter, Elizabeth, and become king of Norway; Vazul’s son Andrew would marry another daughter, Anastasia, and rule Hungary. The prospects for the Anglo-Saxon princes continued to dim, however, until by 1042 it was clear that the throne of England was an unlikely possibility. Cnut had died in 1035 and his two sons had also perished after inheriting the throne in succession. In 1042, the crown was passed to the son of Emma and Aethelraed, Edward the Confessor, who in 1045 married Edith, the daughter of the powerful Earl Godwin. It must have seemed apparent to all that it would be only a matter of time before the dynastic position of this new king was secured through his own line. The following year Edward abandoned Kiev to engage in a risky military gamble in Hungary, helping a fellow exiled prince, Andrew, to claim his throne.

---


38 Snorri Sturluson, Heimskringla, 578. See also Davidson, The Viking Road to Byzantium, 158-73; and Birnbaum, ‘Jaroslav’s Varangian Connection.’ On the date of Elizabeth’s marriage see Manfred Hellmann and Wilhelm Schulz. Die Heiratspolitik Jaroslavs des Weisen (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962), 21.

39 For King Olaf II, also known as Olaf Haraldsson and St Olaf, see Snorri Sturluson, Heimskringla, 486-516. For Magnus Olafsson, also known as “the Good” see Snorri Sturluson, Heimskringla, 538-41. For Harald Sigurtharson, also known as Hardråda (Hard Ruler) of Norway, see Snorri Sturluson, Heimskringla, 590-91; and for the date of his marriage to Elizabeth see Hellmann, ‘Die Heiratspolitik Jaroslavs des Weisen,’ 21. For Andrew’s return and marriage see Thurocz, Chronica Hungarorum, 1.89-90, although Anastasia is not mentioned by name.

40 For Cnut’s death see Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1035. For the deaths of Kings Harald and Harthacnut see Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1040 and 1042 respectively.

41 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a. 1045.
Maternal Heritage

The exact date of the marriage of Margaret’s parents remains a matter of debate. I find it unlikely, however, that Edward would have abandoned Kiev entirely if he had married and established local ties there. I believe instead that his marriage coincided with Andrew’s advancement to the throne of Hungary in 1046. The identity of Edward’s wife also remains obscure. One of the greatest mysteries of Margaret’s life is how her mother, a woman who was mother to a queen and grandmother to three kings and a queen, could remain so completely invisible to the historical record.

Evidently, this mystery also caused great consternation for medieval chroniclers. Without any positive identification, they were compelled to cast about for vague explanations. In the Cotton manuscript version of Margaret’s Vita, Turgot declines to make any mention of Agatha’s lineage, an omission which is particularly striking since he details Margaret’s paternal lineage quite thoroughly. In both the Dunfermline Vita and Aelred of Rievaulx’s Genealogia, however, Agatha is identified as the daughter of a relative of the German emperor, but only the Dunfermline Vita mentions the emperor by name, Henry. The Dunfermline Vita corroborates this assertion twice more in the text. However, both the Dunfermline Vita and Aelred of Rievaulx in his eulogy to King David also claim that Margaret is descended from the Hungarian royal line with no reference to Agatha’s relationship to the imperial house. Frankly, these two claims are difficult to reconcile. The 1057 entry of the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle refers to Margaret’s mother with seemingly deliberate ambiguity as “the Emperor’s kinswoman” (caseres maga). Later, however, in an interpolation that seems to derive

42 The exact year of the marriage is a matter of speculation. John Carmi Parsons reasons that it took place as early as 1042/3. John Carmi Parsons, “Edward the Ætheling’s Wife, Agatha,” The Plantagenet Connection (Summer/Winter 2002): 45.
43 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6vb: Agatha germani sui filia; Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195: 734b.
44 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7ra: Cernens itaque edgarus etheling res anglorum undique perturbarti, ascensis navibus cum mater suæ et sororibus reverti in patriam in qua natus fuerat conabatur, et hoc consilio matris que cum liberis sais insidias adversariorum suorum sub protectione patrui, scilicet, imperatoris studuit declinare. The underlined portion is not in Aelred’s account. Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7rb: At ubi margaritam viderat, eamque de regio semine simul et imperiali esse didicerat, ut eam in uxorem duceret, pecit et optinuit … This text is not in Aelred’s Genealogia. Only John of Fordun follows this account, citing Turgot as his source. Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.15.
45 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 16va: de semine regio anglorum et hungariorum; Aelred of Rievaulx, De sancto rege Scotorum David, PL 195, col. 715b.
from some early version of a Life of St Margaret, she is identified first by name, Agatha, and then as a relative of Emperor Henry (modorcynn  günd to Heinrice casere). John of Worcester is more specific, agreeing with the Dunfermline Vita by naming her as the daughter of a kinsman of Henry, the Holy Roman Emperor (filia germani imperatoris Henrici). William of Malmesbury avers that she was the sister of a queen, whom he declines to mention by name. Orderic Vitalis asserts that Agatha was the daughter of the king of Hungary, mistakenly identified as Salomon rather than Stephen. Gaimar also identifies her as the daughter of the Hungarian king, relating a rather fanciful account of a marriage forced by an early pregnancy, followed by the designation of “Edgar” (meaning Edward) as heir.

The confusion resulting from these differing accounts has persisted throughout the intervening centuries. In the early part of the twentieth century, Hungarian scholars favored Agatha’s direct descent from King Stephen: Jenő Horváth (1937), Ferenc Dőry (1938), and Sándor Fest (1938) all determined that Agatha was the daughter of King Stephen. The problems with this assertion are three-fold. First, assuming that Stephen’s children were all born between 1001 and 1010, as Ferenc Dőry maintains, then Agatha would have been at least six years older than Edward and about fifty years old when her youngest child, Edgar was born. Second, such a marriage would have given Edward a claim to Hungarian throne that was at least as strong, if not more, than that of Stephen’s nephew, Peter Orseolo and his brother-in-law Samuel Aba, each of whom did eventually acquire the crown. This claim would have rendered Edward a competitor rather than a collaborator in Andrew’s bid to reclaim the throne. Furthermore, it is not

47 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, 1067. For the Old English text see The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A Collaborative Edition, vol. 6, ed. Cubbin, 82-83. Cubbin also notes that Agatha’s name is transcribed “in a hand of uncertain date,” causing me to wonder if it was perhaps a later addition.


50 Orderic also mistakenly asserts that Edward the Exile was heir to the Kingdom of Hungary, receiving the realm with his marriage to Agatha. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Chibnall, 4.272-73: [Margaret] filia fuit Eduardi regis Hunorum, qui fuit filius Edmundi cognomento Irneside fratris Eduardi regis Anglorum, et exul coniugem accepit cum regno filiam Salomonis regis Hunorum.

51 Gaimar, Estoire des Engleis, ed. Short, 252-53.

52 Jenő Horváth, “Anglo-Hungarian Connections in History” (Danubian Review, 1937); Ferenc Dőry, The Family History of St. Stephen (Budapest, 1938); Sándor Fest, The Sons of Edmund Ironside, Anglo-Saxon King at the Court of Saint Stephen (Budapest: Archivum Europae centro-orientalis, 1938) and The Hungarian Origin of St. Margaret of Scotland (Debrecen: Department of English, Tisza István University of Sciences, 1940).
likely that the marriage occurred prior to Andrew’s ascension to the Hungarian throne in 1046 because of the tension between the royal houses of Hungary and Kiev as a result of the fact that the latter was sheltering the exiled princes.\(^{53}\) Third, such a positive connection to another dynastic saint would have been far too juicy a tidbit for contemporary chroniclers to have omitted. Stephen and his son Imre were recognized as saints in 1083, and the chroniclers would have been more inclined to trumpet such a blood tie, much as they did Margaret’s far more tenuous relationship to her great-uncle Edward the Confessor, than to gloss over it. As it is, this association with Stephen is a later development.\(^{54}\)

Currently, it is most generally accepted that Agatha was related to the German Emperor, Henry III (1039-56). Henry’s parents were Gisela of Swabia and her third husband, Conrad.\(^{55}\) According to this “Salian theory,” Agatha’s father was Liudolf, Margrave of West-Friesland, Gisela’s oldest son from her previous marriage to Bruno of Brunswick. This theory neatly harmonizes all the discordant notes scattered throughout various chronicles, yet it still fails to provide a distinct melody. It is chronologically feasible, since Bruno and Gisela were married about 1009, which would mean that their grand-daughter, Agatha, could have been born about 1025, making her about nine years younger than Edward and about twenty-nine years old when she had her last child. This theory postulates that she was a blood relation, a *germana*, of the emperor, because her father would have been a half-brother to Henry III. Ronay points out that it even explains how a chronicler could mistakenly assert that Edward was linked through marriage to

\(^{53}\) Many thanks to Prof. József Laszlovszky, who has done extensive work on Anglo-Hungarian relations, for this observation.

\(^{54}\) This “Hungarian” theory was rejected in the early twentieth century by József Herzog, “Skóciai Szent Margit Származásának Kérdése” [The Problem of St Margaret of Scotland’s Scottish Origins], *Turd* 53 (1939): 1-42. It was definitively disproven by the Hungarian scholar Szabolcs de Vajay in his article “Agatha, Mother of Saint Margaret Queen of Scotland,” *Duquesne Review: A Journal of the Social Sciences* 7:2 (1962): 71-80. See also József Laszlovszky, *Angol–magyar kapcsolatok Szent Istvántól a 13. század elejéig* [ Anglo-Hungarian Relations from Saint Stephen to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century], Budapest, unpublished doctoral dissertation (Kandidátusi értekezés kézirata), 1991, in which Laszlovszky observes that the association between St Stephen and Agatha was a later invention.

\(^{55}\) This theory, introduced by Herzog and argued by the medievalist Szabolcs de Vajay, was endorsed by Edward the Exile’s biographer, Gabriel Ronay, and Margaret’s biographer Alan Wilson, and most recently defended by David Faris and Douglas Richardson in their article “The Parents of Agatha, Wife of Edward the Exile,” *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 152 (1998): 224-235. Szabolcs de Vajay further suggests that Mathilda, wife of Henry I of France, was another daughter of Liudolf and therefore sister of Agatha in “Mathilde, reine de France inconnue,” *Journal des savants* (1971): 241-60. See Genealogy Table.
King Salomon of Hungary (1063-74), well after Edward had left Hungary.\(^5^6\) In 1058 King Salomon married Judith, the daughter of Henry III who, according to this theory, would have been Agatha’s first cousin.\(^5^7\) Such an ancestry is therefore plausible, but the question remains as to why a dynastic link between a junior branch of the German royal house and an exiled Anglo-Saxon prince was desirable. Perhaps the marriage was intended to reinforce an association between the kingdoms that had first been articulated through the marriage of Emperor Henry III to Gunnhild, the daughter of Cnut and Emma, in 1036.\(^5^8\) I would also add that this theory is the most plausible because it is the simplest. Four of the earliest sources – the interpolation in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, John of Worcester, the Dunfermline Vita, and Aelred of Rievaulx – all identify Agatha as a relative of the emperor. However, the question remains; if Agatha was linked in any way to the royal family of the Holy Roman Emperor, one of the most formidable rulers on the Continent, why were the chroniclers unable, even loath, to state so clearly and unequivocally?

This Salian theory is the most plausible, but of course impossible to prove conclusively, and this uncertainty has led to various competing proposals. René Jetté first floated the possibility of Agatha’s Kievan origin, beginning with a chronological argument to discount the Salian theory and then relying on a primarily onomastic analysis to support his Slavic theory.\(^5^9\) He notes that the names of Agatha, her daughters Margaret and Christina, and her grandsons Alexander and David are almost unheard of in Western Europe and are first introduced in areas subscribing to the Eastern Orthodox faith.\(^6^0\) Therefore, he concludes, Agatha was indeed a sister of a queen of Hungary, as William of Malmesbury noted, but the queen is Anastasia, wife of Andrew I, making Agatha a daughter of Jaroslav and a princess of Eastern Orthodox Kiev. Norman Ingram supports and expands this claim through a careful and detailed analysis of the chronicles. He speculates that an oral family tradition confused Agatha’s relationship to King

\(^{5^6}\) Ronay, The Lost King of England, 119.
\(^{5^7}\) For the marriage of Salomon to Judith, see Thurocz, Chronica Hungarorum, 1.92 and commentary on 2.333.
\(^{5^8}\) Adam of Bremen, History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen, trans. Tschan, 93 n. 197, 100, 107.
\(^{6^0}\) The names of Margaret’s children are discussed further in Part 2, Chapter 3.
Salomon, the son of Agatha’s sister Anastasia and therefore her nephew, with a blood tie to the Hungarian royal family (Orderic Vitalis) or to Salomon’s wife and therefore the Emperor Henry (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, John of Worcester, Dunfermline Vita, Aelred of Rievaulx).\footnote{Norman Ingham, “Has a Missing Daughter of Jaroslav Mudryi Been Found?” Russian History/Histoire Russe 25:3 (Fall 1998): 242-44.}

The most serious defect in this theory is the fact that no member of Margaret’s family made any mention of such a lofty family connection. The other daughters of Jaroslav had married kings: Anastasia married Andrew of Hungary in 1039, Elizabeth married Harold of Norway in 1044 and then Svein of Denmark in 1067, and Anne married Henry I of France in 1051 and then Raul II, Count of Crépy in 1061.\footnote{For a comprehensive view of these complicated royal family trees see Detlev Schwennicke, ed., Europäische Stammtafeln: Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten, two volumes, Second Edition (Verlag von J. A. Stargardt: Marburg, Germany, 1960), Neue Folge, 2: Tafel 128.}

Margaret’s first cousins would have been the kings of Hungary, Norway and France, kinships which would have been practically helpful to Margaret and her descendants, and irresistible to medieval chroniclers.\footnote{While the Salian and the Slavic theories are the primary contenders, other theories have been percolating and bubbling to the surface on occasion. One recent alternative posits that Agatha was descended from the imperial family of Byzantium. William Humphreys argues that the term used by Aelred of Rievaulx to identify Agatha’s kinsman, Imperator Romanus, could be understood to mean “Emperor Romanus” rather than “the Roman emperor.” An onomastic analysis places Agatha’s name squarely within the Byzantine tradition: Agatha Lekapena (early tenth century) was a sister of Helena Lekapena (d. 961) who married Constantine VII (d.959), and another Agatha was the sister of Romanus II (d. 963). He concludes that Jaroslav of Kiev may have been the son of Vladimir’s Byzantine wife, Anna, daughter of Romanus, through whom the Byzantine names were introduced into the Kievan dynasty, which also lends additional support to the Slavic theory. Alternatively, Agatha may have been the sister of the “Greek” wife of Vsevolod, Grand Prince of Kiev (d. 1093). Humphreys further postulates that the term germanus can be interpreted as the adjective “true” rather than meaning a blood relation, which would render John of Worcester’s phrase, filiam germani imperatoris Heinrici, as “daughter of the true emperor Henry” rather than “daughter of the kinsman of the Emperor Henry.” See William Humphreys, “Agatha the ‘Greek’ – Exploring the Slavic Solution,” Foundations 1:4 (July 2004): 275-90.}

Onomastic analyses have been employed to prove or disprove several of these theories and therefore deserve further consideration. Let us assume for the moment that Margaret was the name she was given at birth. The consensus among scholars of onomastics seems to be that daughters were almost always named after their father’s

\footnote{John Carmi Parsons suggests that Agatha was descended from Vladimir’s anonymous daughter’s marriage to Count Bernard of Haldensleben. This couple in turn had a daughter named Oda, who married Count Cristinus, son of Bruno of Querfurt. In this way the Salian, the Slavic, and the onomastic arguments (the name Cristinus is associated with Christina, the name of Margaret’s sister) are all reconciled. While this solution is neat, perhaps excessively so, it is as equally unsupported; if you look hard enough and long enough, all the noble and royal families of Europe are inter-related. As Parsons concludes, the true identity of Agatha will probably never be known. See Parsons, “Edward the Ætheling’s Wife, Agatha,” 53-54.}
female relatives, in which case Edward boasted a rich reserve of family names from which to draw: his mother was Ealdgyth, his paternal aunt and great-aunt were named Eadgyth, and another paternal aunt was named Aelfgifu, as were two of his paternal grandfather’s wives. Edward, however, had left England as an infant and could have had no living knowledge of any family members. In fact, when choosing to name his son and heir after an Anglo-Saxon king, he was forced to cast his net fairly wide in dynastic waters. He skipped Edmund, the name of both his brother (possibly) and his father, and perhaps more understandably overlooked the name of his grandfather, Aethelraed, whose sobriquet, the Unready or Ill-Advised, indicated a somewhat less than positive perception of his reign. He finally settled on Edgar, the name of both his paternal uncle and his great-grandfather, whose long, peaceful reign (959 to 975) was remembered nostalgically.

The personal name Margaret was, however, almost unknown in Anglo-Saxon England. It is not mentioned as such in either the Domesday Book or the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and Margaret was not a name used by either the English royal or aristocratic families. Margaret might therefore have been named in honor of her maternal ancestry, a supposition which has encouraged scholars to focus on onomastic analyses to determine Agatha’s association with Kiev. The name Agatha has an undeniable connection with the royal family of Byzantium through Anna “the Bulgarian,” the sister of Emperor Basil and wife of Jaroslav’s father, Vladimir I of Kiev, although not perhaps the mother of Jaroslav; it is the name of a sister of Anna’s father (Romanos II), and of a sister of her paternal grandmother Helene Lekapene. Proponents of the Slavic theory continue their

---


65 King Edgar (958-975) was remembered by some as a saint. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, 2.240 n. 6 says that at Glastonbury he was remembered for miracles he effected, most notably the curing of a mad German (furiusus Teutonicus genus).

66 See William George Searle, *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings and Nobles: The Succession of the Bishops and the Pedigrees of the Kings and Nobles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899). Cnut’s sister was named Estrith, a Danish variant of Margaret, but the parallel hardly applies here.


68 Schwennicke, *Europäische Stammtafeln*, 2 table 141; Lynda Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and
argument by pointing out that the names Margaret and Christina are also sprinkled throughout the genealogical charts of the Swedish royal house, which is deemed to be significant in view of Jaroslav’s marriage to Ingegerde of Sweden. However, the names Margaret and Christina do not appear in either the Scandinavian or Kievan royal families until the generations following Agatha and her children. Two daughters of Inge, king of Sweden after 1080, are given the names Margaret and Christina, and in the early twelfth century Vladimir II (Monomakh) had daughters name Margaret (Marina) and Agatha (Agafiia). 69

The Slavic theory of Agatha’s origin also argues that the name Margaret is most closely associated with the Eastern Orthodox Church. St Margaret of Antioch was a fourth-century martyr whose fictional story involves being swallowed by and then rescued from a dragon. The Life of St. Margaret is included in the tenth-century Menology of the Emperor Basil II and an extant version is said to have been derived from an account by Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople in the mid-ninth century (842-846). In the tenth century, Symeon Metaphrastes included his somewhat restrained version in his notable collection of saints’ lives. 70 More specifically for our study, all three names – Agatha, Margaret and Christina – were well known to the Eastern Orthodox Church of Kiev, since all were included in the litany of saints in the Church Slavonic Prayer to the Holy Trinity of the Rus’. 71

However, St Margaret of Antioch had also permeated the culture of Western Christendom well before the eleventh century. She is present in a Latin Martyrology from a ninth-century compilation of the Archbishop of Mainz, Rabanus Maurus (d. 856), and she is included in the nearly contemporary martyrology of Wandelbert, a Benedictine monk of Prüm, and later in the Martyrology of Notkerus Balbulus, Monk of St. Gall (d.

---

69 Faris and Richardson, “The Parents of Agatha, Wife of Edward the Exile,” 234; Nicolas Pierre Serge de Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rusrides russes, du Xe au XIIe Siècle,” Orientalia Christiana 9.1 (1927). In the case of the two daughters of Vladimir II, these names may be a case of cross-pollination since Vladimir married Gytha, the daughter of Harold Godwinson, who perhaps told her husband of the English royal family members.


Furthermore, Sts Agatha, Christina, and Margaret all boasted a very popular cult following in what today we would call Italy. St Agatha’s relics are still housed at the site of her martyrdom in Catania on the east coast of Sicily, and, coincidentally, the cults of both St Margaret and St Christina flourished in Bolsena in Tuscany from at least the early tenth century. Although martyred in Antioch, St Margaret’s relics were supposedly stolen and brought to San Pietro della Valle on the Lake of Bolsena in 908. Tradition holds that at about the same time a certain St Christina, later to be confused with St Christina of Tyre, was martyred at Bolsena, where there is ample evidence of a devoted following, including excavations that prove the existence of a shrine. Clearly, the names of Christina and Margaret were related as a result of the co-existence of the saints’ shrines.

The names of Agatha and her daughters, Margaret and Christina, did not yet belong to any single dynastic repository of names. Rather, they were named after female saints revered in both the Roman and Greek religious tradition. In being named after saints, Margaret and Christina, and their mother Agatha, were at the very forefront of a growing tradition in which royalty elected to name their progeny after Christian saints. King Stephen of Hungary changed his name from Vajk when he was baptized. His son, Prince Imre (Emeric/Henry) was named after his Christian maternal grandfather rather than the estimable, but nonetheless pagan, founder of the Árpád dynasty. Vladimir named two of his many sons David and Roman and another son, Jaroslav, elected to follow this growing tradition by naming his daughters Anastasia, Elizabeth, and Anne. Each of these sisters continued this naming tradition when they married: Anastasia married King Andrew of Hungary and her sons were named David and Solomon; Elizabeth married King Harold of Norway and named one of her daughters after her mother, Ingegerde, and

---

72 Mack, Seinte Marherete, x.
74 Similarly, the English Archbishop Sigeric came into contact with the cults when traveling to Rome in 990 to receive his pallium, and was motivated to reinvigorate them when he returned to England.
76 Györffy, King Saint Stephen, 78; de Cevins, Saint Étienne de Hongrie, 112.
another after the Blessed Virgin Mary; Anne married Henry I, king of France, and had a son named Philip after the Macedonian king of legend. King Olaf of Sweden, a half-brother of Cnut, was also known as James. One of the sons of Earl Thorfinn of Orkney was named Paul. Perhaps, since these recently converted countries had no vernacular Christian saints’ names from which to draw, as had Anglo-Saxon England for example, they chose instead to refer to names adopted directly from the Bible and Saints’ Lives, the important point being that these were decidedly not pagan names. Given the nascent nature of Christianity in Hungary, in which there was no tradition of native, Christian, personal names, names were chosen instead from those included in the liturgy of saints, whether Greek or Roman, so that their orthodoxy was irrefutable. It is not surprising, then, that the names of Agatha, Christina, and Margaret are found in both traditions and it is impossible to ascribe to Agatha either a Western or an Eastern origin based primarily on onomastics. Margaret was the product of a diverse yet connected world indicated in part by this growing, shared practice.

The justification for seeking circumstantial evidence to determine Agatha’s heritage instead of relying solely upon the chronicles is found in the inconclusive nature of the chronicles themselves. They were all written within the lifetime of either Margaret or her children. The entry in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was written soon after events, and seems particularly focused on asserting the superior claim of Margaret’s lineage to the throne. William of Malmesbury was writing his work for Margaret’s daughter, the Queen of England, with an eye toward establishing her royal lineage. Aelred of Rievaulx wrote when Margaret’s youngest son, David, was ruling Scotland and his work seems intent on establishing David’s lineage. And yet, for all their focus on Margaret’s august family tree, there is no consensus regarding her maternal ancestry. Relying solely upon the veracity of the chronicles will never answer the question of Agatha’s identity. They were revised and rewritten over the years, borrowing truths and entangling falsehoods, and richly interpreted. Where the accounts are unanimous, it is easier to infer some degree of accuracy, but where they differ so greatly and are so vague in their assertions, it is impossible to be definitive. Perhaps the only statement that can be made with

---

77 Although subsequent generations would be more comfortable in returning to names such as Béla and Géza.
confidence is that the chroniclers seemed hesitant to identify Agatha’s ancestry and deliberately danced around it. Why? Typically, the chroniclers went to great pains to identify the genealogy of their subject, including the maternal line. The mothers of Queen Emma and Queen Edith are both mentioned by name, as are the mothers of the Hungarian Queens Gisela, Judith, and Anastasia. The Chroniclers did not shy away from naming King Stephen’s pagan mother and detailing some of her decidedly un-Christin behavior, nor did they apologize for the humble origin of William the Conqueror’s mother. Agatha’s identity did not seem to be of great concern to the chroniclers. Maternal heritage sometimes was the foundation for a claim to legitimacy. Svein Estrithson (d. 1074/76) became king of Denmark through his mother, the sister of King Cnut. Duncan I became king of the Scots through his mother, Bethoc, the daughter of Malcolm II (d. 1040). Conrad (d. 1039) was eligible to be elected emperor because of his descent from his grandmother, Liutgard, the daughter of Otto I. William the Conqueror claimed the Anglo-Saxon throne through his great-aunt Emma, the queen of Kings Aethelraed and Cnut. Agatha remains obscure not because maternal heritage was unimportant but because her heritage, in particular, was unimportant.

Further indication of Agatha’s irrelevance is the fact that her name is absent from the genealogical charts of her descendants. Royal houses typically reflected pride in their maternal line by the names that were given to daughters. The name Matilda, for instance, persisted through three generations of English queens and princesses. One of Jaroslav’s daughters was named Anne, in honor of his wife. The name Margaret features prominently in succeeding generations of English and Scottish royal family trees. Yet Agatha is largely absent from the treasury of royal names.

A dynast’s maternal heritage, then, was as important as her paternal one. Agatha’s lineage, however, was not something that either the family or the chroniclers cared to highlight, for whatever reason. Ultimately, I suspect that the ambiguity simply reflects a reluctance to admit a humble birthright for a woman as remarkable as Margaret. If Agatha had possessed even a remote tie to any of the illustrious royal houses with which she has been associated, then the chroniclers would have stated so quite clearly.

78 These examples are also cited by Alex Woolf in From Pictland to Alba 789-1070, The New Edinburgh History of Scotland, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 258-59.
Margaret’s father was heir to more than the ancient and established Anglo-Saxon throne. He brought with him cultural connections which reflected the tangled intersections of the Scandinavian, Russian, and Hungarian courts. Margaret’s mother, while an important constant in Margaret’s life, continues to flit around the edges of history, which, in itself, suggests that her heritage was of little consequence or interest to chroniclers. So, by the middle of the eleventh century an internationally-connected royal couple married and began raising a family in the turbulent, newly-Christian kingdom of Hungary.
I.2. THE HUNGARIAN CONTEXT

Even the barest of facts about Margaret’s birth are subject to debate: she was probably born about 1046, perhaps as early as 1045 and certainly not after 1050; she was probably born in Hungary, but could possibly have been born in Kievan Rus’.\(^1\) It is clear, however, that her early years were spent in Hungary and it is therefore important to explore the context in which she lived in order, first, to dispense with what is not known or has been falsely assumed, and second, to explore the models of sanctity and queenship which would have been available to her.

Models of Sanctity, Piety and Monasticism

Accounts of Margaret’s life attribute her eventual sanctity in part to her early exposure to the rarified religion of the unified and uniformly Christian kingdom of Hungary, under the saintly aegis of King Stephen. Where a direct kinship with Hungary’s founding saint is not established, a connection is formed by claiming that Margaret grew up at his most Christian court.\(^2\) The intent is always to identify Margaret with her Christian past and her saintly forebears as a way of explaining her later sanctity. The truth, as is often the case, is much more complicated.\(^3\)

The traditional story is that, as result of missionary efforts in 995-6 by St Adalbert, bishop of Prague, and the conversion of St Stephen before the turn of the millennium, Hungary became a uniformly Christian kingdom following the Latin tradition.\(^4\) Indeed, the pervasive monastic presence of Latin Christianity is evident,

\(^1\) Recent speculation favoring the theory that Margaret’s birthplace was the castle at Rékahegy near the town of Mecseknádasd in Southern Hungary speaks more to the need to identify a place with Margaret rather than any historical fact. See the paper written by the twentieth-century enthusiast, Baron, which is closely followed by the author of Margaret’s most recent popular biography. Béla Malcomes, “The Hungarian Birthplace of St. Margaret of Scotland,” Hungarian Quarterly (1937): 704-15; Wilson, St Margaret Queen of Scotland, 39-44.

\(^2\) See for example: Wilson, St Margaret Queen of Scotland, 17-18; G. W. S. Barrow, Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 29; Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 10-11.


\(^4\) What follows is a revised portion of my article “Margaret of Scotland and Monastic Traditions in the Eleventh Century,” Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU, 14 (2008), 67-72.
furthered by the fact that an integral aspect of Stephen’s effort to secure administrative control of his nascent kingdom was the establishment of a number of dioceses, together with significant monastic foundations. The monastery of Pannonhalma, structured on the Benedictine ideal exemplified by the monastery at Monte Cassino, was founded toward the end of the tenth century, as was Veszprém, ostensibly the first Latin episcopal church. Stephen also established monasteries at Zalavár on an island in the marshes of the River Zala, at Bakonybél, and at Pécsvárad. A Benedictine convent dedicated to the Virgin Mary near Esztergom, called Esztergom-Sziget, is assumed to be an eleventh century, probably royal, foundation as suggested by King Salomon’s documented visit there in 1073. Another Benedictine convent near the Toma River at the foot of the Somló hill, called variously Somlóvásárhely, or Apáczavásárhely, or Apácasomlyó was in existence by 1212, and at least one scholar has hypothesized an early foundation dating to the eleventh century.

Such evidence would seem to corroborate the general perception of a ubiquitously Christianized Hungarian kingdom in the early eleventh-century, adhering to the Latin rite and nurtured by Benedictine monasticism. In reality, however, the picture was much more complicated. For example, pagan practices persisted, at times conflated with the interests of the native elite against those of the foreign, Christian class. For the purposes of this paper, however, an evaluation of the continuing influence of other Christian monastic traditions is more enlightening. To begin with, in view of Margaret’s eventual role as Queen of Scotland and her purported efforts to reform the Church in the Kingdom
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5 For Stephen’s efforts on behalf of Benedictine monasticism, see de Cevins, *Saint Étienne de Hongrie*, 282-86.
of the Scots, it is worth contemplating whether and to what degree the monastic culture in Hungary was influenced by the Irish tradition. The Abbey of Saint Gall, named after St Gallus, one of the original twelve companions of the Irish missionary saint Columbanus (d. 650), seems to have provided a possible source for such Irish influence. Bruno, a monk at the abbey, was chosen as bishop to the Hungarians, and is credited with having baptized Stephen’s father, Géza. The settlements named Szentgál concentrated around the tenth-century centers of Árpádian royal power bear witness to the more generalized influence of the Irish-based monastery.\textsuperscript{10} The earliest liturgical sources reflect the Rhine liturgy and cult with an unusual emphasis on the saints of Saint Gall.\textsuperscript{11} Finally, the relics of St Columbanus are known to have been at Pécs in the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{12}

Byzantine Christianity had been present in Hungary as early as the mid-tenth century, as is evidenced by the conversion of the Hungarian leaders Bulcsú in 948 and Zombor in 953.\textsuperscript{13} Stephen’s mother, Sarolt, might also have followed the Greek rite.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to such individual expressions of doctrinal preference, the Byzantine tradition was adhered to by extensive regions of the kingdom. In the tenth century the Byzantine Church was prominent in Transylvania and also in the area of eastern Hungary under the control of Prince Ajtony, as manifested by the Greek monastery of St John the Baptist at Marosvár (Csanád, Cenad: Romania).\textsuperscript{15} A Greek monastery in Szávaszentdemeter (Sremska Mitrovica: Serbia), ancient Sirmium, was revived by St Stephen and was still in operation as late as 1071.\textsuperscript{16} Also in the eleventh century under St Stephen, the Greek

\textsuperscript{10} Györffy identifies: “the Szentgáls near Esztergom, Kalocsa, Szekszárd ,and Veszprém, in the vicinity of the quarters of the ruling prince, the prince and the princess respectively, the two Szentgáls in the west of the County of Baranya were situated on the banks of two streams that lead to Koppány, near Siklós. The sixth, above Orci in the County of Somogy, can be linked to Orci, Géza’s Swabian knight.” Györffy, \textit{King Saint Stephen}, 54.

\textsuperscript{11} Györffy, \textit{King Saint Stephen}, 55-56. Although the surviving sources may be later, they suggest the earlier influence of the cult of St Gall.


\textsuperscript{13} For Stephen’s efforts on behalf of the Byzantine church, see de Cevins, \textit{Saint Étienne de Hongrie}, 286-91.

\textsuperscript{14} Györffy, \textit{King Saint Stephen}, 33, 44-47.


\textsuperscript{16} Györffy, \textit{King Saint Stephen}, 152.
convent of Veszprémvölgy was founded in a charter written in Greek, perhaps for Stephen’s mother, Sarolt, or his sister, the abandoned wife of Bulgarian prince Gavril-Radomir, or the intended Byzantine wife of Prince Imre.\(^{17}\) It is possible, although direct evidence is lacking, that King Stephen supported communities of Greek monks at Szávaszentdemeter and Pentele. Another community, Oroszlámos, was founded by one of King Stephen’s military leaders for the express purpose of housing Greek monks who had been displaced following Stephen’s conquest of Ajtony’s territories, which largely adhered to the Greek rite.\(^{18}\)

This Greek monastic presence continued well after the official schism of 1054 and was perhaps even strengthened when King Andrew (1046-1060) ascended to the Hungarian throne. Andrew and his brothers had been exiled from Hungary to Kievan Rus’, which had been converted to the Byzantine rite in the tenth century. He therefore had the opportunity to become familiar with the Eastern tradition, which was then underscored by his marriage to Anastasia, the daughter of Jaroslav, the ruler of Kiev (1019-1054).\(^{19}\) The two royals probably brought elements of the Byzantine faith with them in 1046 when Andrew claimed the Hungarian crown. The most persuasive evidence of such cross-pollination is the continuing close proximity of Benedictine and Greek communities. At St Hippolytus at Zobor, for example, the Greek and Latin monks had coexisted quite comfortably, each following their own liturgy.\(^{20}\) This cooperation was now perpetuated under the royal patronage of King Andrew. He founded and chose to be buried in the Benedictine monastery of Tihany on the northeastern coast of Lake Balaton in 1055. He also established a Greek monastery near Visegrád on the Danube bend named in honor of his patron saint. Each of these coenobitic communities coexisted with their eremitic complements; the caves of Óvár were located near Tihany and those of Zebegény were across the Danube from Visegrád. In both cases, these caves were probably inhabited by monks from a Kievan Cave Monastery (Pechera or Pcherskij


\(^{19}\) Makk contends that Andrew was baptized according to the Byzantine rite while in Kiev in “Les relations hungaro-byzantines,” 16.

\(^{20}\) J. T. Milik, *Święty Świerad, Saint Andrew Zoeradus* (Rome: Edizioni Hosianum, 1966), 47-57. An English summary is appended to this study, with the relevant information on 184.
Monastery). They were either Russian or Greek, but certainly Orthodox. The geographical locations of the caves near Visegrád and at Tihany – located on a steep incline above a lake or river – were commensurate with those of Kiev, Pskov, and Zymne. Archaeological excavations indicate that they were comprised of individual cells in order to facilitate the seclusion of hermits living in eremitic groups. The Kievan monks were probably ensconced in the caves shortly after the arrival of Andrew and his Kievan queen in 1046, where they remained sequestered until the formal establishment of the abbeys in 1055. In 1056 they might have relocated to the monastery of St Andrew where they were joined by the exiled monks of Sázava, forming a mixed community practicing Latin and Greek liturgy. In any event, it is likely that the eremitic monks at Zebegény were connected to the St Andrew monastery at Visegrád, in which Greek monks continued to live according to their rite until the thirteenth century. Two important conclusions should be highlighted here. First, coenobitic and eremitic communities coexisted, with members moving fluidly between. Second, the Orthodox and Roman traditions coexisted comfortably, a situation which continued well past the schism of 1054 until as late as the first half of the thirteenth century.

These diverse religious communities were complemented by equally diverse expressions of piety. The Eastern model of asceticism was exemplified by Zoerard-Andrew, who had fled his native Poland in the first half of the eleventh century and settled at St. Hippolytus at Zobor, a monastic community combining coenobitic and eremitic life in addition to observing both the Latin Benedictine and the Greek-Slavonic rites governed by an Oriental typikon. He subscribed to the eremitic ideal based on the model of Zosimas, a sixth-century Palestinian monk and confessor to St Mary the Egyptian. His distinctive brand of asceticism involved such heroic feats as fasting three days a week, living through Lent on only forty walnuts, sleeping while sitting erect surrounded by spikes, and suffering a wooden crown weighted with heavy stones and a

21 Miladinov, Margins of Solitude, 157-63; Berend, Laszlovszky, Szakács, “The Kingdom of Hungary,” 354. Such coexistence was not necessarily unusual in the eleventh century. See, for example, a comparable arrangement at St Alexius and St Boniface in Rome.


23 For the Life of Saints Zoerard and Benedict written by Bishop Maurice of Pécs around 1064 see Legenda SS. Zoerardi et Benedicti, ed. Emericus Madzsar, in Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum, 2.349-61. See also Miladinov, Margins of Solitude, 115-27.
copper chain that cut into his flesh. His cult spread quickly after his death, reaching Pannonhalma Abbey, and was furthered by a *Life* written in 1064 by Maurus of Pécs. In 1083 Zoerard-Andrew was canonized along with Sts. Stephen, Imre, Benedict his disciple, and Bishop Gerard.  

Gerard was perhaps himself one of these new hermits from Italy who based their ascetic practices on the Italo-Greek model, viewing their eremitism as compatible with the exercise of secular power. They combined intermittent withdrawal from the world for spiritual renewal with active life in secular world, not necessarily after a period of monastic training and supervision. Gerard (or Gellért), who figures so prominently in the history of Hungary in the first half of the eleventh century, might have been one of the followers of St Romuald of Pereum, the father of this movement. According to a later version of his life, he was an oblate at an abbey in Venice and then abbot of same. Detained by King Stephen while on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he became an advisor to the king and a tutor to Stephen’s son and heir, Prince Imre. Although a Benedictine monk, he was critical of what he viewed as the overly-indulgent monastic life, which he countered with periodic retreats to his hermitage at Bél. He was instrumental in engineering Andrew’s successful return to Hungary and was widely regarded as a martyr as result of his death during the uprising which preceded Andrew’s return. He was canonized in 1083 along with his royal patrons, Saints Stephen and Imre, and the other eremitic saints, Zoerard-Andrew and Benedict.

So, at the very least we can conclude that the Benedictine monastic tradition was not the only one to which Margaret was exposed in Hungary. She was probably to some
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24 Cf. Milik, Święty Świerad. Whether or not this canonization had the approval of Pope Gregory VII is still a matter of debate. Local recognition of sanctity, in this case supported by the king, was enough to declare the person a saint. For more on the canonization of these Hungarian saints see Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 123-24.  
26 For the two lives of St Gerard see Vitae s. Gerhardi episcopi, ed. Emericus Madzsar in *Scriptores rerum Hungarianarum*, 2.271-506 (*Legenda minor*, 2.471-79 and *Legenda maior*, 2.480-506). The dating of these two works is uncertain, but the shorter version, the *Legenda minor*, is generally considered to be the older and the more historically accurate. The *Legenda maior* has variously been dated from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, with a contention that some of the parts may even be contemporary. For the dating of the legends see Klaniczay and Madas, “La Hongrie,” in *Hagiographies*, ed. Philippart, 2.133. For more on Gerard see Miladinov, *Margins of Solitude*, 135-42; Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 152-54.  
degree familiar with the Greek and perhaps even the Irish tradition in addition to the varying models of eremitism which complemented coenobitic practices. As we will see later, such diversity of experiences might help explain Margaret’s unique spirituality.

**International Society**

Margaret and her family would also have belonged to a well-connected international elite, who perhaps had more in common with their foreign peer group than the native population.²⁸ Stephen’s wife, Gisela, was accompanied by her Bavarian retainers, including the famed knight Vecellin.²⁹ Two of Stephen’s closest and most trusted advisors in both ecclesiastical and secular matters were the aforementioned Bishops Adalbert of Prague and Gerard of Csanád.³⁰ Peter Orseolo was accompanied by Italian, specifically Venetian, followers. The late thirteenth-century chronicle specifies that one of the grievances against this unpopular king was that he acted together with the Germans and the Italians (*Latini*) to deprive the native nobility of “fortifications, castles and every office in the kingdom.”³¹ When Andrew emerged from his Kievan exile, he was accompanied by his Russian followers, most notably his wife Anastasia, the daughter of Jaroslav.³² In Hungary, it is likely that he met with an already entrenched Russian presence. György Györffy demonstrates, for instance, that beginning during the reign of King Stephen, the “royal army” consisted of a Varangian Russian bodyguard and a contemporary record even accords Prince Imre the title of *dux Ruizorum*, meaning “the leader of the Russians.”³³ The military elite and the emerging noble class were increasingly composed of Bavarian, Italian, and Russian elements. As diverse as their backgrounds were, however, they were united by what they had in common: their religion, languages, education, and loyalty to the crown.

Opposition to the ruling monarch was often represented, certainly by later

---

²⁸ For more on the composition of the noble class during the time of King Stephen see: Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 127-31; de Cevins, *Saint Étienne de Hongrie*, 300-05.
²⁹ Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 63
³⁰ de Cevins, *Saint Étienne de Hongrie*, 242-44; Miladinov, *Margins of Solitude*, 139-41
chroniclers and perhaps even by contemporaries, as a native, traditional, and pagan challenge to Christian rule. The first challenge to Stephen came from a member of a rival branch, Koppány. Bishop Hartvic, writing in the first quarter of the twelfth century but basing his work largely on two earlier lives of St Stephen, writes about Koppány: “But the enemy of all good things, the devil, full of envy and malice, stirred up an internal war against him (Stephen), in order to disturb the holy plan of Christ’s champion, for at his instigation the pagan commoners, refusing to submit their necks to the yoke of the Christian faith, tried with their leaders to withdraw themselves from his rule.”

Xenophobic hostility of the native element toward the ruling elite reached its peak during the stuttering reign of Peter Orseolo (1038-41 and 1044-6). King Stephen’s only son and heir, Prince Imre, had been killed in 1031, possibly while hunting wild boar, so when the king died in 1038 the crown passed to his nephew, Peter Orseolo, the son of his sister and the Doge of Venice. Not only were Peter, his wife, and his retainers all foreign but, realizing his tenuous standing in Hungary, Peter had sought and received the protection of the German emperor, Henry III. In 1041 Samuel Aba, Stephen’s kinsman, successfully challenged Peter, who then sought and received the assistance of the German emperor in reclaiming the crown. As far as the native, traditional Hungarian element was concerned, the situation had just gone from bad to worse. A pagan uprising led by Vata, a dispossessed clan chief, ransacked and burned Christian churches and monasteries, massacred priests and terrorized feudal lords. In desperation, the Church

---


37 *Gesta Hungarorum*, ed. Domanovszky, in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, 1.174-77; Latin with English translation in *Gesta Hungarorum*, ed. Veszprémy, 111-21. Again, it is unclear whether Samuel Aba was King Stephen’s brother-in-law or nephew.
and nobility turned to Andrew, the banished son of Vazul. According to the interpretation of the thirteenth-century chronicle he and his brothers had been summoned because the annihilation of the German and Italian (Latin) leaders had resulted in a return to paganism. Once he had gained the crown, Andrew crushed the rebellion and forcibly restored King Stephen’s laws and policies. Still, the restless pagan element, centered on a traditional agenda distrustful of all things foreign, was not subdued, as evidenced by the uprising of 1061 led by Vata’s son, János. The important point here is that, throughout the eleventh century, rebellion against the established rule was portrayed as an illegitimate, pagan attempt to wrench the crown from a Christian elite.

Membership in the noble class extended beyond a shared Christian faith to a standard of literacy and common languages. There is some evidence that the upper levels of the nobility were taught to read and write. The Přemyslid dynasty of neighboring Bohemia learned to read with the aid of psalters in Latin and Slavonic, even the women. The princess Mlada-Maria, for example, was “learned in the scriptures.” King Mieszko II of Poland (1025-1034) was able to read in three languages – his own, Latin, and Greek – according to an inscription in a book given to him by Matilda, the daughter of Hermann, duke of Swabia when she was married to Duke Frederick of Lorraine (1026-1033). The Legenda minor of St Stephen states unequivocally that he could both read and write. Jonathan Shepard notes that accumulated bits of evidence indicate a fairly widespread degree of literacy among the laity of Kievan Rus’ by the middle of the eleventh century. Anne of Kiev, the wife of Henry I of France, was able to read and write in the Slavonic vernacular, as could, it must be assumed, her sister, Queen

39 de Cevins, Saint Étienne de Hongrie, 417.
It is likely, therefore, that Margaret began her formal education in Hungary.

A polyglot culture also necessitated some common familiarity with languages. It is likely that while in Kiev Margaret’s mother and father had spoken a hybrid Scando-Slavic language, which would have been shared by Queen Anastasia, her retainers, and the aforementioned Varangian guard. Knowledge of the Slavonic language might have been facilitated in Hungary because the religious texts of the Slavonic rite, which we have seen flourished in eleventh-century Hungary, were written in the vernacular. Margaret would also have been familiar with the German culture, its language and its customs, which was so prevalent among the nobility. As we saw in the last chapter, it is possible that her mother was of German descent. Familiarity with both the German and Scandinavian vernacular languages would have been helpful to Margaret in Anglo-Saxon England, as we will see in the next chapter.

Finally, Latin would prove to be a common denominator throughout Margaret’s life. In Hungary, it is possible that she was exposed to not only the ecclesiastical Latin of the Scriptures, but also the Latin of classical antiquity, which was employed by the laity as well as ecclesiastics. A very clear example of the incorporation of classical Latin texts is the Admonitions of St Stephen written c. 1015 by an anonymous cleric, perhaps Bishop Gerard, as a mirror of princes for his son.

**Models of Queenship**

The eleventh century witnessed the first beginnings of a tradition of Christian queenship in Hungary. The extent to which Margaret was aware of the example set by

---

46 Simon Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950-1300* (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 2002), 83-100. It would be interesting to consider how such lay access to vernacular religious tracts contrasted with the West’s use of Latin, while it also paralleled Anglo-Saxon use of Old-English texts, and what impact these differences and similarities might have had on Margaret.
these early queens can only be surmised. She might not have been an eye-witness at the royal court, but she would have at the very least heard something about “the queen” in the sort of everyday speculative talk that absorbs people’s attention. At most, “the queen” would have been invoked as a model of behavior for Margaret as a person of noble birth and the daughter of a prince, a model which could have been enforced even after Margaret left Hungary by those more able to remember it, including Margaret’s mother.

King Stephen’s wife, Gisela, provided an obvious point of comparison. The Legenda Maior S. Stephani, written in the late eleventh century and therefore nearly contemporary with Margaret, followed by Hartvic, portrays her as an evangelizing consort, assisting her husband in his systematic conversion of the country from paganism:

How she stood out in adorning the worship of God, and how fervent and beneficent she showed herself [to be] to the congregations serving God is showed to this day by many churches’ crosses, vessels, and ornaments made or woven by marvelous work. And above all the building of the bishopric of Veszprém [proves this] which she adorned nobly, beginning from the foundations, with every necessary thing for the service of God in gold and silver, and a multiplicity of vestments.49

Gisela and her ladies are credited with embroidering a chasuble for the royal collegiate church at the Alba Regia, which served as the coronation mantle of the kings of Hungary, and was perhaps not too dissimilar to the works of embroidery Margaret is supposed to have fashioned for the Church when she was queen.50 After Stephen’s death, Gisela became the abbess of the convent of Passau-Niedenburg, where she died (1060) and was buried. Her grave became a destination for pilgrims and she was included in the Acta Sanctorum without ever officially having been canonized.51 Even today, “the Blessed Gisela” is regularly included in representations of the founding royal saints of


50 Remarkably, this textile has survived the centuries and can be viewed today. See Éva Kovács, “The Coronation Mantle: King Stephen’s and Queen Gisela’s Chasuble,” in The Hungarian Crown and Other Regalia, ed. Éva Kovács and Zsuzsa Lovag, trans. Péter Balbán, trans. revised Mary and András Boros-Kazai, 2nd ed. (Éva Kovács and Zsuzsa Lovag, 1980), 58-75.

51 Her cult has undergone a recent revival; she was recognized as “blessed” in 1975, a new and as yet inconclusive canonization process began in 1994, and her relics were translated to Veszprém in 1996. Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary” 224 f. 6.
Hungary alongside her husband, St Stephen, and her son, St Imre.

It is possible that Margaret or those around her might have been familiar with the legacy of other favorably-received queens in neighboring countries. Ludmila, wife of Bořivoj, the first Christian ruler of Bohemia, and grandmother to St Wenceslas, was remembered as both a conjugal and a maternal evangeline.\(^{52}\) She was murdered in 921 and her remains later translated to the convent of St George in Prague Castle. In Kiev, Margaret’s parents would have been introduced to the cult of Olga, the grandmother of Vladimir, who was herself baptized in Constantinople in the mid-tenth century, and whose example was instrumental in introducing the Christianity of Byzantium to Kiev.\(^{53}\)

Evidently, Queens were judged according to the extent to which they were a positive, specifically Christian, influence on their husband and by extension the realm. Stephen’s mother, Sarolt, in contrast was described by the eleventh-century chronicler Thietmar of Merseburg as a woman who drank heavily, rode like a miles, and once even killed a man, not exactly the portrait of the ideal Christian queen.\(^{54}\) Her husband, Stephen’s father Géza, was known to have retained his pagan beliefs while dabbling in Christianity, even commenting that he was so wealthy that he could afford to espouse many religions. By implication, Sarolt’s reputation as both a wife and a queen was tarnished because she failed to convert truly and “civilize” her husband.\(^{55}\) A queen’s success or failure, according to the chronicles and those writing them, was dependent upon her ability to infuse her husband’s reign with Christian ethics.

As the highest-ranking and most visible foreigner in the land, the queen was also frequently the target of xenophobic sentiment.\(^{56}\) All the eleventh-century queens of


\(^{55}\) Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary,” 224.

\(^{56}\) Gisela later became the victim of what János Bak refers to as “posthumous moral assassination” when she was assigned the blame both for the bloody blinding of the rebel Vazul and for ushering in the failed
Hungary were foreign, with the exception of the wife of Samuel Aba (1041–4) who was the kinswoman of Stephen, perhaps his sister: Stephen’s wife was Gisela of Bavaria, Peter Orseolo’s second wife and queen was Judith of Steinfurt, and Andrew’s first wife might have been a pagan woman, but his second wife and queen was Anastasia of Kiev. Each of these foreign queens was accompanied to Hungary by their equally foreign knights and courtiers. These noble immigrants were granted influence, land, and income almost always at the expense of the local population, and the queen’s reputation.

The ability of the queen to produce heirs was another standard of measurement that became increasingly important as the system of inheritance changed. Prior to 1100 male primogeniture was not necessarily the accepted norm in Hungary, but it was becoming the trend. The primary system of inheritance was termed *senioratus*, which provided for the succession of the oldest male relative, usually a brother, similar to the system of tanistry that Margaret would encounter in Scotland. As a result, when Stephen inherited the throne from his father he was forced to contend with the competing claim of his kinsman, Koppány. Stephen clearly intended for his only child, Imre, to inherit the throne. However, when Imre died unexpectedly in 1031, Stephen’s kinsman, Vazul, made a bid for the throne and lost. Stephen was succeeded first by his sister’s son, and then by two distant relatives.\(^57\) King Andrew originally conformed to the tradition of *senioratus* by naming his brother, Béla, as his successor. Instead, however, the concept of primogeniture was clearly invoked when Andrew announced the succession of his first-born son, Salomon, which was made official by the crowning of the child. As primogeniture became the accepted system of inheritance, the pressure for a queen to produce sons and heirs increased. Indeed, the *Legenda S. Stephani Regis Maior* clearly states that one of Stephan’s primary motivations for marrying was to have children.\(^58\) The

---

\(^{57}\) Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Arpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386),” 1.

\(^{58}\) Legenda S. Stephani Regis Maior, ed. Bartoniek in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, 2.384: … precipue
importance of this dynastic role was underscored in a very personal way for Margaret as she later witnessed the demise of two English dynasties: the House of Wessex, and the Godwinsons.

The office of the queen was only just beginning to take shape in Hungary. As early as the tenth century the palace at Veszprém was associated with Hungary’s queens, beginning with Stephen’s mother, Sarolt. Gisela was then exiled there by King Peter. The bishops of Veszprém had the right to crown the queens of Hungary, and around 1210 the bishop of this monastery would become the head of the newly founded chancery of the Hungarian queen. There is no evidence of a _comes curiae reginae_ until the early thirteenth century: the first reference to an office is dated 1205, the chancellor of a queen is identified in a charter of 1224, and a treasurer of the queen is mentioned in 1261-2. In the eleventh century, however, the power and position of a queen was derived from her personal association with, and proximity to, the king, which had the advantage of allowing a royal consort with a strong will and charismatic personality to exercise her authority to its fullest. In this sense, the Scottish model of eleventh-century queenship more closely resembled the Hungarian than the Anglo-Saxon.

Margaret might also have been made aware of the role the Church played in the making of a kingdom. King Stephen was determined to accept his crown directly from the pope rather than the emperor. King Andrew acknowledged the importance of this relationship with Rome by declaring Christianity as the official religion of his newly acquired kingdom and ruthlessly subduing the pagan rebellion. He hearkened back to the days and the legend of St Stephen by reinstituting the latter’s laws. King Ladislas reaffirmed and strengthened papal support for the kingdom by promoting the

_causa sobolis propagande ..._

59 For a collection of charters and analysis see Attila Zsoldos, _Az Árpádok és asszonyaik: A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában_. Társadalom-és Művelődéstörténeti Tanulmányok 36 (Budapest, 2005).
60 Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Arpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386),” 17.
62 Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Arpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386),” 19.
64 Although the question is outside the scope of this study, it might also be worth considering whether and to what extent the Hungarian concept of queenship may have been influenced by the Byzantine.
canonization of the founding king and his heir in 1083. Chronicle accounts toward the end of the eleventh century and into the twelfth century emphasized Stephen’s role as “founder and apostolic king,” enabling the kingdom to maintain an independence from the competing attentions of papal and imperial forces. Pope Innocent III gave his canonical approval for the _Legend of St Stephen_ by Hartvic, which portrayed King Stephen as the saintly king who converted his realm to Christianity. The kingdom of Hungary, according to legend and contemporary perception, was thus founded by one man, St Stephen, in association with one institution, the Church. Rome’s recognition of Hungary as a Christian kingdom among equals played a part in keeping it free from the acquisitive impulses of the German Empire.

**Family Position**

Margaret’s family was likely to have found itself politically isolated. As members of an emerging society with fledgling legal and economic structures, the Hungarian nobility derived their strength from a close, mutually supportive kindred, or clan. Immigrant knights in general lacked “a powerful network of family members and friendly witnesses upon whom to rely in physical and legal conflicts with their neighbours.” The position of Margaret’s family would have been particularly precarious given their recent arrival in the kingdom and their lack of the support traditionally provided by blood relatives. Edward the Exile held the ambiguous and unpromising position of an exiled prince. He was neither German, nor Venetian, nor Kievan, nor Hungarian, but Anglo-Saxon. The names of Edward and Agatha and the names they chose to give to their children proclaimed their foreign-ness. It is obvious that Margaret and her family were part of the alien, land-holding noble class that was so resented by the native population, but neither did they truly belong to the mutually supportive network of its society.

Perhaps the final proof of Edward’s lack of any real standing is the fact that in 1057 he chose to abandon Hungary and any property or position which he might have

---


66 Martyn C. Rady, _Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary_ (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, in association with School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, 2000), 17.
held there in order to return to Anglo-Saxon England at the invitation of Edward the Confessor. Edward the Exile had been summoned home after forty-one years and a lifetime in exile to take his place as the heir to the throne of England.

* * * * *

Studies of Margaret often assume that the primary if not the sole influence on Margaret in Hungary was the Christian court of St Stephen and her Benedictine education. Instead, the possible models were far more diverse. The coexistence of Christian expressions of piety was pervasive: Latin and Greek, coenobitic and eremitic, Western and Eastern asceticism. Models of behavior would have been provided by an international elite comprised at least of Scandinavian, Russian, German and Hungarian languages and cultures.
I.3. THE ANGLO-SAXON PRINCESS

Very little is known about Margaret’s experiences at the court of her great-uncle, Edward the Confessor. The chronicles and her own Vita are silent regarding her activities from 1057 to 1066, a silence that echoes in the treatment of these nine years by modern biographers. T. Ratcliffe Barnett states that any consideration of this period “is all conjecture, and we must imagine for ourselves the life, the education, and the religious exercises of Margaret Ætheling during these nine years at Eadward the Confessor’s Court.”¹ While detailing historical events and genealogies, Samuel Cowen disregards her English sojourn asserting that, “the Princess Margaret’s life, as known to us, began with her marriage in 1070 to Malcolm III.”² A. M. D. Henderson-Howat devotes an entire chapter to this portion of Margaret’s life but considers her experiences almost exclusively in relation to her sainted uncle.³ Her most recent biographer, Alan J. Wilson, dedicates only three paragraphs to the topic, concluding simply that Margaret and her family found the “religious atmosphere” in England “compatible.”⁴ Still, these were important years for Margaret. She had come to England as the daughter of the heir to the throne and the great-niece of the king. As a member of the royal family, she would have been presented with established models of behavior and expectations.

Court Position

In order to gain a better knowledge of where Margaret and her family fit into the culture of Edward’s court, it is first necessary to understand the circumstances of their arrival in England.⁵ Edward, the son of Aethelraed and Emma, had been brought out of his Norman exile and made king in 1042. In 1045 he married Edith, the daughter of the

¹ T. Radcliffe Barnett, Margaret of Scotland, Queen and Saint; her influence on the early church in Scotland (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1926), 21.
² Samuel Cowan, Life of the Princess Margaret: Queen of Scotland, 1070-1093 (Newcastle-on-Tyne: Mawson Swan & Morgan Limited, 1911), 98.
⁴ Wilson, St Margaret of Scotland, 44-45.
⁵ For a more detailed historical analysis of the following see Freeman, A History of the Norman Conquest, passim; Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 423-32, 545-80; Barlow, Edward the Confesso, passim.
most powerful earl in England, Godwin. After years of marriage, without either a hope or a hint of a pregnancy, it had become apparent to all concerned that the royal couple would remain childless. The resulting question of succession was complicated by the continuing conflicts between competing factions at court and the fact that there certainly was no dearth of possible contenders for the throne. The Norman camp, led by the recently installed Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert of Jumièges, naturally supported the claim of William of Normandy, while Swein of Denmark (1042-76), the nephew of Cnut, might have found a sympathetic reception from those of Scandinavian descent. Ralph of Mantes, Edward’s nephew by his sister Gunhild, was also a viable contender, holding significant estates concentrated in the Welsh marches. King Edward was further hamstrung by the fact that non-royal power had been concentrated in the hands of four great families, the most significant of which, the Godwins, possessed enough wealth and power to rival that of the king.

In 1054 Edward the Confessor began to negotiate for the return of Edward the Exile as heir to the throne. Such a proposition presented numerous challenges. Edward the Exile had been raised at a foreign court, he had a foreign wife, and he was probably not readily fluent in Old English, the language of Anglo-Saxon England. On the other hand, he had already fathered an heir, thereby promising the smooth succession that Edward the Confessor had failed to provide, whom he had given the royal Anglo-Saxon name of Edgar. Edward the Exile and his contemporaries would have been aware of the many instances in which exiled royals had returned to rule successfully: King Andrew of Hungary, Magnus the Good, and of course Edward the Confessor. In the end, the decision was made to recall Edward from Hungary, probably with the support of royal advisers loyal to the native dynasty and by the order of King Edward himself.

---

8 The wealth of the Godwins not only approximated that of the wealth of the king, but the family was far wealthier than any of their lay counterparts. Clarke states that “King Edward’s demesne lands were worth about £6,000, including the land of Queen Eadgyth. The family of Godwin had lands worth £5,000, and the family of Earl Leofric about half as much. The next richest layman was Beorhtric, Aelfgar’s son, but his lands were worth only £560.” Clarke, *The English Nobility under Edward the Confessor*, 162.
9 Barlow makes the supposition that a key consideration was that, following the Godwin rebellion of 1052, Englishmen determined to unite rather than continue to fight each other. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 109-11.
King Edward first dispatched Bishop Ealdred of Worcester (bishop of Worcester c. 1046-1062; bishop of York 1061-1069) to Cologne to seek the assistance of Emperor Henry III. After a year the bishop returned to England, but without having secured the return of Edward. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records simply that “Bishop [Ealdred] went overseas to Cologne on the king’s business, and there was received with great honour by the emperor, and he stayed there for nearly a year, and the bishop of Cologne and the emperor both gave him entertainment.” John of Worcester adds that the purpose of the bishop’s visit was to retrieve Edward the Exile. William of Malmesbury states that Edward the Confessor regarded his nephew as his heir, but asserts that he sent messengers directly to the king of Hungary, completely omitting any mention of Ealdred’s mission to Emperor Henry. Gaimar records simply that “The English sent for the young men because their father was no longer alive, and to anyone willing to recognize the truth, his two sons were his legitimate heirs.” The Dunfermline Vita includes the mention of the mission to Emperor Henry and agrees that Edward’s intention...
was to make his nephew his heir. The remarkable point is that all the chronicles agree that Edward the Exile was acknowledged as the heir to the kingdom.

The failure of Ealdred’s mission is puzzling. It has been surmised that the intercession of Henry III was required because Hungary was so foreign to the English. Perhaps, but when Ealdred journeyed to Jerusalem in 1058, he chose to go by way of Hungary, thereby demonstrating that direct communication between the two countries was possible and not altogether infrequent, even if only as a point of transit. In any event, Henry himself appears to have been the stumbling block because shortly after his death on 5 October 1056 King Edward chose Harold Godwinson as the leader of a delegation sent to retrieve the Exile. Frank Barlow observes that Harold was known to have been at Saint-Omer on 13 November 1056 when he witnessed a charter of his brother-in-law Count Baldwin V. Barlow further conjectures that, from there, Harold probably traveled to Cologne, where he would have met with young Henry IV and Pope Victor II. Harold might have accompanied the court to Regensburg, where geographic proximity might have permitted him to negotiate directly with Hungary. He could then have traveled to Rome with the pope before returning to Bavaria, collecting Edward the Exile, and beginning the journey back to England.

It is perhaps significant that King Edward chose Harold, his chief battle commander and most powerful earl, to lead the embassy to Saint-Omer. Perhaps he was seeking to assure his designated heir of the indigenous support he would find upon his return. Certainly it would signal to all parties concerned where Harold’s allegiance lay. It also indicates the vested interest that the Godwins had in Edward the Exile’s family from the beginning. In fact, the relations between the family of Godwin and the heirs to

---

15 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6va: diriget nuncios ad henricum imperatorem romanum rogans ut nepotem suum edwardum filium edmundi ferrei lateris debiti sibi regni futurum heredem mittite dignaretur. Aelred gives a similar account in his Genealogia, PL 195: 734b except that he omits the name of the emperor, and identifies Edmund Ironside as Edward the Confessor’s brother: dirigat nuntios ad Romanum imperatorem, rogans, ut nepotem suum scilicet, filium fratris sui Edmundi ferrei lateris, debiti sibi regni futurum haeredem mittere dignaretur. Aelred’s phrase “filium fratris sui Edmundi” is similar to William of Malmesbury’s “filium fratris Edmundi.”

16 Frank Barlow, The Godwins: the rise and fall of a noble dynasty (Harlow, Essex: Longman, 2002), 59. Perhaps, however, this comment says more about the twentieth-century perception of an East/West division.

17 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1058; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1058; Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1058.

the royal line of Wessex was not without history; in 1014, Athelstan, the eldest son of King Aethelraed, in his will restored Compton in Sussex to Godwin, showing that the family was “in Athelstan’s good books and maybe an adherent of [Athelstan’s] warrior brother, Edmund Ironside.”

This historical association between the two houses would have been perpetuated as the young family arrived in England under the auspices of Harold. The purpose of this excursus is not to resolve this question. It is enough to state simply that Edward the Exile was summoned by Edward the Confessor as his acknowledged heir.

It appears that the arrival of Edward and the welcome prospect of a peaceful succession were greeted enthusiastically. Unfortunately, Edward died within a few days of landing, without having ever seen his royal uncle. John of Worcester and the E version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle state simply that Edward died in London only a short time after his arrival. Both the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Dunfermline Vita are more emotional, perhaps confirming Dorothy Whitelock’s observation that the D chronicle was more closely aligned with the Scottish court, and might even include an interpolation derived from a version of Margaret’s Vita.

20 Barlow observes that the only chronicler to have indicated explicitly that they traveled as a family was John of Fordun, whose source we now know was a version of the Dunfermline Vita. Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 218. See Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.14; Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6vb. Further evidence that the family was together is supplied by the fact that Edward’s wife and children are known to have fled to Scotland together in 1067 (see next chapter) and since it is highly unlikely that the family would have journeyed to England at any time after the death of Edward, which occurred almost immediately after his arrival, then it is most likely that they had accompanied him.
21 See Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 215-17.
22 John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1057: Decreverat enim rex illum post se regni heredem constituere... See Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 2.409. Freeman also infers that in order to be named successor to the Crown, he must have had the support of the Witan and Harold. Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 2.369-71.
23 Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 217; Barlow, The Godwins, 59; Ronay, The Lost King of England, 138-140; Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 2.410-12. Ronay surmises that Harold was responsible for Edward’s untimely death, but Freeman points out that if Harold had, in fact, wanted Edward out of the way, then he had ample time to accomplish this task without waiting for him first to set foot in England with his son, another heir and aetheling. If indeed Edward was murdered, Freeman prefers to accuse the Normans rather than implicating his hero, Harold. He asserts, however, that it is most likely that Edward simply sickened on the long journey, which would explain why he was never taken to see the king.
24 The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that he was buried in St Paul’s minster in London, and John of Worcester states only that he died in London. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a. 1057; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1057.
contrast to the more clinical assessment of the E version, the D chronicle gives itself over to unrestrained grief when recounting the tragedy of Edward’s death: “Alas, that was a miserable fate and grievous to all this people that he so speedily ended his life after he came to England, to the misfortune of this poor people.” The Dunfermline Vita includes a well-placed reference to the Old Testament: “But in accordance with the saying of Solomon, sorrow seizes extremes of joy; joy changed into sorrow and laughter into mourning when Edward succumbed to an early death after a few days.” Although these accounts were written after the Conquest, with a keen view to all of the negative implications for Anglo-Saxon society, they clearly indicate the yearnings of at least a segment of the population.

So, within days of their arrival in a foreign land the family of Edward the Exile found itself once again in an ambiguous and awkward situation. Edward’s widow, Agatha, was foreign-born, without family, contacts, or sponsors, and three young children. Edgar, the youngest, would have been about five years old, meaning that Margaret would have been at least eight, leaving room for Christina to be born in between. If we assume that Agatha was the daughter of Liudolf, then Margaret would have been at most seventeen. Bruno and Gisela were married in 1009. If their son Liudolf was born in 1010, and if he married at the age of fifteen, then Agatha could have been born no earlier than 1025. If Agatha had her first child as young as fifteen then Margaret could have been born in 1040. In short, Margaret is likely to have been born between 1040 and 1049. A conservative estimate results in an approximate date of 1045 or 1046, making Margaret about twelve when the family left Hungary. As Edward’s only son and heir, the family would derive their standing from the position in which Edgar was placed, a precarious one that combined the rank of privilege without any of its attendant power.

Edgar’s official position at court is determined by his designation as aetheling, a

26 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1057.
27 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6vb: Sed iuxta illud salomonis, extrema gaudii luctus occupat, post modicum dierum tempus immature morti cedens, gaudium mutavit in luctum, et risum in lamentum.
28 Orderic Vitalis states that Edgar was the same age as Robert Curthose, who was born in 1052. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Chibnall, 5.272.
term indicating that he was ‘throne worthy.’\footnote{For the meaning of the title see Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen, ed. Liebermann, 1.665, para 35 1c, although it should be noted that this source dates to the twelfth century.} By 1066 both the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and John of Worcester had transferred this title from Edward the Exile to his son Edgar.\footnote{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D and E, s.a. 1057; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1057. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a.1066; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1066.} Proof of Edgar’s standing as heir can be seen in the fact that he is identified as such when his name appears alongside those of King Edward and Queen Edith in the New Minster, Winchester’s Liber Vitae.\footnote{British Library, Stowe 944, fo. 29r: Eadweard rex, Eadgyð regina, Edgar clito. D.E.R. Watt translates clito as ætheling, noting that it might be derived from the Greek κλειτός meaning “famous, renowned, illustrious.” Walter Bower, Scotichronicon, ed. D.E.R. Watt, 3.191-2, n. 19. See also Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 83.}

Historically speaking, all sons of kings were viewed as ætheling, simply by virtue of their birth. It was a term charged with meaning, indicating an actual claim to the throne rather than a mere title.\footnote{Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 83.} By granting him such a designation, Edward the Confessor was, in effect, adopting him as his son.\footnote{Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 76; Barlow, The Godwins, 59.} Edgar joined a very select group of privileged few who numbered themselves among Edward’s family. Barlow notes that Edward did not make a habit of stacking his court with relatives, which would presumably make inclusion in that group more significant.\footnote{Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 163.} In addition to Edgar, the court included other potential heirs to the throne: Queen Edith’s younger brothers, Tostig, Gyrth, and Leofwine, and the king’s other nephew Ralf of Mantes.\footnote{Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 163-4.} The anonymous writer of King Edward’s Vita includes among Edith’s other qualities the maternal care she lavished on these children, stating that she “reared, educated, adorned and showered with motherly love those boys who were said to be of royal stock.”\footnote{The Life of Edward the Confessor who rests at Westminster, ed. and trans. Barlow, 24-5: quanto studio pueros, qui ex ipsius regis genere dicebantur, enutrierit, docuerit, ornauerit et omnem maternum affectum in eis effuderit.} A cynical mind might be inclined to ask whether such vigilance was motivated more by genuine care or the need to keep a watchful eye on potential threats. In any case, the value of these young people is clearly underscored by the interest the royal couple is said to have taken in their upbringing, their proximity to the king, and their inclusion at court.
Once Edgar was named *aetheling*, a secure succession could have been assumed. The designation of an heir was not without precedent; Athelstan, Eadred, and Eadwig had been succeeded respectively by a stepbrother, a nephew, and a brother, perhaps with prior designation.\(^{37}\) Furthermore, it was a tradition to allude to an offspring’s *aetheling* status by naming him after royal predecessors. With one exception, Aethelraed named his sons after his kingly ancestors in historical order: Athelstan, Egbert, Edmund, Eadred, Eadwig and Edgar.\(^ {38}\) Edmund Ironside selected the two very popular dynastic names for his sons, Edward and Edmund. Edward in turn named his son Edgar, clearly announcing his Anglo-Saxon royal heritage.\(^ {39}\)

Furthermore, Barlow notes that during this time the chronicles demonstrated a marked lack of interest in the activities of foreign contenders for the throne, which he attributes to the complacency of the chroniclers: the succession having been assured, the activities of the foreign contenders were deemed to be irrelevant.\(^ {40}\) In the meantime, another possible claimant, Ralph of Mantes, was removed by the most natural of causes, death.\(^ {41}\) Edgar certainly had a strong claim in his own right since he was the only descendant of the male line from his grandfather who had been a crowned king of England, if only for a few months. Other contenders, however, could claim descent only through the female line: Harold, son of Earl Ralph and grandson of Edward’s sister Godgifu; another unnamed grandson of Godgifu and Eustace of Boulogne; Gospatric, grandson of Edward’s half-sister Aelfgifu; and Siward and Ealdred, perhaps grandsons of Eadric Streona and Aethelraed’s daughter Edith.\(^ {42}\)

The greatest argument for the weight that the title *aetheling* carried is the fact that Edgar was actually, no matter how briefly, the elected king of England following the death of King Harold. The D version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* asserts that

\(^{37}\) Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 88-89.

\(^{38}\) Egbert is the exception. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 28.

\(^{39}\) Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 91. Margaret also named her sons in order of the historical patrilineal line of succession to the throne of England, with exception of her two last sons. See Part 2, Chapter 2.


\(^{41}\) Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, 2.415-6. Significantly, Ralph’s son was named Harold, perhaps indicating a recognition of Earl Harold’s claim to the throne, or at least his elevated status.

\(^{42}\) Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 88-89.
Archbishop Ealdred of York (the same who had been sent to retrieve Edward the Exile in 1054), the citizens of London, and the Earls Edwin and Morcar met in London to elect Edgar as king, “as was his proper due,” and to pledge their support.  

However, many irregular aspects of Edgar’s designation as aetheling marred its orthodoxy. For example, Edward’s adoption of Edgar as his heir was without precedent given that since 900 the term aetheling had been employed exclusively to describe an individual who was the legitimate son of a crowned king. Although his royal lineage was impeccable, Edgar’s father had never been crowned. Edgar’s claim was further compromised by the fact that he was not English-born. It could be argued, however, that least he would have the benefit of being raised as an Englishman at the court of his predecessor, unlike Edward the Confessor who, although born in England, was raised in Normandy. 

His youth was another disadvantage. Edgar was only five at the time of his father’s death and his designation as aetheling. Still, it could be reasonably assumed that Edward the Confessor would live into the 1070s, when he could bequeath a peaceful kingdom to a young man rather than a boy. Even in 1066 it could be argued that Edgar was technically old enough to rule, although he may not have been regarded as sufficiently wise or mature. The English would have remembered with dread the legacy of previous boy-kings. 

Edgar’s official title does not seem to have been accompanied by any indication of real power or position, since he appears to have possessed neither land nor retainers during Edward’s reign. It was only after the Conquest that Edgar received land while retaining his now empty title. He is listed in the Domesday Book as ‘Edgar Aetheling,’

---

43 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1066.
44 Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 83.
47 Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 272 n.72.
49 Although there seems to be no established precedence given the complicated successions in England’s recent past. Edmund Ironside and Harold II had been forced to gain territory through marriage, and Robert Curthose was famously frustrated with his lack of authority during his father’s reign. Cnut, on the other hand, had given his son Svein an entire kingdom to rule. I suspect that Edgar’s youth was an important factor contributing to his lack of resources.
holding lands in Hertfordshire presumably granted to him by William in recognition of his dignified position.\textsuperscript{50} William also affirmed Edgar’s valuable position in a more negative manner when he took him as hostage along with other prominent Anglo-Saxons immediately following the Conquest.\textsuperscript{51}

**Margaret’s Position**

So, while Edgar was officially acknowledged as the heir to the throne, in many ways this appears to have been an empty position. As might be expected, other members of Edgar’s family similarly enjoyed prestigious positions without any tenable power. As relatives of the *aetheling*, they could expect to benefit from some acknowledged rank. Edgar’s sisters, Margaret and Christina, were probably among the group of young people in whom the queen took such an interest.\textsuperscript{52} More specifically, this maternal affection would have meant that Margaret and her sister were educated at a nunnery according to the customs of the day. They would have been placed in the care of one of the six great nunneries of Wessex that were patronized by the royal family: Shaftesbury in northern Dorset, Wilton and Amesbury in southern Wiltshire, the Nunnaminster in Winchester, or Romsey and Wherwell in Hampshire.\textsuperscript{53} These monastic communities for women were usually under the leadership of royal or upper aristocratic women and, following the centralization of the tenth-century reform movement, they came increasingly under royal control.\textsuperscript{54} They were all closely connected with the royal house having all been initially founded by kings and members of the royal family, and all being governed by abbesses who were almost without exception of royal blood.\textsuperscript{55}

Recent evidence supports the supposition that Margaret was reared at Wilton Abbey. These institutions tended to be familial in that they developed relationships with

\textsuperscript{51} Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1066.
\textsuperscript{52} Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 164.
\textsuperscript{54} Meyer, “Patronage of the West Saxon Royal Nunneries in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” 337-39.
\textsuperscript{55} Meyer, “Patronage of the West Saxon Royal Nunneries in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” 357-58.
specific queens and their resulting distinct dynastic branches. In the tenth century, the abbess at Wilton was the displaced wife or concubine of King Edgar, Wulfthryth, whose daughter Edith, King Edward’s aunt, also resided there as a nun, later becoming the patron saint of the nunnery. Edgar’s queen, Aelfthryth, chose instead to favor Wherwell, a tradition that was continued when her granddaughter became its abess in the mid-eleventh century. Queen Edith and possibly her sisters were educated at Wilton, and her niece, Gunhild, the daughter of Harold, was placed there after her father’s defeat and death at Hastings. Margaret’s sister, Christina, was at Wilton, and Margaret sent her daughters there to be educated under the strict supervision of their aunt. Given all these family associations with Wilton, it would have been highly unusual for Margaret to have been raised anywhere else, and it is therefore safe to assume that the sister of the aetheling was educated at this royal nunnery under the watchful eye of the queen, its principal benefactress and after 1066 its highest-ranking resident.

Despite such privileged status, however, Margaret would have been distinguished from the rest of Anglo-Saxon society by her exotic name. A person’s dynastic affiliation was indicated by their name. It has already been noted, for example, that Edward the Exile announced his son’s position in line for the throne of England by giving him the recognizably Anglo-Saxon name, Edgar. The use of “Margaret” as a Christian name was simply unknown in Anglo-Saxon England. If Margaret had chosen, or had been

57 Stafford, “Queens, Nunneries and Reforming Churchmen,” 25; Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 257.
60 A database of individuals in Anglo-Saxon England from the late sixth to the late eleventh centuries does not include any other person named Margaret. See www.pase.ac.uk.
encouraged, to affiliate herself with the Anglo-Saxon dynasty, the fact that she remained named Margaret is puzzling. It was quite the norm for noble women to alter their names in order to conform to the female names of their husband’s family. When Aethelraed married Emma in 1002 she was given the name of one of the dynasty’s recent royal saints, Aelfgifu, his grandmother. Stafford speculates that Edith might not have been the queen’s original name; if Emma was renamed after a notable family saint, so Edith could have been named for Edward’s holy aunt, the patron saint of Wilton. Even Margaret’s own daughter, another Edith, had her name changed to Matilda after marrying Henry I in recognition of Henry’s mother.

Margaret’s Christian name was recognized as the name of a saint rather than a personal name. The cult of St Margaret of Antioch was strong and growing in England; St Margaret features in the litanies and in almost all the surviving calendars of the Anglo-Saxon church from the late tenth century onwards. An online search of the *Domesday Book* reveals five churches dedicated to St Margaret. An inventory of all known prose saints’ calendars in Anglo-Saxon England up to and including the eleventh century indicates that the feast of St Margaret was widely observed. She was well represented in the surviving Anglo-Saxon litanies of saints. The story of St Margaret existed in popular Old English vernacular versions. Edward the Confessor held the cult of St Margaret in particular favor, dedicating a chapel at the New Minster to her. Margaret’s sister Christina was also named after a saint whose cult was introduced to England at the same time as St Margaret’s. When Archbishop Sigeric went to Rome in 990 to receive his pallium, he came into contact with the cults of both saints and introduced them to

---

61 Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 72; Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 30.
62 Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 257-58.
65 Feasts for St Margaret are listed on July 13, 18 and 20 and for St Marina on July 7 and 17. Rebecca Rushforth, *An Atlas of Saints in Anglo-Saxon Calendars* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2002).
67 *The Old English Lives of St Margaret*, ed. Clayton, 75-77
England simultaneously. It is suspiciously coincidental that both girls possessed the names of the only two female saints recently introduced into England, names that were otherwise unknown. Perhaps Margaret chose to be named after a patron saint particularly close to Edward in an effort to acclimate, much as new wives adopted a dynastic name from their new husband’s family tree. It is more probable, however, that Margaret represented the vanguard of a movement whereby children were given saintly names from the Bible and Late Antiquity in those newly Christianized territories on the periphery of Europe that lacked a treasury of indigenous saintly names.

Stafford concludes that while Edward the Exile chose a popular dynastic name for his son, the “more exotic names, Margaret and Christina, reflect their foreign birth and dynastic marginality.” Perhaps, however, these names were deliberately chosen to associate the young girls with a sanctified dynasty, thereby ingratiating themselves with all elements of the court, or at least offending no one specific faction. Their names were neither Anglo-Saxon, nor Norman, nor German, nor Hungarian. Their affiliation was to a higher, holy order.

In addition to such cultural indications of privilege, Margaret possessed material evidence of her rank. First, she was known to have her own personal Book of Gospels, possession of which seems to have been quite the fashion, reserved particularly for ladies of exalted position. These devotional texts were richly adorned with gold, silver and precious jewels, much as shrine reliquaries clothed their contents in material splendor.

---

68 The Old English Lives of St Margaret, ed. Clayton, 82.
69 Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 91.
70 Brown, The Cult of the Saints, 58: “The later spread of Christian names reflects the need to link the identity of the individual to a saint.”
71 Interestingly, the heightened popularity of Margaret of Antioch after the Norman Conquest is attributed partly to the increased respect for Queen Margaret, the last Anglo-Saxon princess. The Old English Lives of St Margaret, ed. Clayton, 82-83.
73 For the function of books and reliquaries as memorial objects and their ornamentation in support of that function see Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 47-48.
In addition to the elaborate ornamentation of the cover, Margaret’s book would have been costly in terms of the materials used, especially the vellum and gold ink. Judith of Flanders, the wife of Tostig Godwinson, owned a Gospel Book made specifically for her in 1065. Emma of Normandy and Matilda of Tuscany both commissioned books in which they are depicted visually, while Edith, of course, was responsible for the *Vita Eadwardi Regis*.

Although the evidence is slim, it seems that Margaret’s book might have been written specifically for her, or perhaps even transcribed by her. First, it was written during the appropriate time period, sometime between 1030 and 1070. Second, the book was obviously intended for an individual’s personal use: its size indicates that it was meant to be carried and held in the hand; it contains a small number of simplified readings, revealing that it was intended for a lay person rather than for a learned cleric; and it is an unpretentious book, modestly written and not particularly ornate. In any event, the possession of such a treasure, whether received as a gift or personally commissioned, is clearly a mark of privilege.

Margaret was also known to have possessed a relic known as the “Holy Rood,” purportedly a piece of the True Cross. If owning your own book was the fashion for young ladies, the collection of relics was positively the rage. Queen Emma was especially known as being both acquisitive and generous in the dispensation of relics. She secured the body of St Bartholomew from the bishop of Benevento during his visit to

74 Rushforth, *St Margaret’s Gospel-book*, 25-26, 30. 43
76 Gameson, “The Gospels of Margaret of Scotland,” 162. For more on the craftsmanship of the book itself see Rushforth, *St Margaret’s Gospel-book*, 25-55. The book also bears traces of Carolingian influence in terms of iconographic similarities and the unusually rich hues. This observation does not, however, imply that the book was made on the Continent, just that it was constructed by someone in England who had been influenced by the Carolingian style. David Rice Talbot, *English Art 871-1100* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), 211.
77 Rebecca Rushforth suggests that Margaret could have written the Gospel Book, a point which is given more credibility by fact that St Edith (almost certainly) and Eve of Wilton (possibly) wrote their own devotional manuals. Rushforth, *St Margaret’s Gospel-book*, 55. For St Edith and Eve see Goscelin, “The Vita of Edith,” 34 and the analyses in Hollis, “Wilton as a Centre of Learning,” 310 and 312 respectively. Richard Gameson, however, who is generally less inclined to accept the idea of female literacy, contends that given the absence of any positive evidence this book was probably given to her as a gift rather than written specifically for her. Gameson, “The Gospels of Margaret of Scotland,” 154.
England. During her stay in Rouen following the death of Aethelraed she bought the body of St Ouen. Edith’s assiduous collection of relics caused those whom she intended to deprive of their holy treasure to condemn her activities. Evesham records that she ordered all the relics of the monasteries of England to be gathered at Glastonbury, intending to requisition the best for herself. After the shrines were opened for her inspection, Evesham’s St Odulph censored her avarice by striking her blind.

Possessing a piece of the True Cross was particularly fortunate given the culture’s preoccupation with the legend of the True Cross, in part because of the general belief that Helena, who supposedly found the Cross, was of British origin. Copies of the Latin text recording the legend are known to have existed in England by the ninth century, followed shortly by an Old English version composed by Cynewulf, titled Elene. In the tenth century, Aelfric added his own Old English homiletic version to the corpus.

Not surprisingly given the popularity of the cult, fragments of the True Cross were much sought after. The pope was said to have sent a piece of the True Cross to King Alfred (d. 899). Hugh the Great, Duke of the Franks (d. 956) sent King Aethelstan of England (d. 939), among other gifts, a fragment of the True Cross and a thorn from the Crown of Thorns as part of his request for the king’s sister, Eadhild, in marriage. They were then deposited at Malmesbury around 927. At Winchester and

79 Eadmer, Historia Novorum, PL 159, col. 416b.
other foundations, bishop Aethelwold actively promoted the cult of the Holy Cross. At Abingdon the focus of the cult was an iron cross, later known as the Black Cross (crux nigra), which was found in a sarcophagus on the site of what was thought to have been a former nunnery dedicated to St Helen. The iron cross was considered to have been fashioned from a nail of the True Cross and appropriately venerated as such. Edward the Confessor purportedly possessed a portion of the True Cross which he is said to have donated to Westminster.

The relic that Margaret possessed might have been part of her dowry for three reasons. First, as Edina Bozóky argues, it was common for women to possess relics which they acquired as part of the “prix nuptial.” They would then transport these relics to subsequent marriages. For example, Judith of Flanders, widow of Tostig Earl of Northumbria, brought a relic of St Oswald of Northumbria when she was remarried to Henry II Welf of Bavaria in 1171. Second, queens seem to have had a particular affinity for the Cross, perhaps because of its association with St Helena. Third, Margaret and her family had the opportunity to acquire a fragment. Perhaps Edward the Confessor, who, as we saw above, is thought to have donated a fragment to Westminster, made a fragment available to Margaret as part of her dowry. It is also possible that Margaret acquired a relic of the True Cross while she was in Hungary. Éva Kovács speculates that the cross on the dome of the Hungarian crown originally contained a piece of the Cross and she further states that the Árpád dynasty possessed “several small fragments of the True Cross.”

---

87 Bozóky, La Politique des Reliques, 230-1.
89 Éva Kovács, “The Closed Crown and the Coronation Mantle,” in The Hungarian Crown and Other Regalia, ed. Kovács and Lovag, 81. A. O. Anderson, however, asserts without supporting documentation that the relic “was brought by Margaret from Austria.” Anderson, Early Sources, 2.171, n. 1.
The importance imputed to these material goods, their association with queenship, sanctity, and status, helps to explain the attention given to Margaret’s Gospels and the Holy Rood relic by her hagiographer and subsequent biographers. They were not, however, necessarily a mark of her religious vocation, as is so often assumed. Instead, being honored with these gifts was a clear indication of her acknowledged status at court. Only women from the wealthiest, most powerful families would have been favored in such a way. Still, if, like her brother, she enjoyed a certain privileged status at Edward’s court, she was also apparently deprived of any power that might accrue as a result of that status. She held no money, no land, and therefore no real power. It should be noted that it was not at all unusual during this time for women to own land in their own right. Indeed, Edith the Fair, probably the same lady who was Earl Harold’s long-standing mistress, was one of the wealthiest people in the kingdom. At a time when the worth of a woman was reflected in her ability to bring a fine dowry to either a worthy husband or a deserving monastic institution, both Margaret and her sister Christina remained without the means to do so. Margaret’s dowry remained her royal ancestry.

**Queenship and Reginal Piety**

As stated previously, one of the principle functions of Wilton was to serve as a center of learning for aristocratic women, inculcating them with lessons derived from saintly royal exemplars. Stephanie Hollis, in her study regarding the women at Wilton, argues convincingly that Queen Edith modeled her behavior on the example of St Edith, noting that the detailed descriptions of their respective activities makes it unlikely that they were mere hagiographic topoi. St Edith was a textual model of royal sanctity for Queen Edith, who in turn was a flesh and blood model of reginal piety for Margaret. This chapter will establish the connection between the two Ediths, the saint and the

---

91 Hollis, “Wilson as a Center of Learning,” in *Writing the Wilton Women*, ed. Hollis, 322.
queen, and the following chapter will explore the manner in which Margaret might have implemented the lessons she learned.

Life at Wilton would have consisted of a privileged and aristocratic society more akin to a boarding school for the elite than a cloistered convent or the life of austerity so often associated with religious houses. 93 Nor did being raised at a nunnery, contrary to so many of the assumptions made by Margaret’s biographers, imply any degree of religious vocation. 94 Rather, it was a well-appointed, luxurious residence, even sporting its own zoo of exotic animals unknown elsewhere in England. 95 The women would have all been well dressed by court standards and expected to avail themselves of the very best education available. 96 They would have studied languages, the liberal arts, spiritual devotion, as well as more practical ladylike pursuits such as embroidery and weaving. 97

The famous embroidery of Anglo-Saxon England was widely known as Opus


94 Stafford, makes this statement regarding Edith’s upbringing at the convent and Barlow makes the same argument regarding Edward the Confessor and his early childhood stay among the monks at Ely. Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 259; Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 33, 39.

95 Goscelin, “The Vita of St Edith,” trans. Wright and Loncar, in Writing the Wilton Women, ed. Hollis, 41. It seems that in his description of St Edith and these wild beasts Goscelin is seeking to portray his subject as a solitary ascetic able to survive in the wilderness through the grace of God. It is somewhat ironic, therefore, that this passage has been interpreted, rightly, by modern scholars as evidence of her privilege. 96 Indeed, Bishop Aethelwold once rebuked St Edith for her finery at this covering than beneath a goatskin. I possess my Lord, this garment [hairshirt], is reported to have replied in these words: ‘Believe, reverend father, a mind by no means poorer in aspiring to God will live beneath this covering than beneath a goatskin. I possess my Lord, who pays attention to the mind, not to the clothing…’

97 Goscelin, “The Vita of St Edith,” trans. Wright and Loncar, in Writing the Wilton Women, ed. Hollis, 38-39. Indeed, like the sister of Aaron and the sister of the priests of God, she embroidered with flowers the pontifical vestments of Christ with all her skill and capacity to make splendid. Here purple, dyed with Punic red, with murex and Sidonian shellfish, and twice-dipped scarlet were interwoven with gold; chrysolite, topaz, onyx and beryl and precious stones were intertwined with gold; union pearls, the shells’ treasure, which only India produces in the east and Britain, the land of the English, in the west, were set like stars in gold; the golden insignia of the cross, the golden images of the saints were outlined with a surround of pearls.
Royal ladies such as St Aethelthryth, the four daughters of Edward the Elder, and Emma, the wife of King Cnut, were noted for their skill at this craft.\textsuperscript{99} Queen Aelflaed embroidered a stole which Athelstan donated to St Cuthbert in 934, and remains one of the treasures of Durham Cathedral.\textsuperscript{100} Goscelin describes a richly-embroidered alb, which was said to have been designed by St Edith herself and was displayed at Wilton, where Margaret was likely to have seen it and become familiar with the story accompanying it.\textsuperscript{101} Such craftsmanship was expected of noble ladies and appreciated for both its intrinsic value and the majesty which it brought to the court, and by extension, the kingdom.

St Edith was able to read and write as evidenced by a devotional manual she maintained containing scriptural quotations and prayers written in her own hand, some of which she might have composed herself.\textsuperscript{102} Goscelin’s \textit{Vita Edithae} claims “There is kept in her monastery a manual of her devotions as a token of her memory, in which the apostolic precepts shine out, written in her virginal hand, with little prayers subjoined to them …”\textsuperscript{103} Indeed, reading and writing appear to have been part of the traditional education for female royalty, in addition to other particularly feminine crafts. William of Malmesbury notes that King Edward (d.924) had six daughters, all of whom spent most of their time in childhood studying their letters, only then perfecting their spinning skills.\textsuperscript{104} St Edith was also said to be “skilled in painting, writing and working textiles in gold and gems.”\textsuperscript{105} Queen Edith likewise had been instructed in such fine arts as painting and

\textsuperscript{98} For color reproductions of this type of work see Kay Staniland, \textit{Embroiderers, Medieval Craftsmen} (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1991).
\textsuperscript{99} Dowden, \textit{The Celtic Church in Scotland}, 280.
\textsuperscript{100} For more examples see Stafford, \textit{Queens, Concubines and Dowagers}, 107.
\textsuperscript{104} William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.126: \textit{Filias suas ita instituerat ut litteris omnes in infantia maxime vacarent, mox etiam colum et acum exercere consuescarent, ...}
\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Vita Edithae}, chap. 11, in Goscelin, “The Vita of St Edith,” trans. Wright and Loncar,” in \textit{Writing the Wilton Women}, ed. Hollis, 38: \textit{mellita facundia, generosum et ad omnia capax ingenium, legendi intellectuosa flagrantia; manus pingendi scriptitandi, dictitandi tam decentes.}
needlework, and the sciences. 

Goscelin exclaims that she was “a most learned queen.”

Godfrey of Winchester specifies in his obituary for Edith that she had possessed mastery of measures, numbers, and music in addition to languages and grammar. All the evidence suggests that the highest level of female society was both learned and literate, and there is no reason to believe that Margaret did not benefit from a similar education.

St Edith also provided an illustrative model of behavior for royal patronage, which remained a reginal prerogative and duty. While at Wilton Abbey St Edith was known for her ability to intercede on behalf of her community with her royal family. Queen Emma was remembered as a generous benefactor, donating richly embroidered textiles, books and manuscripts, and gold chalices to various foundations, and a particularly ornate gold and silver shrine to Abingdon. She gave gold for the restoration of the roof at Sherborne and financed part of the reconstruction of St Hilaire at Poitiers. Queen Edith rebuilt Wilton in stone and, like her predecessor, presented gifts of precious textiles to many abbeys.

A significant component of this education, probably reinforced by everyday experience, was instruction in languages. This point is important to consider in view of the fact that historians often make assumptions regarding Margaret’s linguistic abilities in order to further their arguments. Thus, establishing Margaret’s Normanizing influence on Scotland, Ritchie argues that she was so Norman in character and comportment that it was necessary for Malcolm to greet her in both the English and French languages. Historians of Scotland, in seeking to claim her as one of their own, argue
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108 Indeed, Stephanie Hollis surmises that Margaret’s need for a royal education at Wilton might have been partly responsible for Goscelin’s presence there. Hollis, “Wilton as a Centre of Learning,” in *Writing the Wilton Women*, ed. Hollis, 338.
110 Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 143-35.
with equal conviction that she spoke Gaelic, the language of the Scottish court.\(^{112}\) On the other hand, Alan Wilson believes that Margaret spoke no Gaelic while endorsing wholeheartedly the notion that her husband spoke English, Gaelic, and Latin.\(^{113}\) It is important, therefore, to consider thoughtfully which languages Margaret might have spoken and which she might have been familiar with.

The language of pre-Conquest England was Old English, a Germanic tongue brought to England by the invading tribes of the “Angles, Saxons and Jutes” as identified by Bede in his \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum}.\(^ {114}\) This language would not have been entirely new to Margaret since it was similar to the German she had most likely become acquainted with in Hungary.\(^ {115}\) Margaret’s speech, possibly tinged with the accents of her childhood, would have marked her as a foreigner, but in this regard she was far from alone. Even native speakers of Old English spoke with varying dialects: Northumbrian north of the Humber River, Mercian (or Anglian) in the Midlands, Kentish in the south-east, and West Saxon from Sussex to Devon. Stir into this linguistic pot the Welsh of Wales, the old Celtic speech of Cornwall known as Cornish, the Cumbric language of the Britons of Cumbria, and what evolves is quite a stew of insular tongues.\(^{116}\) The vernacular was spoken with a distinctive accent.

This melting pot of accents was further spiced by non-English speakers. Edward the Confessor’s English was inflected by his Norman French, and the Queen spoke with the accent of her mother’s Danish. Most of the courtiers spoke more than one language. Queen Edith, for example, was skilled in Latin and able to speak French, Danish and Irish “as though they were her mother tongues,”\(^ {117}\) which of course Danish was. Margaret

\(^{112}\) Alan MacQuarrie, for example, notes that Turgot’s statement that Margaret required Malcolm to “interpret for her at her reforming council might be taken to imply that she never mastered Gaelic; on the other hand, he states that she ‘very often visited with her presence and conversation’ the hermits of Scotia, who would have been Gaelic speakers. …it is hard to believe that Gaelic was not the language used. It is hard to believe, indeed, that Margaret can have lived at Malcolm’s court for so long without acquiring the language of the court.” Macquarrie, \textit{The Saints of Scotland}, 213-14.

\(^{113}\) Wilson, \textit{St Margaret Queen of Scotland}, 97.

\(^{114}\) Glanville Price, \textit{The Languages of Britain} (London, UK; Caulfield East, Australia; Baltimore, MD: Edward Arnold, 1984), 170.

\(^{115}\) See previous chapter.

\(^{116}\) Price, \textit{The Languages of Britain}, 170-85.

might have been aided in assimilating the Danish language to the extent that she was exposed to the Scando-Slavic of the Kievan nobility. Furthermore, Anglo-Saxon England is known to have hosted a German-speaking contingent; some of Wilton’s chaplains were recruited from Germany,\textsuperscript{118} a number of members of Edith’s household spoke the language,\textsuperscript{119} and the language was similar to the Old English vernacular. French and Irish (Gaelic) would have been wholly unfamiliar to Margaret, but it is likely that she would have familiarized herself with them, at least to some degree, fairly quickly. She was compelled to learn Norman French inasmuch as it was the language used by the king and members of his court.\textsuperscript{120} Gaelic might have been required because it was viewed as the Celtic Latin, a language of culture and learning. Geographic proximity, with all the trade and commerce in both people and goods that it entails, also furthered the language. Since Margaret, like Edith, was probably educated at Wilton it must be assumed that their course of study was similar; Queen Edith had been required to learn these languages because they were the most prevalent languages at court and it must be assumed that Margaret would be encouraged to do the same.

Another linguistic point of contact for Margaret was Latin. Latin had been one of the main languages of England for a millennium by the time Margaret and her family arrived. It was the official language of the Church, employed equally in the Christianized kingdoms of Europe, and it quickly became the language of writing and literacy of the Anglo-Saxon dynasties.\textsuperscript{121} Hollis ascertains that Latin was a central element in the education of royal women at Wilton.\textsuperscript{122} It is important to note, however, that the vernacular continued to be employed equally as a written language – in literature, official documents, and religious writings – and it remained, of course, the spoken language. The extent to which Latin was used in conversation can only be surmised. Certainly, the spoken word would have been understood since it was the language of everyday prayers.

\textsuperscript{118} Barlow, \textit{The Godwins}, 78.
\textsuperscript{119} Edith’s chaplain, Walter, was Lotharingian. Additionally, the deacon whom she rewarded in East Anglia, and Theoderic the royal goldsmith were German. Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma and Queen Edith}, 110.
\textsuperscript{121} W. B. Lockwood, \textit{Languages of the British Isles Past and Present} (London: André Deutsch Limited, 1975), 155-59.
\textsuperscript{122} Hollis, “Wilton as a Centre of Learning,” in \textit{Writing the Wilton Women}, ed. Hollis, 309.
and religious occasions. It was intoned by the clergy during the course of their everyday routine. It also was as the *lingua franca* of a community contending with its own Tower of Babel. It is probable, then, that Margaret, like her contemporaries, was familiar with several languages at the Anglo-Saxon court: English, Gaelic, French, and at least some Latin. Her degree of fluency in each of these languages can only be surmised, but it would be unusual if Margaret alone of her peers did not possess some multilingual abilities.

**Sanctity**

While at Wilton Margaret would have had the opportunity to become acquainted with both historical royal saints, and contemporary female recluses. At least thirteen royal women of the tenth and eleventh centuries can be found in the West Saxon genealogy, each of whom were popularly recognized as saints. The list includes: “Ealburh, sister of King Ecgbert of Wessex; Eadburh and Aethelflaed, daughters of Edward the Elder; Eadgyth, daughter of Edgar; Aethelflaed, a relative of Athelstan; Aethelflaed, a relative of Queen Aelfthryth; Aelfgifu, mother of King Edgar and wife of Edmund; Ealhswith, wife of Alfred the Great; Aethelgifu, daughter of Alfred; Wulfthryth, the mother of St Eadgyth and consort of King Edgar; and Wulfhild, a relative of the tenth-century West Saxon kings.” Significantly, “Margaret of Scotland, granddaughter of Edmund Ironside” is also included in this list but not Queen Edith.123

In a hymn to Aethelthryth, Bede articulated the link between spiritual and temporal authority by identifying earthly and heavenly rule as complementary rather than conflicting alternatives; by renouncing the secular world Aethelthryth was able to amplify her authority.124 Writing in the early eighth century Bede observed that the twice-married Queen Aethelthryth derived her elevated status less from her noble heritage that through her embrace of the monastic ideal:

> Of royal blood she sprang, but nobler far
> God’s service found than pride of royal blood.125

---

123 Meyer, “Patronage of the West Saxon Royal Nunneries in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” 333 and n. 3.
More specifically, it was precisely because of the authority attached to their holiness that the opinion of these saintly royals on purely secular matters was so sought after and respected.\textsuperscript{126} Aethelflaed, the abbess of Romsey “was constantly being called to the royal court by the king and queen”\textsuperscript{127} The “mature foresight” and dignity of Edgar’s illegitimate daughter Edith was such that on the death of her father in 975 some magnates of the kingdom urged her to accept the crown.\textsuperscript{128} Still, it was only by renouncing royal authority, by retiring from the world, that these noble ladies were accorded sanctity. St Edith, for example, refused the crown, a humility topos which served to underscore her piety.\textsuperscript{129} The most important figure for Margaret would have been St Edith, the daughter of King Edgar and the patron saint of Wilton. Susan Ridyard observes that for Edith, like other royal female saints, “the foundation of sanctity lay in the renunciation of royal status.”\textsuperscript{130} Throughout St Edith’s \textit{Vita}, her noble birthright is constantly countered by her observance of the monastic ideals of obedience, humility, and chastity.\textsuperscript{131}

A ruling queen, firmly grounded in secular concerns, could only hope to co-opt her predecessors’ sanctity by endorsing their cults. Tenth- and eleventh-century queens sought to secure recognition and authority by associating themselves with their holy predecessors, and by fostering their cults. Pauline Stafford argues that the cults of these ancestral royal saints were employed by the eleventh-century queens to buttress their reginal authority. Queen Edith, for example, was particularly inclined to favor the veneration of Queen Bertha, wife of Aethelberht of Kent, who is generally credited with encouraging her husband to convert to Christianity, and we have already seen how she modeled her example on that of St Edith the patron saint of Wilton.\textsuperscript{132}

Edith did not, however, embrace poverty, a point which ran counter to tenth-

\textsuperscript{126} On this dichotomy see Ridyard, \textit{Royal Saints}, 82-92.
\textsuperscript{127} Meyer, “Patronage of the West Saxon Royal Nunneries in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” 333, n. 1 citing Brit Libr. MS Lansdowne 435, fols. 44v-45r.
\textsuperscript{129} For her rejection of the offer as an element of the humility topos see Hollis, “St Edith and the Wilton Community,”” in \textit{Writing the Wilton Women}, ed. Hollis, 248-50, 292; Ridyard, \textit{Royal Saints}, 84, 140
\textsuperscript{130} Ridyard, \textit{Royal Saints}, 84.
\textsuperscript{131} Ridyard, \textit{Royal Saints}, 84-89.
\textsuperscript{132} Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma and Queen Edith}, 168-71.
century reform movement. Instead, the ideals of asceticism and renunciation of the world were exemplified by a growing number of recluses, two of whom were contemporary with Margaret’s time at Wilton and were associated with the convent. Margaret would have heard about Queen Edith’s younger sister, Gunhild. A memorial inscription in Latin that was found on a small sheet of lead in the now destroyed cathedral church of St Donation at Bruges in 1786 praises Gunhild for taking a vow of chastity and refusing marriage to many noble princes. Following the Conquest, she lived for a while at Saint-Omer in Flanders, and then traveled to Bruges and Denmark before returning to Bruges where she died on 24 August 1087. Significantly in view of the previous discussion regarding Margaret’s Gospel Book and relic of the True Cross, Gunhild was known to have collected relics, such as the mantle of St Bride (Brigit) of Kildare, and possessed her own psalter of Anglo-Saxon glosses.

This is not to argue, however, for an absence of the eremitic life in late eleventh-century England. Tom Licence cautions that a seeming increase in the number of recluses after the Norman Conquest could be the result of an increase in documentation and also a change in terminology, as recluses could have been identified with no distinction between anachorita and heremita. Licence identifies eight precursors to the movement toward lay members seeking a solitary life, rather than isolation within a monastery, six of which

---

are included in the writings of Goscelin.\textsuperscript{138} Perhaps the most known is Eve of Wilton.\textsuperscript{139} She was given at age seven to Wilton Abbey in 1065, so it is likely that she was there at the same time as Margaret, although unlikely that she had yet developed her preference for the eremitic life. About 1080 she left for Saint-Laurent de Tertre in Angers where she resided, according to Goscelin, in an eight foot cell, communicating with the world through a small window.\textsuperscript{140} She later became the subject of a poem written by Hilary, who had known her in France.\textsuperscript{141} He claims that already at Wilton she had displayed a type of personal piety that was similar in many ways to Margaret’s: devoting herself to tearful prayer, reading the sacred texts, adopting ascetic practices, and living in a cell.

Even if the queen herself could not attain the holy dignity of a recluse or cloistered noble, the sacred underpinnings of her office became codified during the tenth-century reform movement in which the power and status of the queen were underscored by emphasizing her regality, and her purpose was defined in Christian terms.\textsuperscript{142} The reformers who wrote the Regularis Concordia called on king and queen together to protect monasteries, emphasizing their common lordship. In this way the equivalence of the king and queen in regality was asserted.\textsuperscript{143} She was more than the lay nobility; she was a queen with a sacred purpose. “The reform movement elevated consecrated queenship and defined her public role as a Christian one.”\textsuperscript{144} The coronation ritual reflected this change in the queen’s purpose, specifying in the prayer that she was to “shun all heretical depravities, bring barbarian peoples to the heavenly power of god and
call them to the knowledge of truth.” Significantly, the rite was no longer simply a derivation of the marriage ceremony, as it had been in 856, the first known consecration of an English queen. She was now portrayed more on a par with the king, as his partner in rule. This change was manifested in 1044 when Edith was consecrated with the addition of a series of benedictions presenting the queen as a *consors imperii*, in shared rule of the English people with the king, although these alterations were probably first introduced during the consecration of Emma in 1017, when Cnut needed her support to underscore the legitimacy of a conqueror’s rule.

The new function of the queen as the champion of the Church was also depicted pictorially in the New Minster miniature in which Mary as crowned Queen of Heaven and an integral member of the Trinity, is seen literally stomping out heresy as represented by Arius. The highest expression of this association occurred with the increasing representation of the Virgin Mary as the Queen of Heaven. She is portrayed as a Queen or a symbol of the Church; enthroned, carrying a scepter or palm branch. She is no longer simply a mother holding a child, but the *theotokos*. In the first half of the eleventh century at New Minster two new Marian feasts were added to the calendar that were not celebrated anywhere else in Europe. Perhaps it is significant that Margaret named her second daughter Mary after the Queen of Heaven, choosing to associate the royal and the divine in the name of her child, much as they were associated in the office of the Anglo-Saxon queen.

Thus the king and queen were united in their public role, which perhaps reached its fullest expression during Emma’s tenure. The frontispiece of the *Encomium Emmae* depicts her as crowned, seated on the throne, being attended to by her two clearly subservient sons, Harthacnut and Edward. Such pictorial majesty is also reflected in the text itself; royal names are distinguished in half uncial, capitalized or highlighted, and

---


146 Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 174-78.

Emma is most often described as queen (*regina*).\textsuperscript{148} By Edith’s time this equivalency was relegated specifically to religious concerns. In secular matters the king was invested with the responsibility of meting out justice and defending the kingdom, as represented ceremonially by the rod of justice in the first case and the sword in the latter. In fact, the queen was expected to shun the outward trapping of secular power. Thus, while a throne was provided for Edith on public occasions, in private she preferred to sit at the king’s feet, displaying appropriate humility.\textsuperscript{149}

It is possible to see, therefore, that the role of the queen had evolved somewhat, first basing its power in the adoption of cults of holy predecessors, then being called upon to rule almost jointly with her consort and finally, by the time Margaret arrived in England, finding equality only with regard to their publicly religious roles. The queen must be regal but modest, powerful but pious. Her royal power was tied directly to her function as a Christian queen.

**Margaret’s Future**

At the time of the Conquest Margaret would have been about twenty years old and the prospects for her future must have been the topic of some discussion. As the sister of the heir to the English throne, it could reasonably be assumed that she would have been perceived as a good match, yet she was repeatedly overlooked by upwardly mobile young men. Earl Harold, for example, could have gained instant legitimacy by marrying someone of royal blood, much as his sister, Edith had done. Tellingly, however, he chose instead to ally himself through marriage with a family possessing real power, real money, and real land. Harold chose Ealdgyth, the widow of Gruffydd ap Llywelyn of Gywnedd and Powys, and the sister of Edwin and Morcar, in an effort to shore up support with the powerful Mercian family.\textsuperscript{150} Edwin and Morcar in turn promised to support Harold, a pledge which might have coincided with Harold receiving substantial holdings in Mercia, valued in the *Domesday Book* at over £250.\textsuperscript{151} Harold was

\textsuperscript{149} Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 167-68.
\textsuperscript{150} Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 243.
finally prompted to marry only late in Edward’s reign and perhaps only in an effort to support his claim to the throne, yet he overlooked the eligible daughter of the aetheling because she could bring him no material advantages.

It should be noted, however, that while it was unusual for a young lady to remain unmarried into her twenties, it was not unheard of. Queen Edith was twenty-two when she wed King Edward, a fact often attributed to her family’s desire to reserve her for the most advantageous alliance possible. Perhaps Margaret likewise was being held in reserve. Some chroniclers maintain that Edward the Confessor intended to marry Margaret to Malcolm of Scotland. Orderic Vitalis claims that when Malcolm invaded Northumbria in 1091 he stated: _Fateor quod rex Edvardus, dum mihi Margaretam proneptem suam in conjugium tradidit, Lodonensem [Lothian] comitatum mihi donavit._ Deinde Guillelmus rex quod antecessor ejus mihi dederat concessit. William of Malmesbury similarly believed that Edward had planned the marriage. Margaret certainly would have heard of Malcolm, the young prince who had sought refuge at Edward the Confessor’s court after his father, King Duncan of Scotland, had been defeated by Macbeth. The Dunfermline Vita asserts that while Malcolm had been a hostage in England for his father he had had occasion to learn about the royal family. Between 1054 and 1058, Malcolm was engaged in the process of winning his crown, so it is unlikely that the two had the chance to meet when Margaret’s family first arrived in England. However, in 1059 Malcolm accompanied Tostig to the Christmas Court at

---

52. Barlow, _The Godwins_, 35.
152 Orderic Vitalis, _Ecclesiastical History_, ed. Chibnall, 4.270-71. Barlow observes that Orderic may have followed a genealogy which now survives at Alencon. Barlow, _Edward the Confessor_, 203 f. 3.
153 William of Malmesbury, _Historia Novella: The Contemporary History_, ed. Edmund King, trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford: The Clarendon Press), 6-9: _Porro Edwardus illius progeniei ultimus, idemque et praeclarissimus, proneptem suam margaritam ex fratre Edmundo Ireneside, Malcolm ri regis Scotorum nuptis copulavit._ Barlow further states that both chroniclers are probably confusing Edward the king with Margaret’s father or her brother, but I do not see why Edward would not have been the one to determine Margaret’s husband. After her father’s death, Edward the Confessor would have acted as the patriarch of the family, and as king he had a vested interest in potential marital alliances. Barlow, _Edward the Confessor_, 203, n. 3. Margaret Gibson supports the view that the two were betrothed in 1059 in _Lanfranc of Bec_ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 126-7.
154 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7vb: _Anglicam enim linguam simul et romanam eaque ut propriam perfecte didicerat, cum pro patre suo obses in anglia, ubi forte de cognitione huius sancta familie aliquid audierat, quare cum eis mitius ageret, et benignius se haberet._ This account is followed by John of Fordun, who cites Turgot as his source. _Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum_, ed. Skene, 5.14.
Gloucester, only about fifty miles north of Wilton, where he would have at least had the opportunity to meet Margaret.\textsuperscript{156} In a further indication of her political irrelevance, Malcolm instead decided to gain the support of the Scandinavian north of Scotland by marrying Ingibjorg, either the wife or the daughter of Thorfinn, earl of the Orkneys and Caithness.\textsuperscript{157} Still, the mere prospect of such a marriage might have dissuaded Margaret from committing to any monastic vows.

The possibility of continued marital negotiations involving Margaret and Malcolm is suggested by further evidence. It is possible to establish a close connection between Malcolm, Tostig, Edith, and Margaret that, when viewed as one complete picture, reveals at least the means by which this proposal could have been nurtured. To begin with, Malcolm and Tostig certainly had an understanding. It has already been noted that Tostig escorted Malcolm to Edward’s court in 1059, thereby initiating the first instance in which a Scottish king had visited the court of the king of England in nearly eighty years.\textsuperscript{158} The close connection between the two is further evidenced by that fact that they became sworn brothers; according to Symeon of Durham, Tostig became Malcolm’s \textit{conjuratus frater} in 1061.\textsuperscript{159} Malcolm proved to be true to his word when, in 1066, Tostig sought and was granted refuge in Scotland as recorded in the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}: “and then he (Tostig) went to Scotland, and the king of Scots (Malcolm) gave him protection, and helped him with provisions, and he stayed there all the summer.”\textsuperscript{160} Another journey of Tostig’s provides another indication of the association between Malcolm, Tostig, Queen Edith, and the family of Edward the Exile. When Tostig traveled to Rome in 1060 he chose a northerly route, one which Barlow asserts might have included contact with the Hungarian court.\textsuperscript{161} The immediate relevancy of this fact is obscure, but it is worth noting and contemplating the supposed purpose and outcome of such a visit, only three years after the arrival of the Exile’s family and one year after his

\textsuperscript{156} Symeon of Durham, \textit{Historia Regum}, in \textit{Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia}, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1059. See also Barlow, \textit{Edward the Confessor}, 203. It must also be asked whether there is any significance to the timing of Malcolm’s visit, shortly after the arrival of Margaret and her family in England.

\textsuperscript{157} See the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{158} Barlow, \textit{Edward the Confessor}, 203.


\textsuperscript{160} \textit{The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, C, s.a. 1066.

\textsuperscript{161} Barlow, \textit{The Godwins}, 63-64.
journey with his sworn brother Malcolm to visit the king.

It is also commonly agreed that Tostig was the favorite of King Edward and, more importantly for this analysis, Queen Edith his sister.\textsuperscript{162} This mutual affection between the two siblings resulted in Tostig’s frequent attendance at court, as implied by the anonymous writer of Edward’s biography when he describes the state of affairs at the outbreak of the Northumbrian revolt in 1065: \textit{Erat \ldots Tostinus in curia Regis, diutiusque commoratus est cum eo, ejus detentus amore et jussis in disponendis regalis palatii negotiis.}\textsuperscript{163} Edith, in return, proved herself to be actively involved in protecting the northern interests of her brother. She was, for example, implicated in the murder of Gospatric, a member of the old Bamburgh family that had ruled Northumbria almost independently since the tenth century, and a potential claimant to the throne.\textsuperscript{164} Perhaps this interest in the succession might have prompted Edith to involve herself directly in the affairs of Margaret, her half-niece and the sister of the designated heir to the throne. It is tempting to think that she and Tostig might have considered the advantages of securing the northern border of the kingdom through marriage. She was instrumental in arranging marriages for other members of the royal household, such as Mathilda her chamber lady, Wulfweard the White’s daughter, and possibly Aelfweard the Goldsmith.\textsuperscript{165} It is even probable that Edith and Margaret stayed in contact following the Conquest inasmuch as Margaret would have remained at Wilton, which Queen Edith was known to have visited frequently and to which, possibly, she retired following the Conquest; she was there March 1071 and February 1072, before dying a week before Christmas 1075.\textsuperscript{166} Edith might have become the focal point for those elements of the old Anglo-Saxon court who were willing to come to terms with Norman conquerors. She remained in contact with English survivors, some remnants of the pre-1066 court still gathered around her at

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{162}] Freeman, \textit{The History of the Norman Conquest of England}, 2.376-83; Barlow, \textit{Edward the Confessor}, 242.
\item[\textsuperscript{163}] The \textit{Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster}, ed. and trans. Barlow, 76-77: “Tostig was at the king’s court; and he stayed with him for some time, detained by his love of the king and while he dealt with some palace business which had been put on him.”
\item[\textsuperscript{164}] John of Worcester, \textit{Chronicle}, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1065: ... quem [Gospatric] regina Editha, germani sui Tosti causa, in curia regis iiii. nocte dominice Nativitatis per insidias occidi iusit ....
\item[\textsuperscript{165}] See also Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma and Queen Edith}, 270-72.
\item[\textsuperscript{166}] Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma and Queen Edith}, 120.
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Wilton in 1072, and she visited Archbishop Stigand in prison after his deposition.\textsuperscript{167} Her actions evidenced a pragmatic approach to a new political world, one which might have prompted her to counsel Margaret to make the very best of her newly ambiguous situation following the Norman Conquest.

Margaret, like her brother the aetheling, benefited from a privileged position at court, but one void of any real power. She was treated as a young noblewoman of rank, educated at the family nunnery, and given the most valuable gifts. Despite this privilege, however, she remained without any real authority, without money, land, or backing, again like her brother. However, as in Hungary, Margaret benefited from her observation of models of queenship and sanctity. Queen Edith, as Margaret’s principal benefactress, was undoubtedly the reginal example for the young girl not as a model of royal sanctity, but in terms of her public duties as the king’s consort. Concerning her personal piety and private devotion, however, Margaret might have been subject to influences from other sources. Previous holy Anglo-Saxon queens, glorified through their veneration by contemporary queens, provided an example of royal sanctity that required retreating from the world, a model which Margaret largely, but not entirely, rejected. Perhaps the ascetic example set by Edith’s sister, Gunhild, and later embraced by Eve, laid the foundation for her own spirituality.

* * * * *

Margaret’s years in Anglo-Saxon England were potentially instructive on many levels. As sister of the heir to the throne, she enjoyed the benefits of a privileged position at court: she received the patronage of the queen and was educated at the royal nunnery of Wilton, enjoying the material indications of her status in the form of a valuable Gospel Book and holy relic. This privilege was curbed, however, by the fact that she remained without any real power in terms either of land, money, or retainers, or of prospects in terms of marriage or monastic vows. She and her family appear to have been most closely aligned with the family of Godwin: Harold fetched the family from Hungary, Edith nurtured, educated and guided Margaret, perhaps Gunhild provided a model of

\textsuperscript{167} Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma & Queen Edith}, 275-77.
personal piety, and it is possible that Tostig and Edith acted together to promote Margaret’s marital alliance with Malcolm. Margaret has typically been associated with King Edward as a result of their shared sainthood, but perhaps other influences at the English court were equally if not more important. After 1066, however, all these considerations suddenly became moot. Edward the Confessor was dead, King Harold and most of his brothers were killed on the battlefield, and Margaret and her family were once more the political outsiders, the exiles.
Part Two: Margaret’s Life

The second part of this study explores Margaret’s life from the moment she enters the historical record as the wife of Malcolm III, king of the Scots, until her death. The various sources will be compared and placed within context to gage veracity. The first chapter considers the circumstances surrounding the family’s arrival in Scotland and the possible motivations for Margaret’s marriage to King Malcolm. Next, Margaret’s recorded actions as queen are compared to those of other reginal models, both literary and historical. Finally, the third chapter evaluates her rather unusual model of royal sanctity.

II.1. THE KING’S CONSORT

In many ways Margaret’s character becomes more, rather than less, obscure when she enters the historical record as the wife of Malcolm Canmore. The bare facts of Margaret’s arrival in Scotland and her marriage to King Malcolm III are few. The chroniclers, such as William of Malmesbury and Aelred of Rievaulx, state simply that they were married. Similarly, the E version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records blandly, “And that summer Edgar Cild went abroad, and Mærleswein, and many people with them, and went into Scotland. And King Malcolm received them all and married the aetheling’s sister, Margaret.” The Cotton manuscript declines to discuss the circumstances of the family’s arrival in Scotland, stating only that Margaret was married to Malcolm “by the desire of her friends rather than by her own, yea, rather by the appointment of God.” Only the Dunfermline Vita includes a more elaborate depiction of the meeting and marriage negotiations.

1 William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 2.228: Margareta, quam Malcolmus rex Scottorum legitimo matrimonio duxit; Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealoga, PL 195: 734-735: Cernens autem Edgarus Edeling res Anglorum undique perturbati, ascensam navi cum matre et sororibus reverti in patriam qua natus fuerat conabatur, sed orta in mari tempestate in Scotia applicare compellitur. Hac occasione actum est ut Margareta regis Malcolmii nuptiis traderetur, cujus laudabiliem vitam et mortem pretiosam liber inde editus satis insinuat...
2 The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a. 1067.
And so Edgar, perceiving that the affairs of the English were troubled everywhere, tried to return to the country in which he was born with his mother and his sisters, and by this plan of his mother and with her children he was eager to avoid the treachery of their adversaries under the protection of [her] paternal uncle, evidently the emperor.  

In this case, the family is not merely fleeing without a destination, but instead purposefully choosing to seek shelter with their kinsman, the emperor, at the suggestion of Margaret’s mother. After landing, Malcolm responds first by sending messengers, who report back about the arrival of a single large ship. Next, he sends many of his highest nobles, who were wiser than the previous messengers, reflecting his perception of the elevated status of the visitors. The two parties engage in polite, formal, one could say diplomatic, speech. The king’s representatives are particularly struck by the eloquence and beauty of one of the women who was evidently the lady, or mistress (domina) of the family. Malcolm then meets with the family, towards whom he was favorably inclined, having heard about them during his exile in England. Having been suitably impressed he asks for and receives Margaret’s hand in marriage, Edgar surrendering his sister more by the will of his people, or rather by the will of God. Finally, the author notes that Margaret brings with her many precious items given to her family by the German emperor, and many relics, including the Black Cross. 

A variation of this hagiographic account is provided by the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which is particularly interested in Margaret and her family: 

Then the aforesaid King Malcolm began to desire [Edgar’s] sister

---

4 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7ra. The opening phrase – cernens res Anglorum ubique perturbati – is very similar to that used by both Symeon of Durham and Aelred of Rievaulx, but the contexts are vastly different. Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195: 734-735: Cernens autem Edgarus Edeling res Anglorum undique perturbati, ascensa navi cum matre et sororibus reverti in patriam qua natus fuerat conabatur, [sed orta in mari tempestate in Scotia applicare compellitur. Hac occasione actum est ut Margareta regis Malcolmi nuptiis traderetur, cujus laudabilem vitam et mortem pretiosam liber inde editus satis insinuat…; Symeon of Durham, Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea, ed. Hinde, 86: (regarding the flight of Bishop Aegelwin) Videns namque res Anglorum undique turbati … John of Fordun follows the Dunfermline Vita, citing Turgot as his source. Johannis de Fordun Chronic a Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.15. Hinde, however, states that John of Fordun credits his authority as “e vetusta chronica,” in Symeon of Durham, Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea, ed. Hinde, 86, note u. Bower then follows John of Fordun: Bower, Scotichronicon, ed. Watt, 5.48-51 and notes on 5.204-05.  

5 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7rb-8ra followed by Johannis de Fordun Chronic a Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.15; Bower, Scotichronicon, ed. Watt, 5.52-53 and notes 5.205.
Margaret for his wife, but [Edgar] and his men all opposed it for a long time; and she also refused, saying that she would have neither him nor other if the heavenly mercy would graciously grant it to her to please in virginity with human heart the mighty Lord in pure continence through this short life. The king pressed her brother until he said ‘yes’, and indeed he dared not do anything else, because they had come into his control….Then the king received her, though it was against her will, …

It has been surmised that account in the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is an interpolation derived from an existing hagiographic tradition, a supposition that should not be underestimated. The disparity between these accounts warrants further analysis.

In both the Dunfermline Vita and the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Malcolm petitions Edgar for Margaret’s hand in marriage, and the latter accedes to the request reluctantly. In the Dunfermline Vita, Edgar makes the decision “more by the will of his people than by his own, or rather by the decree of God.” Importantly, however, Edgar is not coerced into making the decision, and Margaret comes to her marriage not as a captive, but as a royal bride complete with an appropriate dowry. In fact, the entire episode is described as an escalating diplomatic negotiation. First, messengers are sent, then wise nobles of the realm, and only then, finally, does the king meet the party. The Anglo-Saxon party is admired for its nobility, morality, the beauty of the women, and the reverence of the men. Malcolm treats with them respectfully, able to speak with them in English which he learned during his years as a hostage in England, the subtle point perhaps being that he, too, was once a refugee. Finally, Margaret enters the marriage as an equal; she was mistress of her family, destined to be queen of the realm, a partner to

---

6 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1067.
7 Whitelock, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, xvi and 146-147; Freeman, The History of Norman Conquest of England, 4.531. Freeman reasons: “I cannot help thinking that the whole passage, whose prolixity and scriptural quotations form a strange contrast to the short entries on each side of it, is an interpolation. It is a sort of little Life of Saint Margaret, setting forth her inclination for a single life, the courtship of Malcolm, the difficulties which he met with, the final consent of Margaret and her kinsfolk, the marriage and its final good result. Lastly we get Margaret’s pedigree on both sides, and then we go back to Exeter. It is clear that this is not the annalistic way of writing; things are put together which have a connexion of idea, but not of time.”
8 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7vb: magis cum suorum quam sua voluntate, immo dei ordinacione
9 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8ra: Nec tum quasi captiva, immo multis habundans diviciis quas patri suo edwardo tanquam heredi suo sanctus edwardus rex anglie delegaverat, quasque ipse etiam romanus imperator sicut paulo ante predixinus non minimis honoratum muneribus in angliam transmiserat.
the king.  

According to the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, however, the marriage is agreed to against her will, referencing the previous statement that she had intended to maintain her virginity. Furthermore, Edgar only concedes because he “dared not do anything else, because they had come into [Malcolm’s] control.” Rather than a marriage between persons of equal status, the Anglo-Saxon chronicle portrays it as an unwilling sacrifice as the result of coercion and implied threat. Finally the Cotton manuscript assigns a higher hagiographic purpose to the marriage stating that it was the will of God. Neither Edgar nor Malcolm is mentioned and the focus remains on Margaret. The following will examine in turn the claim that Margaret intended to become a nun and how the depiction of Malcolm factored into that narrative, the possibility that the marriage was planned, whether the flight to Scotland was intentional, Malcolm’s previous marriage, and possible motivations for the marriage.

**Monastic or Marital Preference**

Margaret’s intention to become a nun is inferred by modern historians from the statement in the hagiographic interpolation embedded in the D version of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript that Margaret intended to maintain her virginity. However, Margaret displayed no interest in taking the veil during her years in England, as we saw in the previous chapter, and this claim must be viewed as an effort to situate Margaret within the accepted framework of the saintly virgin. Virginity was almost a prerequisite for the early medieval female saints. Typically, the female saint was a young beautiful woman whose virginity is threatened, and this threat is linked to religious persecution. Her tormentor is almost invariably a powerful male authority figure who either desires her or desires that she worship his pagan gods. The torture that she suffers is specific to

---

10 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 7vb: *Nec mirum si illam dominam crediderint quam dominam non solummodo illius familie, sed etiam totius regni reginam, immo et regni sui participem divina praedestinaverit providencia.*

11 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1067.

12 See Karen A. Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997). For the exception that proves the rule, see for example the Carolingian saint, Salaberga, who was married with five children. Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society*, 100 citing *Vita Sadalbergae* 12 (*MGH Script. rer. mer. 5, 56*).
her gender; she is threatened with rape, her nipples or breasts are torn off, she is publicly stripped and beaten.\textsuperscript{13} As examples, we can look to Margaret’s saintly namesake as well as those of both her mother and her sister. In the mid-third century, Agatha, whose “love was consecrated to God from her very earliest youth,” rejected the amorous overtures of Quintianus the Governor of Sicily, preferring torture and death rather than the loss of her virginity.\textsuperscript{14} Another virgin-martyr of the early church, Christine of Tyre, was tortured and killed after refusing to sacrifice to the pagan gods.\textsuperscript{15} St Margaret of Antioch was desired by Olybrius, the prefect of Pisidia, but she preferred to remain devoted to Jesus, and suffered torture and decapitation as a result.\textsuperscript{16}

The sheer number of Anglo-Saxon virgin saints speaks to their popularity. St Lewina, whose popularity was at a peak about the time of Margaret’s arrival in England, was an Anglo-Saxon virgin who was supposedly martyred by the pagan Saxons before their conversion to Christianity. In 1058 her relics, along with those of another virgin, St Ideberga, were translated from Seafor in Sussex to the church of St Winnoc at Bergues in Flanders.\textsuperscript{17} Well known tales of holy virgins were preserved in the Old English vernacular for popular consumption. Cynewulf’s Juliana, for example, is portrayed as a heroic martyr who actively pursued death rather than marriage and its accompanying loss of both virginity and autonomy.\textsuperscript{18} Jane Chance has noted that the women saints described in the \textit{Old English Martyrology} (ca. 850), and Aelfric’s \textit{Lives of Saints} (ca. 994-early 11\textsuperscript{th} century) were particularly compelling to their Anglo-Saxon audience; thirty-four were portrayed as renouncing all physical or spiritual contact with a typically lecherous, pagan tormentor, six concern a queen or wife who remains chaste within marriage, twenty are virgin martyrs who preserve their chastity and faith despite torture and death, and eight present women saints as avoiding sexual assault by assuming the

\textsuperscript{13} See Winstead, \textit{Virgin Martyrs}, 1-18.
\textsuperscript{15} Baring-Gould, 8.527-28; Butler, 3.173-74.
\textsuperscript{16} Baring-Gould, 8.485-87; Butler, 3.152-53.
\textsuperscript{17} Butler, 3.174-75.
look and behavior of a man. Chance concludes that only by renouncing their femininity and sexuality could these women be viewed as heroic *milites Christi*, holy women warriors.\(^{19}\)

In an age when a woman’s sanctity was averred through her virginity or her chastity, how does a chronicler posthumously establish the innate sanctity of a wife and mother? In the case of the E chronicler, perhaps writing before Margaret’s sanctity was firmly established, the subject is obviously moot: Malcolm and Margaret were simply married. The Cotton manuscript offers a religious rationale for the union by maintaining that by marrying Malcolm, Margaret submitted to the will of God. It could be argued that in a way the marriage itself was a kind of persecution, a sacrifice on the part of Margaret. The D chronicler, however, amplifies the nature and extent of her sacrifice by asserting that Margaret always intended to dedicate her virginity to God. There is, however, no evidence that Margaret hoped to take the veil, and a range of circumstantial evidence to suggest the opposite.

Margaret would have been about twenty-four years old at the time of her marriage, certainly old enough to declare her own wishes.\(^{20}\) She could have taken her vows and remained at Wilton with the dowager Queen Edith, in a place with which she was familiar, surrounded by people she knew.\(^{21}\) If her objective was to leave Norman England, she could have joined Gunnhild, the sister of King Harold, whose asceticism might have provided an early model for Margaret’s later behavior. She chose a reclusive

---

\(^{19}\) Jane Chance, *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 55.


life in exile as a nun at St Omer, leaving England with her mother and brothers at almost the exact same time that Margaret fled to Scotland.\textsuperscript{22}

There might also have been some genuine confusion regarding the implications of Margaret’s residency at a convent. During the chaotic years following the Conquest, as landless Norman knights sought to marry wealthy Anglo-Saxon widows and daughters, many women sought refuge in nunneries.\textsuperscript{23} The question arose as to whether such tenure implied an intention to take vows. Apparently the debate was pervasive enough that Lanfranc was compelled to issue a formal announcement advising that those women who had fled to a monastery out of fear of the French were free to leave.\textsuperscript{24} The ticklish topic was resurrected when Henry I married Margaret’s daughter, Edith/Matilda, who was being raised by her aunt Christina at Wilton. Again, it was decided that residency at a convent did not necessarily mean that vows had been taken.\textsuperscript{25}

Furthermore, modern authors have interpreted Margaret’s interest in maintaining her virginity to mean that she intended to become a nun which is not necessarily the same as remaining a virgin. St Edith, for example, remained a virgin but never took vows. As Stephanie Hollis observes, “For many women at Wilton – as the offer of marriage made to Edith illustrates – joining the community did not represent a definitive rejection of earthly marriage or a once-only choice of perpetual virginity. It was, rather, the entry to a liminal state wherein they might be called upon to marry to advance the interests of their families for as long as they were of marriageable age …”\textsuperscript{26}

Indeed, most scholars have accepted the claim of the D chronicler

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} Freeman, \textit{The History of the Norman Conquest of England}, 4.105-06.
\textsuperscript{23} Such a ruse might have been employed against perceived aggressors throughout history, and not confined to a defense against the Normans. Eadmer recounts that a young girl being educated at Wilton hastily dons a veil to shield her from the unwelcome advances of King Edgar. \textit{Memoria\textsc{ls} of \textit{Saint Dunstan}}, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 63 (London, 1874), 209-10. For a thorough discussion of these and other more extreme measures of deflecting unwanted attention see Schulenburg, \textit{Forgetful of Their Sex}, 139-75.
\textsuperscript{25} See Huneycutt, \textit{Matilda of Scotland}, 28-29.
\end{flushright}
unquestioningly. Even Ritchie, who otherwise concedes that it would be misleading to indulge in hyperbolic characterizations of Malcolm as “a wild Highland cateran” and Margaret as “an English martyr,” persists in asserting that Margaret intended to become a nun.

**Malcolm’s Character**

It seems then that our D chronicler might have taken a valid concern – the ambiguous status of otherwise single women who chose to seek shelter in a nunnery – and embellished somewhat, taking the poetic license uncharacteristic of an annalist to portray Margaret as an intended nun. In this way, Margaret was placed obliquely in the role of the consecrated virgin, except, of course, that she did marry. The chronicler emphasizes the parallel with virgin martyr legends by choosing to stress the ignorant, primitive nature of the intended groom, which in the true tradition of hagiography only underscores the extent of the virgin’s torment. Malcolm is portrayed in the D chronicle as an almost pagan, hopelessly unsophisticated boor. It fell to Margaret to “set the king right from the path of error, and turn him to the better way,” just as “the apostle Paul, the teacher of all nations, said, ‘Salvabitur vir infidelis per mulierem fidelem sic et mulier infidelis per virum fidelem’, etc. – that is, in our language, ‘Very often the unbelieving husband is made holy and saved through the righteous wife, and likewise the wife through a believing husband.’” Symeon of Durham likewise presents Malcolm as a brute who is only gentled by Margaret’s influence. In each of the preceding examples of saints’ lives, the holy virgin in question was persecuted by a spectacularly brutish male figure, someone in authority who wielded great power, sometimes a father, but more typically a suitor who was understandably rejected given his very deep character flaws.

---

27 These include her modern biographer Wilson, *St Margaret Queen of Scotland*, 73, and Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 2. Recently scholars have begun to rethink this assumption, most notably Valerie Wall who noted that Margaret could have entered a nunnery of her own will after the age of sixteen and that after her marriage she showed no interest in the cloister. Wall, “Queen Margaret of Scotland,” 30.


29 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1067. Bede also records that Pope Boniface quoted the same passage when urging Queen Aethelberga to convert her husband, the Northumbrian king, Edwin. Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 2.11.

Malcolm’s character suffers a similar depiction, when in fact the evidence is to the contrary.\footnote{Freeman states, “From the words of the Chroniclers one might almost have thought that Margaret had to work on a heathen bridegroom, just like her Frankish and Kentish predecessors,” referring to the wives of Æthelberht and Edwin. Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 4.347, n. 4.}

Instead of being a suspiciously primitive backwater, Malcolm’s court possessed significant wealth. Note, for example, the gifts with which Edgar was endowed when he sailed from Scotland in 1074: “King Malcolm and his sister Margaret gave him and his men great gifts, many treasures in skins faced with purple cloth, marten-skin robes, miniver and ermine-skins, costly robes, vessels of gold and silver.” As if this gesture was not generous enough, the royal couple replenished the hoard when it was lost in a shipwreck.\footnote{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1074. This observation was also made by Huneycutt, Matilda of Scotland, 127.} Furthermore, Malcolm himself was no ignorant rube. By questioning Malcolm’s character, The D Chronicle contradicts itself, stating later in the text that he was a “very sensible man.”\footnote{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1067.} The Cotton manuscript and the Dunfermline Vita both credit his linguistic ability, stating he knew English as well as he knew Gaelic.\footnote{Dunfermline Vita, fo. 11rb-va; Diii, chapter 8. Ritchie concludes that the fact that he was able to translate for Margaret at the ecclesiastical council regarding issues that involved computing days is evidence of his fluency since being able to do figures is “usually the linguist’s last achievement.” Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 12 n. 4} His formative years spent as a guest at the court of Edward the Confessor had turned him into a polished courtier. As Ritchie summarizes, Malcolm had spent a good portion of his youth in England, benefiting “by converse with England’s sainted King, her courtly Archbishops and the most cosmopolitan of her Earls, not to speak of his own cousin Earl Waltheof, whom Orderic commended as having been ‘elegans’.”\footnote{Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 25.} Ironically, in terms of the length of her stay in England, Margaret was less English, that standard of sophistication and elegance to which the chroniclers are inclined to refer, than her husband.

Such cultured sophistication was complemented by an impressive physical presence. A correspondence of 1257 quoted in History of Northumberland published by the Northumberland Country History Committee in 1893 relates the discovery of a body assumed to be that of Malcolm Canmore that indicates he was a man of great stature and
physical strength. His high color and lively expression are described admiringly in The Duan Albanach, an eleventh-century poem probably written during King Malcolm’s reign. Finally, his name, in Gaelic Máel Coluimb, means “servant of Columba,” a deeply Christian association referring to one the most revered Scottish saints, hardly the name a pagan would assume. His lineage was no less noble than Margaret’s; he was descended on his father’s side from a long line of Scottish kings and possibly on his mother’s side from the great earls of Northumbria. Indeed, his sobriquet, Cean Mór, has been interpreted as both “great chief” and “big head,” perhaps a play on words referring to both his great physical and royal stature.

So, if Malcolm was not necessarily the lusting brute portrayed in the Chronicle, and if Margaret did not necessarily intend to “consecrate her love” to God, and if both these interpretations are symptomatic of hagiographic hyperbole, how and why did Margaret and Malcolm find themselves married to one another?

**A Possible Planned Marriage**

As noted in the previous chapter, there is evidence that the marriage between Malcolm and Margaret had been suggested earlier, and perhaps even had been under consideration for quite some time. They might have had occasion to meet. Margaret arrived in England in 1057, where Malcolm had been residing since Macbeth’s murder of his father. In 1054 Malcolm began the reconquest of his kingdom, which he completed

---

36 Ritchie states that this conclusion is implied in the correspondence of 1257 quoted in Hist. Northumberland, VIII, 51-2, concerning the discovery of a body assumed to be that of Malcolm III. Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 12, n. 1

37 Duan Albanach, in Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, 63-4; Anderson, Early Sources, 1.602-3: Malcolm is now king, the son of Duncan, the high-colored, of lively countenance.

38 The ‘I’ version of the Latin lists of Scottish kings identifies Malcolm’s mother by name. Marjorie O. Anderson, Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland (Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1973), 63. John of Fordun claims that she was the kinswoman, perhaps the sister, of Siward, Earl of Northumbria. If true, this kinship might explain Siward’s aggressive interest in his Scottish neighbor and Malcolm’s repeated invasions of Northumbria; each may have felt a claim to the other’s territory. Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 4.44; Anderson, Early Sources, 1.596.

39 There is, however, no reference to this sobriquet until the thirteenth century, and it also has been applied to Malcolm IV. See G. W. S. Barrow, “Malcolm III (d. 1093),” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008, [http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.libraries.smu.edu/view/article/17859, accessed 22 Nov 2010].
in 1058. Given their prominent positions, it is entirely possible that Malcolm and Margaret either knew, or at least knew of, each other during the year or so that they both were guests of King Edward. In 1059, Malcolm returned south as the first King of Scots to visit the English Court in more than eighty years.\textsuperscript{40} Ritchie surmises that, since Malcolm was accompanied by the new Earl of the Northumbrians (Tostig), the Bishop of Durham (Aethelwine), and the Archbishop of York (Cynesige), and as these were the officials who typically escorted Scottish kings, Malcolm was returning to thank Edward officially for his support.\textsuperscript{41} It might be that there was some discussion of strengthening such fealty through a marital alliance with England, and Margaret’s name would probably have entered the conversation since at this time she was the sister of the acknowledged heir to the Anglo-Saxon throne. The conversation might have been continued when Malcolm met with King Edward again in 1061 in Northern England, where they reconciled after Malcolm’s invasion of Northumberland. Gaimar reports that at this time Malcolm was “much honoured” and received many gifts from Edward:

> “Li reis Eadward encontre vint  
  Od Malcolub parlement tint,  
  Presenz li fist, mult l’onura.”\textsuperscript{42} Gaimar, II. 5092-5094

Again, one of these honors might have been the prospect of Margaret’s hand in marriage.\textsuperscript{43} The chronicles provide evidence to support such a supposition. Orderic Vitalis is explicit in quoting Malcolm himself saying that Edward had given him Margaret in marriage.\textsuperscript{44} William of Malmesbury reports that Henry I made the same claim while defending his own right to succession to an assembly of barons.\textsuperscript{45} The lure of such a dynastic alliance between the two kingdoms continued into subsequent generations. Margaret’s daughter, Edith/Matilda, was proposed as a bride to successive sons of William the Conqueror: first to William Rufus, then to Henry I, skipping Robert Curthose

\textsuperscript{40} Symeon of Durham, \textit{Historia Regum}, in \textit{Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia}, ed. Arnold, s.a 1059.

\textsuperscript{41} Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 8. Both Ritchie and Freeman speculate that the purpose of Malcolm’s visit was to recognize Edward as “Basileus” and become his sworn man. Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 8, 385-8; Freeman, \textit{The History of the Norman Conquest of England}, 2.243.

\textsuperscript{42} Gaimar, \textit{Estoire des Engleis}, ed. Short, 276-77.

\textsuperscript{43} Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 16 and n. 2.

\textsuperscript{44} Orderic Vitalis, \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, ed. Chibnall, 4.270-71.

only because he was her godfather. A natural daughter of Henry I, Sybil, was married to Margaret’s son Alexander I.

**Flight to Scotland**

If the marriage between Margaret and Malcolm had been under consideration for quite some time, then it follows that Edgar and his family might have fled to Scotland with the express intention of furthering this marriage.\(^{46}\) The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states simply that the family went to Scotland, the implication being that their destination was predetermined. The typically terse E Version observes succinctly, “And that summer Edgar Cild went abroad, and Mærlswein, and many people with them, and went into Scotland.”\(^{47}\) The usually more poetic D Version also gives an unembellished account: “Edgar Cild went abroad with his mother Agatha and his two sisters, Margaret and Christina, and Mærewein and many good men with them, and came to Scotland under the protection of King Malcolm, and he received them all.”\(^{48}\) The Cotton manuscript implies that the family’s arrival in Scotland, and the resulting marriage between Malcolm and Margaret, was brought about by divine intervention, but there is no mention of returning to Hungary.\(^{49}\) Other chroniclers, seeking to be more specific about the nature of God’s intervention, assert that the refugees were shipwrecked on Scottish shores while attempting to flee to Hungary. The Dunfermline *Vita*, Aelred of Rievaulx, and John of Fordun claim that Edgar was trying to return to the land where he was born, but a storm forced the family to land in Scotland.\(^{50}\) The Dunfermline *Vita* alone asserts that Edgar, following the advice of his mother, was seeking the protection of the German emperor.\(^{51}\) It is difficult to reconcile these two claims – that the family was returning to Hungary

---


\(^{47}\) *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. E, s.a. 1067.

\(^{48}\) *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. D, s.a. 1067.

\(^{49}\) Diii, chapter 3, trans. Metcalfe, 301: “...by the desire of her friends rather than by her own, yea, rather by the appointment of God, she was married to Malcolm son of Duncan, the most powerful King of the Scots.”


\(^{51}\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 7ra.
while simultaneously seeking the protection of the emperor. The Vita then makes a flowery transition from the German emperor to God as “the greatest emperor who commands the winds and the sea.”52 John of Fordun, citing Turgot as his source, continues the “God-as-emperor” motif, but without any parallel reference to the German Emperor. Both the Dunfermline Vita and John of Fordun state that the place where the family landed is now called St. Margaret’s Hope by the locals, with the Vita embellishing a bit by describing it as “a place of horror and a desert of loneliness, but now named for its very great tranquility.”53 Gaimar faults the wind and Symeon of Durham specifies the meeting place as Wearmouth, amidst the carnage and wreckage of war.54

The problems with this legend are numerous and such confused accounts have led to conflicting opinions among modern scholars.55 First, there was no reason for the family to seek to return to Hungary. It must be remembered that Margaret and her family were relative newcomers to the Hungarian kingdom. As such, they had no clan or kin to rely upon, to aid them in battle, or to testify on their behalf in legal proceedings.56 The status and nobility of an immigrant knight were derived from his association with the king, and after eleven years in England, the family had no commitment or guarantee of fidelitas to the reigning Hungarian king.57 Their home and land would probably have been committed elsewhere, particularly because in order to prevent land from being ceded outside the clan, widows and daughters were customarily not granted land but

52 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7ra.
53 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7rb: Applicuit itaque illa sancta familia in [quodu] loco, tunc vero loco horrores et vaste solitudinis, nunc vero pro nimia tranquillitate sua sinus sancta margarite regine ab incolis appellatur. D.E.R. Watt notes that “hope” is Old Norse hop, meaning “a sheltered bay,” and that the use of this word in a Fife place-name is exceptional. Also see St Margaret’s Hope, South Ronaldsay, Orkney.
54 Gaimar, Estorie des Engleis, ed. Short, 252-53; Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1070.
55 Cowan, Life of the Princess Margaret, Queen of Scotland, 106; Wilson for example contends that Margaret and her family were seeking to return to Hungary. and Ronay reconcile the differing accounts by surmising that Agatha might have spread deliberately the rumor that the family was fleeing to Hungary in order to mollify William, who would probably have much preferred to have the ætheling go into self-imposed exile in Hungary than have to follow Cnut’s example. Kázmér Nagy, St. Margaret of Scotland and Hungary (Glasgow: John S. Burns & Sons, 1973), 18; Ronay, The Lost King of England, 163-34. Henderson-Howat asserts that the refugees may only have been seeking temporary asylum in Scotland, having learned to trust Malcolm during his stay in England. Henderson-Howat, Royal Pearl, 34-35. Bruce Webster adheres to the impartiality of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Bruce Webster, Medieval Scotland: The Making of an Identity (New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 58-59
56 Rady, Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary, 67.
57 Rady, Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary, 44.
recompensed in cash or kind.\textsuperscript{58} The widowed Agatha and her children returning to Hungary without property, without the protection of kin, without an association with the king, and without noble status would have been extremely vulnerable. Not a single member of the family or their descendants ever returned to, or as far as can be ascertained, even referred to their supposedly privileged position in Hungary: Agatha probably died in England, Christina took the veil in England, and Edgar, throughout all of his lifelong peregrinations across the Continent, never again set foot in Hungary, even when to do so would have been the logical, most efficient course.\textsuperscript{59} Edgar could even be suspected of purposefully avoiding the country of his birth.

Finally, a ship bound for Hungary had no reason to sail up the eastern coast of England. Orderic Vitalis gives an account of the travels of a French monk and knights to Hungary in 1096. They traveled over land to Cologne and from there across Germany to Hungary where they were graciously received by King Coloman.\textsuperscript{60} Ronay concedes the valid point that perhaps the family “used some deception to allay the fears of William about the purpose of the journey,” which might have included a circuitous route to their destination.\textsuperscript{61} It seems most likely, then, that the family set sail with Scotland as their intended destination and that the misleading detail regarding Hungary, while perhaps rooted in propagandist rumors, was included by later chroniclers in order to add an element of Divine Will to the story of Margaret’s arrival in Scotland.

The events which preceded the family’s fortunate arrival in Scotland might offer significant clues as to its purpose. The years following the Conquest were insecure ones for the new Norman dynasty and the most significant threats naturally centered on those with the greatest claim to the throne: Edgar the ætheling and the sons of Harold II. King

\textsuperscript{58} Rady, \textit{Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary}, 103-5.


\textsuperscript{60} Orderic Vitalis, \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, ed. Chibnall, vol. 5, chap. 4.

\textsuperscript{61} Ronay, \textit{Lost King of England} 164. It would be very instructive at this point to have data regarding ship routes to Hungary. For an analysis of Roger of Howden’s account of maritime travel from the mouth of the Humber and Ouse in Yorkshire down the English coast, across the Atlantic, through the Strait of Gibraltar to the eastern Mediterranean see Patrick Gautier Dalche, \textit{Du Yorkshire a l’Inde: Une “geographie” urbaine et maritime de la fin du XIIe siècle}, Hautes Études Medievales et Modernes, 89 (Geneva: Droz, 2005).
Harold’s mother, Gytha, was able to escape from the besieged city of Exeter and settled in Flanders. Harold’s sons retreated to Ireland, from which they launched an unsuccessful invasion, landing in Somersetshire, and then returning to Ireland. The process was repeated, again in vain, the following year, this time landing at the mouth of the river Tivy.

Edgar was of course a potential contender for William’s newly-won throne, but the challenge posed by his sisters should not be discounted. Eleanor Searle established that the Norman conquerors used marriage to Anglo-Saxon women as a means of legitimizing their settlement, emphasizing that “inheritance through the female line would have been acceptable and valid to people of that time, despite what modern scholars might think.” The real question, then, is why William did not marry Margaret (and Christina) off as part of his initial (pre-1070) plan to rule a united Anglo-Norman kingdom? Perhaps he was biding his time, assessing alternatives, or perhaps he thought she was safely cloistered at Wilton (although this does not seem to have impeded other Norman suitors). Perhaps he was even weighing the possibility of marrying her himself. Although William was already married to Matilda, daughter of Baldwin V, Count of Flanders, it was not unusual for men of position to practice serial monogamy as a means of practical diplomacy. For instance, Orderic Vitalis notes sardonically that Fulk, Count

---

62 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1067: And Gytha, Harold’s mother, and many distinguished men’s wives with her, went out to Flatholme and stayed there for some time and so went from there overseas to St. Omer; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1067: Gytha vero comitissa, scilicet, mater Haroldi regis Anglorum, ac soror Suani regis Danorum, cum multis de civitate fugiens evasit, et Flandriam petit.


64 John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1069: Duo Haroldi filli, circa Nativitatem Iohannis Baptiste, denuo .lxiiii. navibus de Hibernia venientes, in ostio fluminis Tau applicuerunt, et cum Breona Brytonico comite grave prelium commiserunt; quo confecto, unde venerant redierunt. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records a single return of Harold’s sons in 1069. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1069: … Harold’s sons came from Ireland at midsummer with sixty-four ships into the mouth of the Taw, and landed incautiously. And Count Brian came against them by surprise with no little force, and fought against them and killed all the best men who were in that fleet; and the others escaped with a small force to the ships. And Harold’s sons went back to Ireland again.

of Anjou, married a third wife while the first two were still living.\textsuperscript{66} Furthermore, the validity of the marriage between William and Matilda had been questioned. Pope Leo IX prohibited the union at the council of Rheims in October 1049 without explanation, resulting in speculation regarding consanguinity. The two married anyway, and the prohibition was lifted by Pope Nicholas II at the second Lateran Council in 1059. Nevertheless, if William had wanted to gain a kingdom by marriage to a sister of the aetheling, he had both precedent and grounds for setting his current wife aside.\textsuperscript{67}

Such dynastic considerations were trumped by the more imminent threat posed by the rebellion which was brewing in the north, supported by those perennial thorns in England’s tender northern side, Scotland and Norway. William of Poitiers relates that Swein Estrithson, king of Denmark, unable to ignore William’s tantalizing vulnerability, was threatening an invasion.\textsuperscript{68} Perhaps in response to this growing threat, William elected to return to England from Normandy on 7 December 1067,\textsuperscript{69} accompanied by the many highly-placed and potentially troublesome hostages whom he had prudently taken to Normandy, including Edgar the aetheling, Stigand the Archbishop of Canterbury, the earls Edwin and Morcar, Waltheof the son of earl Siward, and “many others of the chief men of England.”\textsuperscript{70} At this point the various accounts differ regarding the timing of the family’s flight to Scotland. The D and E versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle state that Edgar and his family and Maerleswein and others fled to Scotland in the summer of 1067.\textsuperscript{71} John of Worcester places the flight in 1068 after the coronation of Matilda, and the refugees are accompanied by Gospatric.\textsuperscript{72} Freeman reconciles these accounts by

\textsuperscript{66} Orderic Vitalis, \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, ed. Chibnall, 4.186-87. This practice is discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

\textsuperscript{67} Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 76-78.


\textsuperscript{69} A conclusion drawn by Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 213.


\textsuperscript{71} Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D and E, s.a. 1067.

surmising that Edgar and Gospatric left William’s court in the summer of 1068 to join the Northern revolt and the flight to Scotland occurred after the rebellion collapsed with the surrender of the earls Morcar and Edwin to William. For our purposes, it is enough to note that most scholars agree that the flight to Scotland occurred in 1068 rather than 1067.

Why would the rebels have chosen Scotland as their place of refuge? To begin with, Malcolm had pledged his military strength in support of Edgar’s cause. Perhaps Malcolm was repaying the debt he owed for the years of sanctuary he had enjoyed at the court of Edward the Confessor and the military support that Edward had provided to help him secure his throne. Perhaps he even had some fond memories of his meetings with Margaret’s family. It also helped that a fellow conspirator, Gospatric, earl of Bernicia, was cousin to Malcolm. Then again, perhaps Malcolm was simply a pragmatic monarch, taking advantage of an opportunity to further his own interests. In all likelihood, it was probably a combination of these considerations that prompted him to receive the refugees.

During this faltering rebellion Edgar’s female relatives probably sought shelter with Edith, the widow of Edward the Confessor, at Wilton Abbey, with so many other refugees from the Conquest. There, their safety was ensured and, if Margaret had really intended to take the veil, her calling easily could have been fulfilled. Remarkably, however, the refugee warriors opted to take Edgar’s family with them in their retreat to Scotland. None of the chroniclers mention any other families: the D chronicler mentions “many good men;” the E chronicle mentions “many people;” John of Worcester cites “some of the most noble of the Northumbrian nation.” Exiled and refugee warriors more

---

devitantes, et ne sicut alii in custodiam mitterentur formidantes, sumptis secum clitone Eadgaro, et matre sua Agatha, duabuse sororibus suis Margareta et Cristina, navigio Scottiam adierunt, ibidemque, regis Scottorum Malcolm pace, hiemem exegerunt.


74 See for example John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1068, and 3.7 n.3.

75 Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, book 4, chap 5: Malcomus autem, licet ab Anglis requisitus fuerit, et validam expeditionem in eorum auxilium facere paraverit, ...

76 Gospatric’s mother was Ealdgyth, the daughter of Uhtred by his third wife, who was the daughter of King Aethelred, and his father was Maldred brother to Duncan I and therefore uncle to Malcolm. Simeon of Durham, Opera et Collectanea, ed. Hinde, 1.92: Nam ex materno sanguine attinebat ad eum honor illius comitatus. Erat enim ex matre Alghitha, filia Uhtredi comitis, quam habuit ex Algiva filia Agelredi regis. Hanc Alghitham pater dedit in conjugium Maldredo filio Crinani. See also Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 4.89, n. 2.
typically left their female relatives behind. The Godwin family, for example, left the matriarch and her daughters in England when they were forced to flee the country in 1051. The fact that Edgar and the Northumbrian nobility were accompanied in their flight by Margaret, her sister, and her mother suggests that their presence had a purpose. Perhaps previous plans for the marriage were resurrected as a means of supporting Edgar’s military aspirations.

Another indication that this flight was orchestrated with a view to dynastic consequences is hinted at in the muddled account given by the D chronicle in which several events are conflated without regard to proper chronological order. The D chronicle begins in 1067, much like the E chronicle, with the return of King William on St Nicholas’s Day, the very day on which the Christ Church at Canterbury burned down. One wonders if anyone might have seen a correlation between the two events, viewing the destruction of such a significant edifice as an omen. The E chronicle then goes on to record that William “gave away every man’s land,” that Edgar went to Scotland accompanied by Maerleswein and others, and that Malcolm married Edgar’s sister. The D chronicle, however, includes more details with, I suspect, editorial intentions. The revolt of Eadric and the Welsh in Hereford is included. The fall of Exeter is attributed to the betrayal of the thegns and William’s duplicitous behavior. The hagiographic account of Margaret’s marriage follows, which is entirely out of place, chronologically and contextually. Finally, a catalog of events are listed in rapid succession: the story of the siege of Exeter and Gytha’s escape, the coronation of Matilda on 11 May 1068, William’s advance on York in 1068, and the failed counter-invasion of Harold’s sons, again in 1068.

This entire entry seems preoccupied with the lingering question of dynastic threats – or as others might view it, hopeful challenges – to William’s throne. The fall of Exeter can be seen as a metaphor for the collapse of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom in the face of the “betrayal,” or acquiescence, of so many. Then the chronicler examines the consequences of the resulting dynastic diaspora; the coronation of Matilda takes place in 1068, but is included because it signals the initiation of the new Norman dynasty; the flight of Gytha and the defeat of Harold’s sons, although taking place in two separate
years are included together in order to illustrate the elimination of the Godwin dynasty; and between the fall of Exeter (England) and the defeat of the Godwins we have the long hagiographic account of the person who the author, writing with the benefit of hindsight, would see as the only surviving dynastic contender, Margaret. I believe that this chronicler, so enamored of the hope associated with the royal house of Wessex, deliberately placed his brief *Vita* of Margaret between these events in order to make a politically charged editorial comment.

In any event, following the first failed revolt in 1068, Maerleswein and Earl Gospatric fled to Scotland with Edgar the *aetheling* and his family. At this point the negotiations for the marriage between Malcolm and Margaret were resumed in earnest. Perhaps in return for his support for Edgar’s bid for the throne, Malcolm requested, or was offered, Margaret’s hand in marriage. If events worked in their favor, Malcolm would then be brother-in-law to the new king, which at the time was not the distant possibility that history has since suggested. Freeman asserts that at the time, “far more than the half of England must have been in arms against William.” Evidently, William also recognized the enormity of the threat; he responded by marching “his army to Nottingham, and, strengthening the castle there, arrived at York. There he strengthened two forts, and garrisoned them with five hundred knights. He also ordered castles to be set up at Lincoln and other places.” The following year, 1069, these refugees coordinated their attack with their northern allies, meeting the Danish fleet at the mouth of the river Humber, and together they took York on September 20. William once again acted decisively; he marched north, bought off the Danish forces and the resistance again disintegrated. The earls Edwin and Morcar submitted to William. The other leaders of the rebellion, including Maerleswein, fled with their legitimizing standard, Edgar, to the sanctuary of the Kingdom of the Scots.

---

77 A possibility also suggested by Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, 4.523.
Malcolm’s Previous Marriage

According to all accounts, Margaret and Malcolm were married sometime between 1069 and 1070, a year or two after her family’s arrival in Scotland. I believe they were married in the summer of 1069, just prior to the coordinated attack on York, in a bid to secure Malcolm’s support.82 This delay seems to suggest that there were some obstacles that had to be overcome, a very practical one of which might have been Malcolm’s marriage to Ingibjorg, either the daughter or the wife of Thorfinn, Earl of Orkney. The Orkneyinga Saga specifically identifies her as the widow of Thorfinn, or more specifically the mother of Thorfinn’s children, the earls Paul and Erlend.83 The greatest obstacle to believing the veracity of the saga’s account seems to be the question of Ingibjorg’s age. If, as has been suggested, she married Thorfinn before 1030 she would have been born c. 1020 at the latest, in which case she would have been in her 40s during the 1060s – when the Ingibjorg in question had at least one son by Malcolm.84 This may not be perceived as an ideal age at which to have children, but that does not mean that it is impossible. Even Margaret was bearing children until her late 30s, and Queen Emma had a long procreative career. Some contend, however, that since Thorfinn died around 1065, leaving the widowed Ingibjorg free to remarry only rather late in Malcolm’s reign, Malcolm must instead have married a daughter of Thorfinn.85 There is, however, no consensus regarding the date of Thorfinn’s death, which ranges from the 1050s to 1065.86 He was certainly dead by the time of the Battle of Stamford Bridge in

---

82 Ritchie determines that the marriage took place in late 1069 whereas Chibnall prefers a date of 1068. Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 25-26; Chibnall, The Ecclesiastic World of Orderic Vitalis, 4.270 n. 1.
86 Ritchie opts for the latest date, maintaining that Thorfinn died in 1064. (Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland 16-17. Anderson likewise concedes that the later date of 1065 is probable, but points out that the sagas are so vague that it cannot be determined. Anderson, Early Sources, 2. 2-4. This lack of specificity is reflected in Webster’s opinion that Thorfinn died sometime in the 1050s or early 1060s . Webster, Medieval Scotland, 22. Grant vaguely dates his death to around 1060. Grant, “The Province of Ross and the Kingdom of Alba,” 102. Barrow places his death at 1065 “or before.” Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 27.
1066 because the Orkneyinga Saga specifies that the conflict occurred during the reign of Thorfinn’s sons. Alex Woolf has offered a likely scenario in which Ingibjorg was married to Thorfinn in the late 1040s at the very earliest, widowed in 1058, and probably remarried to Malcolm III in the same year while still young enough to provide him with two, possibly three, sons. Ingibjorg’s eventual fate, however, remains a matter of debate, one that was sometimes obscured by the fact that it reflected directly upon the legacy of a woman who later became a saint.

Most scholars contend that Ingibjorg died leaving Malcolm free to remarry. The primary argument in support of this theory seems to be that Margaret never would have consented to marry Malcolm had Ingibjorg been alive. Freeman concludes, “Ingibjorg … must have been removed in some way, and for Margaret’s sake we may hope that she was removed by death rather than by divorce.” This reasoning seems to be rather circular. Although it is possible that Ingibjorg was conveniently deceased by the time Margaret arrived in Scotland, we must not let modern sensibilities regarding the sanctity of marriage, and therefore the impropriety of a future saint being the cause for the dissolution of a marriage, color our conclusion.

It is also possible, and indeed more likely, that Ingibjorg was “set aside” when Malcolm determined to marry Margaret. Wilson proposes that the marriage was dissolved on the grounds of consanguinity, Ingibjorg and Malcolm having a common

---

87 Orkneyinga Saga, ch. 34. Grant concludes that Thorfinn died several years before. Grant, “The Province of Ross and the Kingdom of Alba,” 102 n. 63.
88 I am very grateful to Alex Woolf for sharing this information from unpublished papers: “Lies, Damn Lies and Oral Tradition: the Historical Horizon in Orkneyinga Saga;” and “The Cult of Moluag, the See of Mortlach and Church Organisation in Northern Scotland in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” forthcoming. See also Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 265-71.
89 Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, 4.346. Grant sees no reason to believe that Malcolm set Ingibjorg aside in order to marry Margaret. Grant, “The Province of Ross and the Kingdom of Alba,” 103, n. 68. Duncan concludes that there is no evidence that Ingibjorg was put away, and supposes that she died by 1069. Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom, 118. Barrow surmises that Malcolm was “evidently a widower.” Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 29. Wilson “is fairly certain that if Ingibjorg were still around when Malcolm set his cap at Margaret, the Saxon princess would not have tolerated any advances, let alone a proposal of marriage.” Wilson, St Margaret Queen of Scotland, 69-70.
90 This opinion is shared by Ritchie: “The fact that Queen Ingibjorg’s death is unrecorded aroused [Freeman’s] suspicions, but everything that is known of Margaret and her relatives indicates that they had none. The air of vague reproach adopted by the modern historians when referring to Malcolm Canmore seems unnecessary.” Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 24 n. 4
ancestor, Malcolm II.\textsuperscript{91} This argument is a possibility only if Ingibjorg is assumed to be the daughter of Thorfinn, through whom she would have been related to Malcolm II, but not if she is identified as the widow of Thorfinn, which I believe more plausible. Furthermore, such a theory presupposes the regulation of consanguinity, or more specifically marrying within seven degrees of consanguinity. Such canonical limitations had been implemented and reinforced periodically on the Continent. For example, Boniface introduced broad restrictions prohibiting marriage to the seventh degree of consanguinity, which were codified by Pepin the Younger.\textsuperscript{92} These laws were re-introduced in Normandy by the Council of Rouen in 1072 and confirmed again by the Council of Clermont in 1095.\textsuperscript{93} It is not clear, however, how the issue of consanguinity was treated in the Kingdom of the Scots. Perhaps this explanation is instead simply a modern historian’s way of allowing for the dissolution of the marriage to take place without tainting Margaret’s sanctity.

No such legitimizing was required at the time when the process of setting aside a royal wife was more the norm than the exception. In England, King Cnut was married to Aelfgifu of Northampton, whom he then sent to Norway to act as regent for their son, Swein, when he married Emma, Aethelraed’s widow, in 1017.\textsuperscript{94} Edward the Confessor himself contemplated divorcing his wife Edith, either because she was barren or her powerful family was proving too troublesome. She was sent to a nunnery, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert of Jumièges, urged him to divorce her formally.\textsuperscript{95} Harold Godwinson seemed to have had at least one long-term mistress, Eadgyth Swanneshals, and to have only very late in his life married Eadgyth, the sister of the Earls

\textsuperscript{92} See Wemple, \textit{Women in Frankish Society}, 76.
\textsuperscript{93} Chibnall, \textit{The World of Orderic Vitalis}, 130. Consanguinity was invoked in 1104 to dissolve the marriage of Constance, daughter of Philip of France, to Hugh, count of Troyes, in order that she might marry Prince Bohemond. The marriage between William Clito and Sibyl of Anjou was annulled by Pope Calixtus II in 1124 stating that it was within the seven degrees of consanguinity. Of course, William Adelin’s marriage to Matilda of Anjou was also suspect, but remained uncontested because it suited the parties concerned. See Hollister, \textit{Henry I}, 304.
\textsuperscript{95} Stafford, “The King’s Wife in Wessex,” 74, n. 40. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 1052 and Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a. 1048 send her to Wherwell abbey. Barlow asserts that Wilton Abbey, “where she had once been at school,” was her destination. Barlow, \textit{Edward the Confessor}, 115
Edwin and Morcar. In the north, Harold Hardráda, King of Norway, collected wives; he was married to Elizabeth of Russia (Novgorod), by whom he had daughters Mary and Ingigerd, and also to Thora, the mother of his sons Magnus and Olaf. Within Margaret’s lifetime, Philip of France would repudiate his wife, Bertha, with the support of the French bishops. Malcolm was surrounded by contemporaries who seemed inclined to dispose of one wife in favor of another when it suited them. In Margaret’s world, there would have been little stigma attached to such a practice. The trouble for subsequent chroniclers is that Margaret quickly came to be perceived as a saint at a time when the Church was seeking to promote the sanctimony of marriage.

Furthermore, the chroniclers and the author of Margaret’s Vita, in their effort to promote the sanctity of the Queen, would have ensured that no lingering suspicion regarding Malcolm’s marital status remained if a clear statement regarding the death of Ingibjorg had been possible. Perhaps they likewise accepted serial monogamy as a normal state, though that seems unlikely inasmuch as they tended to be clerics and monks writing at a time when the Church was promoting the integrity of marriage as a sacrament. It is much more likely that the subject is studiously avoided precisely because Malcolm’s freedom and ability to remarry were in doubt. This supposition would go a long way toward explaining the delay between Margaret’s arrival in Scotland in 1068 and the marriage in late 1069.

Perhaps one way of reconciling the entire debate is to consider the fact that at this time there were degrees of marriage. A “Danish” marriage, more danico, conferred legal status, but was not recognized by the Church. Examples of such an arrangement include Harold’s relationship with Eadgyth Swanneshals, and Cnut’s with Aelfgifu.

Children of such marriages were commonly recognized as having legitimate legal status, something the Church was seeking to change. For example, the chronicles persistently refer to Harold’s sons by Eadgith Swanneshals without any qualifying adjectives that would bring their legitimacy into question.

While none of the chronicles explicitly outlines Ingibjorg’s marital status, they do address the subject tangentially by discussing the relative legitimacy of her sons. Malcolm and Ingibjorg had at least two and possibly three sons together. Donald ruled in Moray, but was dead by 1085, and Duncan was King of the Scots briefly in 1094.101 Contemporaries do not seem to have questioned Duncan’s legitimacy. King William accepted Duncan as hostage at Malcolm’s submission at Abernathy.102 The E chronicler recognizes Duncan’s legitimacy by referring to him as King Malcolm’s son, who was in King William’s court he had been given as a hostage.103 Duncan is referred to in a charter to Durham as the son of King Malcolm.104 The *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* implies his legitimacy by referring to Kings Alexander and David as his brothers.105 Later chronicles, however, were more apt to question the marital status of his parents. William of Malmesbury refers to Duncan as Malcolm’s “base-born son.”106 It must be remembered that these chroniclers were recording history after Margaret’s dynasty had been established both in Scotland and, through the marriage of Edith/Matilda to Henry I, in England. It was therefore not unusual that they would call into question the legitimacy of the competing dynasty, the descendants of the children of Malcolm’s first marriage.107

---

101 *Annals of Ulster*, s.a.1085 for Donald’s death.
102 *Annals of Ulster*, s.a. 1072; Anderson, *Early Sources*, 2.34.
103 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, E, s.a. 1093.
106 William of Malmesbury *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, 1.724-5: *Dunecanum, filium Malcolm* nothum; *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. van Houts, 2.272-3: *Sublatis autem de medio fratribus eius Dudecano et Alexandro regibus Scotorum ipse iidem regnum suscepit*. See also Anderson, *Early Sources*, 2.25-26, n. 2; 2.34, n.2; 2.89.
Malcolm’s Motivations

In order to consider fully whether Malcolm might have in fact set Ingibjorg aside, some attention must be paid to his possible motives. I believe that Malcolm chose to marry Margaret for two reasons, the first is purely political, as might be expected of a ruling king, but the second is a little more surprising, and might have been entirely personal. Let us first dispense with some untruths. Ritchie contends that any plausible motivations for this marriage could not have been dynastic. Children of Malcolm and Margaret could have no claim to the English throne while Edgar the aetheling lived, and even after his death, any claim would have been through Margaret, “the spindle side,” while in Scotland Malcolm had both an eligible brother and a son, both of whom in fact did succeed him, if only briefly.\textsuperscript{108} In some respects, however, the motivations were entirely dynastic, except that the claim being laid was not to restricted to the Anglo-Saxon throne, but to the legacy and the legitimacy of Edward the Confessor. William the Conqueror had asserted his right to the throne of England through his somewhat distant relationship with King Edward.\textsuperscript{109} Somewhat ironically, in view of Professor Ritchie’s assertion regarding lesser “spindle side” rights, William’s claim to the throne was derived from his great-aunt, Queen Emma, the mother of Edward the Confessor. Noting his blood ties with Emma, the daughter of Duke Richard I of Normandy, William of Poitiers cited the “right of blood,” \textit{jus sanguinis}, as one of the primary supporting tenets for William’s claim.\textsuperscript{110} William also “continuously argued that [he] was the legitimate successor of Edward the Confessor after an interregnum caused by usurpation, and that he was king of England not only \textit{de facto} but also \textit{de jure}.”\textsuperscript{111} His determination to associate himself with his revered predecessor is evidenced in a vernacular writ issued between 1066 and 1070 in which he referred to Edward the Confessor as “my kinsman” when confirming the rights of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds.\textsuperscript{112} He chose to have himself anointed in Westminster Abbey by the tomb of Edward the Confessor on

\textsuperscript{108} Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 25.
\textsuperscript{109} Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 247-64.
\textsuperscript{111} Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 250.
\textsuperscript{112} David C. Douglas, \textit{Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds} (Oxford University Press, 1932), 48, no. 3.
Christmas Day 1066. William, “posing always as the Confessor’s rightful successor” was not “likely to forget the special position he occupied by virtue of his English royalty.”

William, by consciously deriving his legitimacy from his blood ties to Edward the Confessor was, by extension, required to treat those with even closer blood ties to Edward with some degree of respect and even deference. He permitted the Confessor’s widow to live in quiet retirement with her estates and revenue largely intact, and she was buried with full ceremony alongside her royal husband. Such largesse and magnanimity extended to King Edward’s nieces and nephew. William received Edgar’s submission with a rather avuncular attitude “because he was a gentle boy and without guile,” but also because it was in his interest not to discredit Edward the Confessor’s family. Edgar was “probably given lands and allowed some status,” which is all the more remarkable when considering that there is no explicit evidence that he received anything similar from the Confessor. Christina was granted lands which came to at least 57 hides, a not insignificant indulgence. The possibility that she was made abbess in 1086 confirms her at least noble and probably royal standing. Margaret could not have failed to have been held in similarly high esteem.

113 Douglas, William the Conqueror, 256-57.
117 William of Poitiers, Gesta Willelmi Ducis Normannorum, ed. Foreville, 148: Athelinum ... post Heraldi ruinam ... amplis terris ditavit, atque in charissimis habuit eum.
119 See previous chapter.
Succeeding generations certainly recognized such inherited legitimacy. In a bid to co-opt the Confessor’s revered legacy, which was transmitted through Margaret to her dynasty, Margaret’s daughter, Edith/Matilda, was aggressively courted by a string of Normans, “all of the highest rank, all related to the Conqueror”: the lord of Richmond, the King of England (William Rufus), and William de Warenne, Earl of Surrey.\textsuperscript{120} Henry I, almost immediately after assuming the throne, announced his impending marriage with “King Edward’s niece,” the relevant association here being not her natal family, but Edward the Confessor.\textsuperscript{121} Years after William’s incontestable conquest, his heir, Henry, was still seeking to mollify factions loyal to the previous Anglo-Saxon dynasty. He granted Edith/Matilda “substantial rights” in the city of London in recognition of the support Londoners granted to Edgar the aetheling during the reign of William the Conqueror, and gifted her with London properties and corresponding juridical rights “as a means of gaining the loyalty of those Londoners who still adhered to the house of Wessex.”\textsuperscript{122} Even in death Margaret’s daughter was associated with her exalted kin; she was buried in the church of St. Peter at Westminster.\textsuperscript{123}

William, by elevating the status of Edward the Confessor to revered patriarch of the new Norman dynasty, had also, probably quite unintentionally, elevated Margaret’s status beyond that of simply a sister to the foundering aetheling. She was instead Edward the Confessor’s niece, a much more significant dynastic link. So, although Margaret had no territorial or military power base, her indisputably royal heritage could work to undermine the legitimacy of any of William’s expansionist designs on Scotland. To challenge the inherent rights of Margaret and her offspring would have been to undermine William’s own carefully-woven political propaganda. As will be seen in the following chapter, this marital alliance is an element of the aggressively defensive policy

\textsuperscript{120} Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 99. For a full discussion of Edith/Matilda’s suitors and their various agendas see Huneycutt, \textit{Matilda of Scotland}, 21-25.

\textsuperscript{121} William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 1.714-17. This point is stressed by Ritchie, \textit{The Normans in Scotland}, 101-04.


toward England that would characterize the rest of Malcolm’s reign. The challenge to Malcolm’s rule no longer came from the north, which had necessitated a politically expedient marriage to the house of Earl Thorfinn. Thorfinn was dead, and his territory was being managed by two young boys. Instead, Malcolm now faced William’s steady northward expansion.

Beyond these political considerations, however, Malcolm and Margaret might have opted to marry because there was some genuine affection between them. It is always difficult to evaluate personal relationships, especially the personal relationships of a saintly queen from a distant past, but some observations can be hazarded. As we have already seen, the two would have known of each other and quite possibly might even have met while Malcolm was in England. It is unlikely that the family would have chosen Scotland as their place of refuge if he had proven to be a terribly abhorrent character at that time. Other safe havens were available: Harold’s sons fled to Ireland, Gytha found sanctuary in Flanders, and Edgar eventually was received by King Philip in France. The only concrete evidence we have that the two were not without some affection for each other is that Margaret had at least eight children within about fifteen years. This remarkably efficient procreative career is even more outstanding when compared to her contemporaries. At a time when virginity was equated with sanctity, many royal wives chose to limit the number of children they had in order to assert their relative virginity within the confines of marriage: they might be married, but that did not mean they would necessarily share the marriage bed, and if they were duty-bound to have children, then they would limit their progeny to only the required one or two. An extreme example is Matilda of Tuscany (Matilda of Canossa), a contemporary of Margaret’s born in or around 1046 in northern Italy, who dutifully presented herself to her groom on their wedding night – sporting a hair shirt and newly cropped hair. She eventually spurned her distasteful marital obligations altogether, preferring to become instead the “right-hand woman warrior of Pope Gregory VII.”

The childless marriage of Edward the Confessor and Edith was reinterpreted after his death as one of intentional,

---

holy celibacy. Of course, there are examples of perfectly fruitful unions, but then again, none of the people in question was ever a contender for sainthood: William the Conqueror and Matilda had nine or ten children, while his sister, Adela and Stephen-Henry of Blois had a brood of six to eight.

Margaret might have been motivated to have many children in order to ensure dynastic stability, having heard about and experienced first hand the chaos resulting from the lack of an heir: King Stephen of Hungary and King Edward the Confessor. It might also have been, quite simply, that Margaret and Malcolm were fond of each other. The broadest span of childbearing years that we can give Margaret is fifteen, from 1070 assuming she was married in 1069, to 1085, assuming that is the year of David’s birth. Of course, if she was married in 1070 and David was born before 1083, that span could be reduced to only twelve years or so. Derek Baker surmises that she delivered in rapid succession: Edward was born in 1071, Edmund in 1072, Ethelred in 1073, Edgar in 1074 and Alexander, after a well-deserved interval of three years, in 1077; the two daughters, Edith and Mary, followed, and David, her last child, was born in 1084. At least six of her married years were spent pregnant. For her to conceive this often, almost literally at every conceivable opportunity, the royal couple must have spent a great deal of time in each other’s company. Given the itinerant schedule of the king, it can be inferred that Margaret probably traveled with her husband often, choosing to be together rather than in separate households.

Furthermore, Malcolm is not known to have had any illegitimate children while married to Margaret at a time when bastardy did not yet carry the taint that it would later. Note, for example, that it did not hinder the career of William the Bastard. William and his son Robert Curthose each had at least one illegitimate child, and Henry I made

---

125 Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 256-59.
127 Dynastic stability as an element of statecraft is considered in the next chapter.
128 G.W.S. Barrow, for example, maintains that David was born c. 1085 or possibly a little earlier in Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages (London: The Hambledon Press, 1992), 62.
129 Derek, “‘A Nursery of Saints’: St Margaret of Scotland Revisited,” 138-39.
extensive diplomatic and military use of his bastard brood, marrying eight or nine of his daughters to strategic allies and employing his sons Robert of Gloucester, Richard, Reginald, and Robert in support of his cause.\textsuperscript{130}

An enchanting story suggests the close connection between the royal couple. Its historical veracity is questionable, but it bears repeating simply because of its charm. According to an account written in the \textit{Annals of Dunfermline}, St Margaret was accustomed to retire to the seclusion of a cave near Dunfermline in order to pray in peace. Curious about her nocturnal assignations and perhaps expecting the worst, Malcolm chose to follow her one day. When he saw her at prayer, he was both relieved and inspired and immediately arranged to have the cave properly outfitted. The cave is described by an aged native of Dunfermline who remembered how, in his youth in the early 1700s, he would visit the Oratory Cave. He recalled the ruins of a stone table or bench with a faint carving of something similar to a crucifix. The entrance of the windowless retreat faced west, and the space inside measured six feet, nine inches high, eight feet six inches wide, and eleven feet, nine inches long. Malcolm probably arranged to have the cave sparsely decorated with an altar, a bench, some candles, and perhaps a door at the entrance.\textsuperscript{131} Such a tale supports the view that the two were accustomed to spending time in each others’ company, unlike many royal couples who were more inclined to keep separate households. Malcolm apparently was aware of her presence, or absence, even at night. His devotion to his wife was such that he elected to join her, a possibility to which Turgot alludes when he states that from Margaret’s example the king learned “to promote nightly vigils by praying frequently.”\textsuperscript{132}

Turgot speaks poignantly of Malcolm’s affection and love for Margaret in other ways as well.


\textsuperscript{131} See Henderson, \textit{The Annals of Dunfermline and Vicinity}, s.a. 1080. The legend regarding Margaret’s solitary nocturnal vigils in the cave is still popularly held to be true.

\textsuperscript{132} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 10rb: \textit{Didicit ille ab ea vigilias noctis frequenter orando producere}; Diii, chapter 6.
Wherefore the books with which she was accustomed either to pray or to read, this man, although illiterate, was accustomed to turn often by hand and to inspect, and when he had heard from her which of them was dearer, this he also took to consider more dearly, and often kissed and handled. And sometimes, after summoning the goldsmith, he took this book to be decorated with gold and jewels, and the king himself was accustomed to offer the decorated (book) to the queen as an indication of his devotion.  

Like a lovesick schoolboy, he would derive great pleasure from gifting her with a book of her own that he had ornamented with gold and gemstones. Perceiving her innate piety and goodness, “he dreaded to offend this queen whose life was so venerable in any way, but rather he hastened to obey more quickly her wishes and prudent counsels in all things.”  

From Turgot, it is easy to arrive at a picture of a man deeply and romantically in love, his battle-scared hands caressing the delicate tomes favored by his wife, seeking to gain her favor through generous gifts. It is important to refrain, however, from thinking of Malcolm as an addle-pated, lovestruck youth. Theirs was probably more a case of mutual respect than a one-sided infatuation. Turgot might have been anxious to portray the subject of his hagiography as the object of reverence, but as we will see in the next chapter, this love, or mutual respect, or whatever we care to call it, operated reciprocally. The extent of their compatibility and dedication to one another is demonstrated in the next chapter by the very complementary nature of their public roles as queen and king.

* * * * *

Initial hagiographic treatments of Margaret’s life by her biographers and the chroniclers have resulted in certain misconceptions which persist to this day: that she intended to become a nun, that she would never have consented to marry Malcolm unless

---

133 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 10 rb-va: *Unde et libros in quibus ipsa vel orare consueverat vel legere, ille licet ignarus litterarum sepe manu versare solebat et inspicere, et dum ab ea quis eorum esset carior audisset, hunc et ipse cariorem habere cepit, et sepius deosculari et contractare; Diii, chapter 6.

134 Dunfermline *Vita*, 10rb: *Ipsam tam venerabilis vite reginam quia in eius corde christum veraciter habitare perspexerat, ille quoquammodo offendere formidabat, sed pocius votis eius et prudentibus consiliis celerius per omnia obedire properabat; Diii, chapter 6.
he was already a widower, that a storm tossed her ship onto the shores of Scotland, and that she was forced to marry the barbaric king of Scots as a helpless refugee. Instead, she and her family probably journeyed to Scotland with the express intent of forging a marital alliance between Scotland and the royal house of Wessex. Once the myth of hagiography and the romanticism of subsequent chronicles are pulled aside, it is easy to see how Margaret was propelled by events that later chroniclers felt compelled to explain and interpret.
II.2. THE QUEEN OF SCOTS

When Margaret married Malcolm Canmore she became the Queen of the Scots, the exact implications of which, in this place and at this time, can only be surmised since little information exists on any Queen of Scots before Margaret, with the possible exception of the fictionalized Lady Macbeth. As far as can be determined, the queens of the early medieval Kingdom of the Scots had no established administrative office, no official function, and no tradition of queenship such as that of their Anglo-Saxon counterparts. However, this nearly total absence of any established precedent left Margaret free to set her own standards, drawing upon the queenly examples to which she had been exposed in two kingdoms. This chapter will begin with an overview of Scottish kingship and then consider Margaret’s various reginal roles as peace-weaver, matriarch, mistress of the court, and patron of the Church.

Historical Context

The position of any queen typically is viewed in relation to that of her royal consort; she is either a complement or a hindrance to her husband’s agenda, or at the very least a benign presence. Thoughtful consideration of Margaret’s role must therefore begin with an overview of Scottish kingship. The following section will consider the three factors that determined a king’s claim to rule: hereditary right, ecclesiastical approval, and military strength.

When Malcolm became king in 1058, he inherited the rich legacy of his ancestors as delineated in the Duan Albanach, or the “Scottish Poem,” written during his reign and tracing his lineage back to ancient times. The Alpínid dynasty had ruled the kingdom of Alba since the late ninth century, when it had emerged as a fusion, through conquest and assimilation, of the Gaelic and Pictish kingdoms. Geographically, it extended north of

---

1 For the history of the Kingdom of the Scots during this period I have relied generally on: Woolf, From Pictland to Alba; Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom; Barrow, Kingship and Unity.
3 Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 122-271.
4 Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 340-42. For the term Alba see Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 125-26, 179-
the Forth, was centered on the Tay basin, and included such outlying territories as Iona in the West and Moray and Buchan in the north. One of the earliest instances in which the term *Scotia* was applied to the Kingdom of Alba is the reference by Marianus Scotus (d. 1083) to Malcolm II (d. 1034) as *rex Scotiae*, the king of the people called *Scottsas*. In this study I will therefore refer to the geo-political entity which Malcolm ruled as the Kingdom of the Scots.

Legitimacy was conferred not only by heredity right but also by Church sanction. Kings received the endorsement of Church leaders, the effect of which was to confer legitimacy by defining the king as divinely selected to be the champion of the Church and the enforcer of God’s laws. The seventh-century hagiographer Adomnán related in his *Life of Columba* a compelling vision in which an angel intercedes rather forcefully by beating the saint about the shoulders with a book on three consecutive nights in order to ensure the selection of Áedán as the next king. Although this tale has all the hallmarks of hagiographic embellishment, the point is made that ecclesiastical authorities, Columba in this case, were instrumental in selecting and supporting kings as early as the seventh century. The authority of the rulers of the Kingdom of the Scots was perceived on some level to be divinely ordained and Church sanctioned.

The king, in return, was charged with supporting the authority of the Church, enforcing orthodox practices, and endorsing decisions made by the highest-ranking prelates in his kingdom. As early as the eighth century, the King of the Picts, Nechtan, requested ecclesiastical guidance from his Northumbrian neighbor, Ceolfrith (d.714), the Abbot of Jarrow and Wearmouth, regarding the reordering of the Church in his

---

80; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 71-97.
6 Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 248.
7 Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 146.
8 For David’s anointing see Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 73.
11 For further analysis of the relationship between king and Church see Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 312-20.
The *Scottish Chronicle* reports that Constantine II (900-43) was made guardian of the rights of the Church, portraying the king as the enforcer of the law. This relationship between the Church and the king was clearly articulated in the writings of two ninth-century Irishmen at the Carolingian court, Smaragdus and Sedulius Scottus, who reasoned that it was the responsibility of the king to protect the churches of his realm and to foster the spiritual health of his people. These two were giving voice to theories which were being developed and utilized in Ireland and England. A century and a half later, Abbot Aelfric of Eynsham and Archbishop Wulfstan of York referred to the writings of Smaragdus and Sedulius when orchestrating the great Anglo-Saxon reform, strengthening the interdependency of the king and the Church, a concept which had already been established in the northern Kingdom of the Scots.

As a corollary to the king’s role as protector of the Church, he was charged with maintaining law and order in the kingdom. The *Scottish Chronicle* states that in the reign of Donald son of Alpin (858-862) “the Gaels with their king made the rights and laws of the kingdom [that are called the laws] of Aed son of Eochaid.” Rather than a formal code of legislation, these “laws of Aed” were thought of as “the laudable customs of the time of a good and memorable king,” reflecting a society ruled by custom and a long standing and well-respected system of law.

Above all, the king was expected to be a warrior ruler, defending his kingdom bodily against all threats, engendering loyalty through the distribution of war spoils, and displaying the personal leadership and rule of a warrior king. The *Scottish Chronicle* defines kings and princes in terms of their warrior attributes and material evidence of

---

15 Hudson, “Kings and Church in Early Scotland,” 156-57. Hudson notes that “two generations before the much better known reform movement sponsored by the English King Edgar, the Scots were actively working to create a strong episcopacy at the same time that they were involved in the promotion of the great monastic federations.”
their power is derived from the taking of hostages and the enslavement of their enemies.\textsuperscript{18} The warring nature of a successful ruler was required by ongoing challenges to the king’s rule. From the fifth to the ninth centuries, the primary conflict was between the two kingdoms of the Scots and the Picts, although both also had to contend with Viking incursions. The Scots had migrated from Ireland and settled in the southwestern area of modern Scotland known as Kintyre and Argyll, founding the kingdom of Dal Riata, their presence posing an immediate threat to the ancient kingdom of the Picts. Military confrontation and dynastic challenges resulting from intermarriage finally resulted in the forceful unification of the two realms under Kenneth I in the early ninth century. The conflict continued, however, as different branches of Kenneth’s descendants contended for the throne. The most notable threat to the ancient line of the kings of Alba came from the rulers, or mormaers, of the province of Moray. Boite, who was either a brother of Malcolm II or a son of Kenneth III, had a daughter named Gruoch who married in succession Gillacomgain, mormaer of Moray, and then Macbeth, whose own father, Findlaech, had once also been mormaer of Moray. When Macbeth defeated and killed Duncan I, the grandson of Malcolm II by his daughter Bethoc, he subverted the line of succession and threatened to supplant the descendants of Kenneth mac Alpin with those of the mormaers of Moray. After seventeen years of rule (1040-57) Macbeth was defeated by Duncan’s son, Malcolm III, and the line of succession restored.\textsuperscript{19}

In the roughly 150 years from the mid-tenth century to the end of Malcolm’s reign in 1093, only one king was graced with a natural death.\textsuperscript{20} Most lost their final battle to an

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
King & Reign & Killed by \\
Malcolm I & 943-54 & Men of Moray \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18} Hudson, \textit{The Prophecy of Berchán}.
\textsuperscript{19} Threats from Macbeth’s line continued, however. Malcolm initially sought to mollify Moray by allowing Mael Snechta, the son of Macbeth’s stepson, Lulach, to act as mormaer in Moray. Mael Snechta was called ‘king of Moray’ in the \textit{Annals of Ulster}, s.a. 1085 in Anderson, \textit{Early Sources}, 2.46. However, in 1078 Malcolm is recorded as having, in the manner of a true warrior king, “won the mother of Mael Snechta [King Lulach’s widow] … and all his best men, his treasures and his cattle.” See Anderson, \textit{Scottish Annals}, 100 n. 69. Mael Snechta might have been forced into monastic retirement since he is described in the Annals of Ulster as having ended his life “happily,” a term typically reserved for the religious. Anderson, \textit{Early Sources}, 2.46. Malcolm also looked beyond Moray to Orkney/Caithness by marrying Earl Thorfinn’s widow (or daughter) thereby allying himself by marriage to the new earls. Grant, “The Province of Ross and the Kingdom of Alba,” 102-3 and n. 66. See also Woolf, \textit{From Pictland to Alba}, 249-55.
\textsuperscript{20} The following information is derived from Dickinson, \textit{Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603}: Table 2, \textit{Scottish Kings} 943-1286.
enemy from within the kingdom, with the exception of Indulf (d. 962) who was killed by the Danes. It is therefore notable that the party who according so some accounts was responsible for the treacherous death of Malcolm III was not any potential rival for the throne, but a Norman, Arkil Morel, which is symptomatic of the fact that by the time of Margaret’s marriage to Malcolm Canmore, the primary threat Scotland faced was no longer internal, but lay to the south; William of Normandy’s conquest of Anglo-Saxon England was continuing its northward creep with no sign of abating.21

While English designs on the kingdom of the Scots did not begin with the Normans, they had never before envisioned outright conquest. The threat had been constrained to a mixture of border skirmishes, isolated conflicts, and land trades. As early as the seventh century the Angles were contending with the Scots for control of what would become Northumbria, or north-Humber, the area from the Humber to the Forth. In 603 an Anglian army defeated the Scots, led by King Aidan at the battle of Degsastan. In 685, however, the king of the Picts, Brude, son of Bili, regained supremacy at the battle of Nechtansmere.22 By the tenth century, the kings of Wessex were granting themselves grand titles boasting of supremacy. Aethelstan termed himself Æthelstanus basileos Anglorum et aeque tocius Brittaniae orbis gubernator (Aethelstan, Emperor of the English and likewise governor of the entire British world). Not to be outdone, his brother styled himself as Eadmundus rex Anglorum caeterarumque gentium in circuitu persistentium gubernator et rector (Edmund king of the English and governor and ruler of the other peoples surrounding them).23 These claims were supported on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indulf</td>
<td>954-62</td>
<td>Danes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubh</td>
<td>962-6</td>
<td>Scots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culen</td>
<td>966-71</td>
<td>Men of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth II</td>
<td>971-95</td>
<td>Finella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine III</td>
<td>995-7</td>
<td>Kenneth III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth III</td>
<td>997-1005</td>
<td>Malcolm II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm II</td>
<td>1005-34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan I</td>
<td>1034-40</td>
<td>Macbeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>1040-57</td>
<td>Malcolm III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulach</td>
<td>1057-8</td>
<td>Malcolm III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 For a discussion of chronicle accounts of the death of Malcolm III see Part 3, Chapter 1.
22 Dickinson, Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603, 26-27.
23 H. Pierquin, Receuil Général des Chartes Anglo-Saxonnes (Paris: 1912), 476, 479; online at ascharter.net: charters S448 and S493, S494, S497, S500, S501, S506, S507, S510. Edmund’s phrase was
occasion by military force. In 937 King Aethelstan defeated the combined forces of King Constantine II of Alba, King Owen of Strathclyde, and the leader of the Norse in Dublin, Olaf Godfrey’s son, at the battle of Brunanburh. In order to keep the peace, however, Aethelstan’s successor, Edmund, thought it prudent to pacify his northern neighbor with a gift of land. Thus, in 945 the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reports that King Edmund gave Malcolm I all Cumbria, or Strathclyde. This grant seems to have set a precedent for agreements regarding vassalage that fluctuated according to the relative power and demands of the respective parties. It has been suggested that Malcolm III’s visit to England in 1059, so soon after accession to the throne, might have been to recover those English estates which had been granted to the Scottish king in the tenth century. In addition to military incursions and land grants, the English strove to insert themselves into the internal affairs of kingdom of the Scots by acting increasingly as kingmakers. It was at Edward the Confessor’s command, “jussu regis,” that Earl Siward invaded the Kingdom of the Scots in 1054 for the express purpose of defeating Macbeth and placing Malcolm on the throne.

Most of the conflict between the two realms, however, continued to be confined to brief border skirmishes designed more to acquire booty rather than to conquer. Malcolm III’s raid into Northumbria in 1061 was a continuation of this long-standing tradition. In this particular instance, Malcolm might also have been prompted to support

---

25 Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 117. Duncan suggests that the purpose of these estates was to support the Scottish king on his visits to England: “It has been suggested that the 12 vills restored to Malcolm in 1091 were Cumbrian, but the association with an annual fee suggest rather that the endowment was that to sustain the Scottish king on his visits to the English court. True, Malcolm does not appear as a landlord in Domesday Book (1086), but another survey showed him between 1068 and 1078 as tenant of three hides in Northamptonshire, which he had evidently lost by 1086. These may well, be a part of those manors given to the Scots king in 973, for it is most likely these which Rufus promised to restore.” Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 121 and n.2 citing E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, “A Northamptonshire Estate of Malcolm Canmore” *SHR*, 27 (1948), 101-2. Alex Woolf cautions, however, that this visit does not imply English support for Malcolm’s rule. Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 270.
Waltheof, whose father Siward had championed Malcolm’s bid for the throne in 1054 and had died in 1055, being replaced by Tostig the son of Earl Godwin. Furthermore, Malcolm’s mother might have been a kinswoman of Siward, which would have increased Malcolm’s personal interest in the earldom. On the other hand, Tostig and Malcolm were sworn brothers, and Tostig seems to have taken no lasting offense; by 1066, he was at court of Malcolm seeking his support for the planned invasion of England.\(^\text{27}\) It is most likely that Malcolm was simply testing the water soon after securing his throne, and the incursion was part of the ongoing conversation between the Scots and Northumbria.

With the Norman Conquest, however, military incursions ceased to be border skirmishes and took on weightier significance, threatening outright conquest. Malcolm and his kingdom probably viewed with great trepidation William’s brutal and uncompromising subjugation of the ancient Anglo-Saxon kingdom, resulting in the almost complete extinction of the noble class. They must have wondered exactly how far William intended to carry his conquest and whether he would be content with Northumbria as the northern definition of his realm. Subsequent events in Wales proved that William’s grasp would extend as far as practically feasible. Malcolm’s job was to make such grasping both impractical and painfully unfeasible.

Malcolm’s first task, then, as a warrior king, was to flex his military muscle, to begin a military negotiation for the express purpose of establishing the northern extent of William’s realm.\(^\text{28}\) After 1066, the stakes were higher, involving the future of entire kingdoms, so Malcolm responded in kind. In 1068 the Northumbrian nobility and Margaret’s family had fled to the safety of Scotland. In the summer of 1069 their cause was strengthened by the arrival of a fleet of 240 ships sent by Swein Estrithson, Cnut’s nephew and the King of Denmark (1043-74), intent upon raiding the coast from Kent to the Humber. Together these factions marched on York, which fell to them on September 27 Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 27.

\(^\text{28}\) This point is also discussed by Douglas, *William the Conqueror*, 226, citing G. W. S. Barrow, *The Border Inaugural lecture of the Professor of Medieval History, delivered in the auditorium of the Physics Department, King’s College, Newcastle upon... 1962 (Inaugural lectures, King’s College)* (Durham: University of Durham, 1962). Douglas, given his undisguised bias in favor of William, paints Malcolm as the menacing force.
20, an event which William could not afford to ignore.\footnote{Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 218-19.}

A significant component of Malcolm’s strategy was to align with those opposed to William, including these displaced Northumbrian nobles, but especially the person considered by many to be the legitimate heir to the English throne, Edgar, and his family. Perhaps those committed to Edgar’s cause had even urged his sister to marry with a view toward gaining the political capital and military support needed for an uprising.\footnote{See previous chapter.} In any event, the marriage of Malcolm and Margaret must have alarmed William, who between 1068 and 1072 found himself faced with a successful rebellion in the north, the loss of York, the advent of an invading Danish naval force, and, to cap it all off, a marital alliance between the Scottish kingdom and the displaced royal house of Wessex. At the time, without the benefit of historical hindsight, it must have seemed that the possibility of a re-instatement of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom, beginning with a stronghold in York, was very real indeed.\footnote{Also noted by Douglas, \textit{William the Conqueror}, 219: “The possibilities latent in the developing situation were in fact incalculable, and in the autumn of 1069 it must have seemed possible that a Scandinavian kingdom might once more be established in northern England, or even a realm created for Edgar Atheling, buttressed by the support of Malcolm and Sweyn, and perhaps even to be sanctioned with a separate coronation by a metropolitan archbishop of the distinct ecclesiastical province of York.”}

\textbf{Peace-Weaver}

Margaret’s original task, then, was to act as an impediment to William’s aspirations. She was cast as a “war-impeder,” a significant deviation from, but not entirely unrelated to, the more traditional role of peace-weaver which was often assigned to queens. Anglo-Saxon poetry lauded the woman, specifically the queen, who acted as \textit{friðusibb}, “a bond of peace to the nations” or “peace-pledge.”\footnote{For the first definition see \textit{Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg}, ed. Fr. Klaeber, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 1950), 335, col. 2. The second definition is given by Chance, \textit{Woman as Hero}, 1. See also Sklute, “\textit{Freoðuwebbe} in Old English Poetry,” 208, f. 16.} She was given as a bride to the king of a hostile tribe with whom she was then expected to forge a bond of peace, not only through the marriage itself but through her children, the co-mingling of blood from the warring clans. In \textit{Beowulf}, Wealththeow is expected to bind the Danes and the Helmings in friendship when she marries King Hrothgar. Hildeburh, another character in \textit{Beowulf}, likewise is charged with uniting the Danes and the Frisians. Freawaru also...
aspires to secure peace between the Danes and the Heathobards.33

Historical figures frequently served the same purpose as their literary counterparts. In Anglo-Saxon England, the brides of English kings were often chosen in an attempt to secure the kingdom’s troublesome borders and forge internal alliances. Aethelraed married Aelfgifu, the daughter of Thored, Ealdorman of Deira/Yorkshire in an effort to tame Northumbria.34 Aelfgifu of Northampton was married more danico to Cnut in order to secure his northern borders.35 Ealdgyth, widow of Sigeferth and heiress to the Seven Boroughs was taken as a wife by Edmund Ironside, a union his father openly opposed because of the power and support it would bring to his son and potential rival.36 Ealdgyth, widow of Gryuffydd the King of Gywnedd and Powys, was married to Harold Godwinson in order foster the allegiance of her brothers, the Earls of Mercia.37 In the Kingdom of the Scots, Macbeth married Gruoch to ally himself with the mormaers of Moray and, as we have seen, Malcolm III gained the allegiance of Orkney by marrying Ingibjorg, the widow of Thorfinn the Mighty. In these cases, the bride was expected to serve as a peace-weaver. Both historically and in the literature of the day, marital alliances were typically employed to complement martial strategy.

Within this context, Malcolm’s marriage to Margaret portrayed her as the peace-pledge but only to the extent that it impeded war rather than promoted peace.38 Her natal family had no political power base with which Malcolm could treat for peace. Instead, Margaret’s political worth was derived from her heritage, especially her blood relationship with Edward the Confessor. Edgar and Margaret carried the blood of Edward the Confessor, their half-uncle, while William technically was only related through his aunt’s marriage. William could not undermine Margaret’s royal status without compromising his own claim to the throne, causing him to display

---

33 Chance, *Woman as Hero*, 3.
35 Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 73-74, 134-35.
36 See Part One, Chapter 1.
38 The more traditional role of peace-weaver would be assumed by the following generation: Margaret’s daughter Edith/Matilda married Henry I of England, and her son Alexander married Sybil, the natural daughter of Henry I.
uncharacteristic tolerance toward her family. While he certainly possessed no qualms about ravaging his own kingdom to subdue the rebellion in the north, and he pursued an uncompromisingly aggressive policy toward Wales, he treated Margaret’s brother with cautious deference, granting him lands after the Conquest and permitting him to go into a comfortable exile after the rebellion. For the first time, a Scottish king had made an exogenous marriage, because for the first time the threat to the Scottish kingdom was exogenous.

In response to what he perceived as increasing unrest in the north, William gathered an impressive array of forces and in 1072 made his way to Scotland by land and sea. The resulting show of military might was enough to persuade Malcolm to treat with William, the result being that Malcolm agreed to become William’s vassal on some ill-defined level, surrendered his son Duncan as hostage, and agreed to send his brother-in-law, the figurehead of the rebellion, Edgar, into exile. In return, William agreed that Malcolm could keep all his English holdings. The immediate threat to William of a rival to the throne in a position of power on the northern border of his newly-won kingdom was negated, and Malcolm had achieved an understanding that would honor the status quo that had existed prior to the Conquest: fluid vassalage in exchange for English land and recognition of the northern extent of William’s realm. If it had been Edgar who persuaded Margaret to marry in order to further his own agenda, he was now exiled and his claim to the throne abandoned. Within a few years of her marriage, Margaret’s initial

39 Frank Barlow speculates that one reason Scotland was able to survive as a sovereign kingdom whereas Wales succumbed to the Norman incursions was that the “existence of a long-established and relatively stable kingdom of a familiar type, ruled by a king, encouraged ordinary diplomatic and military relations between the two authorities.” Frank Barlow, William Rufus, Yale Monarch Series (1983, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 319. Malcolm’s marriage to Margaret can be viewed as a key factor in rendering Scotland’s kingship a “familiar type.”

40 For his lands see The Domesday Book, vol. 12, Hertfordshire, ed. Morris, 38. For his post-Conquest career see Hooper, “Edgar the Ætheling.”

41 For more on this event, known as the submission at Abernathy, see: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D and E, s.a. 1072; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1072; Chronicle of Melrose, s.a. 1072; Gaimar, Estoire des Engleis, ed. Short, 308-11. Interpretations regarding the extent and nature of the “submission” vary. Barrow, for example, credits Malcolm for wisely understanding when to concede in order to fight another day whereas Ritchie views it as a bit of a stalemate; William achieved his agenda but only at great cost, leaving Malcolm was still free to pursue his interests. Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 30; Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 29-38.
role as peace-weaver, or at least war-impeder, was thus greatly diminished; her brother
was exiled and her husband had made peace with her brother’s conqueror.

**Dynastic Progenetrix**

At the same time, however, Margaret’s role as dynast was in its ascendancy. Marriage with the official sanction of the Church, rather than the no less traditionally respected *more danico* marriage, often signaled the commencement of a king’s rule through the foundation of his dynasty and legacy. A marriage *more danico* was a monogamous, legal contract, frequently accompanied by the practice of concubinage. The children from all these unions had an equal right to inheritance, creating conflicting claims and tensions, and leading to an arrangement that seemed more polygamous than the Church condoned. The reform movements of the tenth and eleventh centuries had placed increasing emphasis on canonically legitimate marriage, claiming it as the only legally binding and morally correct union, especially at the royal level where the stakes were so high.42

In order to assume their inheritance, rulers who had previously remained unattached or marginally attached suddenly felt required to be legally married in a ceremony recognized by the Church. Aelfgifu was the *gebedde*, or bedmate, of Aethelraed (978-1016) from 984 until 1002 at the latest. During this time, Aethelraed had seven sons and two daughters although not all perhaps by Aelfgifu. Whether she died or was set aside is unclear, but Aethelraed’s marriage to Emma in 1002 is an undisputed fact.43 The first relationship had been a legitimate, recognized marriage, but only the second was blessed and sanctioned by the Church.44 The precedent had been set. Cnut set aside Aelfgifu of Northampton when he became king of England in order to marry his predecessor’s widow, Emma. Edmund Ironside remained unattached until his

---

42 For more discussion of the distinction between Danish and Christian marriage, see Freeman, *The Norman Conquest of England*, 1.414-5 and Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 65-75. Stafford stresses that the distinction between these two forms of marriage was minimal and only later highlighted by the reformers.

43 For the marriage of Aethelraed and Emma, see for example: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, C, D, E, s.a 1002; John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1002. Stafford and Abbot both surmise that Aelfgifu’s marriage ended as a result of her death rather than repudiation. Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 72; Abbott, *Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England*, 213-45.

bid for his father’s shaky throne prompted him to marry Ealdgyth, the widow of Earl Sigeferth and in all likelihood the heiress to the Five Boroughs. It was probably a canonical marriage in which Edmund at least and probably Ealdgyth also was consecrated. Edward the Confessor also was seemingly quite content with the bachelor life until he became king and his need for the support of the powerful Godwin family necessitated his marriage to Edith. Harold II remained firmly attached to his gebedde, Edith Swanshaals, until right about the time that he achieved the throne of Edward the Confessor. He married Ealdgyth, the sister of Earls Edwin and Morcar of Mercia, probably after November 1065, and became king in January of 1066. The particular bride chosen often reflected the geopolitical concerns of the king, but beyond such diplomatic requirements, the king obviously needed to secure his dynasty, which, increasingly, could only be done through a canonically legitimate marriage.

Like his regal counterparts, Malcolm suddenly found it necessary to secure his legacy by means of a Church-sanctioned union. The dynastic agenda was announced quite clearly when the two royals were formally and publicly married at Dunfermline in a formal ceremony that served to proclaim the endorsement of the Church regarding not only her marriage, but also her attendant role as queen of Scotland. Just as the Church supported the selection of the king according to ancient tradition, so the queen also would be likely to receive its sanction.

The queens of Anglo-Saxon England were formally installed into office, beginning with the first recorded consecration of an Anglo-Saxon queen, Judith, in 856. In 973 Aelfthryth was crowned and anointed as part of the second coronation ceremony

45 Freeman asserts that they were probably consecrated at London by Archbishop Lyfing of Canterbury. Freeman, The Norman Conquest of England, 1.256, 457. For the date of their marriage see Part 1, Chapter 1.
47 Andrew of Wyntoun states that the officiant was one of the leading ecclesiastic authorities in Scotland, Fothad, Bishop of St Andrews. Andrew of Wyntoun, The original chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun printed on parallel pages from the Cottonnian and Wemyss mss., with the variants of the other texts, 6 vols., ed. F. J. Amours (Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and sons, 1903-13), Book 7, Chapter 3:
    “Of Saynt Andrews the byschape then
    The second Fothawch, a cunnand man,
    Devotly mad that Sacrament
    That thai than tuk in gud intent.”
I have not found another source to corroborate Andrew of Wyntoun’s claim.
for her husband Edgar. Queens Emma and Edith were both crowned and anointed queens. In 1068 Matilda joined her husband in his newly conquered kingdom and became a consecrated queen of the English. In this ritual the queen was given an official status as the royal partner of the king. She was more than a wife and mother; she was, like the king, anointed, responsible to God for the protection and well-being of the kingdom. Margaret could not have failed to recognize the importance of such a distinctive position and could have reasonably expected similar recognition, not necessarily a formal consecration ceremony but acknowledgment as the lawful wife and queen.48

In case there was any doubt regarding the purpose and permanence of the Malcolm and Margaret’s union, the marriage was commemorated by the foundation of a priory at Dunfermline, the place where the two royals were married. Turgot states that Margaret, “after she had achieved the height of honor” meaning, presumably, becoming queen as well as consort:

… built in the place where her nuptials were celebrated an eternal monument to her name and religiosity. For she built there the noble church in honor of the Holy Trinity with the intention of three salutary wishes; namely for redemption the king’s soul and her own, and in order to obtain prosperity for her offspring in the present and the future life.49

While her hagiographer naturally cast the event in terms of her piety, it is also quite possible that the intention was to build not only a church, but also a dynasty. The foundation served to establish her canonically legitimate marriage to Malcolm and to secure the fortune of the resulting dynasty. Perhaps a further message was communicated by naming the foundation in honor of the Holy Trinity, in emulation of the similarly named foundations at Caen and Canterbury. In this way, her dynastic house would again be placed on an equal footing with William the Conqueror’s.50

---

48 See Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 162-85.
49 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9ra-b; Diii, chapter 4.
50 It would be interesting to consider the extent to which the structure at Dunfermline conformed to or differed from its counterparts and namesakes at Canterbury and Caen. For a study of the relationship between Lanfranc’s *Constitutions* and the architecture of Canterbury Cathedral, see A. W. Klukas, “The Architectural Implications of the *Decreta Lanfranci*,” * Anglo-Norman Studies*, 6 (1983): 136-71, esp. 141-
The successful foundation of a dynasty requires more than a stone monument; above all it required progeny, a mission which Margaret was very likely to have taken seriously since she had witnessed the chaotic and often catastrophic events that had accompanied the absence of a designated heir to the throne. When King Stephen of Hungary died without a surviving son, the newly Christianized country was riven by pagan rebellions and bloody contests for the empty throne. The lack of a clear successor meant that the Anglo-Saxon kingdom was extinguished after the death of the childless Edward the Confessor. Gytha, the mother of Queen Edith and King Harold II, suffered the death of six of her sons, four of them on the battlefield within one month, and the permanent exile of the seventh and last. Macbeth’s attempt to found a new royal line was destroyed when first he and then his stepson Lulach were killed. On a more personal note for Margaret, the death of a dynasty meant almost certain ignominy for the surviving widow; Queens Gisela and Edith survived by keeping a low profile in retirement at a convent, while Ealdgyth and Gruoch fade from history rather rapidly after the deaths of their husbands. Perhaps she was aware that even a large family was not a guarantee of stability, having also witnessed the near extinction of Godwin’s line. In any event, she and Malcolm were seeking to secure their dynasty specifically since the perpetuation of Malcolm’s lineage was already guaranteed by the existence of his brother and at least one, possibly three, sons by Ingibjorg.


51 See Barlow, The Godwins.
Matriarch

The recognized importance of a secure succession might have spurred Margaret to take her role as royal matriarch seriously, which she demonstrated throughout her life her uncompromising commitment to family. She furthered her brother’s flagging cause by marrying Malcolm. When the rebellion failed she ensured that her brother was sent into exile with lavish gifts, not once but twice, replacing the wealth of gifts when they were lost at sea. Edgar returned the favor by acting as mediator between Malcolm and William Rufus, and eventually championing the cause of his nephew and namesake. Nowhere is Margaret’s family orientation clearer than in the care she is credited with taking in raising her children in her Vita:

Nor did she impose less care on her children than on herself, evidently so that they would be raised with every care. Whence, since she knew the Scripture, “who spares the rod, makes his son unlikeable,” she instructed the servant of the family to restrain the children himself with threats and rods, however many times they descended into impudence, as a childish age is accustomed. By this religious zeal of the mother, the children transcended by their worthy character many who were more advanced in age. Among themselves, they always remained kind and peaceful, and the younger exhibited respect to the older ones everywhere. Wherefore, during the service of the Mass, when they marched along after their parents for the offering, the younger in no way assumed to precede the older, but the older was accustomed to precede the younger following the order of their age. They who were often brought to her so that she could inform them, whose maturity could comprehend it, about Christ and faith in Christ, and so that they might always fear, she did enough to admonish them with earnest warnings, for she said: O my pious children, O my desired and esteemed children, fear God since those fearing him will not want, and if you will have loved him with a perfect heart, and him you, since he loves those loving him, then he will return prosperity in this [rotten] life and eternal happiness with his chosen ones. This kind desire of their mother, this admonition, was her prayer day and night with tears for her offspring, that they might know their Creator in the faith that works through love, that by knowing Him they might worship Him, that by worshipping Him they might love Him in all things and above all things, and that by loving Him they might attain the auspicious glory of the heavenly kingdom.52

52 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9vb-10ra; Diii, chapter 5.
The household steward was encouraged to discipline them when necessary, a stricture that was tempered by her careful instruction regarding the meaning and purpose of their life in terms of Christ’s teachings. She is not known to have fostered any of her children, a practice typical for noble and royal families.53 When she sent her daughters to be educated, she arranged for them to be placed in the care of her sister, their aunt Christina, abbess of Wilton.54

The clearest manifestation of the strength of these family bonds was the fact that her children continued to be a source of loving support and providential recourse to each other long after their mother’s death. Edith/Matilda and her sister Mary were dedicated to one another, corresponding regularly, and Edith/Matilda even arranged to have her sister buried near her in England rather than in Boulogne.55 David and Edith/Matilda seemed to have enjoyed the easy, familiar jousting that occurs between a brother and his older, imperious sister.56 The only child who fell out of this family network was Edmund, who, for a brief time and to his everlasting regret, attached himself to the cause of his uncle, Donald Bàn. The mutually supportive actions of Margaret’s children, especially in contrast to the fratricidal tendencies of William’s, makes it apparent that the family ties which she took such care to coax and coddle and finally cement were unusually strong.57

The care she took raising her children and the network of family bonds that she nurtured are all the more remarkable in view of her saintly portrait. Barbara Newman has discussed the inverse relationship between mothering and sanctity that existed in the Middle Ages. A holy woman could overcome the handicap of motherhood only by

54 Ritchie offers a different interpretation, faulting Margaret for sending daughters far away for a Norman education. Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 75. By way of comparison, it should be noted that one of those daughters, Edith/Matilda, sent her own daughter, Mathilda, to Germany, the land of her betrothed, at the age of nine. So by contrast Margaret was quite conservative in entrusting her daughters to the care of her sister.
55 Huneycutt, Matilda of Scotland, 134.
56 Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia Regum Anglorum, PL 195: 736. See also Huneycutt, Matilda of Scotland, 105.
57 Of course, this familial harmony would evaporate in the next generation, during the contest between Margaret’s grandchildren, the cousins King Stephen and Empress Matilda.
deflecting her maternal instincts to the Son of God. She was to take no interest in her children’s upbringing and suffer little grief at their death.\(^{58}\) It has already been noted how Margaret took a particularly active interest in her children and extended family. In her last visit with her confessor, in the knowledge of her imminent death, she asked two things of him: that he would pray for her soul, and that he would care for her children. She dwells at great length on the second of these requests, asking him to act as teacher and father, to instruct them and to guide them.\(^{59}\) This was not the dying wish of a woman bent on “maternal martyrdom”\(^{60}\) but the very real concern of a loving mother for the care of her children after her death.

A dynastic strategy is reflected most unambiguously in the names that were given to Margaret’s first five children. Historical hindsight, colored by the force of Margaret’s later cult, has encouraged many scholars to assume that it was Margaret who selected the names, presumably in deference to her superior lineage.\(^{61}\) However tempting that version of the story might be, it should be noted that Malcolm also had a significant vested interest in the naming of his heirs, and it is likely that he made the choice, or at least supported it, because it strengthened his dynastic defense against William. Both William and the children of Margaret could claim the English crown through the female line.

William’s great-aunt had been queen of England – twice – while Margaret’s grandfather had been king of England, if only briefly; her father and brother had both been the acknowledged heirs to the throne; and her brother had very briefly been named king. Malcolm and Margaret announced this dynastic claim, potential or real, loudly or tacitly, by naming their first four sons in chronological order after the last four Anglo-Saxon rulers of England, Edward, Edmund, Aethelraed, and Edgar, and their first daughter after the last Anglo-Saxon queen, Edith.\(^{62}\) Their dynasty now had not only an equal or

---


\(^{59}\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 15vb; Diii, chapter 12.

\(^{60}\) Newman, *From Virile Woman to Woman Christ*, 93.

\(^{61}\) Barrow describes Margaret as “a woman so obsessed with her royal English ancestry that she named her first four sons in memory of Edward the Confessor (or more probably her father, Edward the Atheling), Edmund Ironside, Ethelred the Unready and Edgar the Peacable.” Barrow, *Scotland and its Neighbours*, 62-63. See also Dickinson, *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*, 60; Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 124.

\(^{62}\) At the time it was customary to name children in honor of maternal relatives if they were of higher status. See LoPrete, “Adela of Blois as Mother and Countess,” 317. Hollister observes, for example, that Henry I
superior claim to the Anglo-Saxon throne, but also a deep well of healthy offspring from which to draw.

It is important to note that the foundation of this dynasty is achieved, literally and metaphorically, through Margaret. From the very beginning of their marriage it was recognized that it was Margaret who would lay the cornerstone for future generations just as she is credited with founding the Church of the Holy Trinity at Dunfermline to commemorate her marriage and to ensure the salvation of her dynasty. Her efforts to protect, nurture, and teach her children, even arranging for their care after her death, were at least partly responsible for giving her children the strength they needed to succeed as rulers. Her position and standing would place this dynasty on an equal footing with its international counterparts.

**Mistress of the Court**

The queen was expected to act as mistress of the royal court: dispensing favors, overseeing hospitality, and ensuring harmony. In the absence of a structured administration and defined offices, she acted as overseer and master of ceremonies, the chatelaine of the kingdom. Pauline Stafford notes that “In a society that relied on outward marks of distinction, the queen’s provision for the royal appearance provided for the charisma of royalty itself.” A well-ordered court was respected and admired, evidence of the sophistication and renown of the king and his realm, and the literature of the time testifies to the queen’s central role in this ordering. In general, the ideal woman was portrayed as “the peaceful and peace-making complement of the warring male,” as evidenced in the Old English *Maxims I*. The perfect queen was, therefore, a conciliator. The role of Wealhþeow in *Beowulf* is to achieve a bond of peace through her personal actions: “she gives jewels to honor her guests and to enhance the reputation for

---

of England was probably named by his mother, Matilda, after her uncle, King Henry of France, for whom her husband, William the Conqueror, otherwise held no particular fondness. Hollister, *Henry I*, 40.


65 Chance, *Woman as Hero*, 61. Chance consider this is a passive role, but I am more inclined to argue that there is nothing passive about waging peace.
magnanimity at her particular court,” and “she speaks words of friendship.”

By way of contrast, the literature was also riddled with examples of bad queens, perhaps the most notable of whom is Offa’s queen in *Beowulf*, who had been inclined to murder any who dared to court her. In doing so, she had subverted the order of the court, creating dissension rather than consensus, discord rather than common ground. A model queen was expected to act as a diplomat in the truest sense of the word, greeting visitors and soothing fractious parties. Her task was to secure the peace of the realm through her actions within her sphere of influence: the court.

In all likelihood, Margaret would have been familiar with such stories. Evidence suggests, however, that she found her strongest role model in Queen Edith. We have already established how Queen Edith followed the royal example she absorbed from her education at Wilton, based largely on the written example of St Edith’s *Vita* and *Translatio*, which were composed by Goscelin. Whether Margaret also modeled herself on that written example is unclear, but it can be demonstrated that she adopted that model as it was moderated through the living example of Queen Edith. This is most evident when comparing Margaret’s *Vita* with written accounts of Queen Edith’s behavior, in particular the contemporary *Life of St Edward the Confessor*, with regard to the depictions of Edith and Margaret in their official function as wife of the king.

Edith was commended for her virtues, which clearly mirrored those of her literary counterpart, the *friðusibb folca*. She kept the peace by bestowing favors, greeting foreigners, and generally maintaining order:

> When faced with some distressful or squalid scene, she could barely pause for a moment but immediately made a suitable comment on it to the company. She had a unique affection for her vassals, and, when necessary, would readily give them help. Her generosity was incomparable, whether she was giving to her own people or bestowing largesse on visitors from foreign parts. Those to whom she pledged her word were in no need of oaths; those she deemed worthy of help had no need of a subvention from any other source.

---

66 Sklute, “*Freoðuwebbe in Old English Poetry,*” 208.
67 Sklute, “*Freoðuwebbe in Old English Poetry,*” 208 n. 16. Sklute confines his argument to the queen’s actions toward outsiders. I believe, however, the argument applies to the queen’s actions in a broader context, to the securing of peace not only with foreign entities but also within the kingdom. See Chance, *Woman as Hero*, 1; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, 99-101.
68 *The Life of Edward the Confessor who rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. Barlow, 22-23: *In respectu*
Likewise Margaret would not tolerate any behavior she deemed rude or offensive:

For there was in the queen such severity with rejoicing, such rejoicing with severity, that all who were in her service, men and women, loved her while fearing her and feared her while loving her. For which reason, in her presence a person not only did not dare to do anything inappropriate, but indeed not even to pronounce any unseemly words. For she, repressing all vices in herself, was joyful with great gravity and angered with great respectability. She was never given over to excessive hilarity in unchecked laughter; never throwing a temper in her anger.  

Both Edith and Margaret were also responsible for ensuring that the material indication of their spouse’s status was commensurate with the king’s dignity. Edith elevated the dignity of the court and the realm by providing for their maintenance in the appropriate style:

Who can reckon, who can recount, her solicitude in providing the king, who took no interest in such matters, with royal finery? In this she seemed more like a daughter than a wife, not so much a spouse as a good mother. For whereas it had not been the custom for earlier English kings in bygone days to wear clothes of great splendour, apart from cloaks and robes adorned at the top with gold in the national style, Edith, from the very beginning of her marriage, clad him in raiments either embroidered by herself or of her choice, and of such a kind that it could not be thought that even Solomon in all his glory was ever thus arrayed. In the ornamentation of these no count was made of the cost of the precious stones, rare gems and shining pearls that were used. As regards mantles, tunics, boots and shoes, the amount of gold which flowed in the various complicated floral designs was not weighted. The throne, adorned with coverings embroidered with gold, gleamed in every part; the floors were strewn with precious carpets from Spain. Edward’s staff, for everyday use when walking, was encrusted with gold and gems. His saddle and horse-trappings were hung with little beasts and birds made from gold by smiths under her direction. Finally, any object that she thought would become him was brought to perfection without the slightest delay.

---

69 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9va; Diii, chapter 4.
70 *The Life of Edward the Confessor who rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. Barlow, 22-25; *Quam sollicitum uero se circa eundem regem, super talibus nichil curantem, regis cultibus parandum prebuerit, quis estimare, quis dicere poterit? In quo non tamuidebatur illi uxor esse quam filia, non tam contiunct quam mater pia. Nam cum prescis Anglorum regibus antea moris non fuerit lauciorum cultibus*
Margaret likewise clothed her royal spouse in dignity, extending her circle of influence to include the palace, and the clothing and behavior of the king’s retinue.

And also this most noble gem of the royal line multiplied the grandeur of the royal honor, and she brought much glory and honor to all the nobles of the realm and their ministers. For she had provided that merchants from diverse regions coming by land and by sea carried many and precious types of things for sale, and varieties which were unknown up until then. Among these things the local people bought were robes with diverse colors and a variety of clothing and native ornaments, and with the king having instructed and the queen urging, they paraded in a succession comprising diverse, highly cultivated clothing, so that they were believed to have been renewed in a certain way by such beauty. She even established grander and more lofty custom for the servants of the king, so that they crowded him when he was riding, advancing in a great crowd with great honor; and this with such discipline that wherever those coming had diverted, no one was allowed to seize anything, nor were any of them allowed to oppress or did they dare to strike either country folk or poor people in any way. Also she multiplied the ornaments of the royal palace, so that it shone not only with the different beauty of cloths, but even the entire house was resplendent with gold and silver. The vessels which were brought in to the king and nobles of the realm for feasts and were offered for drink were either in gold or silver or goldplated or silverplated. And however much she had done from honorable consideration, it was not that she was delighted by worldly honor or pride, but she was mindful to comply completely because the royal dignity required it from her.

In all likelihood, these costly garments were designed and created by the noble women who attended Margaret, and perhaps even by the queen herself. Again, Margaret probably learned the importance of the craft of embroidery from her earlier experiences. We have already seen how Gisela is credited with embroidering chasuble that later became the coronation mantle. In England, embroidery with gold wire or thread

uestimentorum uti preter sagos auro supra paratos et huiusmodi uestes secundum morem gentis, hec a principio sue coniunctionis talibus eum ex suo ipsius opere uel studio redimiuit ornamentis, ut uix ipse Salomon in omni Gloria sua ita indutus putari posset. In quibus ornandis non estimabatur quanto preciosi lapides et rare gemme atque uniones candidi pararentur: in clamidibus et tunicis, caligis quoque et calciamenis nulla auri quantitas in uarietate florum multipliciter se effundencium pensabatur. Sedes ubique nitebat parata palliis acu operante auro intexitis; loca subpedanea tegebantur preciosioribus Hispanicie tapetis. Baculus eius ad cotidianum incessum auro et gemmis operiebatur. Sella et phalera eius bestiolis et auiculis auro paratis, ipsa fabrile opus dictante, appendebantur. Postremo, quicquid excogitare poterat quod deum deceret, id opere maturandi nulla mora fieri posset.

71 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 10va; Diii, chapter 7.
achieved such renown that it became known as *Opus Anglicum*, and it was part of the curriculum for the training of aristocratic women. Like Edith, Margaret adorned churches with needlework completed by herself and her women.

Copes of the cantors, chasubles, stoles, cloths for the altar, other priestly vestments, and church decorations were always seen there. Some were being prepared by a skilled hand, while others were considered fittingly prepared with admiration. Indeed, women were charged with these works who by virtue of their noble birth and probity were deemed to be among those obedient to the worthy queen.\textsuperscript{72}

Both women were described as learned. Edith’s education has been discussed previously, and Margaret’s intellect was noted as being equally profound: “There was in her an acutely keen talent for understanding, a tenacity for retaining many memories, and an ease for offering pleasant words.”\textsuperscript{73} The kingdom benefited from her prudent counsel:

All things were proper that were led by the rule of the prudent queen; by her counsel the laws of the realm were dispensed, and by her work the divine religion was bolstered and the people rejoiced in the prosperity of their affairs. Nothing was more firm than her faith, more constant that her countenance, more tolerant than her patience, more grave than her counsel, more just than her pronouncements, or more pleasant than her speech.\textsuperscript{74}

Turgot later expresses admiration for her intellectual acumen, marveling that amidst all the demands of the kingdom she would find time for intellectual pursuits, often being called upon to teach her teachers.

It should not be wondered that the wise queen moderated herself and her own people so much, since she was always governed by the very wise counsel of the sacred Scripture. For what I was accustomed to admire greatly in her was that amid the tumult of cases and the the multiple cares of the realm, she attended to her holy reading with wonderful eagerness, about which she would confer with the most learned men sitting, often about delicate questions. And so often it happened that these teachers went from her more learned than when they had come.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{72} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9va; Diii, chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{73} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8vb; Diii, chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{74} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8vb; Diii, chapter 3. The Dunfermline Vita uniquely adds that “divine providence preordained that she would even be queen of the entire realm, or rather a partner to the king,” but as this claim is absent from other accounts it will be treated later in terms of its implications for the development of Margaret’s cult. See Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7vb: *sed etiam totius regni reginam, immo et regni sui participem divina praedestinaverit providencia*.
\textsuperscript{75} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 10ra-rb; Diii, chapter 6.
At this point, it is important to note that other sources provide a parallel between the actions of the two queens, suggesting that these accounts are not restricted to hagiographic borrowings and increasing the likelihood that they reflect actual events. For example, stories are related in which both women demonstrate their generous streak. King Malcolm always indulged Margaret’s “pious plundering” on behalf of the poor. The story is told of how she used to pilfer gold coins from the offering that the king had made in order to give them to poor beggars. The king usually pretended to be unaware of such thieving, but on occasion, when she was caught red-handed, he would jokingly threaten to have her arrested.\(^{76}\) The chronicler of Abingdon Abbey relates a similar story in which Edith prevails upon her husband to provide for the less fortunate. During a visit to the abbey, Edith noted with disapproval the poor fare given to the abbey children and remarked that perhaps her husband should assign revenue to provide for them. After a little more persuading, he good-naturedly acquiesces.\(^{77}\) In both these stories the relationship between the king and queen seems to be similar: gentle persuasion on her part and amused indulgence on his.

Additional documented instances of their generosity and patronage underscore the similarities between these two queens in the exercise of their official duties. Edith was a patron of the royal Wessex nunneries, remaining so until her death.\(^{78}\) She took particular interest in Wilton, “rebuilding (it) in stone and providing it with a westwork, presumably to house relics.”\(^{79}\) She presented the abbot of St Riquier with an *amice* decorated with gold and precious stones.\(^{80}\) Similarly, one of Margaret’s first activities as queen was the construction of a church dedicated to the Holy Trinity, which she lavished with gifts including vessels of pure gold, a crucifix covered with a cloth of gold and silver and studded with gems.

After she had achieved the height of honor, she soon built in the place

\(^{76}\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 13va; Diii, chapter 9.
\(^{78}\) Meyer, “*Patronage of the West Saxon Royal Nunneries in Late Anglo-Saxon England*,” 357.
\(^{79}\) For the suggestion the the westwork was used for relics see: *The Life of King Edward Who Rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. Barlow, 47; Ridyard, *Royal Saints*, 109; Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*,145, n. 255; Barlow, *The Godwins*, 77.
\(^{80}\) Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 145, n. 256.
where her nuptials were celebrated an eternal monument to her name and religiosity. For she built there the noble church in honor of the Holy Trinity with the intention of three salutary wishes; namely for redemption the king’s soul and her own, and in order to obtain prosperity for her offspring in the present and the future life. She decorated the church with many types of ornaments, among which, it is known, were not a few vases of solid and pure gold for holy service of the altar, about which I most certainly was able to know much, since for a long time I myself, when the queen ordered, undertook the care for all of them. And also she placed there a cross of incomparable worth having an image of the Savior, which she had made to be covered with purest gold and silver and studded with gems, which shows publicly to those contemplating it even today her devotion to faith. Likewise, signs of her holy devotion remain in other churches, to which the church of St. Andrews attests; there she erected a most beautiful crucifix, as can still be seen today, it preserves the image. She decorated these two crosses with gold crowns and the most precious stones.  

Margaret was also familiar with examples of queens charged with sowing discord. Aelfthryth was suspected of being involved in the murder of her young stepson, Edward the Martyr, in order that her son, Aethelraed, might assume the throne. Edith was suspected of conspiring to secure the earldom of Northumbria for her favorite brother, Tostig, by arranging for the murder of the incumbent, Gospatric. Gisela was the victim of xenophobic backlash after Peter Orseolo’s bungled reign.  

Clearly, an essential and primary function of the queen was to provide for the peaceful and harmonious functioning of a dignified court, a lesson Margaret may have learned from eyewitness accounts of Queen Gisela and her personal knowledge of Queens Anastasia and Edith. She would have known which actions engendered praise and goodwill, and which triggered ever-present xenophobic tendencies. The importance of this role as manager of the court is easily overlooked because today it is often viewed as a more traditional, specifically feminine, role. At the time, however, it was a vital element of statecraft, intrinsic to the successful functioning of the court and, by extension, the kingdom.  

---

81 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9ra-b; Diii, chapter 4. The Cotton manuscript does not include the last sentence.  
82 Abbott, Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England, 170-71.  
83 Barlow, The Godwins, 85.  
84 Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary,” 224-26.
On the other hand, her actions are sometimes judged to be evidence of her Norman influence. Ritchie opines that “The English Margaret’ was manifestly a Continental and the traits which emerge from the contemporary descriptions are rather Norman than English. They correspond point by point to those which are enumerated as distinctive of the ‘Conquerors’ by all who have written about them, from Malaterra in her own day onwards.” He cites as evidence her love of ceremony, her ostentatious display of wealth and the trappings of her court at Dunfermline, her subdued and elegant comportment, her disapproval of inappropriate laughter, and her profligate charity. Nevertheless, neither Margaret nor her actions were any more Norman than those of Edward the Confessor’s Anglo-Danish wife, Edith, or the other members of Edward’s court. Edward was born of a Norman mother, lived in exile in Normandy, and favored Norman advisors for a time when he became king. The Norman influence was undeniable, but it was still an Anglo-Saxon court. Margaret remained in England for only a few years following the Conquest, years that were fraught with fear and insecurity and would not have inclined her to favor the conquerors in any way. It would be more accurate to assert that Margaret was “Normanized” by the writings of later chroniclers rather than being a “Normanizing” influence. History was written in favor of her Norman-oriented son, David, and her daughter Edith/Matilda who married a Norman king. I would argue that Margaret acted more in accordance with the norms, not the Normans, of the day.

Patron of the Church

Margaret’s Anglo-Saxon orientation is most obvious when considering the most public exercise of her authority as queen, the reordering of the Church. In Anglo-Saxon England, the evolution of the office of the queen had grown largely as a result of the tenth-century reform movement in which the king and queen were aligned with the Benedictine reformers. Beginning with Aelfthryth, the wife of Edgar, and codified in the

85 Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland, 70, 80.
86 Indeed, the comparison with the Normans begs the question of just what and who were the Normans at this time. Barlow points out, for example, that many of the Norman fashions so decried by Orderic Vitalis were probably adopted in imitation of the native Anglo-Saxon traditions. Barlow, William Rufus, 173-75.
Regularis Concordia written by St Aethelwold, the king and queen were jointly responsible for the spiritual health of the kingdom and the support and patronage of the Church, in return for which the Church would legitimize and sanctify the royal pair. Aelfthryth became a consecrated queen, a regina consecrata, and her new position as sacred ruler was evidenced by her prescribed inclusion in prayers according to The Rule of St Benedict, which had not previously included the queen. This model of interdependency between the royal consort and the Benedictine reformers was successfully adopted by subsequent queens so that by the time of Edith it had become standard practice. The queen derived her public power through her association with the Church, exercising her influence through benefactions and receiving recognition of her legitimate authority as regina consecrata in return. Margaret’s experience in Anglo-Saxon England could only have served to reinforce what she had witnessed in Hungary, where a similar working relationship between the spiritual and temporal rulers was also evident, and the queen was noted, respected, and admired for her ecclesiastical patronage. There is no evidence, however, that, like her Anglo-Saxon counterpart, a mutually supportive relationship had evolved between the office of the queen of Scots and the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots. Rather, this seems to have been a role that Margaret might have appropriated for herself.

First let us take a moment to clarify to the extent possible just what, in fact, constituted the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots. It is misleading to speak of a Scottish Church per se given the absence of any ecclesiastical hierarchy or strict ordering of dioceses, although episcopal centers certainly existed and their relative power waxed and waned through the centuries. It is possible, however, to posit three types of communities: royal foundations with more of a secular orientation, monastic communities, and ascetic communities of Culdees. Examples of the first include the

---

87 Abbott, Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England, passim.
88 See Keene, “Margaret of Scotland and Monastic Traditions in the Eleventh Century,” 74-80.
episcopal centers of Abernathy, Brechin, St Andrews, and Dunkeld. The most notable monastic community was Iona, founded in the sixth century by Columba. Adomnán’s *Life of Columba* specifies that the monastery, located on an island off the west coast of Scotland, consisted of various buildings designated to serve specific functions, including a church, a communal building, and a number of huts intended for diverse purposes. Other monastic communities might have existed but were destroyed by the Norse invasions, such as Coldingham in c. 870 and Tyninghame in 941, or were deserted, such as Old Melrose sometime before 1074.

The Céli Dé, or Culdees as they came to be known, practiced a strict asceticism, living in hermitages. In order for their physical need to be met, they often lived in small groups, usually twelve monks and an abbot, within communities that were often quite wealthy, located in densely-settled, economically-vibrant places with fine agricultural land. Culdees co-existed at episcopal centers such as Dunkeld and St. Andrews.

Cowan and Easson surmise that in these cases “an early monastic site appears to have existed, and two identifiable communities, one associated with the earlier monastic community and the other with the Culdees, eventually emerged,” perhaps not unlike the cave hermits from Kiev and the monasteries at Tihany and Visegrád. The situation created confusion and misunderstanding as Alex Woolf notes:

“When the reform-minded clergy arrived in the eleventh and twelfth centuries they failed to understand the nature of these institutions and observed instead two separated communities, one pious but apparently poor and excluded from power, and another, apparently made up of laymen enjoying the fruits of the church estates. From a native perspective these two bodies would probably have seen themselves as two parts of a single community maintaining one another symbiotically. The apparent laymen were, in fact, clergy living according to the rules of heir

---

For Turgot, then, the situation that he found in the kingdom of the Scots was something other than the situation in England, namely a strict ecclesiastical hierarchy governed by a primatial see, and religious behavior codified by adherence to Benedictine monasticism. The question is what term should be applied to describe the Church as Turgot found it, and the most agreeable, although somewhat unwieldy, seems to be the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots.

Margaret’s most evident exercise of power involved her patronage and organization of this Church and nowhere is this more obvious than when she chaired the Church reform councils. Turgot relates how the queen “set up many councils,” one of which he remembers particularly well because she alone, “with very few of her own people,” prevailed upon the others during a period of three days. He then goes on to enumerate the specific reforms which she championed. Turgot’s statements indicate first of all that Margaret chaired a series of councils over a period of time. The councils themselves were nothing new; they were held periodically in order to consider ecclesiastical as well as administrative matters of governance. Bede notes that the eighth-century king Nechtan appealed to Coelfrith, abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow in Northumbria, for help in directing the practices of his kingdom to conform to those of Rome with particular regard to observing Easter and clerical tonsure, probably a reflection in part of tension between Columban and Roman religious practices. The Scottish Chronicle records that in 906 King Constantine II and Bishop Cellach I of St Andrews met at Scone to confirm some Scottish ecclesiastical customs, thereby reinforcing the tradition of royal leadership in ecclesiastical matters. Such a practice would mirror a similar arrangement in Gaelic Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England “where
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96 Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 315.
97 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 11ra; Diii, chapter 8.
98 D. E. R. Watt reasons that ecclesiastical matters were also considered in early royal councils. D. E. R. Watt, *Medieval Church Councils in Scotland* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 4-8.
100 Anderson, *Early Sources*, 1.445. For a more thorough treatment of the subject see Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 134-38. Woolf likens this meeting to one that occurred in 838 at Kingston-on-Thames in Southern England between the West Saxon King Ecgbert and Archbishop Ceolnoth of Canterbury which marked the transfer of secular authority in Southeast England (Kent and Essex) from the Mercian to the West Saxon dynasty.
it was not the custom to make a demarcation between the religious and secular spheres: ‘The relationship of church and state was a working partnership and one as yet not theoried over: it was undefined, unsuspicious, friendly.’\textsuperscript{101} The acts of governing and of reforming were synonymous.\textsuperscript{102} The ruling monarch was expected to attend to both the spiritual and temporal well-being of his realm. It was, however, extremely unusual for such a governing council to be chaired by a queen, who was acting in this sense as the face and voice of prudent government.

Margaret was decidedly more than just a royal figurehead at these ecclesiastical councils. During at least one meeting she personally argued the pertinent points, engaging the ecclesiastical authorities in debate. Turgot notes that Malcolm was also present at these councils, observing that “the king himself remained as her distinguished helper, most ready to say and do whatever thing she ordered in this matter” and “because he knew perfectly the language of the Angles as well as his own, was a vigilant interpreter for both sides at this council.”\textsuperscript{103} This last statement is puzzling in that the need for an interpreter, especially one of such an elevated rank, is not obvious since it presumes that Margaret spoke only Old English and was familiar with neither Gaelic nor Latin.

\textsuperscript{101} Although Watt quotes a source dealing with the Church in England, he asserts that the same observation applies to early medieval Scotland. Watt, \textit{Medieval Church Councils in Scotland}, 4 quoting M. Deanesly, \textit{The Pre-Conquest Church in England} (London, 1961), 213.


\textsuperscript{103} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11rb; Diii, chapter 8.
Eleventh-century Scotland was culturally and therefore linguistically diverse, not unlike Anglo-Saxon England and Hungary. English, British, Irish, Picts, Scandinavians lived together, all speaking Anglo-Saxon, Brythonic, Gaelic, Pictish, and Norse. An English dialect was spoken in that area between the Forth and the Tweed known as Lothian, which evolved into Scots with the infusion of dialects brought by English settlers in the twelfth century. Norse was found in the Western Isles until the thirteenth century and survived in Orkney and Shetland for some time. There is some indication, however, that Gaelic had become the dominant language north of the Forth by the twelfth century. The Duan Albanach, the ‘Versified Psalter’ written about 988, and the Prophecy of Berchán, a history of the lords of Ireland and Scotland ending during the reign of Malcolm III, were written in the vernacular and give further indication that Gaelic was the language of the Scottish court in the late eleventh century.

Margaret must have been at least somewhat familiar with Gaelic. She had probably received some formal instruction in the language while at Wilton since we know that Queen Edith had been taught to read and write it fluently. This formal instruction might have been reinforced to some extent by interaction with Gaelic-speaking elements at court. Above all, it seems to me incongruous to argue that Malcolm was able to learn English as well as Gaelic during his years spent in England, but that Margaret could not acquire at least some degree of fluency in Gaelic during the twenty-four years that she was the queen of the Scots. Similarly, how is it possible that Margaret could learn English during her brief stay in England, but not learn the language of the land she lived in as queen? In those cases in which a queen neglected to learn the
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104 For a much more detailed analysis of the language see Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 322-40. See also the comprehensive survey of place names in charters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Simon Taylor, The Place-Names of Fife, 4 vols. (Donnington: Shaun Tyas, 2006-).
106 Webster, Medieval Scotland, 16.
107 Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 28.
108 Alan Macquarrie points to the Duan Albanach as proof that the Scottish court was essentially Gaelic speaking. Macquarrie, The Saints of Scotland, 228, n. 21. Hudson argues the same point by referring to two contemporary chronicles written in vernacular of the Scots, Middle Irish: the ‘Versified Psalter’ written about 988, and the Prophecy of Berchán a history of the lords of Ireland and Scotland ending during the reign of Malcolm III which includes the Duan Albanach. Hudson, “Scottish Gaze,” 34.
language of her husband’s realm she was typically insulated by retainers who spoke her native tongue. In Margaret’s case, both Old English and Gaelic were acquired languages, making it difficult to argue that she could perfect one and not the other. It is likely that she was familiar with both, although her degree of proficiency might have varied.  

In any event, the council was probably conducted in the universal language of Latin. In the Kingdom of the Scots, as in England and Hungary, Latin was the language of the Church. We know from Bede that as early as the eighth century during the reign of Nechtan, some members of the clergy read and understood Latin, as did the king himself. The Gospel Books (including the famous ‘Book of Kells’ and Margaret’s own Gospel Book), saints’ lives, and psalters were all in the language of the Church. It is possible that the administrative business of the realm was conducted in Latin, as evidenced by the charters during the reigns of Margaret’s sons, although no original charters survive from Malcolm’s reign. International correspondence, such as Lanfranc’s letter to Margaret and letters to Rome during the reigns of her sons, was conducted in Latin. Finally, Turgot states that Margaret possessed “a facility for offering pleasant words” and marks her pleasant speech “seasoned with the salt of wisdom.” She does not appear to have been the type of person who required others to articulate for her.

So why does Turgot assign the role of interpreter to Malcolm if it was so unnecessary? Perhaps, since such reform councils were traditionally the purview of the king, Malcolm was present as a nod to tradition. Bede, for example, positions King Oswald as the interpreter for Bishop Aidan. However, Turgot may have chosen to assign to the king the passive part of interpreter in order emphasize Margaret’s dominant, active role. Malcolm’s presence also may have been intended to lend his authority to the rulings of these councils inasmuch as they were not concerned exclusively with matters

---

109 Macquarrie also finds it improbable that Margaret had not learned the native tongue during her time as queen. Macquarrie, The Saints of Scotland, 213-14.
110 Greater homogeneity existed among the Christian world through the common language of Latin before the spread of the vernacular and the resulting linguistic differences that caused divisions beginning in the twelfth century. Chibnall, The World of Orderic Vitalis, 209.
111 Duncan, Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom, 72.
112 Anderson, Kings and Kingship, 88.
113 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9ra; Diii, chapter 3.
114 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9vb; Diii, chapter 4.
115 Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 3.3
of ecclesiastical orthodoxy; they dealt also with statecraft, in this case, with another component of Malcolm’s defensive strategy.

Unorthodox practices had served as a pretext for invasion, most recently with the pope’s endorsement of William’s invasion of England. Early in the eventful year of 1066 William had sent Gilbert, the archdeacon of Lisieux, to seek a favorable judgment regarding his claim to the Anglo-Saxon throne from Pope Alexander II. Essentially, William was giving the pope the opportunity to act as kingmaker, deciding which of the two contenders for the English throne, Harold or William, would better serve the interests of the Church. William’s representative would have emphasized the Norman’s support of the Church and its reforms in the province of Rouen while portraying Harold both as a perjurer, having ostensibly broken a pledge of fealty that he had made over holy relics, and as a dangerous nonconformist given his association with the questionable Archbishop Stigand who had failed to gain his pallium from Rome. Archdeacon Hildebrand, the future Pope Gregory VII, argued forcefully in William’s favor with the result that William invaded England under a papal banner, brandishing consecrated relics around his neck. William was waging a Church-sanctioned holy war, a concept that was carried to extremes across Europe. Norman knights fought in Sicily in 1062-3 with the pope’s blessing. In 1064 the Normans waged a similar crusade at Barbastro in northeast Spain. In 1068 Norman knights served with the Byzantine emperor against the Turks. In 1071 Normans again supported the emperor at Manzikert. In 1072, just as William was menacing the Kingdom of the Scots, Roger, son of Tancred, captured Palermo from the Saracens, which eventually led to the Norman conquest of Sicily. The initial crusading tenor of the Norman invasion of England was underscored by the language of the laudes

117 Douglas, William the Conqueror, 260.
sung in honor of the new, conquering king, which included the phrase “hail to the army of the Christians” and was only later rephrased to “the army of the English”.

The same reasoning that encouraged Archdeacon Hildebrand to endorse William’s invasion of England in 1066, namely papal support for a secular ruler in return for that ruler’s support of the reform movement, was now prompting Pope Gregory VII to steer William toward neighboring lands. His ambition was to establish his aggressive reforming agenda throughout the furthest reaches of Christendom, if necessary with the military support of the local ruler. In 1073, William was given *carte blanche* by Pope Gregory VII in a letter to Lanfranc, which directed the archbishop of Canterbury to correct alleged abuses within the Celtic Church. From Malcolm’s point of view, it would appear that only a year after military submission, he was now being challenged with ecclesiastical domination. It is little wonder, then, that Malcolm and Margaret thought it in their interest to align their kingdom very publicly and very officially with the interests of Rome, thereby negating any pretext for invasion. The reality of this threat becomes apparent when considering the fate of the other realm which had a historical association with the Columban tradition, Ireland. Ecclesiastical incursions began in the eleventh century when the archbishops of Canterbury claimed authority over the bishopric of Dublin. Military forays followed, causing the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to declare that had William lived longer, he would have conquered all Ireland.

William’s intent to exert ecclesiastical supremacy over Malcolm’s kingdom was announced in 1072 at a council held at Windsor, which determined that Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, would be Primate of all Britain, with precedence over Thomas of Bayeux, Archbishop of York, to whom in turn was conceded the bishopric of Durham and all regions from the limits of the bishopric of Lichfield and the Humber River to the furthest borders of Scotia. Bishop Fothad is said to have complied by professing
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121 *Councils and Synods*, ed. Whitelock, vol. 1, part 2, 601-02: *Et tandem aliquando diversis diversarum scripturarum auctoritatibus probatum atque ostensum est quod Eboracensis ecclesia Canturienis debet subiacere, eiusque archiepiscopi ut primatis totius Britannie dispositionibus in iis que ad Christianam
obedience, but as this assertion is recorded only in a twelfth-century account preserved at York, it might have been manufactured to support York’s persistent claim to dominion over the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots. While some scholars assert that this proposed arrangement was not generally known in the Kingdom of the Scots and was never put into effect, others accept Fothad’s concession and attribute it to Margaret’s hold over her husband. Margaret’s influence would have had to be very strong indeed to steer her husband and his realm toward acquiescing to Norman claims of ecclesiastical overlordship, and the fact that many scholars find such persuasive power plausible attests more to the strength of Margaret’s cult than her actual actions. Furthermore, as we shall see, Margaret’s reforms gave no indication whatsoever of submission to the reforming agenda advocated by the Normans.

The threat posed by William was tangible. Just a few months after the Easter council at Windsor, William rattled his seemingly-invincible sword and Malcolm conceded at Abernathy. The military confrontation had resulted in a stand-off, but the ecclesiastical threat remained. Malcolm and Margaret must have felt that it was important to announce loudly and confidently to their subjects, the pope and neighboring kingdoms that theirs was a faithful, Christian realm. In that case, what factors could have motivated them to name the queen rather than the king to lead the reforming councils? Perhaps, as Turgot asserts, she was the more knowledgeable party, “another Helena,” and so was better equipped to fight “with the sword of the spirit.” She certainly had an intellectually keen advantage, a point repeatedly emphasized in her Vita: “There was in her an acute talent for understanding, a tenacity for retaining many memories, and a facility for offering pleasant words”; and “And so often it happened that these teachers

_— religionem pertinent in omnibus oboedire. Subiectionem vero Dunelmensis, hoc est Lindisfarnensis, episcopi atque omnium regionum a terminis Licifeldensis episcopi et Humbre magni fluvii usque ad extremos Scotie fines, et quicquid ex hac parte predicti fluminis ad parochiam Eboracensis ecclesie iure competit, Canturiensis metropolitanus Eboracensi archiepiscopo eiusque successoribus in perpetuum obtinere concessit._

123 Barrow, _Kingship and Unity_, 69.
125 For the agendas of these reforming councils see the reforms of Lanfranc proposed in a council of 1076, and of Anselm in 1102. Hollister, _Henry I_, 165.
126 Dunfermline _Vita_, fo. 11rb; Dii, chapter 8.
went from her more learned than when they had come. Clearly she had not a little religious zeal for the holy volumes, so that her intimate friendship and friendly intimacy compelled me to tire myself by procuring them for her.”

Her reputation for wisdom and learning might also be reflected in the fact that Margaret is commonly depicted carrying a book.

Perhaps Malcolm was tapping into the respect and deference accorded to her blood relative, Edward the Confessor, in order to strengthen his defensive strategy. The Normans might be able to dismiss any reforms initiated by a Scot, supposedly nurtured and coddled by the Columban tradition, but Margaret’s ties to the Church in Rome were as unassailable as those of her revered uncle. Again William found himself in a position where he could not undermine Margaret’s authority without compromising his own position on the throne. Margaret must also have had the personal charisma, the moral authority, the recognized acumen to give to these weighty councils the required credibility and recognition. Only a tremendously forceful personality could possess the personal power to initiate, chair, and spearhead the debate, or to have been plausibly credited with such within the decade following her death.

However, one consideration that did not compel Margaret to take action at these Church councils was any zealous endorsement on her part of the Gregorian reform movement. Rather than campaigning for those reforms promulgated by Pope Gregory VII and championed by the Norman elite, she was seeking ways to bring the Church in the kingdom of the Scots into greater conformity with the mandates of Rome without imposing widespread, unpopular changes. Her proposals danced around the major issues of the day, focusing instead on specific irregularities which could be addressed within the kingdom without outside interference. She argued that Lent should last for thirty-six rather than forty days, that the sacrament should be received at Easter rather than abstained from, and that the Lord’s Day should be properly observed. Turgot further notes her condemnation of the manner in which the Mass was celebrated “against the
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127 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9ra, 10rb; Diii, chapter 8.
128 A parallel point is made by Douglas in his biography of William the Conqueror when he states that ecclesiastical authority was conferred on William by precedent “but also by William’s royal consecration as the Confessor’s legitimated heir.” Douglas, William the Conqueror, 335. Thus William’s association with his revered predecessor also lent legitimacy to his ecclesiastical involvement.
customs of the entire church.” He disclaims any knowledge of this “barbarous rite” practiced by the Scots, but asserts that she was determined to stamp it out entirely.\textsuperscript{129} It could easily be assumed that she was completely successful in her attempt to eradicate such practices, because her own hagiographer obviously remained unaware of the details of such unorthodox practices. Instead, I believe Turgot was taking the liberty of a hagiographer to inflate slightly the abuses of the Church in an attempt to magnify the success of his saintly subject. The Church in the Kingdom of the Scots was relatively orthodox, as evidenced by letters from the pope during the time of Margaret and her sons that dealt only with peripheral matters.\textsuperscript{130} The last reform of Margaret’s, an injunction against illicit marriages, addressed a long-standing concern of the papacy. Letters from Pope Leo II to Aethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 18 January 802 and from Pope John VIII to Burgred, King of Mercia, in 874 and then to Ethelred, Archbishop of Canterbury, in late 877 or early 878 all rail against the practice of incestuous marriages between relatives.\textsuperscript{131} The practice of new rulers marrying the widow of their predecessor continued to border on the incestuous, but allowed the new rule to be legitimated by a veil of continuity with the old regime. In the eleventh century, both Emma and Gruoch were forced to marry their husband’s conquerors, Cnut and Macbeth respectively.\textsuperscript{132} Ealdgyth married Harold II, the man who had murdered her husband, Gruffydd, the king of Gwynedd and Powys.\textsuperscript{133} In Margaret’s case, the concern might have been more than just a matter of policy. The Cotton manuscript warns specifically against marriages between sons and widowed stepmothers while the Dunfermline \textit{Vita} condemns “the unlawful marriages of step-mothers with firstborns and of a brother-in-law with a sister-in-law.”\textsuperscript{134} Margaret had a stepson who was only about ten years her junior being raised at the English court, and a brother-in-law ready to assume the throne after Malcolm’s

\textsuperscript{129} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11vb-13ra; Diii, chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{130} Barrow, \textit{Kingship and Unity}, 62.
\textsuperscript{132} For Gruoch see, Duncan, \textit{Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom}, 99. For Emma see Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1017; Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma and Queen Edith}, 7.
\textsuperscript{133} Abbott, \textit{Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England}, 506-63; Barlow, \textit{The Godwins}, 89.
\textsuperscript{134} Diii, chapter 8: \textit{Illicita etiam novercarum coniugia, similiter et uxorem fratris defuncti fratrem superstitem ducere.} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 12vb: \textit{Illicita eciam novercarum coniugia cum primigenis, sed et leviri cum glore incestus execcrandos esse demonstravit...
death. Marriage to Margaret would have lent them the legitimacy they needed; it was apparently not an option she was willing to countenance.\footnote{According to Germanic custom, a new ruler would marry the previous ruler’s widow in order to share the previous ruler’s \textit{mana} by sexual contagion. Chaney, \textit{The Cult of Kingship}, 26-27. For more examples see Stafford, \textit{Queen Emma & Queen Edith}, 229-30. It should also be noted that according to the traditional custom of the Hungarian nomadic tribes “the lawful heir to the deceased head of family, along with power and property, inherits the wife of the deceased.” Thus, once Géza died in 997, Koppány made a bid for his widow, Sarolt. Győrffy, \textit{King Saint Stephen}, 83. Evidence indicates that kings in Ireland frequently married their predecessor’s widow. See Ann Connon, “Prosopograph II: A Prosopography of the Early Queens of Tara,” in \textit{The Kingship and Landscape of Tara}, ed. Edel Bhreathnach (Dublin: Four Courts Press for the Discovery Programme, 2005), 226. Donald Bán did, in fact, attempt to attach himself to Margaret’s legacy by co-opting her son, Edmund.}

It appears that Margaret’s proposals were never put into effect, a failure which a truly committed reformer would have found difficult to tolerate. Turgot confidently claims that Margaret successfully persuaded the council members to accede to each of her proposals when two letters from Paschal II suggest otherwise.\footnote{Macquarrie, \textit{The Saints of Scotland}, 214 and 225; Duncan, \textit{Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom}, 130. The point is made in Baker, “‘A Nursery of Saints’: St Margaret of Scotland Revisted,” 136-37.} Both letters date to between 1112 and 1114 during the reign of Alexander I and Turgot’s tenure as bishop of St Andrews.\footnote{For analysis and the Latin text of the two letters see Denis Bethell, “Two Letters of Pope Paschal II to Scotland,” \textit{SHR}, 49 (1970), 33-45.} The first advises the clergy and laity to follow Turgot’s advice in observing the laws of the Christian faith, especially with regard to marriage. The second letter is addressed to Turgot in response to King Alexander’s request for written clarification regarding religious practices in the Kingdom of the Scots. Denis Bethell notes that these questions are remarkably similar, though not identical, to those addressed by Margaret’s reforms.\footnote{Bethell, “Two Letter of Pope Paschal II to Scotland,” 37.} It appears, then, that Margaret’s reforms were never fully instituted. In the end, it may have been Turgot’s own zeal rather than Margaret’s which was reflected in his portrayal of the queen because her actions tell quite a different story.\footnote{For Turgot’s agenda see Part 3, Chapter 1.} Giving further lie to the accusation that Margaret was a campaigner for Gregorian (and Norman) ideals is the fact that none of the reforms which she suggested dealt with the issues at the heart of the Gregorian agenda.\footnote{A point also noted by Webster: “It is interesting that Turgot is very concerned with points of observance and ritual, such as when exactly the Church should begin the observance of Lent, and only in passing with what we often take to be the great contemporary issues, such as clerical marriage. His account of Margaret’s activities is reminiscent of the seventh and eighth century troubles over the observance of Easter
eradicate the practice of favoring family members for ecclesiastical offices was disregarded when Margaret’s son Aethelraed was made the lay abbot of Dunkeld, a position previously held by Malcolm’s grandfather, Crinan. Nor does clerical celibacy seem to have been enforced. A grant made by the same Aethelraed to the culdees of Loch Leven about 1100 stipulated that it was to be enforced *ab omnibus sacerdotibus clericis et laicis*, by all the priests, clerks and laymen, and St Andrews was served by a group of five men who apparently were married, and owned and bequeathed property, including their altar rights.¹⁴¹

Finally, if Margaret had been the zealous reformer that she is often claimed to have been, she would have been loathe to endow those churches and communities which differed in their practices from Rome. Instead, the queen took great care to patronize all communities, ensuring that no one group felt isolated and that the influence of royal benefactions was felt by all concerned. In this regard, she was following the example of previous Scottish monarchs. Benjamin T. Hudson establishes that Scottish kings generally had employed this tactic of inclusive patronage, the purpose of which was as political as it was pious, if not more so. Malcolm in particular patronized houses that were historically associated with competing branches of the royal house, employing “a true marriage of piety and empire building.”¹⁴² The king consolidated the kingdom and strengthened his rule by using the authority and organizational strength of the church. Notably in the case of Margaret, the queen was the conduit for such patronage.

The implications of ecclesiastical patronage in terms of Margaret’s piety will be studied in the next chapter. Here, we will note only that the extent of her patronage constituted an expression of statecraft. Turgot specifically states that Margaret’s benefactions extended beyond her own foundation at Dunfermline to other churches.¹⁴³ A notitia indicates a grant made jointly by Malcolm and Margaret to the Culdees at Loch

---


¹⁴³ Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9rb; Diii, chapter 4.
Leven. In this, the concerted action of the royal couple might have been following a pattern begun by their predecessors, Macbeth and Gruoch, who jointly had made a similar grant. Patronage of the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots is further demonstrated when, according to Orderic Vitalis, “…she rebuilt the abbey of Eoa [Iona]…and she gave the monks fitting revenues for the work of the Lord’s, and restored it.” Iona was of particular significance in that it was the ancient monastery that acted as the wellspring for the spread of Christianity in Britain. Founded in the seventh century by St Columba, it quickly gained in royal attention and prestige. In associating herself with Iona, Margaret was seeking a tie to the kingdom’s ancient and noble past. She did not, however, attempt to reform it; it remained a Columban community until becoming a Benedictine monastery a century after her death.

Finally, we are fortunate to have almost certainly contemporary evidence of Margaret’s patronage of Laurencekirk in Mearns. Her visit to the church is recorded in the *Vita S. Laurentii*, by Goscelin of St Bertin, the same who once resided at Wilton Abbey, which dates to the early 1090s. St Laurence, an Italian monk, was one of the original companions of St Augustine, the second archbishop of Canterbury (c. 605-619), and therefore a key figure in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Margaret’s patronage of this early apostle of the English Church could be construed as her endorsement of the English, meaning Benedictine, tradition. Margaret’s reception was, however, somewhat less than hospitable.

Margaret queen of Scotland, however, most honourable descendent of the kings of England and beloved of God, filled with religious piety, brought thither wax candles and other holy offerings, desiring to enter. The canons met her at the entrance to the enclosure and begged her not to transgress this holy law and custom, lest she shold incur the wrath of the patron
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144 Lawrie, *Early Scottish Charters*, no. 8. Macquarrie notes that there was nothing unusual in a grant made jointly by a husband and wife. For example, the grants to the church of Deer similarly associated the wife of a donor with her noble spouse. Macquarrie *The Saints of Scotland*, 216 n. 34. In other words, given these precedents it should not be assumed that Margaret was necessarily the instigating force behind the donation.

145 Gruoch and Macbeth made a grant of Kirkness to Loch Leven. Lawrie, *Early Scottish Charters*, no. 5.

146 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Chibnall, 4, 272-73. This is the only documented claim that Margaret patronized the Culdee community at Iona, but I do not see why, given Turgot’s statement that she patronized other churches, Orderic’s assertion should be discounted.

147 Hudson, “Kings and Church in Early Scotland,” 164.


ruling there. But she replied rather that she would ho
nour and exalt this sacred place, and pressed ahead. Accordingly, she had barely entered the enclosure when suddenly she was seized by severe pains in her whole body, and she said to her retainers, ‘Quick get me out of here! I’m dying!’ Quickly they brought her outside, and she begged the clerics to intercede for her, and blamed herself for not having heeded them when they had warned her.\textsuperscript{150}

She also took care to patronize those institutions that were the traditional religious strongholds of the various factions of Malcolm’s royal line. A historically rival branch, descending from Kenneth I’s son Aed (reigned 876-8), typically patronized St Andrews, which became the site of royal burials, retirements, and a destination for pilgrims.\textsuperscript{151} Margaret and Malcolm signaled their immediate intention to include St Andrews in their circle of patronage by purportedly selecting its bishop, Fothad II, the “ardepscob Alban” or “premier bishop of Scotland” as he is termed in his obituary in the \textit{Annals of Ulster} in 1093, to officiate at their wedding.\textsuperscript{152} Of course, it could be argued that Fothad was selected because of his pre-eminent status, but Margaret also extended her patronage of St Andrews in a way that was intended to benefit the poorest. She provided a ferry for pilgrims to cross the Forth to St Andrews so they could avoid a long and hazardous journey to the nearest crossing. She further arranged for them to be cared for after arriving at the church by furnishing them with “all the necessary things which they might require in order to refresh their bodies,” along with servants to attend them.\textsuperscript{153} Turgot

\textsuperscript{150} This translation of the full account regarding Margaret is provided in Macquarrie, \textit{The Saints of Scotland}, 216-18. Macquarrie observes that the complete version of Goscelin’s \textit{Vita Sancti Laurentii} has historically been overlooked by, among others, Migne and the Bollandists, and that a full collation of the two existing early twelfth-century MSS at the British Library was edited by Wynzen de Vries, “Goscelin of St Bertin’s \textit{Vita Sancti Laurentii Cantuariensis} (BHL 4741),” (unpublished dissertation, Groningen, 1990). For further analysis of the texts see Alan Macquarrie, “An eleventh-century account of the foundation legend of Laurencekirk, and of Queen Margaret’s pilgrimage there,” \textit{The Innes Review}, 47.2 (Autumn 1996): 95-109.

\textsuperscript{151} Hudson, “Kings and Church in Early Scotland,” 165.


\textsuperscript{153} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 13vb; Diii, chapter 9. During the episcopate of Fothad II a new church was built slightly to the south of St Andrews and probably on the site of an old church. Known as St Rule’s, it contained the relics of the saint and became a place of pilgrimage. It was probably in support of this site that Margaret “endowed her ferry and hostels at the Forth for pilgrims to St Andrew’s shrine.” Anderson, “The Celtic Church in Kinrimund,” 6. St Rule’s was probably built in the 1070s and intended as a “reliquary church.” Ronald G. Cant, “The Building of St Andrews Cathedral,” in \textit{The Medieval Church of St Andrews}, ed. David McRoberts (Glasgow: John S. Burns & Sons, 1976), 11.
could personally attest to the nature and value of gifts that she made to the church since she had placed him in charge of their care. According to him, she adorned the church with ornaments of “solid gold and pure silver” and “a cross of incomparable worth,” which “held an image of the Savior which she commissioned to be covered with gemstones that shone among the purest gold and silver.” She had furthermore erected “a very old crucifix” which, Turgot states, could still be discerned in his day because a copy of it remained.¹⁵⁴

Margaret seems to have had a special affinity for St Cuthbert and the focal point of his cult, Durham Cathedral.¹⁵⁵ Durham’s Liber vitae includes an agreement whereby the monks promised to feed one pauper daily and two on Sundays during the lifetime of the king and queen as well as to say collects and masses for the royal couple and their sons and daughters “both in this life and after,”¹⁵⁶ an agenda that again emphasizes dynastic safekeeping. Margaret honored the church with gifts of beautiful vestments, including a “precious cap of linen,” and bequeathed “a copy of the gospels in letters of silver, and the cross set with pearls (margaritis), which her dying hands had held.”¹⁵⁷ Malcolm was probably present at the laying of the foundation of Durham Cathedral,¹⁵⁸ underscoring the fact that this system of patronage was not initiated solely by Margaret,

¹⁵⁴ Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9rb; Diii, chapter 4.
¹⁵⁵ Margaret’s particular devotion to St Cuthbert was reciprocated by Durham cathedral’s ongoing observance of her cult. See Part 3, Chapter 1.
but constituted a joint effort on behalf of the royal pair to patronize all factions. Although Margaret’s veneration of St Cuthbert cannot be questioned, it should also be remembered that the saint held special sway in the contested lands of Lothian and Northumbria. It could not hurt Malcolm’s political agenda to strengthen his presence as a generous benefactor to the shrine that held the precious relics of that most respected and posthumously powerful saint.

Malcolm’s branch of the royal family, the descendants of Donald II, claimed a privileged association with St Columba through their continuing patronage of Dunkeld, the site of St Columba’s relics and a place of special veneration of the saint. Three kings from that line were named Malcolm, or Máel Coluim, meaning “servant of [St] Columba.” In 965 Abbot Duncan of Dunkeld would die fighting for King Dub, Donald II’s grandson. Dub’s nephew, Malcolm II, had a daughter named Bethoc who would marry Crinan, another Abbot of Dunkeld. This same abbot would die fighting against Macbeth to preserve the rights of his son, Duncan I. Despite this close affiliation with Malcolm’s dynasty, I have been unable to find any firm evidence of Margaret’s direct patronage of Dunkeld, although the fact that her son, Aethelraed, would serve as its abbot is certainly proof of continuing devotion on the part of Malcolm’s dynasty. Perhaps it was less necessary to favor a foundation with which the royal family already had close ties than those whose allegiance it hoped to secure. Her patronage of Iona, the place where St Columba began his lifetime of missionary work, could be interpreted as evidence of her continued veneration. Perhaps she was attracted to his cult because the saint included women as partners in his ministry: “Instead of shunning their company, he sought their friendship. Instead of emphasizing their impurity, he recognized their spiritual equality.”

It is also important to note what Turgot excludes from his account. In fact, given the example set by preceding saintly queens of the generosity to the Church, it is amazing that Turgot does not mention Margaret’s interest in patronizing Benedictine institutions; he does not identify any monks Dunfermline and he even fails to mention
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Margaret’s overture to Lanfranc for spiritual guidance, Lanfranc’s response, or the arrival of Brother Goldwin. In contrast, see for example the patronage of Empress Adelheid and Queens Emma and Edith.\(^{161}\)

The crucial point to be made here is twofold. First, Margaret patronized all expressions of the Christian faith: Culdee and Benedictine, different dynastic houses, varying geographic locations. While there is no evidence that she sought to reform specific houses, it is apparent that she embraced all. These were not the actions of a judgmental, reforming zealot. Rather, by blanketing all factions with royal largesse, Margaret was acting as an inclusive, unifying ruler. So, while such tactical patronage was not in and of itself remarkable, what did make it unusual, in that place and at that time, is that it was the queen who is credited with playing such a decisive role. In this sense, she is depicted as co-ruler with her husband the king. This is not to say that Margaret’s patronage and her reforming agenda were entirely motivated by the desire to exercise political power. Behind her actions lay a genuine concern to do good works, to live a righteous life, and to set a good example.

Secondly, Margaret and Malcolm acted together to direct their royal patronage in a way that would best benefit the kingdom.\(^{162}\) They are portrayed as having the same agenda, the same goal, and the same aspirations for the kingdom: stability through unification, and a peaceful coexistence with the new Norman kingdom. In this respect, Margaret and Malcolm worked in tandem, in the type of perfect royal relationship outlined in an Anglo-Saxon poem.

> Battle and warfare shall be strong in the noble man, and the woman shall thrive, beloved by her people, be cheerful of mind, keep counsel … know wise counsel for them both together, the householders.\(^{163}\)

Margaret’s life and her role as queen were significant and, as far as we know, without precedent in the Kingdom of the Scots. Hers was not a life circumscribed by inherited traditions or directed toward maintaining her natal family’s temporal power.

\(^{161}\) Folz, *Les saintes reines*, 72; Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith*, 148-49.

\(^{162}\) Also noted by Schulenburg, *Forgetful of Their Sex*, 20-21. How this partnership was depicted in her *Vita* will be considered in Part 3, Chapter 1. Cunegund and Henry II provide another example of partners in rule, as noted by Folz, *Les saintes reines*, 83-84.

Rather, Margaret seems to have been able to employ the valuable lessons which she had learned from her reginal counterparts in Hungary and Anglo-Saxon England, adapting them to meet the particular circumstances which she and Malcolm faced together.

* * * * *

A contributing factor to Margaret’s considerable influence was the absence of an institutionalized office of queen. Suzanne Fonay Wemple has noted how the Merovingian queens Fredegund, Brunhild, Nanthild, and Balthild were able to carve their own paths, as women of “talent and vision,” rather than be confined to institutionalized parameters. Like her historical predecessors, Margaret seems to have cultivated, nurtured, and exercised power through personal affiliations and the dispensation of patronage. Furthermore, it is likely that the dignity attendant to the office of the queen was attributable as much to Margaret’s powerful personality as to the position itself. In contrast, the following generations of Scottish queens would skirt the edges of historical oblivion. Sybil, the wife of Alexander and the illegitimate daughter of Henry I, and Maud, the wife of David, heiress to the great estates of Northumbria, and the daughter of the great Earl Waltheof and Judith the niece of William the Conqueror, all remain virtually unknown despite their illustrious pedigrees and station.
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II.3. PERSONAL PIETY

Margaret had access to multiple models of personal piety, a detailed analysis of which might explain her somewhat unusual presentation as a queen who fully combined royal dignity and the exercise of royal power with the asceticism and charitable deeds of a holy hermit. Previous queens typically had either wielded great power or resigned from the world and dedicated themselves to a life of self abnegation. A few had combined both practices with varying degrees of emphasis. This chapter will explore first the models of queenly piety available to her and how the details of her personal expression of piety either conform or differ from these. Next, Margaret’s piety is considered within the context of the eleventh century new hermit movement. The clarification between Turgot’s view of Margaret and Margaret’s actual behavior is given only brief consideration in this chapter, and then developed more fully in the first chapter of Part 3.

An important distinction is to be made here between reginal and personal piety. The first can be seen as a system of patronage and as such an element of statecraft. It includes such acts as the foundation and patronage of monasteries, the endowment of churches with precious textiles, relics and works of art, and public acts of charity. The second involves a queen’s choices regarding her personal conduct and lifestyle. The first is the activity of a queen, the second is an example of *imitatio Christi*. Of course these two cannot be completely separated – royal women, whether a queen or a cloistered member of the royal family, often situated their authority in their reputation for piety – but neither should the distinction be completely ignored.

**Reginal Piety**

We have already noted the models of queenship that were available to Margaret in Hungary and its neighboring kingdoms, and Anglo-Saxon England. Now we will consider the hagiographic context in which Margaret operated – those examples of specifically saintly queens who could possibly have provided a template for her behavior, ranging from the Ottonian example of the royal wife who combined authority with pious behavior to the Anglo-Saxon royal women who withdrew from court to exercise royal power from the cloister.
Robert Folz, referring to Jacques Fontaine’s study *Hagiographie et politique, de Sulpice Sévère à Venance Fortunat*, observes that early medieval queens modeled their religious behavior on the example of St Martin by subordinating their royal dignity to religious practice. In Fontaine’s terminology, the queen became a *regina ancilla*, a servant to the poor and less fortunate.¹ Perhaps the most emulated queen-saint was Radegund (520/5-87), daughter of Bertechar, King of Thuringia. After the defeat of her father by Clothar, King of the Franks, she and her brother were taken as captives. When she was about eighteen, she learned that Clothar intended to take her as another of his wives. She fled, but was caught and forced into marriage. As a queen, she adhered to a life of extreme deprivation: she wore a haircloth, fasted assiduously, and spent her night in prayer prostrate on the unforgiving stone floor. Eventually, prompted by the murder of her brother by Clothar, Radegund abandoned the married life altogether, fleeing to Noyon where she took the veil and became a consecrated deaconess. She founded a monastery in Poitiers named Ste-Croix after a relic of the True Cross which she had obtained. There, she focused on an extremely ascetic life dedicated to providing for the poor and needy: she tended to the sick and leprous; she gave her robes and jewelry to hermits; and she fed the poor. Her practices of self-mortification escalated: she wore chains that cut into her flesh; she branded herself with Christ’s monogram by using a heated bronze plate; she burned herself by hugging a tub of hot coals; and she fasted every day but Sunday.²

The Merovingian queen, Balthild (d. 680), was an Anglo-Saxon slave who became the wife of Clovis II (639-657), and regent for her son Clothar III. She was eventually forced to retire to the convent which she had founded near Chelles and became known for her humility, care of the sick and poor, prayer, almsgiving, and patronage of the Church, especially her foundation at Chelles and the monastery at Corbie. The conclusion of her earlier legend places her directly in the long line of previous royal female saints of the dynasty, noting the exemplary lives of Queens Clothild, Ultragotha, and Radegund.

The queen-saints of the Ottonian dynasty consciously patterned their behavior on that of their Frankish predecessors, especially Radegund and her Martinian expression of piety. Mathilda (895-968), daughter of a Saxon noble house, married Henry, the son of the “Duke of the Saxons” in 909 at about the age of fifteen. In 912 Henry became the Duke of Saxony after his father’s death. Six years later he succeeded the childless...

---


3 Two lives are included in Vita Sanctae Balthildis, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SRM 2.477-508. Life A was probably written by a nun or monk at Chelles shortly after the saint’s death in 680. Life B is a later redaction, perhaps coincident with the translation of Balthilde’s remains in 833. For an English translation of the earlier life see Sainted Women of the Dark Ages, ed. McNamara, 264-78. Wemple notes that “Eugen Ewig has assessed these activities as creating cult centers for the Merovingian dynasty and a new economic basis for the monarchy by redistributing resources between the bishoprics and monasteries.” Eugen Ewig, “Das Privileg des Bischofs Berthefrid von A...”

Conrad, becoming the founder of a new dynasty through his son Otto.\textsuperscript{5} As queen, Mathilda gave generously to the Church, establishing royal monasteries for women at Quedlinburg, Enger, and Nordhausen in addition to male houses at Pöhlde and Quedlinburg.\textsuperscript{6} Like Radegund, she was noted for her loving care of the deprived and unfortunate. She fed the poor twice a day and bathed them every Saturday, sometimes with her own hands. She declined to eat until others had been served and kept a supply of food and candles in her carriage to distribute to the needy along her route.\textsuperscript{7} After the death of her son Henry she led an increasingly ascetic life, wearing clothes of mourning, contemplating only holy songs and readings, providing for pilgrims, orphans, and widows.\textsuperscript{8}

Mathilda’s son Otto married Adelheid (d. 999), who also became a generous patron of the Church, favoring the monastery of Cluny in particular. She established a foundation at Payerne, Burgundy, the monastery of St-Saveur near Pavia, and the monastery of St. Peter and Paul at Selz in the Alsace. Additionally, she restored the abbey of St Martin of Tours and bestowed her largesse on many other monasteries and churches including Monte Cassino and Souvigny.\textsuperscript{9} She gave generously to the poor, was deemed to be “thoroughly just, strong, prudent, and extremely modest,” and was eventually canonized in 1097.\textsuperscript{10}

Jo Ann McNamara traces the lineage of saintly queens back to St Helena, the mother of Emperor Constantine who was alleged to have discovered the True Cross while on pilgrimage to the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{11} The Theodosian empresses Eudoxia, Flaccilla, Eudocia, and Pulcheria all modeled themselves on Helena’s example, interceding with the emperor and championing the Church. She then identifies Margaret as the last in this line of saintly queens, having inherited, she argues, a well-defined model which she tailored to meet her own particular needs and interests.\textsuperscript{12} McNamara examines the changing role and function of Continental holy queens through the first millennium of

\textsuperscript{5} Gilsdorf, \textit{Introduction}, \textit{Queenship and Sanctity}, 5.
\textsuperscript{6} Schulenburg, \textit{Forgetful of Their Sex}, 71.
\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Vita Malthildis antiquior}, trans. Gilsdorf, \textit{Queenship and Sanctity}, 80-81.
\textsuperscript{9} Schulenburg, \textit{Forgetful of Their Sex}, 71-72.
\textsuperscript{10} Odilo of Cluny, \textit{Vita (Epitaphium)}, PL 142:967-82; trans. Sean Gilsdorf in \textit{Queenship and Sanctity} 132.
\textsuperscript{11} McNamara, “\textit{Imitatio Helenae}: Sainthood as an Attribute of Queenship,” 51-80.
\textsuperscript{12} See McNamara, “\textit{Imitatio Helenae}: Sainthood as an Attribute of Queenship,” 51-80.
Christianity, asserting that early queens functioned as half of a royal partnership. Their husbands were able to maintain the fearsome demeanor of a warrior king because their female counterpart assumed those aspects of governing which required less brutal tactics: church building, intercessory agendas, and charitable work. In the Carolingian period, however, queens and the power they wielded became suspect. Sanctity instead became aligned with a renunciation of marriage and worldly authority. Only with the Ottonian dynasty were the concepts of holiness and temporal power associated again, along with the idea of royal marriage as an equal division of labor for the rulers.¹³

In his book *Queenship and Sanctity*, Sean Gilsdorf corroborates McNamara’s assessment. He observes that Mathilda and Adelheid, as portrayed in their *vitae*, represent a modified form of female royal sanctity in two ways. First, their sanctity relies more on good deeds than ascetic feats and miracles, representing “a tradition of ‘hagiography without miracles,’ which developed from the Carolingian period onward.” Second, their secular authority is an integral element of their sanctity rather than an obstruction to it. Their roles as queens, wives, and mothers are emphasized and developed.¹⁴ I would also add that all these women benefited from lengthy careers as pious widows, during which they were able to cultivate more saintly pursuits such as prayer, fasting and almsgiving.

The saintly portrait of Cunegund (d. 1033) is a variation of this Ottonian model.¹⁵ She was the wife of Henry II, who was grandson of Mathilda and brother of Queen Gisela of Hungary. Like her Ottonian predecessors, she was happily married, acting in concert with her husband. Unusually, however, her sanctity was based largely on the assertion of her virginal marriage, which was a principal factor in the canonization of her husband in 1146, but the saintly reputation of the couple had been established in the eleventh century, and she was finally canonized in 1200.¹⁶ She was still interpreted as half of a royal, but virginal, couple. Her saintliness was more a function of her virginity,
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¹³ McNamara, “*Imitatio Helenae*: Sainthood as an Attribute of Queenship,” 69-71.
and as such a reflection of her husband’s, rather than the pious widowhood of her Ottonian predecessors.

The Anglo-Saxon model, however, stressed the inverse relationship between power and sanctity. The prototypical example of the Anglo-Saxon queen-saint was Aethelthryth (7th century), a member of the East-Anglian royal house who preserved her virginity through twelve years of marriage, first to Tondbert, a prince of South Gyrwas, and then to the King Egfrith of Northumbria. After receiving her husband’s permission, she retired, like Radegund, to a nunnery, took her vows, founded her own abbey at Ely (673), and became its first abbess, “a virgin mother (virgo mater) to virgins consecrated to God.” As evidence of her sanctity, Bede cites her custom of dressing simply, eating only one meal a day, washing infrequently and even then only with cold water. She welcomed her death in 679 from a neck tumor, saying that it was only fitting that a neck that had been adorned with jewels should now suffer such an affliction.

This model of female royal sanctity remained current in Margaret’s day. The cult of St Aethelthryth was perpetuated by Alcuin and Aelfric, becoming particularly popular in various accounts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, including the Liber Eliensis written at Ely in the mid-twelfth century. St Edith, as we saw in Part 1, Chapter 3, was presented as a model for the young women being educated at Wilton Abbey in which royal female authority was only realized by renouncing the world and retreating to the cloister. As Jane Chance notes, “…when queens attained a reputation for chastity and sanctity, or when they became abbesses, which marked their intentions as socially or spiritually acceptable, their political power within the community increased.”

The actual balance between active royal and cloistered holy authority for women was probably more nuanced. For example, Radegund did not completely abandon her royal role when she took the veil, adopting instead a “theology of power,” as identified and thoughtfully articulated by Marie Anne Mayeski. Of the two lives written about this

---

18 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 86-87.
20 Chance, Woman as Hero, 53.
remarkable saint, Mayeski selected the version composed by Baudonivia, a nun whom Radegund “had nurtured in the monastic life ‘from the cradle’ (as Baudonivia put it).”21 Her version of Radegund’s *Vita*, written shortly after the saint’s death, provides a unique perspective both as a woman and as a close personal acquaintance of her subject. The text explores the use of power by means of its inversion. By renouncing her temporal power as queen, Radegund establishes her holiness and accentuates her authority. She then brings this power to bear on the secular world by acting as mediator between contentious kings, as protector of the realm, and as nurturer of her community of women. While other scholars have observed that the nature of the holy works of female saints tended to be confined to the domestic sphere, Mayeski argues that Baudonivia characterizes Radegund’s service as discipleship, reflecting a Marcan interpretation of the theology of the Cross which emphasizes service to others. Radegund is portrayed as neither the victim of power nor the domestication of female power, but as one who fully expressed a “theology of power” that calls for service to others.22

Regarding the Anglo-Saxon femal royal saints, Ridyard argues that their sanctity was derived in part precisely because of their exercise of royal power, albeit from behind the walls of a nunnery. During her life St Edith was able to intercede with her royal father on behalf of her community, acting as a *mediatrix ad regem*. After her death she became an intercessory saint, acting on behalf of her supplicants.23

Gábor Klaniczay explores the shift from a general belief in the incongruence of sanctity and rulership to one in which that very sanctity supports, defines, and legitimizes rule. Early examples of the first model include the Frankish queen, Radegund, the Anglo-Saxon royal saints Edwin, Oswald, Edmund and Aethelthryth, and the Norwegian king, Olaf. Gradually, however, sanctity came to be seen as compatible with temporal authority. According to his late eleventh-century legend, for example, King Stephen of Hungary was both a strong ruler and a meritful saint. I do not believe that it is any coincidence that the cultures studied by Klaniczay in order to establish his argument regarding the evolving compatibility between sanctity and power are those very same

21 Mayeski, *Women at the Table*, 107.
22 Mayeski, *Women at the Table*, 105-47.
cultures to which Margaret was exposed in her youth. He traces the possible transmission of the models of dynastic cult formulations between Anglo-Saxon England, Scandinavia, Bohemia, Kiev, and Hungary, noting similarities between the articulation of the cults of St. Edmund and St. Olaf, St Wenceslas and the brothers Boris and Gleb, and Jaroslav and St Olaf. He speculates that perhaps the Anglo-Saxon model was translated to Hungary through Margaret’s father and uncle. It is not such a leap to go from that supposition to the conclusion that perhaps Margaret assimilated the models of the active queen-saints of the Continent, as transmitted through the Ottonian exemplars.

It is possible that Margaret might have developed an acceptance of the mutually supportive themes of sanctity and rulership based upon the examples of saintly queens, an understanding of royal sanctity which was in contrast to the Anglo-Saxon concept of queenship. Like Mathilda and Adelheid, and Emma and Edith, she was a partner to her husband, a patron of the Church, and a source of charity to the poor. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon queens mentioned, she had a reputation for personal piety. In contrast to the Ottonian queens, she cultivated her piety while queen, without the benefit of a pious widowhood. She was unusual in that she practiced not only the more traditional type of public, reginal sanctity such as patronage of the Church and charity to the poor, but also a degree of personal asceticism that was somewhat unique for a queen.

**Margaret’s Model of Reginal Piety**

The *Vita* provides a possible clue to the source of Margaret’s personal expression of piety by detailing her patronage of hermits:

> At this time in the Kingdom of the Scots in diverse places separately in cells, through great discipline of life, hermits were living in the flesh not according to the flesh by engaging in angelic conversation while on the earth. In these the queen did enough to venerate and love Christ, and to visit them frequently by her presence and speech, but chiefly to commend herself to their prayers. And since she was not able to persuade them to want to receive anything earthly from her, she would ask more firmly that they might prescribe some work of alms-giving or mercy for her. Without delay the devoted woman fulfilled whatever they wished, either by rescuing the poor from want or relieving the afflicted from the miseries by which they had been oppressed.

25 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 13ra-14ra; Diii, chapter 9.
Margaret thus not only patronized these holy recluses but took spiritual direction from them, choosing to emulate their pious example. In this regard, her personal expression of piety was modeled more on the new hermit sentiments of the late eleventh-century than existing models of queenship. This section begins by looking at royal patronage of hermits before comparing models of eremitic behavior and Margaret’s practices.

It is difficult to ascertain exactly what type of hermits Margaret visited given the nuanced models of eremitic life that existed in the eleventh century. They might have been members of a community of ascetic Culdees. Margaret’s patronage of these Culdee establishments is suggested by a notitia in which she and King Malcolm III granted land to the community of Culdees at Lochleven, for example. The community at St Andrews, which benefited greatly from her generosity, included Culdees. However, Turgot takes care to specify that the hermits Margaret visited would decline her offers of charity. It is unlikely, therefore, that these men lived as part of a community of Culdees, or of any community for that matter.

The majority of hermits, by the very nature of their seclusion, remain unknown to us, yet G.W.S. Barrow asserts that there were probably “a considerable number” who existed in Margaret’s day. Some of the earlier ascetics became well known by virtue of the hagiographic literature they inspired, such as the successive seventh-century bishops


27 Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, no. 8: Malcolmus Rex et Margareta Regina Scotiae contulerunt devote villam de Ballecristin Deo Omnipotenti et keledeis de Louchleuen cum eadem libertate ut prius. Lawrie gives no opinion of its authenticity.


29 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 13vb: Et cum non posset impetrare, ut ab ea terrenum aliquid vellent accipere; Diii, chapter 9.

30 Cowan views the two as mutually exclusive, stating that Margaret patronized the Culdees, but she also held hermits in high esteem. Ian B. Cowan, The Medieval Church in Scotland, ed. James Kirk (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1995), 4-5.

of Lindisfarne, Aidan (d. 651), Cuthbert (d. 687), and Aethelwald, who periodically sought solitude and a respite from their official duties at the hermitage on the island of Farne off the coast of Northumbria.\footnote{Clayton, “Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” 153; Rotha Mary Clay, The Hermits and Anchorites of England (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1914), 1-7. Other hermits include Wilgils (7th century), who live as a hermit in a cell within a monastic community at a place near the mouth of the river Humber, and Cynefrith (early 8th century), who had been abbot of Gilling but sought seclusion in Ireland. Bede lists several hermits: Hereberht who retired to an island in a lake; Wictbert, who was a missionary to Frisia; Haemgils, who sought solitude in Ireland. Clayton, “Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” 153.} Snippets of evidence in chronicles suggest the presence of lesser known hermits. During the reign of Margaret’s son, Alexander I, an anchorite was living on the island of Inchcolm in the Forth, a relatively short distance from the royal residence at Dunfermline.\footnote{The account is recorded in Bower, Scotichronicon, ed. Watt, 3.111 and analyzed in Simon Taylor, “Columba east of Drumalban: some aspects of the cult of Columba in eastern Scotland,” The Innes Review 51.2 (Autumn 2000), 115-16. Many thanks to Simon Taylor for this reference.} Perhaps Margaret’s interest was piqued as a result of her introduction to the cults of sainted hermits after her arrival in Scotland.

It is less likely, however, that Margaret witnessed a tendency to favor hermits during her years at the court of Edward the Confessor. Mary Clayton points out that in late Anglo-Saxon England there was a shift toward an emphasis on the superiority of the coenobitic over the solitary life, as evidenced by the writings of Aelfric. In his homily for the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin in Sermones Catholici II, he interprets the story of Mary and Martha to argue that Mary’s ministry, as a spiritual teacher, is preferred over Martha’s more corporeal concerns, the important point being that Mary engaged in an active, pastoral ministry rather than a life dedicated to solitary contemplation.\footnote{Clayton, “Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” 158-62.} Moreover, when writing his Lives of Saints, Aelfric seems to have deliberately avoided the inclusion of eremitic saints. Notably absent from his work are Antony, Paul the Hermit, Mary of Egypt, and Guthlac. Although Cuthbert is included, his pastoral ministry is emphasized.\footnote{Clayton, “Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” 162-64.} Clayton concludes that in later Anglo-Saxon England more value had been placed on the coenobitic life, and that consequently there is “less evidence of hermits or, indeed, the type of asceticism associated with this life.”\footnote{Clayton, “Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” 167.} This is not, however to assert a complete absence of hermits. The examples of Eve and Gunhild...
at Wilton have already been noted. While it is not possible to claim a direct connection between the pious practices of Margaret and those of Eve and Gunhild, it is enough to say that they shared an environment at Wilton which might have contributed to their shared later behavior.

There is little evidence, however, of any specifically royal patronage of hermits in late Anglo-Saxon or early Norman England and what little does exist is sketchy and inferential. For instance, a will that remains only in its later corrupted form refers to lands at Thorney that King Cnut might have given a hermit who then left them to the abbey in return for his burial there. St Werstan, the little-known martyr-monk of Malvern Hills, is depicted in the series of painted glass windows (c. 1460) that adorn the chapel of St. John the Baptist which is located on the supposed site of the saint’s martyrdom. One of the windows portrays the figure of Edward the Confessor, leading to the supposition that he might have been associated with Werstan in some way, perhaps as a benefactor. I have been able to find no indication that the last two queens of Anglo-Saxon England, Emma and Edith, were inclined to favor hermits with their patronage. Emma’s encomiast diligently details the nature and extent of her support of the Church, but there is no mention of a hermit. The work that Queen Edith commissioned, the *Life of St Edward*, makes no allusion to either the king’s or the queen’s association with hermits. Pauline Stafford’s comprehensive assessment of Queens Emma and Edith contains no reference to their patronage of, or association with, hermits. It is possible that these last two queens of Anglo-Saxon England did support hermits, of course, but such patronage obviously did not warrant notice or comment.

Margaret might have been inclined to favor a solitary expression of piety as a result of her exposure to the cults of sainted hermits during her childhood in Hungary.
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37 Part 1, chapter 3.
39 Clay, *The Hermits and Anchorites of England*, 20. Wulsi, a hermit who lived in a cave near Evesham, is credited with having a vision in which King Edward is absolved from his vow to go on pilgrimage. The vision was then confirmed by the king’s emissaries to Rome.
41 Indeed, Tom Licence argues that the term inclusus (and presumably the practice) was imported to England from the Continent. Licence, “Evidence of Recluses,” 223.
As we saw earlier, the coenobitic and eremitic religious coexisted easily in Hungary. Three holy ascetics in particular came to be venerated as saints after their deaths and were recognized as such in Margaret’s lifetime. Bishop Gerard was martyred in 1046 by the pagan mob shortly before Andrew, the exiled Arpadian prince, returned to claim his throne. His canonization seems to have been orchestrated by King Ladislas as part of an effort to establish the legitimacy of his branch of the royal line. The cults of Zoerard-Andrew and Benedict likewise received royal patronage. As early as 1062, King Solomon and the Princes Géza and Ladislas visited their shrine at Pécs where Bishop Maurice had collected their relics and written their legends.\(^{42}\) Géza was presented with a piece of the chain that Zoerard-Andrew had worn in self-mortification and which was purportedly the cause of the saint’s death.\(^{43}\) The recognized significance of this relic suggests that the sanctity of Zoerard-Andrew and Benedict were popularly recognized. In 1083, King Ladislas initiated the canonization of these ascetics, along with Bishop Gerard, King Stephen and Prince Imre, elevating them to a status of the patron saints of the Kingdom of Hungary.\(^{44}\)

These Hungarian hermits and martyrs are regarded as early examples of the new type of hermit that emerged in the early eleventh century, one imbued with a decidedly reformist agenda. The new hermit movement began first in Italy in the tenth century when Romuald, born in Ravenna, established his first hermitage on Cuxa with Marinus and the retiring doge of Venice.\(^{45}\) These new hermits differed from their predecessors chiefly in their belief that eremitical life was not necessarily a goal in and of itself, as a perfect life of contemplation, but rather as a beginning, a preparation, for testing and refining their monastic order and the world around them. They combined an activist agenda with ascetic practices, and through their example they attracted and accepted companions and built a community, in many cases eventually being absorbed into a

\(^{42}\) Miladinov, *Margins of Solitude*, 185-86.
\(^{43}\) Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 127. Klaniczay also points out that these were the only two out of the five saints canonized in 1083 whose canonizations cannot be demonstrated to have been politically motivated, from which we can infer that their cults had a popular base. Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 131.
\(^{44}\) For a discussion of use of these cults and canonizations to establish the legitimacy of his dynasty see Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 123-34.
The force of their popular appeal, their ecclesiastical endorsement, and the strength of their conviction all worked together to ensure that they operated very visibly at the highest political levels. St Gerard, for example, was a tutor to Imre and an advisor to King Stephen.

In England, the hermit movement caught on somewhat later, really only becoming established in the last years of the twelfth century. The earliest of the new hermits in England felt called upon to reclaim monastic sites that had been abandoned for centuries following the depredations of the Vikings. In this way, they would be furthering the needs of the Church while enjoying their solitude among these ruins. Early evidence of the spread of the movement to Norman England is witnessed first in the re-establishment of Jarrow in 1073/4 by three monks of Evesham and then in the early twelfth century of Nostell in Yorkshire and Llanthony in Monmouthshire. These eremitic communities only later, due to their incontestable success, became monasteries. Radmore became Cistercian, probably because of pressure from Queen Matilda, the wife of King Stephen.

Turgot himself was part of the early movement of hermits to reclaim holy sites that had been destroyed and abandoned. He was at Durham when its bishop, Walcher, advised him to journey to the recently re-established community at Jarrow in order to exchange “the costume of a clerk for the monastic habit.” From there, Turgot and a

---


fellow hermit-monk, Aldwin, proceeded uninvited and with similar intent to Melrose, which was under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Durham within the Kingdom of the Scots. Symeon of Durham records that the monks “suffered grave injuries and persecutions at [Malcolm’s] hands, because they refused to swear fealty to him, adhering as they did to the precepts of the Gospels.” Turgot was recalled unceremoniously back to Durham in order to avoid any further conflict with the king. 

Before venturing any further into the details, it is worth taking a moment here to consider the dynamic between Turgot and Margaret. It is difficult to say whether Turgot’s presence was the cause or the effect of Margaret’s favoritism toward hermits, but it is perhaps no coincidence that she chose one of these new eremitic reformers to be her close spiritual advisor, and even more importantly, this same confidante was selected by her daughter to compose a hagiographic account of her life. These associations are especially significant in view of the contentious history between Turgot and Margaret’s husband. She must have favored Turgot despite Malcolm’s disapproval, which would imply that her decision was deliberate. The Vita states that Margaret continually sought edification, posing questions regarding the Scriptures to the most learned men of the kingdom. Turgot was one of the authorities on whom she relied, asking that he “judge anything reprehensible in her word or deed, and not to hesitate to indicate it by reproving her in private.” When she felt that Turgot was acting with too much restraint, she called upon him not to shirk his duty toward her, because “The just man … would not let the oil, that is, the flattery of sin fatten my head, for the wounds of a chastising friend are better than the caressing kisses of an enemy.” It is equally possible however, that Margaret helped to shape, or to reinforce Turgot’s piety, drawing on the examples about which she had learned in Hungary. Interestingly, Tom Licence observes that Turgot was the first Englishman recorded to have used the noun or participle inclusus or reclusus.

51 Symeon of Durham, Libellus de Exordio, ed. Rollason, 208-09.
52 Symeon of Durham, Libellus de Exordio, ed. Rollason, 208-09.
53 This question will be given more consideration in Part 3, Chapter 1.
54 Or perhaps Margaret was seeking to mollify Turgot and Durham, which would make her selection more politically-motivated.
55 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 10ra-rb; Diii, chapter 6.
56 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 11ra; Diii, chapter 7.
57 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 11ra; Diii, chapter 7.
58 Licence, “Evidence of Recluses,” 223
Another person to whom Margaret might have turned for direction was Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury, a choice which was no less revealing. Lanfranc was born in Pavia c. 1010 and entered the community of Bec c. 1042. William the Conqueror promoted him first by making him the abbot of the newly-founded Abbey of S. Étienne in Caen in 1063 and then by appointing him the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1070, a position which he retained until his death in 1089. As archbishop, he acted as William’s most trusted advisor, the country’s legal authority, and primate of Britain, theoretically including Scotland and Ireland. His personal life and beliefs were informed by his exposure to the new hermit movement; he was educated in northern Italy at a time when the new hermit movement of Romuald and Peter Damian was growing; he joined the newly founded ascetic community of Bec under the tutelage of the hermit-monk Herluin; and his Constitutions reflect an emphasis on the ascetic life and a strict observance of the Rule.  

Margaret’s written correspondence with Lanfranc, from which only his reply remains, might have been a request for guidance similar to that which he had provided for monastic communities in his Constitutions. He thanks her for asking him to be her spiritual father and prays that “there be a mutual exchange between us of prayers and good works.” He also says that he is sending brother Dom Goldwin, as she requested, and two more brothers, since Goldwin alone could not do all that she asked. It is often assumed that Margaret’s intention was to found a Benedictine house at Dunfermline, thereby introducing Benedictine monasticism to the kingdom. Ritchie cites this request and the response it generated as evidence of Margaret’s Norman influence on Scotland, calling the resulting growth of monasticism “one means among many of conquest, appeasement and reconciliation.” However, it is apparent that Margaret had requested at most a single monk, hardly a sufficient force to found a monastery let alone propel an

---

62 Barrow estimates that Benedictine monks were introduced to Dunfermline in the 1080s. Barrow, *Scotland and its Neighbours*, 55.
entire monastic movement. Margaret was probably seeking personal guidance but Lanfranc, being the statesman that he was, took the opportunity to interpret the request in its widest sense. It appears then that Margaret, in being associated with the hermit-monks Turgot and Lanfranc, placed herself at the very forefront of the new hermit movement.

It is difficult, to say the least, to benefit someone vowed to a strict life of poverty and abstinence. Hermits differed from the Benedictines, the black monks, in that they adhered not only to personal, but communal poverty as well. Where the Benedictines regarded it as their duty to glorify God through the splendor of their monastic buildings and accepted generous benefactions, the new hermits eschewed even communal wealth and donated everything to the poor. Peter Damian was motivated to join the eremitic community at Fonte Avellana when its members demonstrated their commitment to the ascetic life by rejecting a gift of two silver vases. In Margaret’s case, instead of accepting goods for themselves, the hermits directed Margaret’s patronage toward others. As Turgot relates:

And since she was not able to persuade them to want to receive anything earthly from her, she would ask more firmly that they might prescribe some work of alms-giving or mercy for her. Without delay the devoted woman fulfilled whatever they wished, either by rescuing the poor from want or relieving the afflicted from the miseries by which they had been oppressed.

Margaret not only accepted their directive, she seems to have taken it to heart. New hermits were expected to address a variety of social needs: tending the poor, the sick, and the enslaved; building and repairing bridges and roads, especially to allow access to shrines; and engaging in manual labor. In many ways, they presaged the

65 Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism*, 55.
66 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 13vb; Diii, chapter 9.
67 Rotha Mary Clay, in her comprehensive inventory of English hermits, specifies that a hermit typically “undertook many social duties … he gathered alms for the relief of the poor at home, or for the freeing of those in captivity … he made roads and bridges and kept them in repair,” especially to give pilgrims access to shrines. Clay, *The Hermits and Anchorites of England*, xvii. Hermits were expected to give away all possessions to the poor and focus their efforts on tending to the poor and the sick. Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism*, 52-68. Giles Constable also notes the importance of manual labor “which formed an important part of the eremitical ideal,” by means of which hermits “supported themselves by a variety of productive activities.” Constable, “Eremetical Forms of Monastic Life,” 246.
mendicant orders of the thirteenth century in terms of their assumption of the role of social welfare providers and public works administrators of the early Middle Ages. In keeping with this directive, Margaret is described as a generous benefactor of the poor, disposing not only of her possessions, but also those of her attendants, and on occasion even coins from her husband’s purse.

For what was more merciful than her heart? What was more kind toward those suffering? If allowed, she would spend not only her own money but even herself on the poor. She was poorer than all her poor, for they, not having, desired to have, whereas she, who had possessed, did not cease to dispose (of what she had). However, when she went out in public either on foot or by horse, a small assembly of poor, orphans, and widows streamed together, as to a most pious mother, none of whom ever went away from her void of hope. And when she had distributed everything which she had brought with her for the use of the needy, she received from her wealthy companions and attending servants the clothing and the other things which they had with them then, in order to give to the poor, lest anybody depart from her without consolation. They did not bear this with annoyance, rather they competed to offer more to her, since they knew for certain that she would return everything to them twofold. Sometimes she even took something that was the property of the king to apportion to the needy, and this pious man always considered this theft of piety wholly acceptable and agreeable. For since he himself had been accustomed to offer gold coins at his command at the supper of our Lord and at the solemnities of the High Masses, she was accustomed to steal often from these and others and to lavish them on the pauper who had petitioned her. Indeed, although the king himself often knew this, pretending that he did not know what was happening, he joked that she was guilty. Nor did she show her generosity of charity with a joyfulness of heart only to the local poor, but indeed even to those coming from almost every country toward the fame of her mercy. Assuredly, we are allowed to say about her: she dispersed, she gave to the poor, and her justice remains forever.68

She ransomed slaves from captivity, something quite unusual, as slavery was common in Anglo-Saxon England and the kingdom of the Scots.69

68 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 13rb-13va; Diii, chapter 9.
69 Slavery was more the norm than the exception. During the time of Edward the Confessor, it has been estimated that about one in every eleven persons in England was a slave. Douglas, William the Conqueror, 311. The Normans were instrumental in greatly reducing the number of slaves; within half a century of William the Conqueror’s death the practice of slavery was almost eliminated from England. Douglas, William the Conqueror, 312. In freeing slaves, Margaret might have been emulating Balthild, who, while the wife and queen of the Merovingian king Clovis II (639-657), was inspired to improve the lot of slaves by prohibiting commerce in Christian slaves and personally securing the freedom of many, perhaps because
For who would be able to enumerate how many she restored to liberty by having ransomed those whom hostile violence had reduced to slavery, taking captives from the people of the English. And so she sent forth secret spies everywhere through the provinces of the Scots, evidently in order to enquire everywhere about that those in captivity who were pressed more harshly and dragged off more inhumanely, and they reported plainly to her where they were and by whom they were oppressed. Suffering for such people from her innermost being, and aiding them more quickly, she hurried to recall those redeemed to liberty.70

During the forty days before Christmas and Easter she redoubled her charitable efforts. Accompanied by the king, she would take it upon herself each day to wash the feet of six poor people and gift them with alms.71 This act would be followed each day by the feeding of nine destitute orphans, which she undertook personally, taking them “on her knee” and feeding them with her own spoons.72 Then she and the king would distribute food and drink to three hundred poor people in the royal hall, behind closed doors without public observance or fanfare.73 Later in the day she would personally attend to twenty-four poor people, whom she would support in this manner throughout the year.74 Finally, immediately after recounting how Margaret would visit local hermits, Turgot relates how she accommodated pilgrims visiting St Andrews: she provided lodging for them, complete with servants to attend them, and a ferry to take them across the river.75 Like a new hermit, Margaret would minister to the marginalized members of society, provide for pilgrims, and labor in imitation of Christ.

One essential aspect of the effort of the new hermits to return to the asceticism of the holy apostles and the purity of The Rule of St Benedict was a renewed focus on

---

70 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 13va; Diii, chapter 9.
71 Dunfermline Vita, fo.14rb; Diii, chapter 10. Feeding and washing the feet of the poor was an established means of emulating Christ and expressing devotion. Orderic Vitalis relates how the monks of Saint-Ervout recognized a general anniversary for the deaths of all the family members of the monks by feeding a number of poor equal to the number of monks with the monks’ portion of bread and drink and a main course, and then all the monks washed the feet of the poor as they did on Maundy Thursday. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Chibnall, 2.114-15. See also Chibnall, The World of Orderic Vitalis, 67.
72 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14rb-va; Diii, chapter 10.
73 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14va; Diii, chapter 10.
74 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14vb; Diii, chapter 10.
75 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 13vb; Diii, chapter 9.
prayer. Reading the Psalter, frequently and throughout the day, was the most usual form of private devotion, becoming a test of asceticism in and of itself. It became such a trial, in fact, that Romuald, the early eleventh-century hermit considered to be the founder of the movement, was prompted to admonish his followers to sing “from the heart” rather than relying on sheer repetition. On the other hand, Peter Damian, Romuald’s hagiographer and the spokesman for the movement, favored hermits who repeated the Psalter up to four times a day. In keeping with this example, Margaret is praised by her hagiographer for reading the Psalter almost continually throughout the day: at least once and perhaps twice during Matins and Lauds, immediately upon rising from her bed at dawn, and repeating it two or three times more throughout the course of the day. Peter Damian would have approved.

The Psalter was supplemented by other devotional prayers. Stephen of Muret was particularly enthused with the Office of the Trinity, repeating it night and day. During the forty days before Christmas and Easter, Margaret would begin her day by completing not only the Matins of the Holy Trinity, but also the Matins of the Holy Cross and the Matins of Our Lady, followed by the Offices of the Dead. She would again complete the Hours of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Cross, and the Holy Mary throughout the course of these holy days. Turgot openly admires her commitment to prayer, remarking that “the queen was accustomed to enter church, and there to offer herself as a sacrifice to God in extended prayers and in sobs of tears.”

A true ascetic, even one who operated in the secular world, sought periodic retreat. As mentioned earlier, Margaret is said to have sought this solitude by retreating to

76 Leyser argues that the focus was a renewed emphasis on a balance between prayer and manual labor, stressing a return to the latter. Chibnall notes that Rule of St Benedict (ch. 48) mandates that monks divide time between spiritual and manual labor. The former came to be interpreted more and more widely so that the daily offices, chanting of psalms, and reading aloud of lessons and passages from the lives of the saints came to be accepted as a form of both types of activities. Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism, 62.
77 Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism, 62-63.
78 Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism 63 citing Vita Romualdi, Ch. 9, p. 31. For identification of Romuald and Damian as founders of the movement, see Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism, 29-33.
79 Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism, 63.
80 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14rb, 14va; Diii, chapter 10.
81 Leyser, Hermits and the New Monasticism, 64.
82 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14rb; Diii, chapter 10.
83 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14rb; Diii, chapter 10.
84 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14va; Diii, chapter 10.
a rustic cave for her nightly vigils, not unlike Sts Radegund and Eadburga (d. early tenth century). It must be assumed, however, that if Turgot had been aware of such practice he would have highlighted it in the *Vita*. Either Turgot was not aware of this truly secret practice, or it is a later legend.

A vital element of eremitic life was a restrictive diet that typically eliminated fat, meat and wine and included primarily cereals and vegetables, combined with periods of fasting. The specifics varied: the *Life of Romuald* details a diet consisting mainly of beans and boiled chickweed; Stephen of Muret restricted himself to bread and water. The definition of fasting also differed greatly: Peter Damian’s rule for Fonte Avellana allowed for only bread, salt, and water; the Constitutions of Camaldoli advised complete abstinence except for one meal a day; at Obazine the hermits had only an evening meal of cooked vegetables. Some fasted on certain days of the week throughout the year, although there was no consensus regarding which days.

Margaret typically confined herself to the most restrictive of diets, her sole meal of the day being so frugal that Turgot claimed that it excited rather than satisfied her hunger. For the forty days before Christmas and Easter, this temperance gave way to near abstinence. Turgot describes her single meal:

> In this refreshment when, in accordance with the Apostle Paul, she took care of the flesh not in fleshly desires, but she scarcely submitted to the necessities of life. For she ate so that she might preserve life, not so that she might yield to delight. Such meager and temperate refreshment incited greater hunger than it restrained. She seemed to taste rather than to consume the food. Hence I ask, hence it is weighed, how great and what sort was her continence while fasting, when she exercized such abstinence while feasting.

Turgot might be suspected of hagiographic embellishment except that he felt compelled, despite his obvious respect and admiration for his subject, to criticize her extreme austerity, attributing her ongoing illness and eventual death to such self-deprivation.

---

85 These suspected nightly retreats are described in a life of of the saint (d. early 10th century) written by Osbert of Clare in the early twelfth century. Osbert of Clare, *Vita Edburge*, BHL, no. 2385. Ridyard, *Royal Saints*, 16-19.
87 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 14vb; Diii, chapter 10.
88 This type of extreme self-deprivation can be viewed as a self-inflicted martyrdom, yet another characteristic she shared with the much-lauded hermit saints of Hungary.
Margaret also became a forceful advocate for the reforming spirit of the new hermit movement. These ascetics, in seeking to improve society and return the Church to its more pristine past, actively preached against simony and marriage for priests. The reformers within the Church and the reforming hermits had a somewhat symbiotic relationship. In some ways their agenda paralleled and complemented that of the Gregorian reform movement, one significant variance being that hermits did not particularly concern themselves with the question of lay investiture. Hermits were not so much endorsing the reforms of Rome as seeking to further their own particular aim of returning the Church to a more pristine state. The Church, on the other hand, tolerated the preachings of these new hermits because they excited popular support for its reforms. It has already been noted that Margaret was actively involved in the reforming councils, chairing at least one of these meetings, and that the issues addressed by these councils did not exactly mirror those espoused by the Gregorian reformers, or the new hermits, or even Lanfranc, the archbishop of Canterbury. Significantly, they were most similar to the ones which Turgot himself would later address as bishop during the reign of King Alexander. Margaret might have initiated them herself, perhaps under the tutelage of Turgot, and certainly with his endorsement. It is not surprising that Margaret, so influenced by the hermits of her day and the emerging new hermit movement, would initiate reforms that resemble most closely the agenda of her hermit-advisor.

Her actions were certainly more typical of a hermit than a queen. In contrast, the patronage of previous queens, such as Gisela and Anastasia in Hungary, and Aelfthryth, Emma, and Edith in Anglo-Saxon England, remained firmly within the practical realm of statecraft, aligning themselves with the power and authority of the Church. All were active benefactors of the Church: procuring and donating treasured relics, granting lands, and rebuilding and endowing monasteries. All were engaged in the management of the

---

89 Romuald, according to Damian, was the first to demonstrate that simony was a heresy according to canon law. Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism*, 70.
90 Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism*, 70-73.
91 See Bethell, “Two Letters of Pope Paschal II to Scotland,” 33-45.
92 Turgot praises her for fighting with the “sword of the spirit” to “prove wrong the erring” and correct their mistakes. Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 11rb; DiIII, chapter 8.
93 See Abbott, *Queens and Queenship in Anglo-Saxon England*. 
Church hierarchy, appointing bishops and governing monasteries. None of them, however, can be described as personally attending to the needs of the least powerful and the least influential people in the realm. Even the indisputably saintly Aethelthryth, the seventh-century wife of King Egfrid of Northumbria, was not known for her acts of charity to the poor, but for her lavish gifts to St Cuthbert: “a magnificent stole and maniple, adorned with gold and precious stones,” and perhaps the priceless jewels and ornaments with which she adorned herself before joining the convent. Margaret’s public acts of selfless charity, directed by the hermits whom she frequented, set her apart from her predecessors. She took her commitment to the hermits one very significant step further, however, by choosing to emulate in her personal life and habits those whom she patronized.

If a royal parallel to Margaret’s actions is to be found it perhaps the confessor kings of the eleventh century rather than the queens. Stephen of Hungary, Edward the Confessor, and Robert the Pious were all praised for their just, Christian rule. In his early Vita, Stephen is credited with converting his kingdom to the Christian faith, portraying him as the paradigmatic rex iustus. In a Vita written shortly after his death by an anonymous monk, Edward the Confessor is noted for his piety, claiming in the final paragraph that he proved “a saint in this world.” Robert the Pious (d. 1031) is most interesting in terms of how his legend compares to Margaret’s. His hagiographer, the monk Helgaud of Fleury, writing about a decade after Robert’s death, praises the Capetian king for his ostentatious acts of clemency, piety, and patronage of the Church. Like Margaret, he was also noted for his ritual almsgiving. He ordered that 1000 poor be fed bread and wine daily at each of his residences. During Lent he had bread, fish, 

94 For more details on the patronage of Emma and Edith, see Stafford, Queen Emma and Queen Edith, 143-61.
95 Dowden, The Celtic Church in Scotland, 185-86.
96 On this new interpretation of royal sanctity see Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 114-54.
97 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 147. See Part 1, Chapter 2.
and wine, fed to 100 to 200 poor. On the day of the Last Supper, he gathered 300 poor and gave each of them beans, fish, bread and a penny. He then fed 100 poor clerics and gave them 12 pennies. After the meal, he washed and dried the feet of 160 poor clerics. While this behavior is clearly similar to Margaret’s, I am inclined to believe that it was more indicative of the spirituality of the time, rooted in a return to Benedictine ideals of poverty and charity, than a direct model for Margaret.

A clear indication of Margaret’s increased orientation toward the divine is the names of her children. All eight of her surviving children were given names which incorporated both the royal and the saintly, with a notable shift in emphasis in the names of her last three children. The names of her first five children, although dynastic, carried unmistakably sacred overtones. As noted previously, her first four sons were named in chronological order after previous reigning Anglo-Saxon kings: Edward, Edmund, Aethelraed and Edgar. Of equal significance, however, is the fact that these are also the names of Anglo-Saxon rulers who had come to be revered as saints, and as such the names were imbued with sacred connotations. Edward the Confessor was recognized for his intercessory powers almost immediately following his death.100 Edward the Martyr (975-978) was murdered and then succeeded by his brother, Aethelraed, who declared a feast day in honor of the newly created saint.101 King Edmund of East Anglia (866-870) died a martyr at the hands of the Norse invaders and was especially venerated by King Cnut.102 The association of the name Aethelraed with the divine is somewhat less obvious but defensible. Aethelraed, the king of Mercia (774-84), abdicated and became a monk.103 Edgar was named after Eadgar the Peaceful, one of the first male royal saints of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, who was particularly revered at Glastonbury.104 In order to continue the dynastic naming trend the youngest two sons would have had to be named after Eadwig (955-959) and Eadred (946-955), neither of whom appears to have warranted any sort of a cult following. Instead, Margaret’s youngest sons were named after the two contemporary paradigms of royal virtue, Alexander and David, a choice that

100 Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 255-63.
102 Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 248; Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest, 1.31, 1.294; Ridyard, Royal Saints, 211-33.
103 Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 203.
104 Rollason, Saints and Relics, 140.
was almost certainly Margaret’s.

G.W.S. Barrow has suggested that Alexander was named in honor of the pope at the time of Margaret marriage.\(^\text{105}\) Alternatively, Alexander might have been named after the historical king of Macedonia, who by the time of his death in 323 BC had conquered the Persian Empire, had invaded India, and was planning a conquest of Arabia. He is depicted in the Bible as an insatiable and invincible ruler, which would make the selection of his name, rather than for example the wise Solomon, particularly telling.\(^\text{106}\) The possibility that Margaret’s son was named after the conqueror rather than the pope is increased by noting that Henry I of France and his wife, Anne of Kiev, named their child Philip, after the father of Alexander the Great. It is possible, then, that interest in these two Macedonian rulers accompanied both Anne and Margaret from Russian and Hungary to the West. The custom of employing the name of the Old Testament king, David, as a personal name also traveled from Russia, to Hungary and finally to Scotland. Margaret, or at least her parents, would have been acquainted with the martyred Russian prince Gleb who had been given the Christian name David.\(^\text{107}\) Returning from Russian exile, King Andrew of Hungary in turn baptized his sons David and Solomon.\(^\text{108}\) Margaret’s last two sons were therefore named after revered Old Testament kings in another example of the naming trend in which the names of biblical and legendary saints were adopted by dynasties which lacked a reservoir of indigenous Christian names.

The pattern becomes even clearer when considering the names of her daughters. Edith/Matilda was named after Edward the Confessor’s queen and/or the patron saint of


\(^{106}\) 1 Machabees 1:1-7.


\(^{108}\) David (d. c. 1090) was the brother of King Salomon of Hungary (1063-74, d. 1087) and younger son of King Andrew I of Hungary (1047-1061). A charter issued by him for the monastery of Tihány on Lake Balaton (c. 1090) is preserved in the archives of the archabbey of Pannonhalma (L. Erdelyi, *A Tihanyi Apátság Története...* 1055-1701 (Budapest, 1908), p. 496, n. 3. Further benefactions by David to Tihány are listed in the confirmation issued by King (Saint) Laszlo in 1092, ibid., 499, no. 4. The Old Testament David had, incidentally, been a popular motif in Pictish stone carvings, although the extent to which these were still a part of the landscape, geographic and cultural, is unclear. St Andrews, for example, still has custody of a carving of King David wresting open the jaws of a lion. Thomas Charles-Edward interprets such iconography as evidence of Pictish high-kingship. Thomas M. Charles-Edwards, “‘The Continuation of Bede,’ s.a. 750: High-kings, Kings of Tara and ‘Bretwaldas’,” in *Seanchas: Studies in Early and Medieval Irish Archaeology, History and Literature in Honour of Francis J. Byrne*, ed. A. P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 142-43.
Wilton Abbey. The name Mary, however, is almost entirely absent from the genealogical charts of Western Europe up to that time. Margaret seems to have turned again to a religious ideal, naming her youngest daughter after the epitomy of female royal sanctity, Mary, Mother of God and Queen of Heaven. The cult of the Blessed Virgin had flourished in both Hungary, where St Stephen is said to have bequeathed his kingdom to her, and Anglo-Saxon England.\(^{109}\) Other possible evidence of Margaret’s personal devotion to her is the fact that, as Rebecca Rushforth observes, the selected readings of her Gospel Book seem to represent disproportionately those concerning the Mother of God.\(^{110}\)

All eight of Margaret’s children were therefore given names that conflated both the sacred and the secular, the first five adhering more to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of featuring royal saints’ names and the youngest three introducing unmistakably divine names that were not yet firmly attached to any dynasty but were still decidedly regal. Such a shift in relative emphasis could be interpreted as a reflection of Margaret’s own spiritual growth.

As a queen, Margaret sought to return to the asceticism and seclusion of Radegund while remaining active and involved in her temporal role like Mathilda and Adelheid. The principles espoused by the new hermit movement, which was only beginning to emerge in Norman England and would not truly flourish until the twelfth century, allowed her to straddle both the eremitic and the reginal worlds. In this way, she emulated the example of those who embraced a life of extreme asceticism while continuing actively to change and to improve conditions around her, the sincerity of her devotion giving force to her authority.

**Eternal Life**

In Anglo-Saxon literature, the ideal woman, chaste, virtuous, loyal, and wise, is often depicted as a “doomed and tragic figure,” rendered vulnerable by the death of her husband/brother/son: Hildeburh mourned the death of both her son and her brother; the Geat woman mourned Beowulf’s death; and Beadohild in Deor is raped and her brothers

---


killed. Like the heroines of Anglo-Saxon poetry, Margaret was fated to suffer the deaths of both her husband and oldest son before her own.

According to the Vita, Margaret had been ill for quite some time before her death. The priest who attended to her in her final days and hours informed Turgot that she had not been able “to sit on a horse for at least half a year, and even rarely well enough to rise from her bed,” suggesting a prolonged illness. It is worth wondering, therefore, whether Margaret’s sickness could be attributed to an unspecified malady rather than the strict fasting of which Turgot was so critical. Could the extent of her fasting have been the result of an illness rather than its cause? This possibility is suggested by an account in the Life and Miracles of St Lawrence, written by Goscelin possibly in the early 1090s, it describes how Margaret had recently, probably shortly before her death in 1093, traveled to the church of St Lawrence (Laurencekirk) in East Lothian, intending to worship at the saint’s shrine. She insisted on laying her gifts on the altar herself even after being informed that women were barred from the shrine. However, as soon as she entered the porch of the church she was overcome with excruciating pains and called to her retainers to save her, exclaiming that she was about to die. She was eventually revived by the prayers of St Lawrence’s priests and, evidently chastised, delivered her gifts into the custody of the community.

This tale of a trespassing female suffering divine retribution is not unique. Judith of Flanders, Tostig’s wife, promised more land to St Cuthbert’s church on condition that she be allowed to visit his tomb. After her request was refused, she sent one of her women to test access to the shrine. Once the unlucky servant set foot in the sanctuary, she was “overthrown by a rushing wind and died soon after.” An attendant of Maud, the wife of David, was likewise struck down when she attempted to pass the boundary at

111 Chance, Woman as Hero, 10.
112 Dunfermline Vita, fo: 16rb; Diii, chapter 13.
113 Goscelin wrote a vita of St Laurence, the seventh-century archbishop of Canterbury, toward the end of the eleventh century, probably in the early 90s, possibly during Margaret’s lifetime. An abbreviated paraphrase is contained in the fourteenth-century compilation of saints’ lives by John Capgrave and included in AASS, February 1.296-97. A full account is found in MS London, BM, Cotton Vespas. B XX, f. 197r ff and MS Harley 105, f. 227v ff. The edited text is available in Wynzen de Vries, “Goscelin of St Bertin’s Vita Sancti Laurentii Cantuariensis (BHL 4741),” (unpublished thesis, University of Groningen, 1990) and a translation into English in Macquarrie, Saints of Scotland, 216-18. For analysis of the text see Macquarrie, Saints of Scotland, 211-29.
the same tomb. After recovering, she sought atonement by becoming a nun in the
convent of Elstow. Still, rather than being a literary trope, Margaret’s encounter at
Lawrencekirk rings true if only because it was recorded shortly after its occurrence. The
incident occurred late in Margaret’s life, possibly as a symptom of her illness, but
perhaps Goscelin made it conform to a standard literary topos. Shortly afterwards, as
attested to in her Vita, Margaret was confined to her bed.

Margaret’s illness might have been an inherited malady that she then passed on to
her offspring. Again, the answer may not ever be known, but the evidence is
suggestive. The chronicles indicate that her daughter Edith/Matilda also suffered from a
prolonged, unspecified ailment. Her confidante, Hildebert of Lavardin, wrote a brief
letter that dates to about 1113 inquiring after her health. It includes a prayer composed
specifically for the queen by Herbert Losinga asking for the intercession of St John the
Evangelist to effect her “long awaited recovery.” The wording of the prayer suggests that
the queen had already been ill for some time. Her last datable public action is recorded
in 1116, yet she died in May 1118, a gap which further suggests an illness of some
duration. William of Malmesbury notes cryptically that Edith/Matilda “shared in the lot
of her relations, who almost all departed this life in the flower of their age.”

Edith/Matilda died two years before her son William, so the chronicler could only be
referring to her natal family, her sister and brothers, four of whom died at a young age.
Margaret’s daughter, Mary, died in the spring of 1115. Of her six sons, only David
lived to old age: Edward was killed in 1093, the date of Edmund’s death is uncertain but
he is absent from the historical record after 1097, Edgar died in 1107, and Alexander died
in 1124 at the age of about 48.

Margaret died 16 November 1093, three days after the death of her husband and
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116 Dunfermline *Vita*, 16rb; Di11, chapter 13.
117 Further research is required to identify the possible illness or illnesses. David Pratt conducted a similar
line of inquiry regarding Alfred the Great, concluding that the king might have suffered from Crohn’s
118 Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 89 n. 84 citing PL 171, cols 289-90; *Epistolae Heribert de Losinga*,
#18, 33-37.
119 Huneycutt *Matilda of Scotland*, 93.
121 Huneycutt *Matilda of Scotland*, 90. Huneycutt suggests that the exact date was probably 31 May 1115.
oldest son, shortly after she had been informed of their fates by her son Edgar. Against the prophetic protestations of his wife, Malcolm had traveled to Gloucester at the invitation of William Rufus, arriving on 24 August. The purported objective of the meeting was to fulfill treaty obligations following William’s conquest of Cumbria, one element of which might have been a proposed marriage between William and Malcolm’s oldest daughter. Once there, William had refused to see him, and Malcolm returned to Scotland with his wounded royal pride. To avenge this slight, Malcolm assembled an army and embarked on a punitive mission into Northumbria. He was killed on 13 November 1093 on the banks of the river Alne, and was buried hastily and without ceremony at Tynemouth. His oldest son Edward was mortally wounded and died three days later in Jedworth Forest. He was buried in a place that was later known as Edward’s Isle.

Margaret’s reaction to news of this tragedy is related in emotionally-charged detail by Turgot, who heard it from the priest (probably her confessor) who had attended to Margaret during her last days. The priest later joined Turgot as a monk at Durham, where he had occasion to relate tearfully the story to Turgot “more than once,” increasing the credibility of this firsthand account. As the queen lay dying, reciting the Fiftieth Psalm for comfort, her son Edgar entered her chamber to bring her the horribly tragic news:

What was then his agony, what tormented his soul? Standing there, he was stunned; confined by adversities on every side, he did not know where to turn. For he had come to announce the slaying of his father with his brother, but in finding her whom he loves before others, he found her about to die at any moment. Alas, alas. Disasters never come singly, and seldom does the sorrow of disease attack without another serious admixture. This cruel messenger comes to announce the death of two. But he did not know about the third death, that is, seeing his mother leaving her body, which he lamented first. At last, the demise of his dearest mother, whom he was seeing fall towards her death almost at that very moment, pierced his heart with more bitter sorrow. Amid all these proofs
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122 Dunfermline *Vita*, 16rb; Diii, chapter 13.
123 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1093.
124 For the suggestion that the purpose was to fulfill treaty obligations see Barlow, *William Rufus*, 309-11. For the possible marriage negotiations see Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 21-25.
125 The circumstances surrounding Malcolm’s death will be considered in more detail in Part 3, Chapter 1.
of sorrow, concern regarding the status of the realm was disturbing him, because he knew for certain that unrest would follow the death of his father. Indeed, the queen, even as she was it seemed lying in agony and seized by stabbing pains, when suddenly her strength was restored, and she addressed her son. She asked him about his father and his brother Edward, evidently her firstborn, whom she loved above all. Indeed, he did not want to reveal the truth by responding to her questions, lest, having heard about the death of the deceased, she might die immediately. He replied to her that they fared well, and she, sighing deeply said: I know, my son, I know. I adjure you through this Holy Cross and through the bond of our shared blood, that you speak whatever truth to us (me). Coaxed and urged by his mother, he revealed the event just as it had happened.\textsuperscript{127}

Here we have a tale full of compassion by and for all those concerned: the priest for young Edgar, Edgar for his dying mother, Margaret for both her dead husband and child and also for the conflicted and confused son who had to deliver the news. The bond of blood to which Margaret refers is no empty metaphor. Her son, grieving for his father and brother and worrying about the looming struggle for the throne, nevertheless places his mother’s well-being before his anguish. The mother, on the verge of death herself, rallies to enquire about her husband and son. She reads the news in her son’s face in a way that only a mother can, and knows her loved ones have perished.

Shortly after this exchange, Margaret’s soul is released. Her passing bears all the hallmarks of hagiographic treatment. Instead of railing against the horrible turn of events which had resulted in the deaths of those dearest to her, she welcomes the added tribulation saying: “Offering, I, who you wished to bear such agonies at the end of this corporeal prison, return thanks and praise to you Almighty Father and Holy Ghost, but O would that you wished me to become wretched in these passions of the body and the heart by other faults and work, I thought to be healed in the heart.”\textsuperscript{128} In her concession to this additional trauma, Margaret is like St Aethelthryth, who welcomed her death from a neck tumor saying that it was only fitting that a neck that had been adorned with jewels should now suffer of this affliction that would absolve her from the guilt of her “needless

\textsuperscript{127} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 16vb-17ra: a shorter version in Diii, chapter 13.

\textsuperscript{128} Dunfermline Vita, fo. 17rb-va; Diii, chapter 13.
vanity."

She embraces her death, accepting it peacefully: another element of hagiography. The priest remembers the details of her passing vividly, painting an inspiring picture.

She sensed that she was approaching death, and soon she began the prayer which the priest was accustomed (to say) after receiving the body of the Lord. Saying: Lord, Jesus Christ who, according to the will of the Father, cooperating with the Holy Spirit, through your death you have given life to the world, deliver me: For at this word, deliver me, her soul was freed from the chains of the body, it moved to Christ, truly the author of liberty, whom she had always loved, and by whom she was made a participant of their happiness, whose example of virtue she had followed. Her passing was so tranquil and quiet that it should not be doubted that her spirit passed over to the place of eternal rest and peace. And what is marvellous is that her face, which had paled in the manner of death, when in death was suffused with red and white mingled, so that we were able to believe she was not dead, but slept.

The details of this account – her last words, the exact moment of her death, her countenance after her death – seem to be the observations of an eyewitness, giving added weight to the priest’s testimony. The possible theological significance of the fact that she acts as priest at her own impending communion with the Lord is intriguing. There is no mention of the priest acting as her intercessor, giving her the Eucharist and saying the prayer. Instead she speaks the words herself. The detail concerning her complexion after her death is also compelling. It was as if by dying and assuming her celestial form, life had been breathed into her corporal form. Note also, that Turgot takes this opportunity, less than a decade after Margaret’s death, to place her immediately in the company of saints; she had emulated them during her lifetime and she resides with them in eternal peace.

* * * * *

---

130 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 17vb; Diii, chapter 13.
Although Margaret is comfortably situated within a long tradition of holy queens, she is neither the cloistered royal, such as Sts Radegund and Aethelthryth, nor the pious widow, such as Mathilda and Adelheid. Instead, she seems to have remained active in the world while cultivating a model of personal piety that focused on prayer, fasting, charity, and good works, similar more to the new hermits of her day than the queens of the past.
Part Three: Margaret’s Cult

Part three of this study considers the evolution of Margaret’s cult from her death in 1093 to her canonization in 1249. The first chapter evaluates a hypothetical original version of Margaret’s Vita in terms of the author’s sources and original intent. It then compares the different contexts in which the Vita evolved. The focus of Chapter two is the care with which Margaret’s children nurtured the memory of their mother. Chapter three places Margaret’s growing cult within the political and hagiographic context of the twelfth century. Finally, the last chapter considers the evidence for and circumstances surrounding Margaret’s canonization.

III.1. THE VITA

The first step in the cultivation of the memory of Margaret was the composition of her Vita between 1100 and 1107 by the Benedictine monk, Turgot.\footnote{On Turgot and the different manuscript versions of the Vita see the Introduction.} This chapter will evaluate the textual tradition in an effort to understand more fully the early evolution of her cult. Of the surviving versions of the Vita, the Cotton Tiberius Ei manuscript is outside the temporal framework of this study and the Acta Sanctorum edition of the lost Vaucelles manuscript is almost identical to the Cotton Tiberius Diii manuscript. The following analysis will therefore focus on a comparison between the versions of the Vita in the Cotton and Dunfermline manuscripts. The first section is an analysis of those passages that are common to both the Dunfermline and Cotton manuscripts, hypothesizing that these are most likely to have been original to Turgot. The second section is a comparative textual analysis beginning with a study of the relationship between the Dunfermline Vita and the analogous works of Aelred of Rievaulx. Next, consideration of the differences between the Dunfermline and the Cotton Vitae signals the different ways in which Margaret’s cult evolved.

Hagiographic Study

Only those portions of the Vita that are common to both the Cotton and the Dunfermline manuscripts can reasonably be assumed to derive from an original text. The
following study considers the structure and source material of this hypothetical text in an effort to understand Turgot’s purpose.

Structure

The way in which Turgot chose to organize the *Vita* hints at his intent. For the purposes of this study, I have divided the common text into four sections: The *incipit*, prologue, and opening passage of the *Vita*; Margaret’s public acts; Margaret’s private devotion; and her illness and death. The *incipit* and prologue are understandably more formulaic, beginning with Turgot’s address to his patron, Margaret’s daughter, and continuing with a typical humility disclaimer. The *Vita* proper is introduced with an excursus on the meaning of names, Margaret’s in particular, continues with a dramatic recounting of Turgot’s grief at her death, and extends to the first sentence of the genealogy. This first section comprises almost one folio in the Dunfermline *Vita*.

At this point, the two manuscripts offer drastically different versions of Margaret’s genealogy, which are considered later in this chapter. They converge again with consideration of what I have chosen to call Margaret’s public acts – those acts which are externally directed, intended either to provide a model of behavior for others, or to correct errors in others. Turgot describes these acts in the following order: Margaret’s foundation of a church at Dunfermline, her patronage of churches, her general comportment, her education of her children, her study of holy writings, her example to the king, her care for the court and the royal dignity, and her Church reforms. This section is significantly longer, consisting of four folios in the Dunfermline *Vita*.²

Turgot indicates a transition from an externally- to an internally-centered focus by listing Margaret’s private devotional practices only after commenting how she had first “eliminated the stains of error in others.”³ He details her daily pious practices, specifically her humility, prayer, fasts, charitable deeds (including the ransoming of slaves), visits to hermits, and provision for pilgrims to St Andrews. It is significant that Turgot opts to portray these last two very public acts – the patronage of both hermits and
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² Dunfermline *Vita*, fos. 9ra-13ra, including a description of Dunfermline (fo. 8vb) and the king’s five legal reforms (fo. 11va-vb); Diii, chapters 3-8.
³ Dunfermline *Vita*, fo.13ra; Diii, chapter 9.
pilgrims to St Andrews – as acts of private devotion. Such details serve as an introduction to Turgot’s increased focus on Margaret’s exaggerated piety during Lent and Advent: her rigorous daily schedule of prayers; her personal attendance on nine orphans and three hundred poor; her care for twenty-four poor throughout the year; and her excessive fasting. At this point, Margaret’s saintly reputation would typically have benefited from a pious, cloistered widowhood, as was the case in the *Vitae* of Mathilda and the *Epitaphium* of Adelheid. Instead, this section of the *Vita*, focusing on exaggerated expressions of devotion, might serve a similar function, allowing Turgot to reconcile her sanctity with her royal authority. Attention to Margaret’s private devotional practices constitutes a little more than two folios in the Dunfermline *Vita*.4

Turgot devotes great attention to the details of Margaret’s death. His consideration of more eschatological concerns begins with the single miracle recorded in Margaret’s *Vita*, the loss and miraculous recovery of Margaret’s Gospel Book. He twice alludes to her gift of prophecy: when she predicts that Turgot will survive her; and when she perceives that the Kingdom of the Scots had suffered a tragedy even before being apprised of the deaths of her husband and son. Turgot accentuates the emotive quality of the text by rendering it in the first person rather than the third, although the details of Margaret’s death had been related to him by the priest who had attended to her in her final moments. The exquisite details of Margaret’s physical and emotional anguish and her passive acceptance of such torments underscore the function of this section as an abbreviated *passio*. This section consists of a little more than two folios in the Dunfermline *Vita*.5

Thematically, the *Vita* progresses from the fairly mundane to the more sublime. Turgot begins by describing Margaret’s actions as a secular ruler intent on reforming the behavior of her subjects. He then concentrates on her pious habits, detailing her daily practices which were intensified during the holy seasons of Lent and Advent. Finally, Turgot turns to more elevated concerns: a miracle, prophecies, and the circumstances surrounding her pious death.
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4 Dunfermline *Vita*, fos. 13ra-15ra; Diii, chapters 9-10.
5 Dunfermline *Vita*, fos. 15ra-17vb; Diii, chapters 11-13.
Sources

Turgot relies foremost on the authority of Holy Scripture. The presumed original text contains thirty-six Scriptural references, some of which are attributable to more than one verse, and in one case a reference to is made to Esther rather than a direct quote. These are divided almost equally between the Old Testament and the New Testament (17 references to the Old Testament and 19 to the New Testament). Twenty five percent of all references are to Psalms, and slightly more, 10 out of 36, are attributable to St Paul.

Other sources quoted are primarily Bede and Gregory the Great, the latter of which is sometimes filtered through Bede. Bede (d. 735) was an eighth-century monk at the dual monastery of Wearmouth/Jarrow who wrote extensively about the political and ecclesiastical affairs of the Northumbrian kingdom. One of his recurring themes is the apostolic activity of Gregory the Great (d. 605), the sixth-century pope who was instrumental in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to Christianity. Turgot would have been intimately familiar with Bede’s geographic and topical interests, beginning with his own monastic career at Jarrow and Wearmouth, then as Prior of Durham, and finally as Bishop of St Andrews.

At times Turgot cites his sources. He directly quotes two of Pope Gregory’s letters when describing how Margaret outlined the proper observance of the Lord’s Day. He also uses a phrase that was favored by Bede, but without attribution. At other times the contributing source can only be inferred. Turgot describes Margaret’s daughter, Edith/Matilda, as having been made Queen of the Angles by the King of the Angels (quae a rege angelorum constituta regina anglorum). This play on words echoes Bede’s
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8 *Sermo eius sale sapientie conditus*. Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9vb; Diii, chapter 3. See Bede, *Letter to Egbert*, PL, 94. 657
9 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 1ra; Diii, *prologus*. 
probably apocryphal story regarding Pope Gregory’s comment on the English slaves who he had seen in the market place. According to Bede, the Pope exclaimed that it was appropriate that they were called Angles because they were so angelic looking.\textsuperscript{10}

A more detailed textual comparison between the Cotton and the Dunfermline texts indicates slight but significant variations in the quotes, with the former usually reflecting the more accurate or more generally accepted version. For example, the Dunfermline Vita adds the word \textit{revera} to the passage from John 1:1.\textsuperscript{11} The Dunfermline Vita attributes the command \textit{Irascimini inquit et nolite peccare} to the prophets whereas the Cotton version more correctly credits the Psalmist.\textsuperscript{12} The Dunfermline Vita version of Proverbs 13:24 (\textit{qui parcit virge filium suum odibilem facit}) is less common than the corresponding Cotton version (\textit{Qui parcit virgae odi filium}).\textsuperscript{13} As a final biblical example, rather than completing the reference to Job 14:1 as the Cotton text does, the Dunfermline Vita trails off with a rather weak \textit{et cetera ut in sequentibus continentur}.\textsuperscript{14}

The Cotton version remains consistently more accurate even when quoting other, non-biblical, authorities, as is the case in the reference to Gregory the Great’s counsel regarding the Lord’s Day.\textsuperscript{15} At times, a source can be found for a phrase in the Cotton version while no source can be found for the corresponding phrase in the Dunfermline version. For example, the Cotton manuscript uses the more common “temple of God” than the Dunfermline manuscript’s “temple of justice.”\textsuperscript{16} Such awkward, inconsistent, and sometimes inaccurate phrasing leads me to wonder if the author of the Dunfermline Vita might have been working from memory.

**Turgot’s Perception of Margaret**

Turgot seeks to address his great challenge of reconciling Margaret’s royal

\textsuperscript{10} Bede, \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 2.1.
\textsuperscript{11} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 1rb; Diii, \textit{prologus}.
\textsuperscript{12} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 9vb; Diii, chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{13} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 9vb; Diii, chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{14} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fos. 10vb-11ra; Diii, chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{15} Gregory the Great, \textit{Registrum epistularum}, Cl. 1714, SL 140A, Book 13, letter 1: \textit{Dominicorum uero die a labore terreno cessandum est atque omnimo orationibus insistendum, ut, si quid neglegentiae per sex dies agitur, per diem resurrectionis dominicae precibus expiertur}; translation in \textit{The Letters of Gregory the Great}, trans., Martyn. 3.823. Compare with Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 12vb; Diii, chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{16} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 13ra; Diii, chapter 9.
authority with her sanctity by drawing from his source material to sketch a picture of a specifically monastic authority figure. Previous hagiographers had also handled this apparent contradiction. The Ottonian queens, Mathilda and Adelheid, are portrayed as “women whose status as aristocrats, and particularly as queens, is intrinsic to their sanctity.”

Their functions as queen, wife, and mother are fully employed. Additionally, these women benefited from a period of pious widowhood, which the hagiographer was able to interpret as a type of claustration, focusing on the widows’ piety and devotion. Turgot approaches his subject somewhat differently. First, he credits Margaret with the pious practices typical of many saints, including Mathilda and Adelheid. More particularly, he likens Margaret to Bede’s idealized abbots, drawing parallels between her royal court and the monastic cloister to strengthen the association. Finally, he negotiates her gendered roles as mother and queen by reinterpreting them within the framework of a non-gendered monastic authority.

Turgot positions Margaret as a ruler early in the Vita, immediately after her marriage but before the account of her life, by summarizing her qualities in terms that convey secular lordship: her rule was prudent; her counsel governed the dispensation of laws; and she brought about prosperity for the people. In short, “nothing was more firm than her faith, more constant that her countenance, more tolerant than her patience, more grave than her counsel, more just than her pronouncements, or more pleasant than her speech.”

Next, Turgot identifies attributes that are similar to those required of specifically abbatial authority. Like the ideal Benedictine abbot, Margaret is depicted as a model of good behavior, focusing unwaveringly on her eternal reward. She is moderate in her joy and hilarity; righteous in her anger, friendly in her justice, wise in her speech; silent and serious. The Benedictine Rule likewise stresses moderation in all things, advising that an abbot should not be overly joyous, angry, or talkative. In this way, Margaret’s moderate behavior evidences the Benedictine self-rule of the ruler.

17 Gilsdorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 35-43, quote on 35.
18 Dunfermline Vita fo. 9ra; Diii, chapter 3.
20 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9va; Diii, chapter 4.
21 Rule of St Benedict, chapters 12, 22, 54, 23, 39, 40, 52.
Margaret’s general comportment, as described by Turgot, bears striking similarities with Bede’s description of the exemplary abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow. Like Margaret, both Benedict and Easterwine are praised for being nobler in mind than by birth. Bede’s abbots are noted for their learning, Benedict in particular, as is Margaret. As monastic authorities, both Margaret and Bede’s abbots brought dignity to their courts by adorning them with relics, books, and cloaks of incomparable workmanship. Importantly, Bede’s abbots are depicted as Roman: Benedict traveled to Rome six times, he constructed a Roman (stone) style of church, and the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow were dedicated to the first two apostles of the Roman Church.

Margaret argued in favor of the practices of the Roman church at the reform council, and she founded a stone church at Dunfermline, which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity. As a case study, a comparison between Turgot’s description of Margaret and Bede’s description of Bishop Aidan reveals striking similarities. Aidan required all who accompanied him to meditate on the Scriptures or Psalms, ate sparingly, fasted and urged others to do likewise, rebuked even the wealthy, distributed alms to the poor, freed slaves, and inspired piety and devotion in King Oswald. However, Turgot’s Margaret does not display the patience and tolerance toward non-conforming practices which Bede’s Aidan advises are the best means of conversion.

Turgot’s portrait of Margaret as the embodiment of abbatial authority is then underscored by drawing parallels between Margaret’s royal court and a properly administered monastic cloister. He describes Margaret’s attendants almost as Benedictine nuns: they are noble and proper; they were never in the company of men unless escorting the queen, which implies that they did not often venture out; they were never familiar with any man; and they were never frivolous. She oversees the proper conduct of both her women and the courtiers, ensuring that the latter act in an honorable and disciplined manner. Turgot encourages a comparison between ecclesiastical and
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24 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9va; Diii, chapter 4.

25 For the caretakers of the church see Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9va; Diii, chapter 4. For the courtiers see Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 10va-vb; Diii, chapter 7.
royal courts by describing Margaret’s foundation and ornamentation of the church at Dunfermline (ch 7) and her reform and decoration of the royal court (ch. 11) in similar terms. In both cases, she outfitted them with textiles and vessels of gold and silver. It might also be significant that, when describing how Margaret decorated the court with diverse cloths, or textiles, Turgot chooses to use the word *pallium*, instead of, for example, *lana*. A *pallium* could refer to an indication of a bishop’s office, a monk’s habit, a nun’s veil, or simply a cloth. The double meaning is unlikely to have been lost on a twelfth-century audience and it is possible that Turgot used it intentionally to draw a comparison between monastic and royal courts. Then, after reforming the royal court – the royal house – Turgot describes how Margaret directed her attention to reforming “the house of God, which is the Church.”

Turgot further establishes Margaret as the ruler of a monastically-ordered royal court by depicting her, at times, as cloistered. He acknowledges that she occasionally ventured out in public, which presented her with the opportunity to patronize crowds of supplicants. When describing her accentuated piety during the seasons of Lent and Advent, however, Turgot seems to emphasize her seclusion. The Chamberlain brought six paupers to her bedchamber so that she could wash their feet immediately after Matins. In the first hour of the day, nine orphans were brought to her to be fed. She and her husband ate with three hundred poor, who were seated in order, without outside observers, which is somewhat reminiscent of monastic refectory. In all cases, the supplicants are brought to Margaret and cared for in relative private. In contrast, the Saxon queen and saint, Mathilda, is often out and about, traveling between monasteries, distributing alms along the way. The *Vita Posterior* remarks upon her charitable activities undertaken while traveling, even during her period of heightened piety which followed the death of her favorite son, Henry.

This interpretation of implied claustration is reinforced as much by what Turgot
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26 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 10va; Diii, chapter 7.
27 Appendix, n. 231.
28 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 11rb; Diii, chapter 8.
29 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 13rb; Diii, chapter 9.
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omits as by what he openly states. He fails, for example, to mention Margaret’s traumatic visit to Laurencekirk. This event, mentioned in the previous chapter, occurred late in Margaret’s life, probably while Turgot was Prior at Durham. It is likely, therefore, that Turgot was aware of it, making it possible that he purposefully chose to exclude it. Similarly, Turgot does not refer to Margaret’s nightly vigils in the cave, even when to do so would have situated Margaret squarely within an acknowledged hagiographic trope. 34 St Radegund, for example, would sneak from her marriage bed, much to the consternation of her husband. 35 Queen Mathilda, in imitation of Radegund, is said to have observed nightly vigils with the consent and sometimes in the company of her husband. 36 Perhaps Turgot, as a Benedictine monk, preferred nightly vigils, which although solitary occurred safely within the regulated confines of a church. In fact, later in the Vita he describes how Margaret would go to the church for her nightly prayers. 37 Again, this might be part of Turgot’s effort to use discussion of her accentuated piety in lieu of a pious widowhood. The widowed Queen Mathilda is praised, for example, for leaving the comfort of her bed to attend the “sacred service of hymns” in church. 38

Importantly, Turgot refrains from portraying Margaret according to a gendered ideal. First, she is described as a mother only to the extent that an abbot, abbess, or bishop is often likened to a parent. Second, Turgot favors the missionary bishop rather than the evangelizing queen as his apostolic ideal. The distinction between abbess and mother was frequently blurred by Bede among others. Bede identifies Ethelburga (d. ca. 675), abbess of Barking, variously as mater et nutrix, mother, and mother of the community. 39 He describes Aethelthryth (d. 679), abbess of Ely, as a virgin mother (virgo mater). 40 Bede also uses regal and monastic imagery to explore Aethelthryth’s marital status, stating that she was a “queen and bride of Christ, and therefore truly a

34 Dunfermline Vita fo. 10rb; Diii, chapter 5.  
35 Venantius Fortunatus, Vita Radegundae, chap. 5; trans. Women in the Dark Ages, ed. McNamara, 73.  
36 Vita Posterior Mathildae, chap. 5; trans. Gilsdorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 95.  
37 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14rb; Diii, chapter 8.  
38 Vita Posterior Mathildae, chap. 10; trans. Gilsdorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 101-102.  
40 Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 4.19; PL 95:201
queen because a bride of Christ.” Her sanctity was grounded, however, in her virginity, as Bede makes clear in his elegiac poem to her. In the end, she was not, therefore, a model for either Turgot or Margaret, except to the extent that she practiced similar pious behaviors, such as fasting and prayers. Hild, the abbess of Whitby (d. 680) was called a mother because of her wonderful devotion and grace (insigne pietatis et gratiae). She was known for her poverty, charity, alms, and especially her good works. However, in terms of Turgot’s portrait of Margaret, it is perhaps most significant that she is noted for her learning. She is credited with instructing five men who would later become bishops, and the debate regarding the proper observance of Easter took place at Whitby while she was abbess (664). Perhaps, however, it would be more accurate to say that Bede portrayed the ideal abbot or bishop as a non-gendered parent. For example, he describes Cuthbert as follows: “As bishop he followed the example of the blessed Apostles and enhanced his dignity by his holy actions, protecting the people entrusted to him by his constant prayer and inspiring them to heavenly thing by his salutary teachings. Like a good teacher, he taught others to do only what he first practiced himself. Above all else, he was afire with heavenly love, unassumingly patient, devoted to unceasing prayer, and kindly to all who came to him for comfort.”

Like Bede’s authorities, Margaret is portrayed as a pious, caring, but firm abbatial parent toward the poor and unfortunate. Turgot states that “when she went out in public either on foot or by horse, a small assembly of poor, orphans, and widows streamed together, as to a most pious mother, none of whom ever went away from her void of hope.” In her care for the nine poor children she “carefully discharged for Christ her office both of a servant and of a pious and most sweet mother.” Towards her biological children, however, Margaret acts more as an abbess than a maternal nurturer. She requests that her children be strictly disciplined in terms similar to the Benedictine Rule’s
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admonishment regarding the training of young monks. The orderly procession of her children according to their age is similar to the procession of Benedictine monks according to their date of entry into the monastery. Margaret’s interest in the instruction of her children is offered as evidence of her maternal care when it could also be interpreted within the model of, for example, Hild’s instruction of future bishops.

Indeed, the *Vita* minimizes any indication of maternal affection. Margaret’s children are instead considered primarily in terms of how they reflect on her function as an abbess-figure. They are neither mentioned by name, nor detailed in terms of their character or looks. They are included, instead, to highlight Margaret’s general ordering of the court in terms of their discipline and comportment. The single exception occurs during the account of Margaret’s death, when she expresses love for her deceased son and concern for the son who had been sent to deliver the tragic news. In this case, however, her feelings toward her children serve to accentuate her suffering, serving Turgot’s intent to portray her anguish.

Turgot’s assessment of the marital bond serves a similar function, portraying Malcolm’s devotion toward Margaret as unilateral. He decorates her favorite books to please her, good-naturedly tolerates her pious plundering of his resources, passively interprets for her at a Church council, and follows her devout example. In short, “he hastened to obey more quickly her wishes and prudent counsels in all things.” It is tempting to view in this relationship between husband and wife something of the Gregorian Reform’s advocacy of royal submission to ecclesiastical guidance, especially if Margaret has been cast in the role of the reforming bishop. However, Turgot gives no indication of Margaret’s feelings for her husband. The exception, again, is her grief at the news of Malcolm’s death, but again Turgot’s intent is to highlight the torments suffered by Margaret at the moment of her death, not her relationship with her husband.

In contrast, the *Vitae* of Mathilda stress her devotion to her husband and his memory, and to the product of their union, their children. The couple is praised for their

---
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cooperative piety which resulted in, among other things, their joint foundation of a monastery. This mutual affection in marriage serves as one of the pillars of Mathilda’s piety. Gildsorf observes that “their close relationship continues to be an object of praise throughout the text: Mathilda’s activities on behalf of monasteries and churches are performed first in concert with her husband, then in his memory, and at the end of her life Mathilda is laid to rest not at her favored convent, Nordhausen, but at her husband’s side in Quedlinburg.” Mathilda’s sanctity is also grounded in her function as a mother. The Vita Posterior highlights the beauty and accomplishments of her children, particularly Otto and Henry, stressing that she provided for their intellectual, moral and spiritual instruction, and was at all times preoccupied with their welfare.

Textual disparities between the Vitae of Margaret and Mathilda also suggest different purposes. The sentiments contained in the texts regarding mothering are similar, but without the verbatim borrowings that could be expected if Turgot was using a written account of Mathilda’s life as a model. One example serves to illustrate this point. In both texts the mothers instruct their children to fear God, advising that he will then reward them with prosperity. Turgot quotes Margaret as exclaiming, “O my pious children, O my desired and esteemed children, fear God since those fearing him will not want. And if you will have loved him with a perfect heart, and him you, since he loves those loving him, then he will return prosperity in this life and eternal happiness with his chosen ones.” The anonymous author of the Vita Posterior of Mathilda uses different phrasing to provide the same counsel, “Beloved children, remember to fear God and honor him always in all things, him who has the power to do great things.” However, we cannot draw a linear textual connection since Turgot is quoting Psalms 33:10, and Mathilda’s Vita refers to Revelations 14:7 and Romans 4:21.

Turgot’s interest was not, therefore, to portray Margaret as a specifically female nurturer, a mother, but as a non-gendered, abbot-like figure. It has been noted that the
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Epitaphium of Adelheid similarly does not model female sanctity. Corbet observes that her sanctity resided not in her behavior as a queen, wife, or mother, but transcended gender to illustrate an ideal of pious rulership. Her actions as a mother reflected on her status as a ruler rather than a woman. Similarly, when choosing from among Bede’s evangelizing models, Turgot seems to favor the missionary bishop rather than the more typically gendered role of the evangelizing queen. He does not, for example, invoke such Anglo-Saxon evangelizing queens as Bertha and Aethelberga. Bede contends that Pope Boniface quotes passages from St Paul in his letter to Queen Aethelberga when urging her to convert her husband, the Northumbrian king, Edwin: “For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife.” This verse is also used to justify Margaret’s marriage to Malcolm in the D version of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle. Turgot, however, abstains from such a reference, preferring instead to cite Esther and Helena as Biblical reginal examples, not however in terms of their evangelizing efforts. Esther, the Old Testament queen who saved the Hebrew people from persecution, was frequently invoked as a model of royal female sanctity. Helena, the mother of the first Christian emperor of Rome, is credited in her legend with successfully defending her faith against the arguments of pagans. Gregory the Great cites her example in two letters to queens: in a letter to Queen Bertha (601), encouraging her efforts to convert the English race; and another to Empress Leontia (603), calling Empress Pulcheria a second Helena in her “zeal for the Catholic faith.” Helena and Esther are therefore both noted for their evangelical efforts. Turgot, however, mentions these queens not necessarily as instruments of conversion. Margaret, like Esther, only wears the luxurious clothing of a

56 Corbet, Les saints ottoniens, 109-10. See also Gilsdorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 55-58
57 Some have argued that Bede purposefully de-emphasized the role of queens in the conversion process. See Stephanie Hollis, Anglo-Saxon Women and the Church: Sharing a Common Fate (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 179-270. Indeed, as Stacy Klein notes, Bede omits Gregory the Great’s letter to Bertha urging her to convert her pagan husband, King Aethelberht of Kent, to Christianity, although, as she concedes, it is equally possible that Bede was unaware of such correspondence. Stacy S. Klein, Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2006), 24. See also Schulenburg, Forgetful of Their Sex, 191-95.
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queen because she must while remaining humble in her heart. She is like Helena in terms of her intellectual ability to argue Scripture. Both women are apt, recognizable, and gender-appropriate parallels, but not necessarily employed as models of evangelical fervor.

In terms of her apostolic activities, Margaret’s actions are more reminiscent of Bede’s ecclesiastical authorities than such biblical and historical queens. This is not to say that Turgot thought of Margaret as a bishop or an abbot, but that he could most comfortably interpret her secular concerns within the constructs provided by these models of holy authority figures. First, Margaret addresses reforms that are similar to those that concerned Bede’s ecclesiastical authorities. Like Augustine, Aidan, and Coelred, Margaret redresses the practices of an errant church. Bede records Pope Gregory’s response to Augustine’s question regarding, among other things, marriage, much as Margaret does during her reform council. He advises that it is unlawful to for a man to marry a stepmother (noverca) or a sister-in-law (cognata). Both the Dunfermline and the Cotton manuscripts likewise forbid marriage to a stepmother, but the second term, cognata, seems to have proved problematic. The Dunfermline text denounces unions between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law (leviri cum glore) while the Cotton text states that a brother cannot marry the wife of a deceased brother (uxorem fratris defuncti fratrem). All three Bedan authorities concerned themselves with the proper dating of Easter, much as Margaret detailed the proper calculation of Lent.

Second, like Bede’s ecclesiastical authorities, Margaret undertakes these reforms with the support of the king, even requiring him to act as interpreter. King Nechtan of the Picts requested a letter from Abbot Coelred of Wearmouth and Jarrow advising him on the dating of Easter and clerical tonsure, and sending him somebody to build a church of stone in the Roman style. Bishop Aidan was not able to speak English (qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat), but King Oswald acted as an interpreter since he himself “had gained a perfect knowledge of Irish during his long period of exile” (quia
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nimirum tam longo exilii sui tempore linguam Scottorum jam plene didicerat). Turgot makes a similar observation regarding Malcolm’s function in interpreting for Margaret, even using language reminiscent of Bede: the Dunfermline manuscript claims quoniam perfecte anglorum linguam noverat; and the Cotton manuscript records qui quoniam perfecte Anglorum linguam aeque ut propriam noverat. In terms of her actions, Turgot seems to liken Margaret more to those bishops who were instrumental in converting the kingdoms of Anglo-Saxon England in the seventh and early-eighth centuries than the evangelical queens.

**Turgot’s Purpose**

In the previous section we explored how Turgot relied on the authority of Gregory the Great and Bede to promote his notion of the ideal authority figure as one who lives according to Benedictine monastic ideals. Specifically, Turgot negotiates gender by depicting Margaret more as a parentally-inclined abbot than a biological mother, and more as a proselytizing bishop than an evangelizing queen. This portrait of Margaret serves as a foundation for Turgot’s personal, unarticulated interest in inserting himself into what he perceived as the continuing the apostolic mission of Gregory the Great.

The *Vita* has been interpreted as a didactic treatise by Lois L. Huneycutt, who contends that Turgot wrote the *Vita* for Margaret’s daughter, Edith/Matilda, as a guide for her behavior as both the wife of Henry I and the queen of England. In contrast to other hagiographic examples, however, Turgot does not include an express statement of this intent. He states in the prologue that he is writing the *Vita* in compliance with Edith/Matilda’s request to memorialize her mother and provide a record of her virtues. As I have argued, the result is not necessarily a gender-specific “Mirror of a Princess,” but a gender-neutral Bedan authority figure – abbess, abbot or bishop – subject to the discipline of the Benedictine Rule and the authority of the Roman Church. If Turgot’s purpose was to provide guidance for specifically feminine royal behavior, it might be expected that he would state so. Odilo of Cluny, for example, writing about Adelheid,
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stipulates that his purpose is the edification of female royalty, “so that eminent deeds expressed in even more eminent words might resound in the ears of empresses and queens.”70 The Vitae of Mathilda, however, propose to serve as a model for the entire royal line. The Vita Antiquior of Mathilda states, “By order of the most glorious Emperor Otto, however, we have recorded … the praiseworthy lives of his most distinguished forebears … which may serve as an example both to him and to those yet to come.”71 The Vita Posterior of Mathilda, continues this theme: “Nonetheless, it is no less virtuous for you [Henry II] to seek after the pious deeds of your kinfolk who preceded you, and particularly those of your great-grandmother Mathilda, the renowned queen, whose splendid life ought rightly to be imitated …”72

It is possible that Turgot saw his own purpose, as opposed to the one he expressly stated, to be the continuation of Gregory the Great’s (d. 605) mission as the apostle of English. Bede casts Gregory as a contemplative monk, absorbed by both pastoral cares and secular concerns. He emphasizes the importance of Gregory’s mission to the English, stating:

And it is fitting that he should receive fuller mention in this history, since it was through his zeal that our English nation was brought from the bondage of Satan to the Faith of Christ, and we may rightly term him our own apostle. For during his pontificate, while he exercised supreme authority over all the churches of Christendom that had already long since been converted, he transformed our still idolatrous nation into a church of Christ. So, we may rightly describe him by the term apostle; for if he is not an apostle to others, yet doubtless he is to us, and we are the seal of his apostleship in the Lord.73

Turgot perhaps admired Gregory’s apostolic mission, but considered it a work in progress. The Roman rite had been adopted at the council of Whitby in 664, Iona had followed in 716, and Lindisfarne had finally completed the process in 768. Perhaps, however, customs still varied despite doctrinal conformity with the practices of Rome.74 It is possible that Turgot was following Bede’s lead in setting up a contrast between ill-

70 Odilo of Cluny, Epitaphium, trans. Gildsorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 128.
71 Vita Antiquior Mathildae, prologus; trans. Gilsdorf, Queenship and Sanctity, 71.
72 Vita Posterior Mathildae, trans. Gilsdorff, Queenship and Sanctity, 88.
73 Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 2.1.
74 On the early Church in Britain see Woolf, From Pictland to Alba, 14-16.
defined, non-conforming, local practices and Roman authority. As evidence, he alludes to the unspecified “barbarous” practices that were followed in the Kingdom of the Scots, much as Bede claims that Columba corrected “barbarous” practices including the erroneous observance of Easter, and the Lord’s Day.75 Indeed, the Vita seems to be as concerned with the proper dating of Lent much as Bede was with the calculation of Easter. Finally, Turgot states that Margaret, “burning with apostolic faith,” corrected practices of the Church.76 Apparently, he did not consider the conversion process to have been fully completed.

Significantly, Bede’s effusive praise for the austerity and piety of the Columban Church is glaringly absent from Turgot’s account. Bede greatly admired the asceticism of the saints of the Columban Church, especially Aidan, Cuthbert, and Columba. Turgot, however, neglects to mention any of these early saints, except when he introduces the priest who narrates Margaret’s death by stating that he later became a monk at Durham where the uncorrupted body of St Cuthbert lay. Nor does he mention any of the holy places associated with these saints such as Cuthbert’s episcopal see at Lindisfarne or Margaret’s possible patronage of Columba’s foundation at Iona. Instead, these holy sites of the Irish church are replaced in the Vita by the newly “Romanized” sites associated with Margaret: Dunfermline and St Andrews. Equally notable is the complete absence of any demons and only one rather tame miracle, in contrast to Bede’s lively accounts of struggles between the divine and demonic. This emphasis might be seen as part of a more general trend. Sean Gilsdorf, for example, notes that the Vitae of Mathilda and the Epitaphium of Adelheid place significantly more emphasis on the saints’ good works than miracles, placing them within a tradition of “hagiography without miracles” which had begun in the Carolingian period.77

Bede’s admiration for the asceticism of the saints of Anglo-Saxon England is replaced by Turgot with an emphasis on the new hermit movement’s return to primitive practices of the early Church. Turgot mentions Margaret’s visits to hermits, but does not choose either to name them, or to dwell on them. For Turgot, perhaps, the individual,
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solitary expression of piety was not as important as its monastic interpretation by the new hermit movement. Margaret’s piety is depicted as being similar to the Bedan Sts Columba, Ninian, Adrian and Cuthbert in terms of her asceticism and prayer, but Turgot portrays her as being strictly subject to ecclesiastical authority, represented in this case by Turgot and fully supportive of the Gregorian Reform agenda.

The balance of power between the Church and the monarchy was a key preoccupation of the Gregorian reform movement. If Margaret functions as an abbess or bishop, then Malcolm as king hastened to obey her in all things. Nor did Margaret act without proper supervision within the hierarchy. She submitted herself to Turgot’s authority, urging him to judge her harshly and to chastise her frequently. Perhaps he saw himself as the Gregorian counterweight to royal authority. More specifically, it is possible that Turgot viewed himself in some indistinct way as bishop of Northumbria, heir to Wilfrid’s episcopal see. Wilfrid had been a contentious character, zealous in his promotion of the authority of the Roman Church in Northumbria during the early eighth century. He was made bishop of Northumbria, argued with the king, and suffered repeated exile. When Turgot became bishop of St Andrews perhaps he saw the position, in some fashion, as a resurrection of both the ancient, grand title as well as the struggle between episcopal and royal authority which accompanied it. He would later question the authority of King Alexander, resulting in the loss of his bishopric and his return to Durham. It should be remembered that the famous quarrel between Henry IV and Gregory VII was still fresh at the time Turgot was writing in the first decade of the twelfth century.

This hypothesis might explain why Turgot works so hard to establish his personal association with Margaret, perhaps intending or hoping that it would bolster his authority. He asserts that he cared for the precious gifts of the queen to the church at her request

78 Walter Goffart argues that Bede’s disaffection for Wilfrid is evident in his writings, but Turgot might not have been as sensitive to such literary clues. Goffart, Narrators of Barbarian History, 235-328.
79 Simeon of Durham, Libellus de Exordio, ed. and trans. Rollason, 208-09. It has been speculated that the argument centered on Turgot’s endorsement of Canterbury’s authority over St Andrews. If this is true, it must be asked why Turgot did not mention Margaret’s letter to Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, asking for his advice and spiritual guidance. Again, perhaps Turgot was not as close to Margaret as he asserts.
80 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 9rb; Diii, chapter 4.
and that he exhausted himself procuring books for her.\textsuperscript{81} He expresses his personal opinion frequently, referring to himself, \textit{ego}, nine times. Although the author asserts his credibility through his personal knowledge of Margaret, perhaps as part of a hagiographic veracity trope, the final result is somewhat circumscribed. It is significant that Turgot does not mention any details of Margaret’s youth, or indeed any of the events prior to the time when he might have made her acquaintance. Typical hagiographic accounts regarding early indications of the saint’s eventual sanctity are lacking. In one sentence Turgot states only that at an early age (\textit{primaeva aetate}) Margaret began to desire God above all things, studying holy writings.\textsuperscript{82} He does not include pertinent details regarding where she was educated or by whom. He also neglects this opportunity to build an image of suffering innocence by omitting tragic stories of the exile of her father and uncle to Hungary, the untimely death of her father in England, and her brother’s loss of his rightful inheritance.

In contrast, the \textit{Vitae} of Sts Radegund, Aethelthryth, and Mathilda richly detail this theme of suffering and lost innocence. Venantus Fortunatus recounts how Radegund was taken from her conquered home as a spoil of war and endured an austere childhood.\textsuperscript{83} According to Bede, Aethelthryth tolerated two marriages before finally securing the reluctant consent of her husband to enter a monastery.\textsuperscript{84} Corbet observes that the \textit{Vitae} of Queen Matilda describe her marriage as a type of \textit{Brautwerbung} – bride theft or “courtship tale” – in which the young girl is snatched from the convent by the enamored Henry.\textsuperscript{85} It appears that Turgot wrote only about that period of Margaret’s life to which he might have been an eye-witness, but lacked personal information regarding her ancestry or early life that could only have been conveyed to him by Margaret or her family through direct personal contact. Even the eyewitness account of her death was second hand, provided to Turgot by a priest who later became a monk at Durham. Perhaps, in the final analysis, Margaret had not confided in Turgot as much as he would have liked us to believe.

\textsuperscript{81} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 10rb; Diii, chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{82} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 9ra; Diii, chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{83} Women of the Dark Ages, ed. McNamara, 70-72.
\textsuperscript{84} Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 4.19.
For Turgot, Margaret is the ideal ruler, operating according to the strictures of the Church, and espousing a monastic ideal. He does not necessarily equate her with an abbot or evangelizing bishop, but those were the models of saintly rule available to him, in contrast to the Anglo-Saxon royal saints who were typically either cloistered or martyred. Finally, Turgot might have been creating a role for himself as the ecclesiastical authority charged with continuing the conversion process begun by Gregory the Great.

**Hagiographic Accounts in Chronicles**

The probability that these hagiographic topoi common to both the Cotton and Dunfermline manuscripts belong to Turgot’s original writing is increased by the fact that they are so closely echoed by early twelfth-century chroniclers. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in an interpolation probably written in 1100 but inserted under the year 1067, gives an account almost certainly derived from an existing hagiography:

The Creator in his foreknowledge knew beforehand what he wished to do through her, because she was destined to increase the glory of God in the land, and set the king right from the path of error, and turn him to the better way, and his people as well, and put down the evil customs that this nation had practiced, just as she afterwards did. Then the king received her, though it was against her will, and her behaviour pleased him, and he thanked God who by his power had given him such a consort; and he meditated wisely, like the very sensible man he was, and turned to God and despised every impurity. About this the apostle Paul, the teacher of all nations, said, ‘Salvabitur vir infidelis per mulierem fidelem sic et mulier infidelis per virum fidelem’, etc. – that is, in our language, ‘Very often the unbelieving husband is made holy and saved through the righteous wife, and likewise the wife through a believing husband.’ The aforesaid queen afterwards performed many useful acts in that country to the glory of God, and she also prospered in the State even as was natural to her.

William of Malmesbury mirrors specific details in the *Vita*, stating:

All her life long, wherever she was, she kept twenty-four poor persons, whom she fed and clothed. In Lent, she would anticipate the chanting of her chaplains and keep nightly vigil in the church, herself attending triple matins, of the Trinity, of the Cross, and of the Blessed Virgin, and then
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reciting the Psalter, her dress wet with her tears, her bosom heaving. On leaving chapel, she used to feed the poor: three at first, soon nine, then twenty-four, and finally three hundred; she was there to receive them with the king, and poured water on their hands. 87

John of Worcester lauds her piety and charity, declaring:

When she was alive, she devoted herself to piety, justice, peace, and charity, often chastening her body with vigils and fasts, enriching churches and monasteries, loving and honouring the servants and handmaidens of the Lord, breaking bread for the hungry, clothing the naked, furnishing lodgings, clothes, and food for those strangers coming to her, and loving God with all her spirit. 88

Orderic Vitalis includes almost a mini-vita on the occasion of her death:

This noble lady, descended from a long line of kings, was eminent for her high birth, but even more renowned for her virtue and holy life. When she had made provision for the kingdom and distributed her wealth to the throngs of beggars, she entered a church and asked the chaplains to celebrate Mass. She took part most devoutly in the celebration, and after receiving the holy Eucharist died with a prayer on her lips. 89

These accounts, all written in the first half of the twelfth century, are so similar in language, sentiment, and details to the existing versions of Margaret’s Vita that it can be safely concluded that the authors had access to some version of the legend similar to what we have described as the “original.” 90 They all mention her assiduous fasting, care for the poor and hungry, and John of Worcester’s account includes her patronage of churches and hospitality for pilgrims to St Andrews. Having delineated a hypothetical original we will now evaluate the differences between the Cotton and Dunfermline versions of the Vita in an effort to track the evolution of Margaret’s cult.

87 William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 4.311.
89 Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Chibnall, 4.272-73.
90 For later references in the chronicles to a Life of St Margaret see: Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195:735; Gesta Normannorum Ducum, ed. van Houts, 2.240-43 (book 8, chap. 25): Uterque [King Henry II and his grandmother Queen Matilda II] enim coniunx consanguinitatem veterum regum Anglie, licet diverso modo, proxime attingebat, sicut in libro, qui de vita ipsius regine scriptus est, continetur. Quem propter noticiam rerum gestarum, et ad honorem et memoriam utriusque matris, de qua editus est [Margaret], et filie, ad quam editus est [Queen Matilda II], haec operi forsitan adiungamus. This note is particularly interesting given that the Cotton manuscript version of Margaret’s life refers the reader to the Gesta Normannorum to read more about Edward the Confessor’s ancestors. Diili, chapter 2.
Comparative Textual Analysis

This section will evaluate the variations in the existing versions of the Vita. We will begin by considering the relationship between the Dunfermline Vita and the analogous passages from the works of Aelred of Rievaulx. Next, a comparison of Dunfermline and Cottonian manuscripts reveals differences which speak to the distinct evolutionary paths of the Vita.

The Dunfermline Vita and Aelred of Rievaulx

Direct textual parallels are found between the Dunfermline Vita and two works by Aelred of Rievaulx, specifically: Aelred’s Genealogia and the first seven folios of the Vita which concern Margaret’s ancestry, including the dedication (to Queen Matilda for the Vita and the future King Henry II for the Genealogia) and Malcolm’s encounter with the traitor; Godwin’s death in both the Vita and Aelred’s Life of St Edward; and the description of the Black Cross given in both the Vita and the prefatory portion of Aelred’s Genealogia sometimes referred to as the Lament for King David. In her insightful analysis of the relationship between the Dunfermline Vita and Aelred, Alice Taylor has demonstrated that the account of Earl Godwin’s death was probably a later interpolation derived from Aelred’s Life of Saint Edward since Aelred’s description of “the vision of the green tree” from the same work is also interpolated later in the Chronicle portion of the Dunfermline manuscript. She further compares six instances in which the the Dunfermline Vita and the Genealogia correspond. In one case, the lengthy account of Margaret’s ancestry, the text is shorter in the Vita than the Genealogia. An exception is Aelred’s briefer rendition of the combat between Edmund and Cnut, Edmund’s murder, and Cnut’s retribution, which is perhaps indicative of the Dunfermline Vita’s heightened interest in Margaret’s grandfather. I would add that the lengthier accounts given in the Genealogia are more likely to include Scriptural references and ecclesiastical concerns, most notably Aelred’s account of King Edgar’s speech to the clergy which is absent from the Vita.

91 The Genealogy and the Lament for King David were originally intended to constitute a single work. The artificial division is only the result of modern editing. See Watt, Scotichronicon, 3.xix.
Taylor identifies five instances in which the *Vita*’s account is more elaborate than Aelred’s: Malcolm’s confrontation with the traitor, and four others in which the qualities of Margaret’s ancestors are amplified. She concludes, “It is therefore probable that the additional attention devoted to Malcolm’s courage and mercy when faced with an assassin in the Dunfermline manuscript version of the *Vita* was one of a series of expansions made by the interpolator to provide an even more favourable picture of his subjects than their depiction in his source, the *Genealogia Regum Anglorum*.”

Aelred’s *Genealogia* and the Dunfermline *Vita* are almost identical in one other passage. In almost verbatim accounts, both Margaret (in the *Vita*) and David (in the portion of the *Genealogia* known as the Lament for King David) ask for the relic of the cross to be brought to them on their deathbed. It is puzzling that in both cases Margaret is described as being of English and Hungarian descent when earlier in both texts her ancestry is clearly identified as English and German. Watt surmises that this passage is derived from Aelred so it seems most reasonable to assume that it was added to the Dunfermline *Vita* after 1154.

Finally, Taylor notes textual parallels between the Cotton and Dunfermline versions of the *Vita* which lead her to postulate that Turgot was probably the original author of the portion of the *Vita* regarding the marriage of Malcolm and Margaret. Furthermore, she observes, Aelred’s account of the marriage in the *Genealogia* begins with the same sentence included in the Dunfermline *Vita*. Since the marriage account is shared by both the Dunfermline and Cotton texts and is therefore likely to be original to Turgot, and Aelred includes one of the same sentences in his account, she reasons that it might be assumed that Aelred was working off an early version of the *Vita*. Aelred acknowledges as much when he refers the reader to such a text. She then concludes,

---

94 See Part 1, Chapter 1.
96 Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 240-41. Compare for example Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 7vb: *magis tamen suorum quam sua voluntate, immo Dei ordinatione*; and Diii, chapter 3: *suorum magis quam sua voluntate, immo Dei ordinatione*. The other examples she gives are considered elsewhere.
97 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 7ra: *Cernens itaque edgarus etheling res anglorum undique perturbari …*. Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia*, PL 195: 734-735. See also the appendix, n. 172 and n. 173, where similarity with Symeon of Durham is also noted. Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 240-41.
98 Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia*, 195:735: *Hac occasione actum est ut Margareta regis Malcolmi nuptis traderetur, cujus laudabilem vitam et mortem pretiosam liber inde editus satis insinuat...*; translation in
plausibly, that Aelred’s source was not, however, the same version contained in the Dunfermline manuscript because: (1) the marriage account is situated between the interpolator’s account of the royal family’s flight to Scotland and Malcolm’s encounter with the traitor; and (2) it is thematically consistent with the interest of the interpolator in the status of the family.99

Taylor concludes that the *Vita* as it currently exists in the Dunfermline manuscript without the account of Godwin’s death could have been completed between December 1154 and December 1285, between the completion of the *Genealogia* and the Dunfermline compilation. In most of the cases, then, the similarities between Aelred’s works and the Dunfermline *Vita* are the result of the addition of Aelred’s material to the *Vita*. Given that the account of Earl Godwin’s death is so awkwardly and obviously inserted, Taylor postulates that it was added between 1249 and 1285 to a version of the Dunfermline *Vita* which existed before the Continuator completed the Dunfermline compilation. The *Vita* was perhaps therefore completed in two distinct stages.

I am in agreement with this detailed analysis, with the only caveat being that the relationship between Aelred and the *Vita* might be even more complicated. Hypothesizing that a textual analysis of narratives shared by both Aelred and the *Vita* might reveal details indicating a later evolution or interpolation of the text, I analyzed the textual tradition of the stories regarding the murder of Edmund Ironside and the death of the traitor Godwin.

In the Dunfermline *Vita*, an anonymous Danish traitor murders King Edmund by piercing him him through his private parts while he sat to do “what is required by nature,” and is then executed by Cnut.100 This version is an obvious elaboration of the more contemporary Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, followed by John of Worcester, which states simply that Edmund died on St Andrew’s day and was buried in Glastonbury alongside his grandfather, Edgar.101 The story then evolved to include specifics. The *Encomium Emmae*, commissioned by Queen Emma, the widow of Cnut and written c. 1041/2,

---


100 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 5.rb-va.

interprets the death of Edmund as an act of Divine Providence, ensuring that the kingdom was no longer torn by two competing rulers. Hermann the Archdeacon of Bury St Edmonds, writing c. 1100, is the first to identify the perpetrator as the acknowledged villain of the era, the traitorous Anglo-Saxon nobleman, Eadric Streona. William of Malmesbury likewise implicates Eadric Streona, and then rather delicately adds the ugly detail that Edmund was murdered while sitting down to do what is required by nature. Henry of Huntingdon relates a similar story in the second quarter of the twelfth century, using language very similar to that in the Dunfermline Vita. The connection between Edmund’s death and Eadric’s execution seems to be a later development. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the Encomium Emmae, and William of Malmesbury all relate Eadric’s execution after Edmund’s death without making any connection between the two.

Henry of Huntingdon, however, connects the two dramatic events and adds for the first time Cnut’s cunning interpretation of Eadric’s reward. It seems that the story began in the eleventh century simply with a record of Edmund Ironside’s death and was then increasingly embellished. William of Malmesbury added the specifics of the murder, and Henry of Huntingdon connects Edmund’s murder with the execution of Eadric Streona. The Dunfermline Vita seems to be situated somewhat in the middle of these narrative developments, without any indication of later embellishments. Like William of Malmesbury it includes the details of the murder and like Henry of Huntingdon it connects the murder with the execution of the murderer. It does not, however, identify Eadric Streona as the guilty party, perhaps suggesting that it predates the popular acceptance of that detail introduced by Hermann the Archdeacon.

102 Encomium Emmae reginae, ed. Campbell, 2.14. It should be noted that Emma was married to Cnut and the Encomium was written during the reign of their son. Wright assigns an earlier date of 1026 to the text. Wright, Cultivation of Saga, 190.
103 Hermann the Archdeacon, Memorials of St. Edmund’s Abbey, 1.39, ch. 9. Bury St. Edmund’s was founded by Cnut in 1020 and heavily patronized by him, which might explain why Eadric, an Anglo-Saxon not a Dane, is identified as the culprit.
106 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a.1017; Encomium Emmae, ed. Campbell, 2.15; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1015; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 2.181
The next story involves Edward the Confessor and the great Anglo-Saxon nobleman, Earl Godwin, who was suspected of being involved in the murder of the king’s brother, Alfred. Upon entering the king’s hall, the earl slips with one foot and recovers with the other stating: *Sic est frater fratrem adiuvans, et alter alteri in necessitate subveniens.* Edward the Confessor retorts that his brother, Alfred, would likewise have helped him if the traitor Godwin had allowed him to live: *Hoc inquit (meus) michi frater fecisset, si godwynus permisisset.* Only William of Malmesbury includes a similar account but with different characters: King Aethelstan and his cup-bearer. Following Edward the Confessor’s accusation, Godwin submits to an ordeal whereby the accused will choke on a piece of bread if guilty, suffocates, and is dragged out of the hall by his son. This story of “ordeal by blessed morsel” is found in three other sources, each of which dates to the early eleventh century: William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum* (c.1120); Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum* (c. 1129-1154); and the *Liber Monasterii de Hyda*, which concludes in 1023, but is extended to include events between 1035 and 1121 in a fragment contained in a thirteenth-century manuscript. Again, the version of this story rendered in the Dunfermline *Vita* seems to be situated within this early twelfth-century tradition.

These two stories in the Dunfermline *Vita* describing the deaths of Edmund Ironside and Godwin have early- to mid-twelfth century analogs, the latest being Aelred of Rievaulx’s work in the mid-twelfth century. Although I had originally hoped that an analysis might offer textual proof to confirm the hypothesis that these stories are later interpolations, in the end it neither confirms nor disproves the theory. Further consideration regarding the relationship between the work of Aelred of Rievaulx and the Dunfermline *Vita* is therefore warranted. We know the Aelred had access to some

---

109 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 6ra-6va.
version of the *Vita* as a source, and that he was an avid borrower.\textsuperscript{113} It might also be of significance that John of Fordun chose to cite a text similar to the Dunfermline *Vita*, rather than Aelred, although he had access to the latter’s work. Finally, a comparative textual analysis of those stories common to both the Dunfermline *Vita* and works by Aelred does not offer proof that the Dunfermline *Vita* evolved after the mid-twelfth century, when Aelred was also writing.

**Cotton and Dunfermline Manuscript Versions of the Vita**

The versions of the *Vita* in the Dunfermline and Cotton manuscripts differ significantly in three aspects: Margaret’s genealogy; the portrayal of Malcolm; and their treatment of twelfth-century developments related to Margaret’s cult.

**Genealogy**

The Dunfermline *Vita* accentuates Margaret’s royal Anglo-Saxon lineage. In seven out of the seventeen folios, Margaret’s saintly, distinctly Anglo-Saxon ancestry is traced through the millennia, beginning with Adam and the biblical icons, continuing to Woden, the divine progenitor of Germanic kings, and extending through the line of the most Christian Anglo-Saxon kings, each of whose probity and rectitude is detailed and evaluated.

In contrast, the Cotton manuscript aligns Margaret with Edward the Confessor’s Norman ancestry. It credits Edward’s religious inclinations equally to both his Anglo-Saxon and Norman – his paternal and his maternal – ancestry:

[Edmund Ironsides’] brother on his father’s side, but not on his mother’s, was the most religious and meek Edward, who proved himself the Father of his Country; and as another Solomon, that is, a lover of peace, protected his kingdom by peace rather than by arms. He had a mind that subdued anger, despised avarice, and was entirely free from pride. And no wonder; for as he derived the glory of his kingly rank from his ancestors, so also he derived from them as by hereditary right, the nobility of his life; being descended from Edgar, King of the English, and from Richard, Count of the Normans, his grandfathers on either side, men who were not only most

illustrious, but also most religious.\textsuperscript{114}

It then includes a brief \textit{Vita} of the revered duke of Normandy, Edward’s maternal grandfather, Duke Richard I:

Richard also, the father of Emma, the mother of this Edward, was an illustrious ancestor worthy of so noble a grandchild. He was a man of the greatest energy, and deserving of every praise. None of his forefathers ruled the earldom of Normandy with greater prosperity and honour, or were more fervent in their love of religion. Endowed with great riches, like a second David, he was poor in spirit; exalted to be lord over his people, he was a lowly servant of the servants of Christ. Among other things which he did as memorials of his love of religion, this devout worshipper of Christ built that noble monastery of Fecamp, in which he was often wont to reside with the monks, and where, in the habit of a secular but in heart a monk, he used to place the food of the brethren on the table when they were eating their silent meal, and serve them with drink; so that, according to the Scripture, “The greater he was the more he humbled himself in all things.” If any one wishes to know more fully his works of magnificence and virtue, let him read the \textit{Acts of the Normans}, which contains his history.\textsuperscript{115}

The inclusion of a sainted Norman ancestry in Margaret’s \textit{Vita} is a bit odd, a fact to which the author seems sensitive since he concludes this passage by stating somewhat awkwardly and repetitively, “On the father’s side only, as was before said, he [Edward the Confessor] was the brother of King Edmund, from whose son came Margaret, who by the splendour of her merits completes the glory of this illustrious family.”\textsuperscript{116}

Edward’s Norman heritage is not, technically speaking, pertinent to Margaret’s lineage, but by the end of the twelfth century, when the Cotton manuscript was transcribed, the author might have intended to associate Margaret with the increasingly popular cult of Edward the Confessor, thereby bolstering the legitimacy of the Norman dynasty as a whole.\textsuperscript{117} The cult of Edward the Confessor, the single common denominator between the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman ruling houses, had evolved

\textsuperscript{114} Diii, chapter 2; AASS, chapter 4; trans. Metcalfe, 299-300;
\textsuperscript{115} Diii, chapter 2; AASS, chapter 5; trans. Metcalfe, 300.
\textsuperscript{116} Diii, chapter 2; AASS, chapter 5; trans. Metcalfe, 300.
slowly and haltingly. After his death in 1066, his cult at Westminster lacked a strong popular following and the Norman abbots did not seem interested in promoting it.\(^{118}\) The first life of Edward the Confessor was written by an anonymous monk at the monastery of St Bertin in St Omer in Flanders. It was begun probably during his lifetime, in 1065, as an encomium for Edith’s family, but after the events of 1066 had drastically reshaped the political landscape a second book was added, recasting the story in more spiritual terms. It does not, however, present a strong case for Edward’s sanctity.\(^{119}\)

Later chroniclers would situate Edward the Confessor within a saintly genealogy but without advancing the cause for his saintliness. William of Malmesbury, writing for Queen Edith/Matilda c. 1125-35 with an introductory letter to her brother, King David, included an abbreviated *Vita* of the king, outlining the miracles he had performed, his prophetic abilities, and his monkish lifestyle. He justifies the inclusion of a summary of Edward’s saintly Anglo-Saxons ancestors by stating, “I think a knowledge of several members of the royal house of either sex is relevant, to establish that King Edward, of whom I was speaking before this digression, fell by no means short of the virtues of his ancestors.”\(^{120}\)

Osbert of Clare, a monk at Westminster, took the initiative to recast Edward’s story as more of a saint’s life, writing *Vita beati Edwardi regis Anglorum* in 1138.\(^{121}\) Despite his best efforts, however, both popular and monastic support for his cult appear to have remained minimal during the first half of the twelfth century.\(^{122}\)

Perhaps the most elegant argument for the advancement of Edward’s sanctity as an instrument of Plantagenet politics was made by Aelred of Rievaulx.\(^{123}\) In the dedication of his *Genealogia Regum Anglorum* to the future Henry II, Aelred makes an explicit connection between the venerated sanctity of the old Anglo-Saxon line and the legitimacy of the new Norman house. He prefaces his work by stating:

> When you see the integrity of your ancestors, the virtue that shone out and

\(^{118}\) Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 263-64.

\(^{119}\) *The Life of Edward the Confessor who rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. Barlow. Barlow suggests that the anonymous author might have been Goscelin (or Folcard). See Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 257-61.


\(^{122}\) See Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, 257-61.

the holiness that radiated from them, you will realize how natural it is to you to abound in riches, to excel in virtues, to be renowned for victories, and – more than all this – to glow with Christian religion and the prerogative of righteousness. To know that one has been bequeathed nobility of blood from the finest on both sides is a great incentive to acquiring habits; one is always ashamed to find a noble mind become ignoble in renowned offspring. And for bad fruit to spring from good stock is contrary to nature.  

Aelred asserts that not only is Henry descended from such glorious stock but he is also its continuing embodiment.  

King Henry II of England seems to have taken Aelred’s argument to heart. The canonization of Edward the Confessor was announced in two bulls issued by Pope Alexander III on 7 February 1161 and the translation of the king’s remains followed on 13 October 1163. Bernard Scholz suggests that although the ecclesiastics at Westminster initiated and propelled the process, Henry II also utilized it to his advantage. He “co-operated with the abbey of Westminster in the canonization in order to continue the policy of William the Conqueror and Henry I who had wielded the memory of Edward as a political tool. They venerated in Edward the king through whom Anglo-Saxon rulership had been transferred to the dukes of Normandy.” Scholz concludes that the intention was not to portray Henry in the role of priest-king, or holy king, but “to

---

124 Aelred of Rievaulx, *Vita Sancti Edwardi*, PL 195:716… *ut cum videris quanta fuerit antecessorum suorum probitas, qualis in eis virtus inuituerit, qualis splenduerit pietas, agnoscas, etiam quam naturale tibi sit abundare divitiis, flore virtutibus, victorius illustrari,* et quod his omnibus praestat, Christiana religione et justitiae praerogativa fulgere. *Est enim optimis mores obtinendos maximum incentivum, scire se ab optimis quibusque nobilitatem sanguinis meruisse, cum ingenuum animum semper pudeat in gloria pro genie degenerem inveniri, et contra rerum sit naturam de bona radice fructus malos pullulare.* Translation in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Historical Works*, trans. Freeland, 71. I am unable to find any reference to Henry’s nobility of blood “on both sides” in the PL version cited above. Perhaps it is derived from a different manuscript version.  

125 Turgot’s dedication to Queen Matilda in the Dunfermline *Vita* (fo.1vb) uses the same language almost verbatim: … *ut cum vidimus quanta fuit antecessorum suorum probitas qualis virtus enuituerit et qualis splenduerit pietas, agnoscamus etiam quam naturale sit ei habundare diviciis, flore virtutibus, bonis moribus illustrari, et quod hiis omnibus praestat religione christianae atque justicie praerogativa fulgere. Est (enim) ad optimis mores eligendos ac optinendos permaximum incentivum scire se quemquam ab optimis quibus nobilitatem sanguinis accepiisse, cum ingenuum animum semper pudeat in gloria pro genie degenerem inveniri, et contra rerum sit naturam de bona radice fructus malos pullulare.*  


provide the Plantagenets with the halo of an inherent sanctity.”

This was achieved by linking the well-attested sanctity of the Anglo-Saxon line with the newly-asserted legitimacy of the Norman rulers. King Henry himself made the association between the two by underscoring in his petition to the pope his shared blood with Edward the Confessor, whose sanctity, he asserted, radiated throughout the dynasty.

Aelred was commissioned to compose a life of the newly-canonicalized confessor king in which he employed the hagiographic trope of a prophetic vision to continue his promotion of Henry II as the current embodiment of inherited legitimacy. In the Vita Sancti Edwardi, Aelred reports that before Edward the Confessor died he had a vision foretelling calamity for Anglo-Saxon realm that would be righted “when a green tree, having been cut from its trunk and set apart from its own root at the space of three yokes, returns to its trunk and is restored to its old root … and, with its sap restored, flowers again and bears fruit, then some comfort in this tribulation and a remedy for the trouble we have foretold is to be hoped for.” Aelred then poetically interprets the portentous vision in terms of Henry II’s reign: “The tree flowered when the Empress Matilda came forth from the seed of both. And then it bore fruit when our Henry rose from it like the morning star, joining the two peoples like a cornerstone.” He thus marks the beginning of a new saintly dynasty, the result of the fruitful union of the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman lines. Notably absent is any mention of Margaret, who in his Genealogia represented the culmination of the holy line of Anglo-Saxon kings.

The saintly reputation of Edward’s Norman forebears had likewise evolved over time.

---

129 Vatican Library, latin 6024, fo. 150v, in a letter from King Henry II to Pope Alexander III: De cuius sanguine propagatum me, licet indignum, dignatus est dominus sua dispositione in solio regni eiusdem regis sublimare sicut datum fuerit desuper pro tempore regnaturum. The letter is printed in Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 310.
131 Aelred of Rievaulx, Historical Works, trans. Freeland, 205-6.
133 For further discussion see Martin Aurell, The Plantagenet Empire 1154-1224, trans. from French by
the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century:

For indeed he would be the mellifluous sweetness of the strong, the
courage of the weak, the defender of the orphaned, the supporter of the
wretched, the calmer of evils, the staff of the destitute, the repairer of
churches, the genuine light of the blind, the summit of the clergy, the
salvation of the needy, the pillar of the children, the ornament of prelates,
the salvation of widows, the apex of the priests, the lover of alliances, the
cultivator of virtues, the greatest hope of everyone, the compassion of the
sorrowful, the memorable assurance of friendships, the glory of the
despairing, the safeguard of presbyters, the throne of the laws, the ruler of
the people, the shepherd of the poor, the model of the upright, the weapon
of warriors, the judge of accusers and accused, the scale of judicial
investigations, the assuager of quarrels, the father of the exiled, the
receiver of the fugitive, the apportioner of offices, the sweet love of
servants, the example for all, the punishment of thieves, the defeat of
bandits, the corrector of believers, the labor of kindnesses, the wall of
regions, the light of all, the ideal of sanctities, the sweet chief of
magistrates, the aider of kings, the protector of all peoples.  

Richard’s son followed in his father’s pious footsteps, as William of Malmesbury
recorded:

Duke Richard [II] was the son of Richard I, and in good fortune and
integrity the equal of his father; in the things of God he surpassed him.
The monastery of Fécamp, begun by his father, he brought to completion.
He was as devoted to prayer and abstinence as any monk or hermit, and
his humility was so lowly that by long suffering he subdued the obstinacy
of those who attacked him. It is said, for example, that by night he would
give the servants who guarded him the slip, and join the monks all by
himself at matins, remaining on his knees till daybreak. This was his
practice particularly at Fécamp …After twenty-eight years in the dukedom
he trod the path of death, leaving orders that his body should be buried
near the door of the church, where it would be exposed to the feet of
passers-by and to the rain that fell from above, but in our own day
William, third abbot of that house, feeling that there was something wrong
in this, ended the prolonged neglect by raising the body from where it was
and placing it before the high altar.  

135 William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 2.178: Erat ille Ricardus filius Ricardi
Note that in the author’s time, the body was “raised” (*levatum*) and placed before the high altar by the abbot, which effectively amounted to an elevation and translation.

One year after Edward’s canonization, the sanctity of the Plantagenet royal house was recognized at the translation of the remains of the Dukes of Normandy, Richard I (942-996) and Richard II (996-1026), at the Abbey of the Holy Trinity at Fécamp in 1162, a ceremony in which Henry II participated, offering safe conduct for those who attended. Although these dukes also did not receive the papal canonization that was awarded to Edward, they were nevertheless recognized as saints through the translation ceremony. Thus, Edward’s sanctity was derived from both his Norman and Anglo-Saxon heritage, a sanctity which radiated uniquely through the Plantagenet dynasty, heirs to Edward’s kingdom. In following this hagiographic tradition the Cottonian manuscript succeeds in incorporating the Norman dynasty into Margaret’s ancestry when in fact Margaret was not related to Edward’s Norman ancestors in any way. This development makes the most sense if it reflects the perception of the Norman dynasty following the translation of the dukes’ relics in 1162.

The interpretation of Margaret’s genealogical relevance evolved along two very different lines. In the Dunfermline *Vita* her Anglo-Saxon ancestry anchors the narrative, occupying seven out of the seventeen folios. In the Cotton manuscript, however, the focus is centered on Edward the Confessor, both his Anglo-Saxon and Norman heritage, the latter of which is rather oddly incorporated into Margaret’s *Vita*.

---

Portrayal of Malcolm

The two versions of Margaret’s Life also differ in their characterization of Malcolm. Both the Dunfermline and Cotton versions of the Vita naturally describe him in terms that highlight Margaret’s behavior: he marries Margaret, is reformed by her Christian behavior, acts as her interpreter at the Church council, funds her charity, and his death causes her great sorrow. As is to be expected in a vita, the focus remains squarely on the hagiographic subject, Margaret. Somewhat less traditionally, Malcolm features much more prominently in the Dunfermline Vita in three specific instances: an encounter between Malcolm and a traitor, his legislative reforms, and his death. Each narrative will be analyzed in an attempt to understand the purpose for its inclusion.¹³⁷

Malcolm and the Traitor

I believe that Malcolm is cleverly associated with the parade of Anglo-Saxon rulers included in the Dunfermline Vita by comparing him favorably with those ancestors of Margaret who best exemplify the characteristics of a just king: Margaret’s grandfather, Edmund Ironside, and her great-uncle, Edward the Confessor. Edmund emerges as the warrior king glorified by his Christian faith. His invincibility and strength earn him the cognomen Ironside (yrnsyd). As the champion of the Christian English against the Danish invaders (whose Christianity is always suspect), he engages them repeatedly in battle, even fighting a dramatic duel with the Danish king, Cnut.¹³⁸ He is clearly the superior warrior, striking his opponent’s head “with such violence that it seemed to the spectators that he did not so much strike as hurl lightening. For it seemed that the single strokes between the sword and the helmet were erupting in fire, not only in appearance but kindled from above.”¹³⁹ When faced with certain defeat, the cunning Cnut, compromises by offering to share his empire. Edmund readily concedes because of his gentle spirit (erat suavis animi) and kindly disposition (erat benigne mentis).¹⁴⁰ And so, he “who had not yielded with swords is bent by friendly speech, and he who was not able

¹³⁷ D.E.R. Watt observes that Fordun and Bower, unlike Turgot, portray Malcolm “as the queen’s equal in the good works which they jointly performed – Malcolm is even (5.23, rubric) called ‘saint.’” Watt, Scotichronicon, 5.19. I would only clarify that while this observation holds true for the Cotton manuscript, the Dunfermline Vita shows evidence of portraying Malcolm more as the queen’s equal.
¹³⁸ Dunfermline Vita, fos. 4ra-5ra.
¹³⁹ Dunfermline Vita, fo. 4vb.
¹⁴⁰ Dunfermline Vita, fos. 5ra and 5rb.
to be bent by hostile attack is worn down.”

His desire for peace, to save his people from the ravages of war, led him first to offer himself in single combat and then to compromise with an enemy whom he clearly could have defeated.

Edmund Ironside’s half-brother, Edward the Confessor, embodies similar characteristics of both courage in the face of a challenge and the rule of a just king, acting in this case as both an arbiter and an agent of divine justice. The account of Godwin’s death was discussed earlier in the chapter in terms of its analogues. Here we will note how the Dunfermline Vita uses it to illustrate Edward’s judicious rule. Earl Godwin, father of both Edward’s wife and the future King Harold II, was suspected of being complicit in the death of Edward’s younger brother, Alfred. Godwin responds to this accusation by submitting to a trial whereby the accused will choke on a piece of bread if guilty. He takes the morsel, which had been blessed by the king, but he can neither swallow it nor cough it up, his eyes bulge, his arms and his legs stiffen, his entire body turns cold and very black and he dies.

This story is remarkable simply for its narrative potency and its graphic account of divine retribution, but it is also somewhat unique and oddly placed. The Cotton Vita omits it altogether despite its interest in Edward and his saintly lineage. William of Malmesbury alone includes a similar version of the brother-helping-a-brother story but with different characters: King Aethelstan and his cup-bearer. Aelred of Rievaulx includes a very similar account in his Life of Edward the Confessor (1163), which is entirely fitting given the subject, but it is not included in the Genealogia, which was written a decade earlier. Instead, Aelred restricts himself in the Genealogia to the simple statement that “[Edward’s] brother Alfred had died a cruel death in England, betrayed as it is thought, by Godwin.” In the Dunfermline Vita, however, this story stands out as the sole anecdote regarding Edward’s reign. Even the author seems to acknowledge its

---

141 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 5rb.
142 For an analysis that exculpates Godwin see Freeman, Norman Conquest, 1.327-35; for an opposing evaluation see Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 421.
143 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6rb-va.
145 Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195:734: Nam frater ejus Alfredus proditione, ut putatur, Godwini in Anglia crudeli morte perierat; translation in Aelred of Rievaulx: Historical Works, trans. Freeland, 113. Note also that Aelred does not implicate Emma in the crime as does the Vita, which tends to portray the Norman queen as a villain.
awkward placement stating at the end, “But now let us return to our story from which we have digressed a little.” It serves, however, to illustrate Edward’s just treatment of a traitor.

Malcolm’s noble character is likewise revealed by his judicious handling of a traitor. When the king hears that one of his retainers is planning to betray him, he responds by ordering his nobles to assemble at dawn for a hunt. Coming to a broad plain encircled by a dense forest, he stations his men in pairs around the open space. The author notes that in the vulgar tongue such a formal hunting technique is called a *tristram, tryst* being the Old French term for a method whereby the quarry was driven by dogs and men on horseback into an area enclosed by hedges or woods and then shot with arrows by dismounted men. This style of hunting was known to be particularly hazardous, a fact which only serves to highlight Malcolm’s courage in selecting this

---

146 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 6va: *Sed nunc ad narracionem nostram revertamur de qua paulisper digressus sumus*. Alice Taylor interprets this statement as direct evidence of its later interpolation. Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 232.

147 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8ra: *Igitur de hac virtutis femina locuturi quia caput mulieris vir sicut et viri christus, ideo de viro suo tanquam de capite duximus aliquid praetermittendum, ut cuius fuerit cordis quanti ne animi, unum opus eius hic exaratum legentibus declarat.*

148 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8rb. Barlow, *William Rufus*, 123-32. Edward of York, writing at the beginning of the fifteenth century describes such a hunting method in *Master of the Game*, although it had been in use for centuries. For examples, see Barlow, *William Rufus*, pp. 131-32. This method of hunting was also practiced at least as early as the twelfth century and probably earlier. Reginald of Durham’s *Life of St. Godric* mentions a large glade in the bishop’s forest near Finchale which was used for such a purpose, and which was called ‘the royal enclosure’ (*saepes regia*) because the woods encircling it resembled a crown, language which is curiously similar to the Dunfermline Vita’s description of the place as ringed ‘in the manner of a crown’ (*in modum corone*). Reginald of Durham, *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici, Heremitae de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson, 63; fo. 8r. D.E.R. Watt likens this type of hunt to one described in “… the alliterative poem, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*: ‘Men and hounds were stationed at various points around the area in which the game was to be hunted. Light greyhounds and other *taysours* [hounds for putting up and driving game] were slipped, and as they droved the deer the *stablye* or beaters belonging to the ring of stations, directed their course to where the lord and his party stood ready to shoot them. The men of the *stablye* also tried to strike down the deer if they came close enough, and at any of the stations there might be some larger greyhounds (*receivers*) to pull the deer down.’” Watt, *Scotichronicon*, 3.195 citing J. R. R. Tolkien and E.V. Gordon [eds.], *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 2nd ed., revised by N. Davis (Oxford, 1967), 106-7. Watt also suggests that the term *tryst* could derive from the literary figure, Tristram, “an Arthurian warrior, best known for his tragic love-affair with Isolde, but also particularly associated with hunting skills. Sir Thomas Malory, a younger contemporary of Bower, describes him thus: “And after, as he [Tristram] grewed in myght and strength, he laboured in huntynge and in hawkynge – never jantylman more that euer we herde rede of. And as the booke seyth, he began good mesure of blowynge of beestes of venery and beestes of chaace and all maner of vermaynes, and all the tearmys we have yet of hawkynge and huntynge. And therefore the booke of venery, of hawkynge and huntynge is called the booke of sir Tristrams.”” Watt, *Scotichronicon*, 3.195 citing E. Vinaver [ed.], *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* (Oxford, 1954), 279-80, cf. also the anonymous 13c., possibly Scots, romance, *Sir Tristrem*, 441-528 (G.P. McNeill [ed.], *Sir Tristrem* [STS, 1886], 13-15.
particular setting for a confrontation. 149 Malcolm himself appears to be fully cognizant of the danger. He orders the traitor to accompany him as his companion in the hunt. Once they are alone, he displays his courage by giving the traitor the perfect opportunity, taunting, “If you think to kill me, when would be better, safer, freer, and finally more manly?” 150 The traitor backs down in the face of such bravado, repents, and is magnanimously forgiven. Again, this story is not included in the Cotton manuscript, but a shorter version is included in Aelred’s Genealogia. 151

These accounts, considered together, are intended, I believe, to identify Malcolm with his wife’s vaunted Anglo-Saxon heritage. The noble character of the Anglo-Saxon kings is displayed through their just and righteous handling of the challenges of treachery, a trait which is then exemplified by Malcolm. 152 Edmund and Malcolm each confront their opponent bravely and singly, and Edward verbally challenges his brother’s murderer. The kingly characteristic of magnanimity is manifested by both Edmund’s peaceful compromise with the contentious Cnut and Malcolm’s charitable forgiveness of the craven traitor. Edward, however, is content with witnessing divine retribution for the unrepentant offender, a method that is equally just and effective, though less fortunate for the perpetrator. In contrast, King Cnut displays the Danish characteristics of cunning and duplicity, eschewing either divine retribution or open confrontation and relying instead on a trickster’s device – the literal interpretation of a verbal promise. Cnut’s shrewd (astutus) reliance on words is first demonstrated in his battle with Edmund Ironside; observing that he will lose the single combat, and not wishing to negotiate from such a disadvantaged position, he marshalls one final desperate assault. Only then does he break off and suggest a truce. 153 Later, Cnut promises the assassin, who had been seeking to ingratiate himself with the ungrateful king, that he will place his head above all the

---

149 Frank Barlow proposes that William Rufus was killed in 1100 during such a hunt when a companion, Walter Tirel, accidentally shot him with an arrow. Barlow, William Rufus, 425.
150 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8va.
151 Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195:735. Alice Taylor surmises that either “Aelred has abbreviated a longer text later used by the interpolator of the Vita or the latter has expanded upon Aelred’s text, thus creating his own longer version,” and that the latter scenario is the more likely. Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 239.
152 Compare also with Robert the Pious’s magnanimous treatment of twelve traitors. Helgaud of Fleury, Vie de Robert le Pieux, chapter 4.
153 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 4vb.
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English and Danish nobles. He then orders him to be beheaded and his head suspended on the uppermost gate of London.\textsuperscript{154}

**Malcolm’s Legislative Reforms**

Malcolm’s qualities as a ruler are then underscored by his actions as a legislator. He proposes and argues for five reforms: the right of any household to free its slaves; a prohibition against the king accepting bribes; a prohibition against any pardoned exiles bringing charges for previous criminal accusations before the king; a prohibition against the king seizing the estates of the deceased; and a prohibition against the king using his superior rank in court proceedings.\textsuperscript{155} Perhaps these are best seen within the “mirror of princes” genre, advice manuals written by clerics and scholars for noble patrons regarding the proper qualities of Christian ruler. Examples of such treatises began with the Merovingians, and were refined during the Carolingian era.\textsuperscript{156} Closer in time and place to our study are the *Admonitions of St Stephen* and the dedication of Aelred of Rievaulx’s *Genealogia*. The *Admonitions* was allegedly written by St Stephen for his son Imre as direction on ideal rulership.\textsuperscript{157} Aelred had intended for his *Lament for King David* to be viewed as the preface for his *Genealogia*, which is dedicated to the future Henry II of England. In the *Lament*, he catalogs King David’s exemplary qualities: humble, chaste, merciful, and just. Likewise, Aelred’s *Life of King Edward*, was dedicated to King Henry, pointing to Edward’s life as an example.\textsuperscript{158} The qualities Malcolm exemplifies are consistent with the effort throughout the text to portray him as the ideal ruler.

Malcolm’s legislative reforms are unique to the Dunfermline manuscript and intentionally placed, I believe, to provide a parallel to Margaret’s ecclesiastical reforms.

\textsuperscript{154} Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 5va.
\textsuperscript{155} Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 11va-vb. The content of these reforms will be considered here only briefly as it will be the subject of a forthcoming article by Robert Bartlett.
\textsuperscript{158} For Aelred’s works as a “mirror of princes” see Marsha Dutton, *Introduction*, in *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, trans. Freeland, 10-12.
First, these reforms take place at the same council that Margaret chairs. The Dunfermline 
\textit{Vita} prefaces the account by stating that Margaret held frequent councils in order to 
correct the improper religious practices of the Scots. At one council in which she 
participated directly, for “two or even three days” the king was present acting as her chief 
advisor, supporting her most willingly in each of her endeavors.\textsuperscript{159} After setting the 
stage, the \textit{Vita} declares that “the king thoroughly annulled certain unjust practices 
contrary to royal piety, which had been done inappropriately by his ancestors against all 
pious justice.”\textsuperscript{160} Like his wife, Malcolm was intent on correcting previous unjust 
customary practices, but in the secular rather than the ecclesiastical field. Like Margaret, 
he specifies the particular misconduct of his predecessors after proposing each reform, 
except the second: some people had previously objected to the “good work” of freeing 
slaves; previously the king had destroyed the homes of people based on the verbal 
testimony of exculpated exiles; the king would no longer practice the custom of seizing 
the estates of the deceased; and “often the rights of lesser men had been subverted by 
rank as well as by affection.”\textsuperscript{161} 

The parallel between the secular and ecclesiastical proposals is underscored by 
the fact that in each case they number exactly five. We saw earlier that Margaret is 
credited with enacting reforms regarding: the number of days in Lent; the correct practice 
of taking communion; the proper celebration of the Mass; the proper observance of the 
Lord’s Day; and cautioning against incestuous marriages with in-laws.\textsuperscript{162} A final 
connection between the legislative actions of the royal couple is the fact that the king and 
queen are portrayed as being mutually supportive. Malcolm proposes the reforms at the 
suggestion of the queen: “He did so for love of God and at the queen’s entreaty, for the 
petitions which she had urged on him for a long time, he conceded to her in the hearing 
of all.”\textsuperscript{163} The king’s reforms are approved by both the king and the queen, in addition to 

---

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{See Part 2, Chapter 2.}  
\textsuperscript{160} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11va: \textit{Unde et ipse rex quedam iniqua et regali pietati contraria que ab 
antecessoribus suis contra omnem pietatis justiciam usurpata fuerant,...}  
\textsuperscript{161} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11va-vb: \textit{Cui bono operi quidam ante contradicebant; Ante enim rex iuxta verba 
huiusmodi reconciliatorum sine allis testibus domus eorum depopulat; Hoc enim quam diu factum est, 
nec eo nec hominibus acceptabile fuit; Sic enim quandoque inferiorum iura tum honore cum amore 
subvertebantur.}  
\textsuperscript{162} \textit{See Part 2, Chapter 2.}  Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fos. 11vb-12vb; \textit{Diii, chapter 8.}  
\textsuperscript{163} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11va.
the bishop and magnates of the realm and to the acclaim of the entire populace.\textsuperscript{164} The king was, in turn, present at the council to support the queen, and “whatever she ordered in this cause he was most prepared to say and do.”\textsuperscript{165}

We have, then, five legislative reforms and five ecclesiastical reforms, the first championed by the king and the second by the queen, passed at the same council with each supporting the other’s effort. It seems that the author of the \textit{Vita} intended for the two rulers to be viewed as acting in a coordinated and symbiotic partnership for the good of the realm. In case there is any doubt, the author states elsewhere that Margaret was “preordained” to be “queen of the entire realm, or rather a partner to the king.”\textsuperscript{166} In the Cotton \textit{Vita}, however, Malcolm’s legislative proposals are not included and he is presented primarily as a monarch and husband appropriately reformed and supportive of both his wife, and through her, the Church. The focus remains squarely centered on Margaret and her ecclesiastical reforms.

\textit{Malcolm’s Death}

Malcolm is depicted uniquely in this manuscript as a noble ruler who is unjustly murdered, similar to the hagiographic type that had gained popularity in the newly Christianized kingdoms on the fringe of Europe: kingdoms in Eastern Europe, Anglo-Saxon England, and Scandinavia.\textsuperscript{167} We will begin here with popular cults in the twelfth century in the further orbits of Eastern Europe and Scandinavian before returning to the Anglo-Saxon models which have more bearing on Margaret’s lineage.

Early examples of representative cults include Sts Boris and Gleb of Kievan Rus and St Wenceslas of Bohemia.\textsuperscript{168} Wenceslas (908-935), noted for his piety and charity and just rule, welcomed his murder at the hands of his brother with the passive resignation of a true martyr. Three years later, the murderer himself, Boleslav, proclaimed the sanctity of his victim by translating the remains to the castle in Prague.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{164} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11vb.
\bibitem{165} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 11rb; Diii, chapter 7.
\bibitem{166} Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 7vb.
\bibitem{167} For the cults of murdered royals see Folz, \textit{Les saints rois} 23-67; Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 158-67.
\end{thebibliography}
Boris and Gleb were the sons of Vladimir, the first Christian ruler of Kiev, who were murdered in 1015 during the protracted struggle by Vladimir’s twelve sons for the throne. The first to promote their cult was the victor of these struggles, Jaroslav, who placed the blame for their assassination, not surprisingly, on his rival Svjatopolk. In 1072, the relics of these martyred princes were solemnly translated by the victors of the next generation, Izjaslav (d. 1078), Svjatoslav (d. 1076), and Vsevolod (d. 1093), and again in 1115.¹⁷⁰

The prototypical Scandinavian royal martyr was St Olaf Haraldsson of Norway (d. 1030).¹⁷¹ He had been exiled to Kiev, where he might have become acquainted with Margaret’s father and uncle.¹⁷² After returning to Norway, he was killed in battle by the forces of King Cnut. Miracles were immediately reported after his death and in 1031, with the support of Cnut’s son Swein and Swein’s Anglo-Saxon mother Aelfgifu, Olaf’s

---


¹⁷² See Part 1, Chapter 1.
relics were translated and he was recognized as a saint. The cult was further promoted by Olaf’s son, Magnus Olafsson (d. 1047), and his half brother Harald Sigurdsson.\footnote{Antonsson, \textit{St Magnus of Orkney}, 112.} For the purposes of our study it is important to note the points of contact between these cults and Margaret’s family. Olaf Haraldsson and Margaret’s father, Edward the Exile, probably encountered the cults of Sts Boris and Gleb during their joint sojourn in Kiev. Similarly, Turgot, the author of Margaret’s \textit{Vita} is said to have spent time at the Norwegian court of King Olaf III (1067-1093), perhaps as a tutor to his son Magnus.\footnote{Symeon of Durham, \textit{Historia Regum}, in \textit{Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia}, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1074; See also \textit{Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea}, ed. Hinde, i, lxi.} The cult of St Olaf was also popular in Northumbria, where the grandfather of David’s wife, Siward, had erected a church in his honor.\footnote{Stéphane Coviaux, “Les Échanges Culturels au Sein du Monde Nordique: L’exemple du Culte de Saint Olaf,” \textit{Les Échanges Culturels au Moyen Âge} (2002): 207-25. Also, David’s father-in-law, Earl Walthoeof was popularly considered a martyr. See Johanek, “‘Politische Heilige’ auf den britischen Inseln im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert,” 90-91.} The popularity of this model of sanctity endured into the twelfth century in those kingdoms and territories within the Scandinavian orbit. St Cnut IV of Denmark (d. 1086) was canonized by Pope Paschal II 1100.\footnote{On the development of the cult and its political ramifications see Antonsson, \textit{St Magnus of Orkney}, 127-33; Aidan Conti, “Ælnoth of Canterbury and Early Mythopoiesis in Denmark,” in \textit{Saints and Their Lives on the Periphery: Veneration of Saints in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe (c. 1000-1200)}, ed. Haki Th. Antonsson and Ildar H. Garipzanov (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming).} At about the same time, an unknown clergyman of Odense wrote the \textit{Passio sancti Kanuti regis et martyris}, in which Cnut is portrayed as a just Christian ruler who is unjustly martyred by those resenting his Christian reforms.\footnote{For the edited text see \textit{Passio sancti Kanuti regis et martyris}, in \textit{Vitae sanctorum Danorum}, ed. Martin Clarentius Gertz (Copenhagen: J. Jørgensen for Selskabet for Udgivelse af Kilder til dansk Historie, 1908-12), 62-71.} Following the translation of Cnut’s relics in 1101, Aelnoth of Canterbury wrote a hagiographic account of his life (c.1120).\footnote{For the edited text see \textit{Gesta Swegnomagni Regis et filiorum eius et passio gloriosissimi Canuti Regis et martyris}, in \textit{Vitae sanctorum Danorum}, ed. Martin Clarentius Gertz (Copenhagen: J. Jørgensen for Selskabet for Udgivelse af Kilder til dansk Historie, 1908-12), 77-136.} Haki Antonsson notes that this “work is both a history of the Danish royal dynasty and a Life of St [Cnut] IV,” rendering it similar, in this way, to the Dunfermline \textit{Vita} with its dual focus on a history of the Anglo-Saxon line and Margaret’s Life.\footnote{Antonsson, \textit{St Magnus of Orkney}, 36.} Recognition of Scandinavian royal sanctity extended well into the late twelfth
century. A hagiographic account of Cnut Lavard of Denmark (d. 1131) was written by Robert of Ely and his sanctity was confirmed by Pope Alexander III in 1170. \(^{180}\) Erik of Sweden died in 1160 and the translation of relics followed perhaps in 1167, although his sanctity was not recognized by the papacy until 1256 when Alexander IV granted indulgences to pilgrims who visited his tomb. \(^{181}\)

The cult of St Magnus of Orkney bridged the closely related worlds of Scotland and Scandinavia. He was the son of Erlend, who in turn was the son of Ingibjorg, Malcolm III’s first wife, through her first marriage to Thorfinn of Orkney, thereby making him a half-brother to Duncan II. He was killed in 1117 and his relics elevated in 1135 by the descendant of a rival branch, Rognvald, seeking sacral legitimization of his rule. \(^{182}\)

There seems to be a connection between the English cults of martyred rulers and their later Scandinavian counterparts: Aelnoth of Canterbury wrote a Life of Cnut IV and Robert of Ely composed one for Cnut Lavard. David Rollason attributes this connection to the missionary activities of English monks who were in turn influenced by the popular cults of royal Anglo-Saxon martyrs. \(^{183}\) Royal families sometimes promoted cults to


\(^{182}\) Antonsson, *St Magnus of Orkney*, 72, 77-78.

bolster their position relative to neighboring dynasties. For example, St Eahlmu of Derby (d. c. 800), the martyred king of Northumbria, was killed by King Eardwulf of Northumbria, but he was interred and recognized as a saint by the Northumbrian king’s opponent, King Cenwulf of Mercia. Alternatively, the cult of a martyred king could be employed in a conflict between collateral branches of a royal house. The cult of the Mercian murdered prince, Kenelm (d. c. 810), son of King Cenwulf, was used against the rival branch which descended from Penda.

The cult of Edmund of East Anglia continued to flourish in the century after the Norman Conquest. King Edmund was murdered by pagans in 869 and his Passio written a century later by Abbo of Fleury. Hermann the archdeacon, writing in the last years of the eleventh century, supplemented Abbo of Fleury’s work with a collection of miracles and an account of the translation of the body of St Edmund in 1095. The twelfth century witnessed a growing compendium of miracle accounts, and the introduction of a work entitled De infantia sancti Edmundi, written c. 1155 by Geoffrey of Wells, which was devoted to the martyred king’s childhood and early life.

185 Rollason, Saints and Relics, 123; Thacker, “Kings, Saints, and Monasteries,” 10 and 14.
186 For Edmund’s cult see Ridyard, Royal Saints, 61-73, 211-33.
187 Abbo of Fleury, Passio sancti Eadmundi Regis et Martyris, in Three Lives of English Saints, ed. Michael Winterbottom (Toronto: Center for Medieval Studies, 1972), 67-87. Ridyard cautions that the manuscript versions of Abbo’s Passio survive from the eleventh century and might, therefore, include post-Conquest interpolations. Ridyard, Royal Saints, 65.
188 Hermann archidiaconi liber de miraculis sancti Eadmundi, in Memorials of St Edmund’s Abbey, ed. Thomas Arnold, 3 vols, Rolls Series 96 (London, 1890-96), 1.26-92. For the most recent assessment of Hermann as an author see Tom Licence, “History and Hagiography in the late Eleventh Century: The Life and Work of Herman the Archdeacon, Monk of Bury St Edmunds,” English Historical Review, cxxiv. 508 (June 2009): 516-44. Licence argues that Hermann was interested in history as much as hagiography, crafting a unique, seamless account, and as such he was superior to other hagiographers, including Turgot. He disagrees with Antonia Gransden’s conclusion that Hermann never existed. Antonia Gransden, “The Composition and authorship of the De miraculis sancti Edmundi Attributed to ‘Hermann the Archdeacon’,” Journal of Medieval Latin, v (1995): 1-52.
In the Dunfermline Vita, Edmund Ironside’s death is comfortably if somewhat obliquely couched within this tradition of the princely martyr. The similarities between the narrative portraits of the legendary St Edmund and his namesake, Edmund Ironside are striking and, I believe, not coincidental. They are both characterized as Christian kings who are martyred while fighting the pagan Danes. In a reference to Matt. 10:16, St Edmund combines the ‘cunning’ of ‘serpents’ with the ‘harmlessness’ of ‘doves’ while Edmund Ironside was of “lionlike ferocity” against his enemies and ‘dovelike in candor’ toward his friends. Edmund is tied to a tree and shot through with arrows by the Danes, in an obvious allusion to the martyr St Sebastian, while Edmund Ironside is pierced with a sword by a treacherous Dane, both men portrayed as powerful warriors who had been murdered while at their most defenseless and vulnerable.

In case the reader (or listener) failed to make the association between Edmund Ironside and the East Anglian martyr, the author of the Vita invents a martyr’s death for another Edmund, King Edmund of Wessex (d. 946). According to other chronicle accounts, the Wessex king was killed while defending his steward against an exiled criminal, an undeniably noble and selfless act, but one that lacked the key components of a proper martyrdom. He does not die at the hands of horrible pagans or in battle while defending his faith and his kingdom. In the Dunfermline Vita, however, the Wessex king is deliberately likened to his East Anglian namesake by being described as a most Christian defender against the impious pagans, meaning the Danes, who planned his

Susan Ridyard reconciles conflicting opinions regarding the sequence of these compositions: “Osbert’s work was composed after his visit to Rome in 1139 and comprised only miracles not included in the Morgan collection; thereafter Abbot Samson revised the Morgan collection and added an appendix to one of its miracles; and finally, late in the twelfth or early in the thirteenth century, a further Bury compiler conflated Osbert’s miracles with those of Abbot Samson to produce the collection now extant in Titus A. viii.” Ridyard, Royal Saints, 71-72; R. M. Thomson, “Two versions of a saint’s Life from St Edmund’s abbey: changing currents in XIth century monastic style,” Revue Bénédictine 84 (1974), 391-3 [383-408]. For edited texts of De infantia sancti Edmundi see: “Geoffrey of Wells, De infantia sancti Edmundi (BHL 2393),” ed. R. M. Thomson, Analecta Bollandiana 95 (1977): 34-42; Memorials of St Edmund’s Abbey, ed. Arnold, 1.93-103.

On the probability that the House of Wessex adopted the name see Folz, Les saints rois, 138; Ridyard, Royal Saints, 224-25.

For Edmund of East Anglia see Abbo of Fleury, Passio Sancti Eadmundi; also discussed in Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 91. For Edmund Ironside see Dunfermline Vita, fo. 4ra-rb.

William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 1.159; John of Worcester, Chronicle, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 946. The attack occurred at Pucklechurch in Gloucestershire, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D, s.a. 946. Henry of Huntingdon states only that the king was ‘struck down by an execrable treachery’ in Historia Anglorum, ed. Greenway, 5.21.
death by nefarious treachery. The author’s discomfort with the manufactured story is evident in the deliberately ambiguous and sketchy manner in which he relates it. The perpetrators are nameless opponents, whose planned regicide is ill-defined. If the author of the Dunfermline *Vita* wanted to link Edmund Ironside with a martyred namesake, why would he undertake such narrative contortions? Why invent a wholly fictitious murder by pagans for King Edmund of Wessex instead of associating Edmund Ironside with the popular and undeniably martyred ninth-century king of East Anglia? After all, the dynasty of Wessex had embraced the East Anglian saint as a legitimizer of its line of rulers since the ninth century. His name was incorporated into the Wessex line: Edmund was king of England (939-946) as was Edmund Ironside (1016). The saint also benefited from royal patronage: Athelstan (d. 939), Cnut (d. 1035), and Edward the Confessor (d. 1066) all endowed the saint’s shrine at Bury St. Edmund’s. If the intention of the author of the Dunfermline *Vita* had been to associate Malcolm and Edmund Ironside with a dynastic royal martyr, then Edmund of East Anglia would have been a natural and effective choice. However, the focus of this text is on the House of Wessex and its distinctive, elaborate genealogy. Perhaps it was not enough to adopt a martyred saint from another dynasty into the genealogy. Instead a martyr’s death had to be invented for a former Wessex king named Edmund. In any case, the invented martyrdom certainly provides a strong narrative link between the martyrdom of the East Anglian king and the death Edmund Ironside.

The laudatory account of the Edmunds – Edmund of Wessex and Edmund Ironside – and the grisly manner of their deaths are intended, I believe, as clear parallels for what is meant to be seen as the similar type of martyrdom of Malcolm III. Their deaths were not martyrdoms in the classic sense of suffering and death in defense of one’s faith. Rather, they represent a later re-interpretation of the martyred ruler as the noble ruler who is unjustly murdered. In an account given only in the Dunfermline *Vita* and then copied by John of Fordun, Malcolm’s death is described at the siege of

---

193 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 2vb.
195 Aidan Conti observes that Aelnoth of Canterbury also made use of parallel illustrations to highlight the martyr’s death suffered by Cnut IV. Conti, “Ælnoth of Canterbury and Early Mythopoiesis in Denmark,” in *Saints and Their Lives on the Periphery*, Antonsson and Garipzanov, forthcoming.
Alnwick in 1093. According to the Vita, those besieged within the castle, recognizing their imminent defeat, devise a cunning plan in which “one who was more expert than the others in trickery” offers to ride out and present the keys of the castle to Malcolm at the end of his spear. The king hastens from his tent, “unarmed” and therefore defenseless. As the king approaches, the villain stabs him with his spear and runs off into the nearby woods.

The author of the Dunfermline Vita thus casts both Edmund Ironside and Malcolm in the role of the martyred ruler, a type that was widely known and still popular in northern Europe in the twelfth century. Like Sts Magnus, Olaf, and other royal Scandinavian martyrs, they had suffered a treacherous death while defenseless and vulnerable. Like St Cnut IV, Malcolm is pierced with a lance, an obvious allusion to the Passion of Christ. Still, the author was forced to labor diligently in order to draw these parallels, and the final effect is somewhat clumsy. Malcolm offers no final prayer protesting his innocence and commending himself to the mercy and justice of the Lord. He does not die in defense of the Christian faith, but while besieging a town, and at the hands of the Normans, not any pagan non-believers.
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196 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 17ra-rb. Intrigingly, the assassin in this case is a Norman rather than a Dane, in which case a connection must be inferred between the Normans and the pagan Danes if the martyrdom narrative is to be considered literally. Such an interpretation of a pagan orientation might not have been too far-fetched for contemporaries. Pauline Stafford comments that Queen Emma’s family considered themselves as much a part of the northern world as the French. She notes, for example, that although Emma’s father received a Christian burial, it took place “on the heights above the harbour of Fécamp like a Viking warrior.” Stafford, Queen Emma & Queen Edith, 209-17, quote on 210.

197 In contrast, Paul Hayward asserts that the cults of Anglo-Saxon “innocent martyrs” show that they were considered as such not only because of the manner of their death, but because their martyrdom in combination with their youth and posthumous miracles are evidence of their innocence. Paul A. Hayward, “The Idea of Innocent Martyrdom in Late-Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Hagiography,” in Martyrs and Martyrologies, Studies in Church History 30, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1993), 84. Would such an interpretation imply that Turgot, more rooted in Scandinavian world, was author of this martyrdom narrative rather than Aelred? Alternatively, perhaps this view of Malcolm was fostered by his immediate family. Paul Hayward asserts that the cults of Anglo-Saxon martyr-saints were originally established as an expression of “private religious devotion” of the family toward a particularly admired ancestor. Paul A. Hayward, “The Idea of Innocent Martyrdom in Late Tenth- and Eleventh-Century English Hagiology,” 86. See also: N. W. Ingham, “The sovereign as martyr, East and West,” Slavic and East European Journal, 17 (1973): 1-17; Edward S. Reisman, “The cult of Boris and Gleb: remnant of a Varangian tradition?” Russian Review, 37 (1978): 141-57; R. M. Price, “Boris and Gleb: Princely Martyrs and Martyrology in Kievan Russia,” in Diana Wood, ed., Martyrs and Martyrologies, Studies in Church History 30 (Oxford: Blackwell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1993), 105-15.

198 Although, again, the author does not appear to have been overly fond of the Normans, and the implied aspersion might have been intentional.
The intent of the Dunfermline *Vita* might have been to depict Malcolm as a type of martyr, a fitting complement to the saintly Margaret and a worthy successor to the noble Anglo-Saxon heritage, in order to emphasize the partnership between the royal couple. In this regard, it agrees with the laudatory account of Malcolm III given by some twelfth-century chroniclers. The interpolation in the D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle naturally focuses on Margaret but it also portrays her husband as a pious and holy man stating that through Margaret’s influence “he turned to God and despised every impurity,” and was “made holy.” William of Malmesbury is more direct in his assessment that both Malcolm and Margaret were “famous for their devotion,” but qualifies this somewhat by adding “especially the queen.” The *Gesta Stephani* infers their shared sanctity by recording that David I was a worthy heir to his religious parents.

Scottish Audience

The Dunfermline *Vita* is clearly oriented toward a Scottish audience. Whereas the Cottonian version only mentions St Andrews by name, the Dunfermline version identifies several Scottish place names associated specifically with Margaret’s cult: the Bay of St Margaret (fo. 7rb: *sinus sancta margarite*); Dunfermline as the location of Margaret’s marriage (fo. 8vb) and as the place of Margaret’s burial (fo. 17vb); and St Andrews (fo. 14ra). St Andrews is associated with the cult of St Margaret in a passage that is unique to the manuscript. After describing how St Margaret arranged for a ferry to transport pilgrims to St Andrews and to provide hospitality for them, the author then continues:

And since it is written that he who prays for others, also works on his own behalf. And elsewhere: You will be measured by the same standard of measurement by which you have measured others. What the venerable queen had done out of reverence for the Holy Apostle Andrew, now conferred honor on her, and that reverence which she had shown by her compassion for those wretched ones, she already now shares with Him. For no one considers himself to have been completely satisfied in his own

---

199 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, D. s.a. 1067.
pilgrimage to Saint Andrew unless he has visited, either in coming or in going, with great reverence, the holy place of mercy where the body of Queen Margaret rests. And deservedly, since just as in her life no one needy ever went away from her empty-handed, neither did anyone needy return from her tomb without consolation, if he has asked without hesitating in true faith. Whence it is written about her: This hope of reward through prayer, that a cure can be sought for every disease, was confirmed by coming to the aid of the deserving, of the sick, and of those shouting with devotion.

It is possible that this emphasis on St Andrews is related to the fact that Turgot was appointed to the bishopric in 1107. I think it more probable, however, that this passage was written after sufficient time had passed to allow for the popular recognition of Margaret’s sanctity to take root.

Alice Taylor also observes that the Continuator of the Dunfermline Vita underscores Margaret’s association with Dunfermline, leading to the suggestion that the author was affiliated with the abbey. I would only add that such interest is also evident in passages unique to the Dunfermline Vita. The location of Margaret and Malcolm’s marriage is identified as a place “which now is called Dunfermline, but at that time the king held as a town,” suggesting that it had undergone a period of evolution.

In addition to stressing Scottish place names, the Dunfermline Vita neglects to mention any instance in which the Scots were defeated by the English. Aelred of Rievaulx, in contrast, notes such numerous English victories in his Genealogia Regum Anglorum: Edward the Elder defeats the Scots; St John of Beverly promises victory over the Scots to Aethelstan at Brunanburh in 937; Edmund grants Cumberland to Malcolm in exchange for the latter’s allegiance; Eadred extracts an oath of allegiance from the Scots; and Edgar secures the submission of the Scots.

Treatment of Twelfth-century Developments Regarding Margaret’s Cult

202 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 14 ra.
204 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8vb.
205 Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, PL 195:711-38; translated in Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works, trans. Freeland, 71-122. Compare the accounts in the Dunfermline Vita, fos. 2va, 2vb, 2vb-3ra, again on 3ra and 3rb, with Aelred, Genealogia, PL cols. 723, 724-5; Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 945; Aelred, Genealogia, PL 195:725, 726, respectively. Alice Taylor also notes the specific instance in which “Eadred’s casual subjection of the Northumbrians and Scots is missing,” concluding that is was excised from Aelred’s text. Taylor, “Historical writing,” 238-39.
The Dunfermline *Vita* is also notable for the absence of any references to developments after the mid-twelfth century which might have had a direct and significant impact on Margaret’s cult. Both the Cotton and Dunfermline versions probably antedate Margaret’s miracle collection since they do not describe any posthumous miracles, although the Dunfermline *Vita* alludes to unspecified instances of her supernatural intervention on behalf of supplicants at her shrine. Bartlett hypothesizes that the miracles were collected for Margaret’s canonization inquiry in the mid-thirteenth century, with the latest recorded miracle dating to 1263. However, the author of the collection also claims to have heard directly from the supplicant in question, a monk at Dunfermline Abbey, about a miracle that took place at Margaret’s shrine in 1180, leading Bartlett to surmise that perhaps the collection was assembled at an earlier date and then later interpolated. Surely, if this *Vita* was composed at Dunfermline Abbey after that miraculous event at the abbey, then such verification of Margaret’s sanctity would have been included, perhaps as a brief addendum.

The two versions differ in their treatment of the translation of Margaret’s relics in 1180. The late twelfth-century Cotton manuscript begins with the rubric “*Incipit Translatio et Vita Sanctae Margaretae reginae Scottorum,*” presumably a reference to the event. The Dunfermline *Vita*, however, remains silent. Furthermore, the Dunfermline *Vita* does not include any mention of the cult of Edward the Confessor, which, following his papal canonization in 1161 and the translation of his relics in 1163, would have bolstered Margaret’s claims to sanctity by association. As we have seen, the Cotton manuscript, written in the last quarter of the twelfth century works very hard to include these saintly Normans in Margaret’s ancestry even though such a direct lineage is, of course, pure invention.

Language is also a possible differentiator between the two versions of the *Vita*. The author of the Dunfermline *Vita* continues to refer to William I as “the bastard” even though by the early twelfth century he had begun to be called “the great” or “the
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206 Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 14ra.
208 *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea*, ed. Hinde, vii-lvii.
Conqueror” to distinguish him from his son, William Rufus.  Furthermore, the Old English term yrnsyd is used to identify Edmund by his cognomen, Ironside.  Aelred of Rievaulx uses the term Preysyd, although his translator concedes that this could be a copyist’s error.  Henry of Huntingdon is the only other chronicler, aside from the authors of the vernacular Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (s.a. 1057), who uses the appellation, spelling it as Irenside.  The Old English seems to have been dropped in favor of the Latin equivalent, ferreum latus, by the second half of the twelfth century.  The inclusion of Woden in Margaret’s genealogy is not atypical of the twelfth century, but seldom occurs afterwards.

Finally, it should be noted that the Dunfermline Vita remains silent where the Cotton version asserts that it was composed during the reign of Margaret’s son Edgar (1097-1107), which could be an indication that it is a later revision of the vita.

The markedly different evolution of the Cotton and Dunfermline manuscript versions of the Vita is evidence of distinct interpretations of Margaret’s memory.  The first invents a Norman heritage whereas the second emphasizes her Anglo-Saxon one.  The virtues of Malcolm as a just and wise ruler are underscored in the Dunfermline version whereas the Cotton manuscript restricts him to the more passive role of a saint’s supportive and loving spouse.  Finally, the Dunfermline Vita displays a distinct interest in Scotland, and does not seem to include any references to twelfth-century developments of

---

209 Freeman asserts that Orderic Vitalis was the first to use the term “Conqueror.” Freeman, History of the Norman Conquest, 2.409-11.
211 Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. Greenway, 356 and n. 52 in which the editor notes Henry’s use of the English form of the name.
213 Dunfermline Vita, fo. 16vb.
Margaret’s cult.
III.2. NURSED BY SAINTS

If the *Vita* functioned as the cornerstone in the construction of Margaret’s memory, then her children must be credited with laying the foundation upon which it would be built; Edith/Matilda commissioned the *Vita*, David elevated the Church of the Holy Trinity to abbatial status, and, perhaps most remarkably, each of her children sought to lead exemplary lives in imitation of their mother. Her cult does not seem to have been fostered initially for political reasons, but rather as an expression of filial devotion. The supernatural sanction of Margaret’s descendants’ right to rule was provided instead by St Cuthbert. By the time of her youngest child’s death in 1153, Margaret was popularly recognized as a saint and the foci of her cult were well-established. In all, the relationship between the children’s memory of their mother and the dynastic support afforded by their mother’s burgeoning cult was undeniably symbiotic. If Margaret was instrumental in founding a nursery of saints – to paraphrase Dom Knowles – then Margaret’s children were no less so in nursing her sanctity.¹

Filial Devotion

As we saw in the previous chapter, the initial catalyst for Margaret’s cult, was Turgot’s *Vita*, a text which was, significantly, written at the request of her daughter, Edith/Matilda, soon after she became queen of England through her marriage to Henry I.²

The prologue to the *Vita* begins:

By ordering you have asked and by asking you have ordered that I should offer to you an account in writing of your mother of venerable memory, a pleasing association with God which you have often heard proclaimed by the harmonious praise of many. Apparently you said that you especially trusted me in this matter, since you understood me to be privy to the most part of her secrets by reason of my great familiarity with her. These orders and desires I freely embrace, embracing I venerate greatly, venerating I congratulate you, that having been established Queen of the English by the

¹ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 242 refers to the Scottish court as “something of a nursery of saints,” a phrase which Derek Baker then incorporated into the title of his article. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 242; Baker, “‘A Nursery of Saints’: St Margaret of Scotland Reconsidered.”

² Perhaps Margaret’s *Vita* can be viewed as part of a trend on the part of the first Anglo-Norman generation after the Conquest to adopt rather than to replace native saints. See Ridyard, *Royal Saints*, 6-7, 121-9, 171-5; 196-210, 226-33, 251-2; Hayward, “Translation-Narratives.”
King of the Angels, you wished not only to hear what is correct but also to contemplate a written life of your mother the queen, who always longed for the kingdom of the angels.\(^3\)

In addition to this textual memorial to Margaret’s pious reputation, a more concrete acknowledgment of her status was commemorated through the increasing importance of Margaret’s foundation at Dunfermline. What had begun as a simple church marking the location of Margaret’s marriage to Malcolm became by the end of David’s reign a royal mausoleum dedicated to honoring her memory. Dunfermline soon eclipsed Iona, the sixth-century abbey founded by St Columba, where all kings of Scotland, with two exceptions, had been entombed.\(^4\) A certain symmetry exists in the fact that the last ruler of the Scots buried at this Columban foundation was Donald Bàn, Malcolm’s brother, who had founded his claim to the throne on his Gaelic base of support.\(^5\) Breaking with tradition, Margaret was entombed at Dunfermline at her direction:

So, her body was shrouded honorably as was appropriate for a queen, and we carried it to the church of the Holy Trinity, which she had built, and there, just as she herself had previously ordered, we surrendered it to the tomb, opposite the altar and the venerable sign of the Holy Cross, which she herself had erected. And so her body rests near Dunfermline, where she was accustomed to burden herself in vigils, prayers, tears, and kneeling, to the glory and praise of our Lord, Jesus Christ, who lives with God, the Father, and is glorified in unity of the Holy Spirit forever and ever, Amen.\(^6\)

From the beginning, this church was designed to memorialize the royal couple and their descendants:

After she had achieved the height of honor, she soon built in the place where her nuptials were celebrated an eternal monument to her name and religiosity. For she built there the noble church in honor of the Holy Trinity with the intention of three salutary wishes; evidently for redemption the king’s soul and her own, and in order to obtain prosperity for her offspring in the present and the future life.\(^7\)

---

\(^3\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 1ra; Diii, *prologus*.


\(^5\) Donald’s burial at Iona might have been a legend invented by the monks of Iona. Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 127-28.

\(^6\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 17va-vb.

\(^7\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 9ra-rb.
Despite such lofty ambitions, however, the architectural design of the church remained rather humble, consisting of two simple structures: a tower with a slightly narrower room to the east. Eric Fernie surmises that Margaret had this stone, Romanesque church constructed shortly after her marriage, describing it as “an unusual type of two-cell church with a tower for a nave.”¹⁸ The structure was then expanded to the east either during Margaret’s lifetime, or shortly after her death by her son Edgar. Excavations in 1916 conducted by Peter MacGregor Chalmers revealed five graves in this extension, two in the apse and three in the nave.⁹ Eric Fernie reasons that Margaret’s original grave was located in the center of the nave of the eastern addition, in front of the rood screen, meaning that this structure must have existed prior to Margaret’s death.¹⁰ Richard Fawcett adds that the embellished eastern piers of the nave might have been added after Margaret’s burial, intending to adorn her grave, and that the extension might, therefore have been added during the reign of her son.¹¹ In general, however, Fawcett is more inclined to locate the first burial place in the nave of the original stone structure, cautioning that it might have been overlooked during the course of the less-than-thorough excavations in 1916.¹²

Recent studies focused on the architecture of this early monument hint at the possibility of undocumented royal patronage. Noting that the eastern apse in the expanded structure is somewhat of an architectural novelty prior to the twelfth century in that geographic region, Richard Fawcett suggests that Edgar might have added it at the same time that he supplemented the monastic foundation with monks from Canterbury.¹³ Importantly for this study, such an act would have been one of the first public displays of the family’s devotion to Margaret’s memory, roughly coincident with the composition of

---

¹¹ Fawcett, “Dunfermline Abbey Church,” 41.
the *Vita*. Dunfermline’s early association with the royal family was strengthened when King Alexander caused his father’s remains to be taken from Tynemouth and reburied alongside those of his mother.\(^\text{14}\) Still, it remained a very modest establishment, measuring at the most roughly ninety feet long and less than thirty feet at its widest point, especially when compared with the cathedral that was begun in the same year as Margaret’s death in Durham.\(^\text{15}\) It was, indeed, an intimate, almost personal chapel.

This fairly humble foundation would flourish, however, under the patronage of Margaret’s youngest son, David, in terms of both its monastic status and physical reconstruction. Whether Dunfermline was a monastic house during Margaret’s life is not known. In a letter addressed to Margaret, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury indicates that he is sending Godwin and two other monks to accomplish “what is required in God’s service and your own.” He further requests, however, that they be returned to Canterbury.\(^\text{16}\) By 1120, Dunfermline was a priory as evidenced by Eadmer’s record of the arrival of Prior Peter of Dunfermline arriving at Canterbury.\(^\text{17}\) In the first years of his reign, David took steps that hinted at grander plans for his mother’s small foundation. From 1124-1128, he made a series of grants in favor of Dunfermline.\(^\text{18}\) In 1126, he elevated Dunfermline from a priory to an abbey and in the same year Geoffrey, the Prior of Christ Church Canterbury, was consecrated as its first abbot by Bishop Robert of St Andrews.\(^\text{19}\) Reflecting the enhanced standing of the abbey, the town of Dunfermline was granted burgh status before 1128.\(^\text{20}\) In all, 28 out of the existing 216 charters from his reign, thirteen percent, concern Dunfermline.\(^\text{21}\)

He also undertook a major expansion of the existing structure, culminating in the June 1150 dedication of new abbey church.\(^\text{22}\) Fernie emphasizes that throughout the
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15 Fernie, “The Romanesque Churches of Dunfermline Abbey.” 26, fig. 2.
17 Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, s.a. 1120.
20 *Registrum de Dunfermlyn*, ed. Cosmos Innes (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1842) no. 1. The Dunfermline *Vita* identifies Dunfermline as an oppidum, a town rather than an abbey. Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 8vb: *Hec a(d)facta sunt in loco qui nunc dic(itur) dunfermelyn, quem tunc temporis rex habebat pro opido.*
21 *Charters of David I*, ed. Barrow. In contrast, only 5% are addressed to Durham, 10% if Coldingham is included.
22 *Charters of David I*, ed. Barrow, no. 171; *Chronicle of Holyrood*, in *Monachi anonymi Scoti Chronicon*
construction great care was taken to establish “an intimate relationship” between the old and the new building, with one of “the strongest linking elements” being the original site of Margaret’s burial. In the new structure the importance of her grave “is underlined by the fact that it lay in the middle of the space, on both the east-west and the north-south axes.”

It is worth asking if there had been any official treatment of Margaret’s relics, such as an inspection of her tomb. If so, such activity could possibly have been considered a “translation” of her relics. Osbert of Clare, writing in 1138 about the inspection of Edward the Confessor’s tomb in 1102, calls the event a translation, which Barlow considers an “obvious exaggeration.” It is possible, however, that contemporaries could have viewed it as such. There is no evidence, however, that David orchestrated any such public recognition of his mother’s sanctity. Instead, he oriented the new structure architecturally around the focal point of her cult, her burial site, making the entire edifice a deeply personal monument to her memory.

It might also be the case, however, that the enhanced abbey was intended as a political statement. First, the architectural similarities between Durham and Dunfermline could be viewed as a connection between the new royal mausoleum and the ancient community of St Cuthbert, one more path to proclaiming saintly approval for the rule of Margaret’s family. Then again, perhaps David simply employed the same craftsmen, who had become available after completing work on Durham in 1133.

There were probably many agendas at work, both those expressly intended and those inferred, public and private, political and personal. In the final analysis, however, I believe that David’s attention to Dunfermline was prompted primarily by his personal devotion to the memory of his mother. Undoubtedly, he remained the driving force behind the abbey’s construction. Fernie concludes that the declining quality of
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Anglo-Scoticum, ed. C. W. Bouterwek (Elberfeld, 1863), 35; Anderson, Early Sources, 2.211.


24 Aelred of Rievaulx, Vita sancti Edwardi regis, PL 195:781; Barlow, Edward the Confessor, 267.

25 Fernie, “The Romanesque Churches of Dunfermline Abbey,” 34. David Rollason also observes that the similarities between Durham and its dependent priory of Lindisfarne, in particular the nave pillars and vaulting, were intended to symbolize “in stone the close connection between Durham and Lindisfarne, which was seen as stemming from St Cuthbert.” Rollason, Saints and Relics, 202.

26 Richard Fawcett suggests that Dunfermline benefited when construction at Durham was interrupted by the death of Bishop Ranulph Flambard in 1128. Fawcett, “Dunfermline Abbey Church,” 39.
construction, as evidenced by the contrast between the rich decorative plan of the arcade and the relatively plain arches in the gallery, is explained by the financial constraints suffered after the death of David.\(^{27}\) When David died in 1153, financial support evaporated. He was buried at Dunfermline, joining his parents and his brothers Edward, Edgar, and Alexander I, and confirming its function as a family mausoleum centered literally on his mother’s grave and figuratively on her memory.\(^{28}\)

David also consciously honored his mother’s memory through his devotion to the relic of the Holy Cross. The hypothetically original \textit{Vita} mentions this famed relic when Margaret directs that it be brought to her as she perceives her death is imminent.\(^{29}\) It is noted on two more occasions in the Dunfermline \textit{Vita}: as one of the relics Margaret had with her when she landed in Scotland; and a more complete description of it when she receives it on her deathbed.\(^{30}\)

This wonderful cross had the length of the palm of a hand and the work had been created of purest gold, which opened and closed in the manner of a box. A portion of the Lord’s cross is seen in this, as had often been proven by the evidence of many miracles, having an image of Our Savior sculpted of the most comely ivory, and wonderfully adorned with spangled gold.\(^{31}\)

According to Aelred of Rievaulx, King David likewise requested the relic as he was dying.\(^{32}\) This association between the deaths of Margaret and David is strengthened

\(^{27}\) Fernie, “The Romanesque Churches of Dunfermline Abbey,” 32. See also Fawcett, “Dunfermline Abbey Church,” 44.

\(^{28}\) The manuscript containing the Dunfermline \textit{Vita} describes the location of the royal burials. Edward was buried “next to his father before the altar of the Holy Rood” (Dunfermline manuscript, fo. 23va); Alexander was buried “next to his father and mother and brother before the great altar” (Dunfermline manuscript, fo. 24 rb); Malcolm was buried “to the right of his grandfather, David, before the great altar” (Dunfermline manuscript, fo. 24vb). The above quotes from Taylor, “Historical writing,” 236, n. 45. See also Broun, \textit{The Irish Identity of the Scots}, 196. For Dunfermline as the burial place of Margaret, Malcolm, Edgar, Alexander, David and Malcolm IV see A. H. Dunbar, \textit{Scottish Kings: a revised chronology of Scottish History, 1005-1625}, (Edinburgh: D. Douglas, 1906), 33, 48, 53, 64, 74. For the sequential burials of Malcolm’s remains see Anderson, \textit{Early Sources}, 2.86-7; Barrow, \textit{Kingdom}, 167. William I broke with tradition when he elected to be buried at the Tironensian abbey of Arbroath and Alexander II was buried at Melrose. However, Alexander III and Robert I returned to Dunfermline. See Dunbar, \textit{Scottish Kings}, 82, 91, 99, 140. With David II’s burial at Holyrood, Dunfermline ceased to be a royal mausoleum. Dunbar, \textit{Scottish Kings}, 154.

\(^{29}\) Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 16va; Diii, chapter 13.

\(^{30}\) Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fos. 8ra and 16va.

\(^{31}\) Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo: 16va.

by the fact that the description of the relic is identical in both Aelred’s text and the Dunfermline Vita. Importantly, Margaret and David are linked textual through their devotion to the holy relic. Further evidence supports David’s devotion to the Black Cross, as it was known. In 1128, he brought canons from Merton in Surrey to found Holyrood Abbey, which he lavishly endowed according to a charter dating to about the same year.

Another testament to David’s devotion to his mother is the chapel at Edinburgh Castle, which would eventually come to be known as St. Margaret’s Chapel. Purportedly built by David late in his reign as a private oratory, it is referred to in one of David’s charters simply as the castle church, without any dedication. Other castle churches, however, were known according to the saint after whom they were named. In a charter dated to between 1150 and 1152, for example, Earl Henry confirms a grant to the church of St John at Roxburgh Castle. Perhaps the Edinburgh chapel was dedicated to a saint—it would be rather unusual for it not to be—and perhaps it was dedicated to Margaret, the matriarch of the family, but as a private chapel centered on familial devotion, not public ceremony. It was one thing to acknowledge her shrine at the royal mausoleum, among the tombs of other family members, but quite another to dedicate publicly a chapel to her memory.

Perhaps the greatest monument to Margaret remains the degree to which her children modeled their behavior after her saintly example. In the twelfth century, they had two possible examples of holy rulership on which to model their behavior: the royal martyr or confessor king. Their father and great-grandfather were both commemorated in the Dunfermline Vita as wise rulers and valiant warriors who were unjustly murdered.
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33 For comparison of the texts, see the appendix. D.E.R. Watt concludes that Aelred’s text is original. Watt, Sctoichronicon, 3. 271.
34 Anderson, Early Sources, 2.171. For the foundation charter see Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, no. 153. See also Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom, 150, 152.
35 Charters of David I, no. 147: Ecclesiam scilicet castelli. Dated to between 1141 and 1147. According to G.W.S. Barrow, editor of the collection of David’s charters, the charter refers to St Margaret’s Chapel at Edinburgh Castle. Charters of David I, ed. Barrow, 122.
36 Charters of David I, ed. Barrow, no. 201.
37 It should be noted that Corbet makes a similar point regarding the Ottonian dynasty, arguing that royal sanctity was not primarily a political tool intended to secure legitimization of the royal line, but instead a declaration of the royal family's religious standing which relied both on the virtuous example of the saint and also the efforts of those who initiated their cults. Corbet, Les Saints ottoniens, 68-72.
Instead, however, Margaret’s sons and daughters chose to adopt the model of sanctity that was gaining currency among their contemporaries of the monkish ruler, noted for his or her ascetic lifestyle at court, especially the priest-like quality of sexual abstinence.

Edith/Matilda consciously emulated her mother when she cared for the poor, patronized ascetics, and fasted strenuously. \(^{38}\) William of Malmesbury records that:

> …she was a woman of exceptional holiness, and by no means negligible beauty, in piety her mother’s rival, and in her own character exempt from all evil influence … Under her royal robes she wore a shift of hair-cloth, and trod the church floors barefooted during Lent; nor did she shrink from washing the feet of the diseased and handling their foul discharging sores, after which she would kiss their hands at length, and set food before them. She took especial pleasure in hearing divine service …”\(^{39}\)

This descriptive comparison with Margaret has led some scholars to believe that she might have engaged in a little competitive piety, one-upping her saintly mother by wearing haircloth and washing the feet of lepers. \(^{40}\) Edith/Matilda’s biographer, Lois L. Huneycutt, confirms this assessment by demonstrating the degree to which she constantly sought to emulate her mother. \(^{41}\)

David was praised effusively by contemporary and near-contemporary luminaries both at home and abroad. The Scottish Chronicle extols him as a “powerful and pious” king who generously founded and endowed monasteries. \(^{42}\) William of Newburgh, writing toward the end of the twelfth century, represents him as a king-monk:

> He was a man great and glorious in the secular world, but equally glorious in Christ; for we are assured by witnesses worthy of credence who were acquainted with his life and actions that he was a religious and holy man. He was a person of great prudence, of most competent management in the administration of temporal affairs, yet none the less he showed great devotion to God. He was not in any way more sluggish in his religious duties because of the business of the kingdom, nor any feebler in

\(^{38}\) Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 105, 106.

\(^{39}\) William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, 5.418: Sanctitudinis egregiae, non usquequaque despicabilis formae, maternae pietatis emula, nichil sinistrum quantum ad se moribus admittens ... Cilitio sub regio cultu convoluta, nudipes diebus Quadragesimae terebat aecclesiarum limina, nec horrebat pedes lavare morbidorum, ulcera sanie distillantia contractare, postremo longa manibus oscula protelare, mensam apponere. Erat ei in audiendo servitio Dei voluptas unica ...

\(^{40}\) Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, 38.

\(^{41}\) Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, passim.

\(^{42}\) The E version extends to 1165 and was completed before 1214. *Chronicle of the Kings of Scotland*, version E in *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, and other Early Memorials of Scottish History*, ed. Skene, 132-33; Anderson, *Early Sources*, 2.220-21.
conducting the business of the kingdom because of his attention to religious duties ... He was so open-handed in his devout generosity that, leaving aside his abundant distributions to the poor, many churches of holy men which he founded, enriched and adorned, proclaim his almsgiving.\textsuperscript{43}

Similar praises were echoed by chroniclers such as Richard, prior of Hexham (1141-c. 1162) and John of Hexham.\textsuperscript{44} Bernard of Clairvaux, seeking David's support for the Cistercian foundation at Fountains in Yorkshire in 1134, fairly gushes in a direct address to the king:

I have long since learned to love you, most illustrious king, your fair renown has for long stirred in me the desire to meet you in person. This is my desire and relying on the words, 'The Lord has heard the desire of the poor,' I am confident in the Lord that one day I shall see you in the body whom even now I delight to gaze upon in spirit and imagination, and who I constantly think of with such pleasure and joy.\textsuperscript{45}

The \textit{Life} of Suger (d. 1152) written by Bernard's disciple, William, refers to David as "the religious king of the Scots," noting how he gave generously to the abbot of Saint-Denis.\textsuperscript{46} Pope Innocent II (d. 1143) praised his charitable gift to the monks of

Westminster on the anniversary of the death of his sister, Queen Matilda “of blessed memory.” Pope Urban III (d. 1187) referred to David as “a catholic sovereign and one who enlarged the Christian faith.” The greatest accolades came from Aelred of Rievaulx in his lament for the dead king, in which David was eulogized as “a gentle king, a just king, a chaste king, a humble king.” Indeed, scholars have commented on the similarities between Aelred’s eulogy and Margaret’s Vita. Most importantly both are praised for abiding by monastic standards while wielding royal authority.

David was also singled out for his marital chastity, siring only the required single son (although he might have had another son who died or was murdered in infancy) and remaining faithful to his wife even after her death. Edgar never married and neither he nor Alexander sired any children, with the possible exception of Alexander’s bastard son. Edith/Matilda limited herself to only the required son and daughter, and then retired from court into semi-monastic retreat: “The bearing of two children, one of either sex, left her content, and for the future she ceased either to have offspring or desire them, satisfied, when the king was busy elsewhere, to bid the court goodbye herself, and spend many years at Westminster.” Mary had only a single daughter, Matilda of Boulogne. Such relative chastity seems to have been a family characteristic for, as William of Malmesbury states, “besides their [Edgar, Alexander, and David’s] abstinence, their copious almsgiving and their constancy in prayer, they successfully overcame the vice most prevalent in kings, and it is recorded that no woman entered their bedchamber except their lawful wives, not did any of them bring a stain upon his innocence by keeping any mistress.” This behavior continued into the generation of David’s grandsons, much to the frustration of the more practically minded. Malcolm IV, for

1738-1876), 12.105; Anderson, Early Sources, 2.220, n. 3.
48 Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis (Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs, 1843), no. 66.
50 Noted by Oram, David I, 207.
51 “After contracting an honourable marriage and maintaining an undefiled bed, from which his sole son was born to him to mirror his father in close similarity of manners, he lived a celibate life for very many years.” (Post honorabiles nuptias et thorum immaculatum, ex quo illi unicus natus est filius, qui simillimis moribus patrem exprimeret, annis plurimis in caelibatu permansit). William of Newburgh, The History of English Affairs, ed. Walsh and Kennedy, 1.101; Anderson, Scottish Annals, 229.
52 William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 5.418.
example, was strenuously urged by his mother, Ada de Warenne, to foreswear celibacy. It is possible that a marriage to Constance of Brittany was considered. In letter to King Louis VII, the proposed bride expresses her desire to marry a Frenchman, because, as she haughtily intones, she would surely prefer a Frenchman of lower rank than to be queen of all Scotland. Malcolm, perhaps not surprisingly, opted for celibate bachelorhood.

Perhaps Margaret’s descendants had forgotten the practical lesson which she had absorbed regarding the perils of a shallow pool of heirs. Instead, they embraced a model of piety that increasingly focused on the monastic ideal reinterpreted as chastity in marriage. Margaret’s children elected to imitate their mother, or perhaps more precisely their parents, according to the ideals of the twelfth century when a royal saint could be depicted as both ruler and monk. The kings did not shirk their martial duty, and the queens fulfilled their marital duty, doing what was required of them, but in their private life, in those decisions over which they had the most control, they made the choice to model themselves on their mother’s saintly example.

St Cuthbert as Dynastic Saint

Supernatural support for Margaret’s descendants’ political right to rule in the early twelfth century was provided by St Cuthbert, the saint who historically had championed the right of the Wessex dynasty to rule Northumbria and England. Cuthbert, the hermit-bishop of Lindisfarne, died 687 and was buried in the sanctuary of the Church of St Peter on Lindisfarne. Only eleven years later, according to the anonymous author of Cuthbert’s first Vita (written between 699 and 705), his remains were disinterred and found to be perfectly preserved. His recognized sanctity was then immortalized by
Bede in two compositions: a Life of the saint in verse (written before 716) and another in prose (before 721).\textsuperscript{58} Walter Goffart has demonstrated, however, the vast differences between the characterizations of the saint given by the anonymous author and Bede. Bishop Wilfrid (d. 705) dominated Northumbrian ecclesiastical and political affairs for forty years. He was twice exiled and twice traveled to Rome to vindicate himself. Some viewed him as a champion of the Church in Rome, while others resented him as a somewhat alien interloper into the vibrant Church of northern England. These wide-ranging perspectives were articulated in part by the different interpretations of the life of St Cuthbert. As Goffart suggests, “The first Life of Cuthbert is sensitive to Wilfridian themes. It specifies, without details, that Cuthbert obtained the Roman Tonsure at Ripon and that the rule of life he taught was observed at Lindisfarne to this day ‘with the rule of Benedict,’ both assertions being unverifiable and the former being very unlikely.”\textsuperscript{59} Bishop Wilfrid, his interests and sympathies, were clearly oriented toward Rome. Bede, however, changed Cuthbert “from an eccentrically holy wonder worker into a model pastor, losing much of his primitive charm but becoming instead the grounds for militant advocacy of the (basically Irish) institution to which he had belonged and which Lindisfarne perpetuated.”\textsuperscript{60} For Bede, the glory of the Northumbrian tradition was its convergence of Irish and Roman traditions, from the time of Gregory the Great’s evangelizing mission to his day. For Wilfrid, Northumbria had succumbed to “the poisonous weeds planted by the Irish.”\textsuperscript{61} Quite soon after his death, Cuthbert became the


\textsuperscript{59} Goffart, \textit{Narrators of Barbarian History}, 268; internal quote \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti auctore anonymo}, 3.1; regarding tonsure \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti auctore anonymo}, 2.2.

\textsuperscript{60} Goffart, \textit{Narrators of Barbarian History}, 293.

patron saint “not only of Lindisfarne but also of the party in Northumbria opposed to Wilfrid and his followers.”62 David Rollason reaches a similar conclusion, identifying Cuthbert’s function in the eighth century as the patron saint of a unified Northumbria, breaching the divide between Bernicia in the north and Deira in the south.63

Within the next century, Cuthbert went on to become the patron saint of the House of Wessex and therefore of all England.64 During the Viking invasions of the ninth century, the community fled the overly-exposed island of Lindisfarne and wandered farther inland, eventually settling in 883 at Chester-le-Street, a few miles north of Durham. Their final move to Durham took place in 995. The complexion of the community had also changed. Lindisfarne had been a monastic foundation but Cuthbert’s caretakers had altered over the centuries, becoming a community of married clerks by the eleventh century. In 1083, these were replaced by Benedictine monks drawn from the newly refounded abbeys at Jarrow and Monkwearmouth (one of the refounding monks might have been Turgot) at the direction of Bishop William of St Calais. In a text entitled *The History of St Cuthbert: a record of the places and regions which Cuthbert originally possessed, from the beginning down to the present day*, which David Rollason posits was written soon after settlement as Chester-le-Street, Cuthbert appears to King Alfred in a vision, promising him victory in his fight against the Vikings: “…God has delivered your enemies into your hands and this whole land and its hereditary kingship to you, your sons and your grandsons. Be faithful to me and my people, because to you and your sons is given the whole of Albion. Be just, for you are

elected king of all Britain.” The author of the *History* then illustrates the hereditary nature of this association with Cuthbert through a series of gift exchanges. Alfred directs his son and heir, Edward the Elder, to give St Cuthbert two armbands and a gold thurible. Edward in turn urges his son and heir, Athelstan, to continue to “care for St Cuthbert and venerate him above all other saints.” His brother and successor, Edmund is also reputed to have patronized the shrine of St Cuthbert. David Rollason concludes that this evident interest that the author of this northern text had in associating the West Saxon dynasty with Cuthbert was returned in equal measure by the West Saxon rulers themselves. This saintly sanction was especially valuable in those areas, like the territory north of the Humber River, where the Wessex dynasty had the least political clout. Moreover, according to the *History*, Cuthbert had a history as a kingmaker; at the end of the ninth century he was instrumental in having a Viking by the name of Guthred recognized as king in Northumbria. Valerie Wall notes that beginning with Alfred in the ninth century and continuing with his son Edward the Elder and his grandsons Athelstan and Edmund in the tenth century the family reiterated its devotion to the saint in return for victory over Northumbria. Clearly, both the author of the *History* and the kings themselves perceived that St Cuthbert had the power and authority to select the ruler. This understanding between saint and dynasty was renewed and fulfilled by succeeding generations, eventually devolving on the only remaining heirs to the once mighty house of Wessex, the descendants of Margaret.

Sometime after monks were introduced to Durham Cathedral in 1083, the King of the Scots, Malcolm III, entered into a formal understanding with Durham:

This is the covenant which the convent of Saint Cuthbert has promised to Malcolm, king of the Scots, and to Queen Margaret and to their sons and daughters, to keep forever. Namely that, on behalf of the king and the queen, while they are alive, one poor man shall be nourished daily, and likewise two poor men shall be maintained for them on Thursday in Holy

65 For the date of the text see Rollason, *Saints and Relics*, 145-6, text on 149. See also L. Simpson, “The King Alfred/St Cuthbert Episode in the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto*: Its Significance for Mid-tenth-century English History,” in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Rollason, 397-411.
68 Wall, “Malcolm III and Durham Cathedral,” 332-34.
Week at the common maundy, and a collect said at the litanies and at mass. Further, that they both, in this life and after, they and their sons and daughters, shall be partakers in all things that be to the service of God in the monastery of St Cuthbert, that is to say in masses, in psalms and alms, in vigils and prayers and in all things that are of this kind. And for the king and queen individually, from the day of their death there shall be thirty full offices of the dead in the convent, and Verba mea shall be done every day, and each priest shall sing thirty masses and each of the rest ten psalters; and their anniversary shall be celebrated as an annual festival like that of King Athelstan.⁶⁹

A.A.M. Duncan observes that this was a unique contract: “No other lay persons enjoyed such a record of fraternity … it is called an agreement, conventio, and there was assuredly another side to it, the promise of Malcolm which is not recorded.”⁷⁰ Valerie Wall suggests that the other side of the compact was a promise by Malcolm and the Scottish dynasty to protect of the lands of St Cuthbert.⁷¹ In return for the patronage of the Scottish royal house, the monks at Durham would undertake the spiritual care of the king and queen and their dynasty both in this life and the next. It is understood that this is done with the divine blessing and support of St Cuthbert, much as he had supported King Aethelstan in the tenth century. Clearly the focus of this agreement was a mutually beneficial understanding between the saint on the one hand and the dynasty of Malcolm and Margaret on the other. Cementing this pact, Malcolm III was present at the laying of the foundation of the new cathedral in 1093.⁷²

This strategy was continued by the next generation. In 1094, in the sole surviving charter from his reign, Duncan made a gift of lands to Durham which was probably in fulfillment of his father’s earlier pledge and intended to secure both the support of the Durham community and the divine assistance of St Cuthbert in an effort to lend legitimacy to his bid to take the throne from his uncle, Donald.⁷³ In this document, Duncan first asserts that he is King of Scotland by the indisputable right of inheritance,

---

⁶⁹ Durham Liber Vitae, ed. Rollason and Rollason, 1.155-56.
⁷² Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1093.
⁷³ The text is included in Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, no. xii. A translation is available in Gordon Donaldson, Scottish Historical Documents (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1970) 16-17. For the authenticity of the document see Duncan, “Yes, the Earliest Scottish Charters,” 4. Note, however, that the original agreement entered into by Malcolm is explicitly restricted to the descendants of Margaret, and therefore implicitly excludes Duncan.
thus establishing his legitimate claim. He then confirms the gift of lands to St Cuthbert and the monks of Durham for the sake of himself, for the souls of his father, his brothers, his wife, and his children, and with the express consent of his brothers. Noticeably absent from this list is his mother, Ingibjorg, who was dynastically irrelevant with respect to Durham. Cuthbert’s covenant with Malcolm’s dynasty is thus reiterated with the agreement and support of the possible contenders for the throne.

Once he became king, Edgar’s general investment in the Church was rather unimpressive. He was not known to have made any significant contributions to existing foundations and he certainly did not underwrite any new monastic foundations. Indeed, he did not even appoint a bishop to fill the see of St Andrews, which had been vacant since 1093. In contrast, his interest in Durham was remarkable. He signed a charter in favor of the monks of Durham in 1095, perhaps as a repeat of Duncan’s petition for success in gaining the kingdom. Once king, he granted lands and property to Durham. In one particular charter, Edgar tellingly refers to Cuthbert as “my lord.” In 1104, before becoming king, Alexander was given the unique honor of being the only secular representative present at the inspection of St Cuthbert’s tomb. He further bound the servants of St Cuthbert to Scotland by selecting the Prior of Durham, Turgot, to be the Bishop of St Andrews.

By the end of David’s reign, however, the prevailing influence of Cuthbert had been diluted. David had invested greatly, some would say extravagantly, in introducing new orders to Scotland and building numerous foundations. Although he never succeeded in controlling Durham, by the end of his reign the territory of the Scoto-

---

74 Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom, 127.
75 Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, no. xv; for authenticity of the documents see Duncan, “Yes, the Earliest Scottish Charters,” 16-35.
76 Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, nos. xvii-xxii.
77 Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, no. xix: Scatis quod ego do in elemosinam, Deo omnipotenti et Sancto Cuthberto domino meo et ecclesiae Dunelmensi et monachis in eadem ecclesia Deo servientibus. Perhaps Edgar felt that he held Scotland for the saint. Similar cases are found in Norway with St Olaf and Hungary, which was given by St Stephen to the Virgin Mary.
79 Although Turgot was not confirmed in this position until 1109. Chronicle of Melrose, ed. Stevenson, 64, s.a. 1109; Symeon of Durham, Opera et Collectanea, ed. Hinde, 2.204, s.a. 1107; John Dowden, The Bishops of Scotland, ed. Dr. J. Maitland Thomson (Glasgow, 1912), 1-2.
Northumbrian realm was firmly under his control.\textsuperscript{80} Margaret and her dynasty would always have ties to Cuthbert and his community, but never with the singular focus of the perilous years of the early twelfth century.\textsuperscript{81}

* * * * *

The cornerstone of the royal family was always Margaret. This development was not necessarily a conscious effort on the part of her descendants to appropriate her sanctity; rather, they were emulating their mother’s rather unique model of holiness. The result was a degree and type of royal sanctity unusual in that time and place. Members of the Scottish royal family were not the martyred kings or royal abbesses of their Anglo-Saxon predecessors and their Scandinavian and Continental neighbors. Instead they effectively combined royal prerogative with monastic ideals. They embraced virginity or conjugal chastity while fully exercising royal authority. In short, Margaret’s cult does not seem to have been initially promoted for expressly political reasons, but as an articulation of personal devotion on the part of her children. Margaret may have founded a nursery of saints, but in emulating her saintly example, her children in turn nursed her sanctity. It was up to Margaret’s great-grandson, William I, to cast Margaret in the role of a dynastic protectrix.

\textsuperscript{80} Oram, \textit{David I}, 167-89.
\textsuperscript{81} Cuthbert’s standard was conspicuously absent at the Battle of the Standard (1138), which is instead named after a standard that combined the banners of Saints Peter the Apostle (the patron saint of York cathedral), John of Beverley, and Wilfrid of Ripon on a mast holding a pyx containing the consecrated host. \textit{Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works}, trans. Freeland, 247, n. 2.
III.3. A DYNASTIC SAINT

The second half of the twelfth century was marked by the translation of Margaret’s relics from their original resting place to an ornate shrine indicative of her elevated status. This chapter will begin by evaluating the event in some detail, since it has only just been brought to the attention of scholars and has not therefore received much commentary. It will then explore the hagiographic and political contexts of the twelfth century to consider those factors which might have contributed to her increased standing.

Evidence of Twelfth-Century Recognition of Margaret’s Sanctity

A clear indication of the increasing popularity of Margaret’s cult is the ceremonious translation of her relics in 1180, which is recorded uniquely in a collection of her miracles.¹ Such local recognition of the saint is significant in that at this time it was sufficient to declare the person’s sanctity. Papal ratification was not yet required and was only established later as the result of a lengthy and not always linear process.² The first papal canonization dates to 993 when Bishop Ulric of Augsburg (d. 973) was declared a saint by John XV. It is still a matter of debate as to whether or not the canonization of the Hungarian saints in 1083 was realized with the sanction of Gregory VII.³ In 1171 or 1172, Pope Alexander III issued a letter to King Kol of Sweden asserting that a person could not be venerated as a saint without the express approval of Rome.⁴ Vauchez has

---

¹For more information on the miracle collection see the Introduction. See also Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xli-xliv.
⁴The pertinent portion of the letter came to be referred to by the fist word of the relevant paragraph, Audivimus. For the full text of the letter, Aeterna et incommutabilis, see PL 200:1259-61. For an analysis see Vauchez, Sainthood, 25.
demonstrated, however, that pontifical oversight of the process was not fully instituted until the papacy of Innocent III (1198-1216).\(^5\) The important point for our study is that episcopal translations were as valid as papal canonizations during this period of transition, between the first example of papal canonization in 993 and its full, legal articulation at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.\(^6\) Only in the second half of the twelfth century did the official stamp of the papacy begin to rival and then supersede local translations.\(^7\) Moreover, observance of the pontifical prerogative at this time was far from uniform, appearing to have been most concentrated in England. In Iceland, however, “the local episcopate and the Althing – the assembly of the people – instituted the public cult of the bishops Perlakr Perhallsson (d. 1193) in 1199 and Jón Ogmundsson (d. 1121) in 1201.”\(^8\)

We know that Margaret’s remains initially had been laid to rest “opposite the altar and the venerable sign of the Holy Cross, which she herself had erected.”\(^9\) The Dunfermline Chronicle, followed by John of Fordun, records that Margaret’s body was smuggled out of Edinburgh castle shrouded by a protective fog, and whisked away to Dunfermline before it could be snatched by Donald Bán, Malcolm’s brother.\(^10\) According to this account, Donald Bán, after having heard of Margaret’s demise, besieged the castle “where he knew the king’s rightful and lawful heirs were,” expecting that since the place was naturally fortified by the steep cliffs on which it rested the only place to guard would be the front gates. However, those who had been taught to honor God by the queen’s example brought her “holy body” down “by a postern on the western side.” Indeed, the entire family was “miraculously sheltered” by an unusual mist so that

---


\(^6\) David Rollason makes the interesting observation that the notion of a translation as a prerequisite for acknowledged sanctity seems to have originally reached England and Scotland through Gaul, as a Gallic rather than a Roman or Irish tradition. Rollason, *Saints and Relics*, 49-59.

\(^7\) Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 24.


\(^9\) Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 17va-vb; Diii, chapter 32.

\(^10\) Dunfermline ms, fos. 18-19; *Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, ed. Skene, 5.21.
they were able to make their escape. So, just as she had instructed in life, her body was buried at the little church in Dunfermline.\textsuperscript{11}

Although this sketch is the diaphanous stuff of hagiographic legend, it very neatly illustrates the early emergence of Margaret’s cult, depicting this episode almost as the first translation of Margaret’s relics. Contests over relics frequently occurred at waterways. As a precedent, Paul Antony Hayward refers to the episode related by Gregory of Tours regarding the relics of St Martin. Immediately after the saint’s death the people of Poitiers and Tours fought for possession of his remains. During the night, God caused the men of Poitiers to be overcome by sleep, allowing the men of Tours to stow the body on a boat and carry it down the Loire. Hayward notes that such struggles are almost always located on a waterway, “as the body is being or is about to be ferried across or down to its rightful home.”\textsuperscript{12} In this case, the struggle over the relics is between Donald Bán and the descendants of Malcolm, and the liminal water feature is perhaps the mist which miraculously conceals Margaret’s body.

In 1180, Margaret’s relics were translated and elevated to a new shrine located on the north end of the altar of the abbey which had been constructed by her son, David I. Margaret’s miracle collection contains three references to the hitherto unknown occasion, in chapters five, six, and nine, the latter of which provides a refreshingly descriptive account of the process:

In the year 1180 AD, the first year after the consecration of Master John at Edinburgh, the thought was sent from above (as we believe) into the minds of the brethren of the church of Dunfermline that they should move the tomb of St Margaret the queen from the place in which it was situated. And since the place of her last repose had been prepared (as it seemed to them) in a less than suitable way, they should raise it up and employ more elegant craftsmanship. To increase devotion to her they had already employed an artist called Ralph, a man of great reputation and most renowned as a creator of carvings. He prepared a reliquary for the blessed queen, covered with gold leaf and with carved images, made more splendid by these rich objects, as can be seen from the item itself. When the day appointed for the task arrived, after chapter, while the brother in charge of the workmen was beginning the proposed work, along with the

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum}, ed. Skene, 5.21.

\textsuperscript{12} Hayward, “Translation-Narratives in Post-Conquest Hagiography,” 69. Hayward offers another example on p. 85 involving the translation of the remains of St Felix.
servants, the other brethren lay prostrate on the ground in the choir, and began to recite the seven penitential psalms and the litany, not without fear and trembling but with tears, so that, if perchance what they had undertaken should not find grace with the divine will, the sacrifice of jubilation should wash away the fault of presumption. But since love expels fear, they had a mind less weighed down with terror, because they were doing something that a spiritual devotion had conceived in them. When they were finished, they established the tomb, which they had removed from its place, at the north end of the altar, covered with an elegant cloth as a mark of the reverence that it was owed. The masons meanwhile applied themselves in constructing a stone table on which it was to be raised up, so that the reliquary placed above might make a more beautiful sight to onlookers."

The text is unclear regarding whether the purpose of the translation was to stimulate observance of saint’s cult or to accommodate the needs of an already well-established and popular cult. Chapter nine states that the shrine was crafted in order “to increase devotion to her,” while chapter two claims that the elders decided to keep her body next to the high altar “as miracles multiplied.” However, it appears that Margaret’s sanctity was already popularly acknowledged through the celebration of her feast day. Reginald of Durham records processions which occurred on the anniversary of her feast day, asserting that she was venerated by the entire kingdom. Significantly, Reginald completed his work about 1174, meaning that this description of the celebration of Margaret’s feast day probably took place before the translation of her relics in 1180. It is possible, then, to assert that the translation was in recognition of her popularly

---

13 Bartlett, Miracles, 93 with Latin on 92.
14 Bartlett, Miracles, 77 with Latin on 76.
acknowledged sanctity rather than an effort to establish it.

Margaret’s miracle collection corroborates this annual recognition of her sanctity. Chapter five of the text specifies that the feast of St Margaret was celebrated each year on the day of the translation “of her holy body from the former church to the high altar, as described above” with “a great celebration of psalms and hymns.”\(^{17}\) This reference could only apply to the aforementioned translation of 1180. Additionally, chapter six describes “the great crowd of sick people, weighed down with infirmities of mind or body,” who thronged to the tomb to keep vigil on the eve of her feast day.\(^{18}\) By the end of the twelfth century, there is direct evidence of popular and ecclesiastical recognition of Margaret’s sanctity, all that was required at the time in order to have her officially declared a saint.

The next section explores three other factors in the hagiographic context of the late twelfth century which might have contributed to the surge in interest in Margaret’s cult: the cult of Thomas Becket; the rewriting of the lives of Anglo-Saxon saints; and the canonization of royal, dynastic saints.

**Twelfth Century Hagiographic Context**

Thomas Becket cast a long shadow as adviser and confidante of the king and then Archbishop of Canterbury, but his clash with King Henry II followed by his murder elevated him instantly to the status of martyr. The catalyst for the historic rift between King Henry II of England and his archbishop occurred in 1164 when Henry issued the Constitutions of Clarendon, calling for a return to the royal rights with regard to the Church which had been enjoyed by his grandfather, Henry I.\(^{19}\) While in exile, Becket

---

\(^{17}\) Bartlett, *Miracles*, 83 with Latin on 82, and xlv for analysis. Vauchez notes that until at least the thirteenth century the feasts of new saints were celebrated on the anniversary of their translation. Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 20.

\(^{18}\) Bartlett, *Miracles*, 85 with Latin on 84.

publicly condemned the Constitutions from the pulpit at Vézelay in 1166, excommunicating those ecclesiastics and magnates who had acquiesced to the terms, and threatening to pronounce anathema on the king himself. The king protested this humiliation by threatening to withdraw his support for the pope, whose seat on the papal throne was by no means secure. Becket was only finally persuaded to compromise when the Archbishop of York usurped the traditional privilege of Canterbury by the crowning Henry’s son, thereby challenging the primacy of Becket’s archiepiscopal see. Becket returned to England where he was infamously murdered 29 December 1170 by four knights thinking they were acting in accordance with their sovereign’s wishes. He was immediately revered as a saint and martyr, and Henry was compelled to make public penance. The murder of Thomas Becket had created a cult figure more powerful than he had been in life, which led to a “spillover effect,” in which the cult of saints as a whole flourished in the reflected glory of his popularity. As news of his intercessory abilities spread, the absolute number and frequency of those seeking help increased: some supplicants would visit multiple shrines, some would visit shrines closer to home, and some would visit more often. As Robert Bartlett observes, the year 1170 was a watershed, “the 1066 of [the] English saintly cult … the long shadow of Becket lay over all hagiographical activity in the period 1180-1220.” Other cults were forced, to some extent, to meet the challenging success of Becket which loomed large in the popular consciousness.

The Angevin ruling dynasty was also forced to confront Becket’s popularity. One response was to refresh the cults of Anglo-Saxon saints, particularly Anglo-Saxon royal saints. Peter Johanek observes that the recognition of a saintly ancestor was a powerful


Susan Ridyard, “Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons,” Anglo-Norman Studies 9 (1986): 179-206. Indeed, Bartlett notes that in the period 1180-1220 thirty hagiographical works in Latin were produced in England, and that most of these, about two-thirds, were
tool for Henry in his ongoing battle with the memory of Thomas Becket. In addition to Edward the Confessor, other popular Anglo-Saxon saints included Edmund of East Anglia and Oswald of Northumbria, discussed previously. Royal female saints also received attention. Robert of Cricklade, an Augustinian canon and prior of St Frideswide’s, Oxford (1139/41 to 1174/80) was an active hagiographer in the latter part of the twelfth century. In gratitude for the miraculous cure he received at the tomb of Thomas Becket, he composed a life honoring the saint, probably around 1173 but not later than 1180. More importantly for our study, he rewrote a life of the seventh-century Anglo-Saxon princess, St Frideswide, and contemporary recognition of her sanctity was achieved with the formal translation of her relics in 1180. St Aebbe was a seventh-century abbess and virgin, the sister of Kings Oswald and Oswiu of Northumbria. An account of her life and miracles was redrafted, possibly also by Reginald of Durham. This textual account was bracketed by two translations. The first occurred sometime after the settlement of the Priory of Coldingham by Durham monks, between Edgar’s grant of Coldingham to the monks of Durham in 1107 and the first reference to monks serving the church at Coldingham in 1139. The text records that the

23 See Part 3, Chapter 1.
24 For more background on Robert of Cricklade see Antonsson, St. Magnús of Orkney, 43-44. Antonsson surmises that Master Robert visited the Scottish court where, it is interesting to speculate, he might have been influenced by the cult of St Margaret. See also Knowles, Brooke and London, The Heads of Religious Houses, 180.
27 The historical Aebbe is detailed in: AASS, Aug. VI, 98-99; Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 4.19, 25; Vita Cuthberti auctore anonymo, in Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), 80 (ii,3); Bede, Vita S. Cuthberti, in Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), 188 (c. x); The Life of Bishop Wilfrid, ed. Colgrave, 78 (c. xxxix). See also Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xii-xxix.
second translation was conducted “within the lifetime of someone still alive when the author wrote,” prior to about 1190. Our third example of the remembered distant Anglo-Saxon past is St Aethelthryth. The bishopric at Ely, the cathedral of which housed the saint’s shrine, was established in 1109 by Henry I. Extensive royal patronage is indicated by the witness list at the council that established see, which included the king, queen, and their 8-year-old daughter, Matilda, the mother of the future Henry II. Between 1131 and 1174, the Liber Eliensis was compiled, which cast Ely “in terms that contributed substantially to the triumph of the beata stirps ideology.” Of particular significance to this study is the fact that a brief life of the saint was included in the same late-twelfth-century manuscript as Margaret’s Vita.

These three examples represent female, Anglo-Saxon, royal virgins of the distant past who found eager royal patrons in the twelfth century. Their lives were rewritten for a contemporary audience, their relics translated with reverence, and their foundations enlarged. They helped to legitimize the Plantagenet dynasty’s rule through a sacred, Anglo-Saxon inheritance. The current rulers had inherited the sanctity of their predecessors, most obviously that of Edward the Confessor, but also the extensive Anglo-Saxon legacy, including female royal saints.

The cult of St Sunniva provides another example that is pertinent because it emanates from the Scandinavian world that was so geographically and culturally proximate to Scotland. According to the late-twelfth-century Latin legend the saint was a mid-tenth-century Irish royal who became queen upon the death of her father. To escape the onerous advances of unwanted suitors she and a few of her followers fled Ireland in

---

29 Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xx-xxi. The exact date of the foundation of the Coldingham Priory remains uncertain, but Bartlett reasons that it came into existence between 1107, when Edgar granted the church and estate of Coldingham to Durham, and 1139, when reference is made to monks serving the church of Coldingham. Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xv.

30 Folz, Les saintes reines, 24-31; Ridyard, Royal Saints, 51-55, 176-210; Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 86-89; Blanton, Signs of Devotion.


three boats, eventually landing among the as yet unconverted pagans on the island of Selja off the coast of Norway. The locals were suspicious of the strange newcomers, resolving to eliminate any perceived threat by killing them. When the small party of refugees saw the menacing band approaching, they retreated to a cave where God responded to their prayer for death by sending an angel to cause the roof of the cave to collapse, thereby entombing them. Later, while Olaf Tryggvason (d. 1000) ruled, sailors passing the island noticed a column of incandescent light, which led them to a sweet-smelling skull. The king and the bishop, following up on this discovery, decided to build a church on the spot. In 1170, the purported remains of St Sunniva were translated to the Cathedral at Bergen, where she became the patron saint.\textsuperscript{34} The similarity between St Sunniva and other legendary royal virgins, such as Aethelthryth, Frideswide, and Aebbe is obvious, but it should also be noted that Sunniva is described as a ruling queen.\textsuperscript{35}

There was, of course, precedent for the political use of translation ceremonies. Paul Antony Hayward has demonstrated that post-Conquest translation narratives were crafted as part of an effort to authorize the cults of existing Anglo-Saxon saints. Goscelin wrote a Life of St Kenelm in the 1070s or 1080s in which he “uses the translation-scene to provide the subject’s cult with papal as well as archiepiscopal validation.”\textsuperscript{36} Goscelin’s \textit{Vita et translatio S. Edithe}, written between 1078 and 1087, likewise establishes archiepiscopal validation through a series of visions. The saint appears to Archbishop Dunstan on two separate occasions requesting that her remains be elevated, a request that is then echoed by St Denis in another vision.\textsuperscript{37} In these and other examples, Hayward repeatedly emphasizes that the endorsement of secular and ecclesiastical authorities as recorded in the translation narratives authorizes the cults of these Anglo-


\textsuperscript{35} Alexander O’Hara suggests that Sunniva’s gender was important in view of Magnus Erlingsson’s claim to the throne of Norway through his mother. O’Hara, “Constructing a Saint,” 116-17.

\textsuperscript{36} Hayward, “Translation-Narratives,” 73.

\textsuperscript{37} Hayward, “Translation-Narratives,” 77-79.
Saxon saints. Hagiographers were writing for the Norman elite advocating “the righteousness of these English communities in the sight of God which was signified by the history and continuing prosperity of their saints’ cults.”\textsuperscript{38} In time, these cults of English saints would be appropriated by the conquerors themselves in support of their own legitimacy.\textsuperscript{39}

Edina Bozóky supports Hayward’s specific arguments regarding the political uses of the cults of Anglo-Saxon saints through more general observations. In all the cases she studies, beginning with the Merovingian veneration of St Martin’s relics to the Crown of Thorns famously acquired by Louis IX, she notes that the translation of relics was concomitant with the transfer of power to a dynasty seeking legitimization.\textsuperscript{40} This argument might explain why the canonization of dynastic saints was almost always followed by a formal translation of the relics. Indeed, the translation ceremony itself was such an acknowledgement of sanctity that people tended to perceive it as the official initiation of a saint’s cult.\textsuperscript{41} Such a formal occasion publicly marked the sacred endorsement of the new dynasty by the recognized saint whose divine intercessory powers could now be marshaled in support of the \textit{arriviste} ruler.

Royal saints were particularly effective in asserting dynastic legitimacy. The idea of a saintly dynasty, or \textit{beata stirps}, was not new to the twelfth century. The Christianized tradition began with the Holy Family, although a pagan version of inherited divine authority also existed.\textsuperscript{42} Folz notes that emphasis was placed on the blood line connecting the old dynasty to the new, or \textit{le triomphe de l’hérédité}, in which the line was certainly descended from but also currently embodying legitimizing sanctity.\textsuperscript{43} Vauchez

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38} Hayward, "Translation-Narratives," 89.
\textsuperscript{40} Edina Bozóky, \textit{La Politique des Reliques}, 119-69.
\textsuperscript{41} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 32.
\textsuperscript{43} Folz, \textit{Les saints rois}, 139-48, quote on p. 142.
\end{flushright}
emphasizes, however, that it was not the sanctity of the lineage as a whole that was acknowledged, but that certain individuals within that lineage embodied a model of virtue endorsed by the Church. Not only was the individual predisposed to receive saintly attributes by reason of his or her ancestry but he or she also radiated sanctity throughout the extended family. Janet Nelson, followed by Susan Ridyard, clarifies that the Christian king, unlike his pagan predecessor, did not immediately assume sacral authority by virtue of his birth. Rather, sanctity was a quality that was earned, achieved by exhibiting those qualities which the Church deemed essential in a Christian ruler, and only awarded by the Church posthumously. The reflected sanctity of a dynastic ancestor represented powerful political capital for an aspiring dynasty. Nevertheless, an individual member of the dynasty was only predisposed toward sanctity, a designation that still had to be merited.

Klaniczay builds on these observations by analyzing how royal dynasties employed the concept of a hereditary propensity for sanctity in order to secure legitimacy. The concept of beata stirps, hereditary sanctity, more specifically royal sanctity, was adopted by the Ottonian dynasty in the second half of the tenth century. Notable examples are Sts Matilda and Adelheid, in addition to Edith, the Anglo-Saxon first wife of Otto I. The idea was fully utilized by Hungarian rulers in the late-eleventh century. In the twelfth century, royal saints continued to be used to legitimize ruling dynasties. Kings Olaf, Cnut IV, Cnut Lavard, Eric, and Magnus Erlendsson have already been discussed. Peter Johanek notes several examples in which recognition of a saintly ancestor was a powerful tool. Henry relied on the memory of Edward the Confessor in his ongoing battle with Thomas Becket. Emperor Conrad had hoped to make Henry II

---

44 Vauchez, Sainthood, 177-83, especially 179. See also Vauchez, “‘Beata stirps’: sainteté et lignage en Occident aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles.”
45 Nelson, “Royal saints and early medieval kingship,” 39-44; Ridyard, Royal Saints, 74-78.
46 For a comprehensive overview of scholarly treatment of the concept of sacral kingship and hereditary sanctity see Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 2-16.
47 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 121.
48 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 121-23; Corbet, Les saints Ottoniens.
49 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 123-34; Vauchez, “‘Beata stirps’: sainteté et lignage en Occident aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles,” 397-406; Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 123-34.
50 See Part 3, Chapter 1.

The translation of Margaret’s relics in 1180 occurred in the midst of this dynamic hagiographic context. The next section considers the political pressures faced by Margaret’s dynasty and how her memory might have been employed in response to them.

**Twelfth-Century Political Context**

The fourth quarter of the twelfth century began rather inauspiciously for Margaret’s great grandson, William (1165-1214). The nadir of Anglo-Scottish relations, at least from the Scots’ point of view, came in July of 1174 when King William was defeated and captured outside the walls of Alnwick by the forces of King Henry II. The resulting “obnoxious treaty of Falaise,” to borrow G.W.S. Barrow’s preferred phrase, stipulated that William would continue to hold Scotland north of the Forth as a vassal of Henry, and that he would surrender all claims to the earldom of Huntingdon and Northumberland.\footnote{Gesta Regis Henrici Secundis Benedicti Abbatis, in \textit{Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptore}, ed. W. Stubbs, no. 49, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), 1.72; Anderson, \textit{Scottish Annals}, 254-55. Duncan, \textit{Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom}, 228-31; Barrow, \textit{Scotland and its Neighbours}, 28, 74-5, quote on p. 28; and \textit{The Acts of William I}, ed. Barrow, 15.} The treaty was solemnized in August 1175 at the cathedral church of St Peter at York in a formal ceremony witnessed by the leading magnates and prelates of...
Dauvit Broun notes the exceptional nature of this series of events on several fronts. First, it involved the public humiliation of a reigning king. William was brought to Henry with his legs “shackled under the belly of a horse,” held in chains during his captivity in Normandy, and forced to concede to onerous terms in a very formal, public setting. Second, the terms were stipulated in a legal, written document so there was no possibility for later interpretations, which William’s predecessors had employed so effectively. Third, the pledge of fealty made to Henry by the prelates and nobles of Scotland was intended to supersede any made to William. As Broun observes, “Such a direct intervention by an overlord in the relationship between a king and his people was unprecedented.” Finally, this one-sided arrangement extended to future generations; the heirs of King William would hold Scotland of the king of England and his heirs, becoming the feudal subjects of the kings of England in perpetuity.

The treaty also mandated that Scottish bishops were subject to the authority of the archbishop of York. The papacy responded by pursuing a diplomatic balancing act throughout the twelfth century between, on the one hand, the desire of the Scottish monarchy to have St Andrews recognized as metropolitan see of the Scotticana ecclesia and, on the other hand, the ambition of the archdiocese of York and the English Crown to exercise what they perceived as York’s metropolitan authority over the church. In the past, the Scottish crown had thwarted the persistent efforts of York to exercise jurisdiction by managing to avoid having its bishops consecrated by the archbishop. Bishop Robert of St Andrews had been consecrated by Archbishop Thurstan of York, but without a profession of obedience. Following the bishop’s death in 1159, King Malcolm IV, like his grandfather before him, petitioned for a pallium for St Andrews. As before,
the pope stalled, in this case appointing Malcolm’s ambassador, Bishop William of Moray, to serve as papal legate for all of Scotland, in which capacity he was able to consecrate Arnold, abbot of Kelso, as bishop of St Andrews. However, by appointing a papal legate Pope Alexander III had recognized for the first time the existence of Scotland as “a distinct ecclesiastical and (by implication) a distinct political region.” In 1164 at Sens, the pope consecrated Ingram, Malcolm’s chancellor, as bishop of Glasgow, thereby once again avoiding interference from York. Arnold of St Andrews was succeeded in 1165 by Richard, and a confrontation with York was again avoided by allowing him to be consecrated by other Scottish bishops. Not surprisingly, York protested its supremacy at every juncture, basing its complaint on the plan of Gregory the Great to divide all of the British Isles between the metropolitans of Canterbury and York, a design that was then corroborated by Lanfranc at Windsor in 1072. This historic right was forcefully asserted in the terms of The Treaty of Falaise, in which the bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld, the abbot of Dunfermline, and the prior of Coldingham conceded that, “the church of England shall also have the right in the church of Scotland which it lawfully should, and that they will not oppose the right of the church of England.” However, the Scots successfully dodged the first test of this onerous restriction involving the status of Bishop Jocelin of Glasgow. Sometime between the negotiations at Falaise in 1174 and the ratification of the terms at York in 1175, the pope exempted Jocelin and his diocese from the jurisdiction of York, granting his see unique status as a “special daughter” of Rome. Another bull clarified this “special” arrangement by stipulating that only the pope had jurisdiction over the church of Glasgow with the exclusive right to impose interdict or excommunication. The papal policy of equivocation and avoidance

was brought to a head by Henry II at a legatine council at Northampton in early 1176, in which the king sought to impose the subjection of Scottish bishops to York according to the terms of the Treaty of Falaise.\(^{66}\)

Following Henry’s pronouncement at Northampton in 1176, Rome issued a papal bull known as *Super anxietatibus*, which expressly stated that the Scottish bishops should regard the pope as their metropolitan, displacing York and by extension any English oversight.\(^{67}\) It also condemned Henry II for trespassing on ecclesiastical rights. In 1179, however, a disagreement over the selection of a bishop of St Andrews led Pope Alexander III to excommunicate King William and place the realm under interdict.\(^{68}\) The royal chaplain, Hugh, had been consecrated Bishop of St Andrews in late 1178 or early 1179.\(^{69}\) The competing claimant, John the Scot, whose candidacy was promoted by either the canons of St Andrews, as per Roger of Howden, or the archdeacons and Culdees as suggested by A.A.M. Duncan, went to Rome to advance his cause. Pope Alexander III sent a papal legate, Alexius, who consecrated the ecclesiastically-endorsed candidate, John, at Holyrood in mid-June 1180. Tensions escalated. In a letter to William I (1180), Pope Alexander warned that “as we have labored that your kingdom should have liberty, so we shall take care that it reverts to its original subjection,” threatening to revoke his earlier decision granting the Kingdom of the Scots independence from the metropolitan authority of York.\(^{70}\) William was summoned to Normandy in 1181 to answer to his liege lord, Henry II.\(^{71}\)

---


\(^{69}\) For a history of the conflict see Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 270-74;

\(^{70}\) Pope’s letter in: Roger of Howden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. Stubbs, 2.211-212; and Benedict of Peterborough, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, ed. Stubbs, 1. 263-6; Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 272. See also Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 113; Barrow, *Scotland and its Neighbours*, 3. Broun notes that this is the first articulation of Scottish independence, or, perhaps more accurately, an implicit threat to its possible independence.

\(^{71}\) Benedict of Peterborough, *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, ed. Stubbs, 1.276-77; Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 277. The issue of ecclesiastical, and by extension political, independence was settled for the moment by a papal bull known as *Cum universi*, in 1189 or 1192, which recognized full independence for the Scottish Church. Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 112. Barrell argues that the bull, issued by Celestine III in 1192, might have been a re-articulation of an earlier bull issued in March 1189. Barrell, “Background to *Cum universi*.”
In the midst of this dialogue of graduating threats on military, diplomatic, and papal fronts, William perceived the value of employing saints’ cults to give voice to political opposition. A few years after his concession at York, in 1178, William dedicated a church at his impressive foundation of Arbroath Abbey to the undeniably popular St Thomas Becket, who represented, not coincidentally, a check to the political might of his new overlord, Henry II. It is not unreasonable to assume that Margaret’s cult would also enter into account. The dynastic link between the Scots rulers and their saintly progenitrix was strengthened in a number of ways: the translation of her relics in 1180, the incorporation of Margaret’s name into the family tree, and a growing sense that Margaret’s descendants had an inherited predisposition toward sanctity.

Although the translation of Margaret’s relics is a clear indication of the growing recognition of her sanctity, it is not obvious who was responsible for the initiative. In the miracle collection, the impetus for this ceremony is attributed to either divine inspiration (divinitus immittitur) or a direction from the elders (decreto seniorum). It was certainly supported by the abbot of Dunfermline, who seems to have already attained the almost episcopal authority that would characterize the office in the next century: the abbot at the time, Archibald (1178-1198), perhaps acted as a justice for the king. Perhaps in recognition of the increased standing of the abbey following the elevation, Pope Lucius III granted special privilege to the abbey in a bull dated 30 April 1182. A prime motivating force must also have been King William, as the saint’s great-grandson, although the direct evidence of such royal involvement is slim indeed. The only indication of the king’s physical presence in the vicinity is that sometime between 1178 and 1184 William signed a charter at Dunfermline, which granted to Arbroath Abbey the church of Glamis in Angus. G. W. S. Barrow’s “skeleton itinerary” does not show William at Dunfermline in 1180. Charter no. 236 places him at Haddington on March 30, 1178.

---

73 Bartlett, Miracles, 92-93 and 76-77.
74 Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom, 214.
75 Anderson, Early Sources, 2. 349, n. 4; Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, 153-55, no. 238.
and on July 14 he is at Stirling. The spring and summer of 1181, however, were spent in Normandy and then Canterbury with Henry II. In fact, the popularity of Dunfermline as a royal residence seems to have diminished, as shown by the decline in the number of acts signed there after the early years of reign. Of the 437 acts which survive with place dates, only 12 were issued at Dunfermline compared with 45 at Perth (46 if Scone is added), 45 at Forfar, 44 at Stirling, 34 at Edinburgh, 27 at Selkirk, 21 at Kinghorn, 20 at Montrose, 18 at Haddington, 17 at Jedburgh, 14 each at Elgin, Lanark, Roxburgh and Traquair, and 10 at Clackmannan. Most remarkably, however, of the over 500 charters that exist in whole or in part, only 21 make a grant to Dunfermline. In all, it can be concluded that William did not devote the same attention and resources to the royal mausoleum as his grandfather, David. The timing of the translation, shortly after William’s excommunication, indicates that he perhaps intended for it to be viewed as an assertion of his dynasty’s saintly and political relevance in an effort to mollify the papacy during the ongoing dispute.

One clear indication that Margaret had evolved into a dynastic saint is the emergence and proliferation of her name in the royal family tree. As Klaniczay notes, “The formation of dynastic cults of saints was often reflected in the names given in baptism.” Margaret’s great-grandchildren were the first to name a daughter after the dynasty’s foundress. David I had two daughters rather inexplicably named Clarice and Hodierna. Margaret, the eldest daughter of David’s son, Henry, was married first to Conan IV of Brittany and then to Humphrey de Bohun. William I named two of his daughters Margaret. The first married Hubert de Burgh and the second married Gilbert Marshal (although the latter might also have been named Marjory). An illegitimate daughter of William’s was also named Margaret. William’s brother, Earl David of Huntingdon, named his eldest daughter Margaret, and she was wed to Alan of Galloway.

---

77 Intinerary in Acts of William I, ed. Barrow, 96-105, year 1180 on 97. See also Lawrie, Scottish Annals, 274-77, charter no. 236.
81 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 128.
82 Anderson, Early Sources, 2.149, n. 1.
Alexander II had only one daughter, whom he named after his mother, Ermengarde. However, his son, Alexander III, married Margaret of England (d. 1273). In two centuries, therefore, the name of an English princess had been incorporated into the Scottish dynasty and then come full circle as it was again adopted by the English royal family.

Neighboring dynasties increasingly favored the name. Hakon, son of Paul, son of Thorfinn, named his daughters Ingibjorg and Margaret, rather curiously representing both wives of Malcolm III. At other times Margaret’s name is paired with her sister’s, suggesting perhaps a persistent affection for the old Wessex dynasty. Hextilda, the Anglo-Saxon daughter of Uhtred, son of Waltheof of Tynedale, married first Richard Cumin, nephew of David I’s chancellor William Cumin, and then Malcolm earl of Atholl, a descendant of the Scottish royal house. The Liber Vitae of Durham records the names of fourteen of her family members, including her nieces Christina and Margaret. Christina of Markyate (d. c. 1155-66) had a sister named Margaret. Christina was born c. 1096-8, shortly after Margaret’s death, to an Anglo-Saxon noble family in the county of Huntingdonshire. Perhaps these sisters were, like Margaret and her sister, named after the early virgin martyr saints, but it is not difficult to see how their names might reflect a nostalgic nod toward the Anglo-Saxon princesses.

In the previous chapter we saw how Margaret’s children, particularly David and Matilda, consciously emulated their mother and were recognized for their sanctity by contemporaries and near-contemporaries. In the latter part of the twelfth century this sanctity became not the result of a deliberate pattern of behavior, but because of an inherited predisposition which then permeated the beata stirps, the saintly lineage. In this regard, the Scottish family is not unlike its Plantagenet counterpart. Just as the Norman rulers co-opted the legitimizing sanctity of their newly-acknowledged dynastic saint, Edward the Confessor, so the Scottish dynasty sought to benefit from the reflected sanctity of members of the extended family. Sanctity was no longer simply acquired

---

84 Margaret married Matad (Maddad), earl of Atholl. Anderson, Early Sources, 2.139.
85 Durham Liber Vitae, ed. Rollason and Rollason, 1.190; Barrow, “Scotland and Durham,” 322.
through direct descent; it radiated throughout the family tree.

The primary example of this nuanced change in perception is the treatment accorded to the memory of St Waltheof, the stepson of King David I. Joscelin of Furness, writing about 1210, dedicated his Life of Waltheof to William I, and to William’s son and brother, in other words, the entire existing male dynastic line. 87 Bartlett observes that Joscelin’s dedicatory note is curiously similar to Aelred’s address to Henry II in his Life of Edward the Confessor, urging imitation of a holy and dynastic exemplar. Joscelin writes, “In this book you will have a clear mirror of imitation, of wonder and of exultation: great wonder is evident in the miracles he has performed; the privilege of exultation is bestowed on you through the common stock and descent you share; imitation is proposed to you and others in zeal for virtue and the exercise of works of mercy.” 88 Aelred had similarly presented Edward as a model of dynastic virtue: “It is pleasant to marvel at his great moderation in the midst of so many riches and pleasures. The special renown of our Henry is his physical descent from such a holy line.” 89 The similarities are even more striking when the first sentence is added, which Bartlett notes is missing from the printed version in Patrologia Latina: Cum etiam sanctissimam eius vitam et preciosam legeris mortem, videas in eo quid imiteris, videas quid ammireris, videas in quo glorieris. Imitanda enim est tanti regis tanta iusticia, mirari dulce est in tot diviciis ac deliciis tanta continentia, de sancta eius progenie traxisse carnis originem Henrici nostri specialis est gloria. 90 Henry was not, of course, directly descended from the childless Edward the Confessor, but through his mother, the great-great-half niece of Edward, he shared in the radiated sanctity of the Anglo-Saxon line. Perhaps Joscelin was


90 BL, Additional MS 57533, f. 1 and similar in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 668, f. 1v; MS Bodley 285, f. 58; the first sentence is missing from the printed version in PL 195:738; Bartlett “Hagiography of Angevin England,” 42, n. 18.
to some extent asserting a sacred lineage for the extended royal family of Scotland just as his fellow Cistercian Aelred had done so successfully for the Plantagenet line. Waltheof was no blood relation at all to David I, being his stepson through his wife’s first marriage to Simon de Senlis, but his sanctity nevertheless is both attributed to his relationship with the holy Scottish dynasty and reflects upon it.\footnote{It must also be noted that both Aelred’s and Joscelin’s dedicatory prefaces are strikingly similar to the Dunfermline \textit{Vita}’s preface to the genealogy. Dunfermline \textit{Vita}, fo. 1vb.}

Even William I was added to the family nursery of saints, although he seems at first to have been an unlikely candidate.\footnote{For the following assessment of William’s actions and reputation see Barrow, \textit{Scotland and Its Neighbors}, 69-70.} On the debit side of the saintly ledger, William of Newburgh coolly remarks that, “for a long time [William] postponed the good gift of marriage either for offspring or for the relief of continence,” during which time he is said to have fathered “at least half a dozen” illegitimate children.\footnote{\textit{Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I}, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1884-9), 1.148; quote in Barrow, \textit{Scotland and Its Neighbors}, 69. For William’s natural daughters, Isabel and Margaret see \textit{Acts of William I}, ed. Barrow, 99; Lawrie, \textit{Scottish Annals}, 228, 290.} He was excommunicated by Pope Alexander III and an interdict placed throughout kingdom as result of his disobedience over selection of the bishop of St Andrews in 1179. He certainly evidenced no saintly quality of mercy during his invasions of the northern territories of England. Even his later sobriquet, “the Lion,” gives no clear indication of a tendency toward pious behavior.\footnote{Barrow notes that the epithet, “the Lion,” was applied by later generations. \textit{Acts of William I}, ed. Barrow, 20-21; Barrow, \textit{Scotland and its Neighbours}, 72-73.} Indeed, he was known as Uilleam Garbh, “William the Rough” or “the Harsh” to the annalist of Loch Cé.\footnote{\textit{Annals of Loch Cé}, ed. W.A. Hennessy (Rolls Series, 1871), 1.251.}

Nevertheless, he seems to have matured into his inherited sanctity. Roger of Howden, an English royal clerk writing in the early thirteenth century, records that when William was considering another invasion of England in 1199, he sought Margaret’s advice by spending the night at her shrine. She came to him in a dream and cautioned against such an attack, advice which he prudently heeded.\footnote{Roger of Howden, \textit{Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene}, ed. Stubbs, 4.100.} In seeking and abiding by Margaret’s counsel, William exhibits a spiritual maturity far beyond that of the young king who had been defeated and humiliated in 1174. In 1206, while meeting with King
John at York, he is credited with curing an ill child by touching and blessing him.\textsuperscript{97} In 1209, John’s troops were reluctant to confront William because the latter was assumed to benefit disproportionately from divine favor.\textsuperscript{98} Gerald of Wales describes William as a man “with lenity and mildness, with deep and lasting devotion towards God and holy church, liberal to the poor, pious, provident and peaceful, upholding the law with equity,” in keeping with the qualities exemplified by his ancestors.\textsuperscript{99} Gerald’s exalted opinion was corroborated by two independent sources. The Icelandic annals identify him as “William the Holy, king of Scots,” while Alberic of Trois Fontaines, commenting on his death, praises him as, “King William, a holy man.”\textsuperscript{100}

* * * * * * *

The end of the twelfth century witnessed the elevation of Margaret’s relics, a sure indication of the popular recognition of her sanctity. The cults of saints in general benefited from the spillover effect of the hugely popular cult of Thomas Becket. These cults were then employed by competing political interests either to confer dynastic legitimacy or to act as a counter to royal authority. In Margaret’s case, King William of Scotland was likely to have utilized her cult to alleviate his constrained position following the concession at York, when military and diplomatic avenues were closed. By the end of the century, the Scottish royal family was credited with having inherited the ancient sanctity of the Anglo-Saxon line through their foundress, Margaret. While Margaret’s children had deliberately emulated their mother, later generations seem to have benefited from passively inheriting dynastic sanctity, some, like William I, despite their initial behavior. The sanctity of this \textit{beata stirps} then radiated through the extended family.

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum}, ed. Skene, \textit{Gesta Annalia}, chap. 28.
\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Islandske Annaler indtil 1578}, ed. G. Storm (Oslo [Christiania], 1888), 23, 63; \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica} (Scriptores), xxiii, 902.
III.4. A CANONIZED SAINT

On 19 June 1250 Margaret’s remains were translated a second time, supposedly in recognition of her elevated status as a newly-canonized saint. The canonization process itself had been the result of the briefly coincident interests of Rome, Dunfermline Abbey, and the ruling dynasties of Scotland and England. This chapter will discuss the evidence for her canonization and consider the reasons for seeking and securing such papal recognition.

Evidence for Margaret’s Canonization

Whether or not Margaret was ever in fact canonized remains a matter of debate amongst scholars. Ottfried Krafft, in his monumental work on papal canonizations, takes exception to the lack of contemporary sources, both papal and otherwise, and the absence of a miracle collection which was considered so essential to the process. He concludes that the papacy simply recognized Margaret’s veneration as a local saint by granting a remission of forty days of enjoined penance for all who visited her shrine on her feast day, but stopped short of canonizing her. Roberto Paciocco reaches a similar conclusion. These doubtful arguments are centered on: a lack of documentation, including, most importantly, a bull of canonization and a miracle collection; the order for a second inquest after the initial dossier was deemed insufficient; and the grant of only a

---


minimal number of days of indulgences. Each of these objections will be considered in turn, after first identifying and discussing the surviving documentary evidence.

Any consideration of Margaret’s canonical status must be founded on an evaluation of the existing evidence, beginning with four letters from the Pope addressed to the prelates of Scotland. In a letter to the Bishops of Dunkeld, St Andrews and Dublane, dated 27 July 1245, Pope Innocent IV indicates that he had received a request from King Alexander II asking that Margaret be inscribed into the catalogue of saints. On 13 August 1246, another papal letter to the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow states that the Pope had determined that there was insufficient documentation “because neither the statements nor the names of the witnesses had been transmitted” and orders a new inquest. In a letter dated 16 September 1249, Innocent IV informs the abbot of Dunfermline Abbey that, in response to the petitions of the abbot, the Cardinal of Sainte-Sabine has arrived at a favorable conclusion and that “so that no one can doubt what the

---

3 For comprehensive inventories of such documentation see: Folz, Les saintes reines, 102-04; Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xxxvi-xxxvii; Paciocco, Canonizzazioni, 300-04.


5 Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, no. 285, p. 183; Regesta, ed. Potthast, no. 12252, The letter is known as Cum ad instanciam: Innocentius episcopus servorum Dei venerabilibus fratibus Sancti Andree et Glauensii episcopis salutem et apostolicam beneficicionem. Cum ad instanciam karissimi in Christo filii nostri regis Scoccii illustris tibi frater episcopo Sancti Andree et venerabilibus fratibus nostri Dunkeldensi et Dunblanensi episcopis nostri dederimus litteras in mandatis, ut de vita, meritis et miraculis sancte Margaritae regine Scoce inquireretis diligentius veritatem, nobis quod invenitis super hsi fideliter rescriptur, licet rescripseritis nobis vos inquisivisse plenius super his, quia cum nec dicta neque nomina testium receptarum nobis fuere transmissa, vo to eiusdem regis, cum non sit currendum in talibus, annue nequvium in hac parte. Quocirca fraternitati vestre per apostolica scripta mandamus, quattinuis inquirentes super premissis iuxta primarum litterarum continentiam quos plenius poteritis veritatem, omnia et singula qua invenitis fideliter redacta in scriptis nobis sub sigillis vestris per fidelem nuncium transmittatis, ut exinde quod expedire viderimus, disponamus. Dat. Lugdoni, id. Augusti, pontificatus nostri anno IIII.
cardinal has written, we address this letter to you as evidence of our benevolent will.” He indicates that a letter to this effect has also been sent to the Bishop of St Andrews. In a letter dated 21 September 1249 the pope offered an indulgence of forty days to all those who visit Margaret’s shrine on her feast day. Importantly, perhaps, Margaret is identified as sancta, although it should be cautioned that until the middle of the thirteenth century sancta and beata were used interchangeably. Nevertheless, it is significant that in the pope’s final missive on the subject of Margaret’s holy status he elects to use the more elevated terminology.

This trail of papal correspondence is augmented by a wealth of documentation regarding the translation of Margaret’s relics on 19 June 1250, allowing for textual comparison and corroboration. The late-fourteenth-century chronicler John of Fordun gives a succinct account:

Again, in the second year of King Alexander III, on the 19th of June 1250, this king, and the queen his mother, with bishops and abbots, earls and barons, and other good men, both clerics and laymen, in great numbers, met at Dunfermline, and took up, in great state, the bones of the blessed

---


7 Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, no. 291, p. 185-86; Regesta, ed. Potthast, no. 13807. The letter is known as Licet is de: Innocentius episcopus servus servorum Dei universis christifidelibus per regnum Scocie constitutis salutem et apostolican bisedictionem. Licet is, de cuius munere venit, ut sibi a fidelibus suis dignae ac laudabili servitatur, de abundancia pietatis sae, que merita supplicum excedit et vota, bene servientibus multa maiora retribuat quam valeant promereri, nichilominus tamen desiderantes Domino reddere populum acceptabilem, fideles Christi ad complacendum et quasi quibusdam illectivis premis, indulgenciis scilicet et remissionibus invitamus, ut exinde reddantur divine gracie aptiores. Cum igitur dignum existat ut maior ecclesia monasterii de Dunfermlyn Ordinis sancti Benedicti diocesis Sancti Andree congruis honoribus frequentetur, omnibus vere penitentibus et confessis qui ecclesiam ipsam in festo sancte Margarite venerabiliter visitaveri annuatim, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum eius auctoritate confisi, XL dies de iuncta sibi penitencia annis singulis misericordier relaxamus. Dat. Lugduni, XI kal. October, pontificatus nostri anno VII.

8 Vauchez, Sainthood, 85.

9 In addition to the accounts described in more detail below, see an account of the translation followed by the lessons of the feast in the sixteen-century Breviary of Aberdeen, ed. William, bishop of Aberdeen, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1509-1510); facsimile reprint, (London: Bannatyne Club, 1854), 2:3 (June 19th).
Margaret, sometime queen of Scots, out of the stone monument where they had lain through a long course of years; and these they laid, with the deepest devoutness, in a shrine of deal [pine wood], set with gold and precious stones.  

Walter Bower expands John of Fordun’s account:

Next year, that is 1250, the king and the queen his mother along with the bishops and abbots and other magnates of the realm assembled at Dunfermline. There they raised the bones and earthly remains of the glorious Queen Margaret his great-great-great-grandmother from the stone sepulchre in which they had rested for many years, and with the utmost reverence raised them in a casket of firwood entwined with gold and precious stones. When the grave had been opened up by digging, such an intense and sweet-smelling fragrance poured from it that men thought that the entire sanctuary had been sprinkled with the fragrance of spices and the scents of flowers in full bloom. And a miracle, sent by God, was forthcoming there and then. When that famous treasure had been placed in the outer church preparatory to re-burial in the choir beyond the high altar, a move intended as a mark of honour, it was raised without difficulty by the holy hands of the bishops and abbots, and was being carried in procession, with instruments playing and the choir singing harmoniously. They got as far as the chancel door just opposite the body of Margaret’s husband, King Malcolm, which lay under an arched roof on the north side of the nave, when all at once the arms of the bearers became paralyzed, and because of the great weight they were no longer able to move the shrine which held the remains. Whether they liked it or not they were forced to halt and quickly lay their load on the ground. After some delay more helpers were added, perhaps stronger than the first, to help carry the shrine, but failed all the more feebly the more they tried to lift it. At last, as they were all marveling one to another, and saying that they were not worthy to touch such a precious relic, they heard a voice coming from one of the bystanders, but as is believed divinely inspired, which loudly proclaimed that it was perhaps not God’s will that the bones of the holy queen be translated before her husband’s tomb had been opened, and his body raised and honoured in the same way. These words met with general approval, and following the advice which they conveyed, King Alexander, [Malcolm’s great-] great-great-grandson, with companions chosen for this purpose, lifted up the casket containing the bones of the king along with that, now raised, which held the remains of the queen, without expending any effort or encountering any obstacle. They solemnly placed both

coffins in tombs which had been decked out elegantly for that purpose, as
the congregation sang and a choir or prelates followed in solemn
procession, on 19 June. There God in his mercy has often worked all
manner of miracles through [the merits of] that holy queen.\(^{11}\)

This later account is distinguished from the first in three ways. First, it
accentuates the direct descent of Alexander from his holy great-great-great-grandparents.
Second, it adds the common hagiographic trope of a sweet fragrance emanating from the
saint’s opened tomb. Third, it includes a marvelous account of the refusal of the saint’s
bones to proceed with the translation ceremony until accompanied by those of her spouse.
This miracle will be discussed in more detail later, but it serves in the text as an
introduction to the claim that “all manner of miracles” occurred at Margaret’s shrine.

The two points of disagreement in the scholarly evaluation of these accounts
involve the year of the translation and the identity of Alexander III’s mother. His father,
Alexander II, died on 8 July 1249 prior to receiving a response from Rome (or more
accurately, Lyon) regarding Margaret’s canonization in September.\(^{12}\) All the accounts
state that the translation took place in the presence of the young Alexander III and his
mother, among others. The historical background provided in the *Acta Sanctorum*,
followed by Folz, identifies Alexander’s mother as Joan, the first wife of Alexander II,
who had died in 1238 at a nunnery in Dorset, having remained in England following a
visit in 1235.\(^{13}\) Alexander II had then married Marie de Couci (d. 1284) in 1239, who

\(^{11}\) Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ed. Watt, 5.296-99. Bower is closely followed by the fifteenth-century Book of
Pluscarden. It was composed by a monk from Dunfermline, who, it can be assumed, would have had the
opportunity to view the shrine, and might have had access to oral or written accounts of the translation
2.56-7. Dr. Marinell Ash, who has done extensive work on the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots during
the reign of Alexander III in particular, concludes that although this is a later work there is “no reason to
doubt the account.” Marinell Ash, “The Church in the reign of Alexander III,” in *Scotland in the Reign of

\(^{12}\) For the date of his death see: *The Chronicle of Melrose*, trans. Stevenson, s.a. 1249. For more
information on the exact day of Alexander II’s death see Anderson, *Early Sources*, 2.558, n. 3 and 4.

\(^{13}\) *AASS*, June, vol. 2, 339: *Transactis igitur a Christo Salvatore nostro annis quinquaginta uno ducentis &
mille, Alexander, illius nominis tertius, Scotorum Rex inclitus, Scotorum Rex inclitus (a populo persuasus præmissorum exequendi
gratia) cum matre sua Joanna, Scottie pro tunca Regina, sorore Henrici Regis Angliae, ejusdem patris
primogenita, cum varis & quam pluribus regni sui Episcopis, Abbatisbus, Ducibus, Comitibus, Dominis,
Baronibus & Militibus, Clericis & laicis, devotionis & peregrinationis causa, ad ecclesiam de
cérémonie de la translation eut lieu le 19 juin 1251, en présence du jeune roi Alexandre III, de sa mère la
was in fact the mother of Alexander III.\textsuperscript{14} A.O. Anderson notes that Marie was in France in June of 1251 and 1252, so the translation of Margaret’s relics must have taken place in 1250.\textsuperscript{15}

It is worth taking a moment here to consider the serial locations of Margaret’s burial.\textsuperscript{16} From 1093 to 1180 her remains were located “opposite the altar and the sign of the holy cross” in the church which she had founded. According to the miracle collection, her remains were relocated in 1180 to “the north side of the altar” in David’s expanded abbey church. Finally in 1250, her bones were translated to a dedicated feretory chapel in the eastern apse of the church. A possible contradiction arises between the position north of the altar, in the east end of the church, given in the miracle collection and the claim by Bower that Margaret’s remains were removed from “the outer church,” and carried through the chancel arch into the choir. Bartlett reasons that Bower’s description implies that in 1250 Margaret’s bones were removed from a tomb in the nave, and concludes that the mistake was probably Bower’s.\textsuperscript{17} However, Bower also specifies that Margaret’s relics “had been placed in the outer church preparatory to re-burial in the choir beyond the high altar.”\textsuperscript{18} It is possible that Margaret’s relics had been taken from their location north of the altar to the outer church, or nave, in preparation for a ceremonial procession. It was perhaps during this procession that Margaret’s shrine made its weighty protest as it approached the chancel near the tomb of her husband.

Although Dunfermline Abbey was largely destroyed, a shortened structure was rebuilt in the nineteenth century. The base of the shrine still exists outside the reconstructed church, although Peter Yeoman cautions that new stones might have been used when it refashioned in 1368.\textsuperscript{19} It consists of the famous “dark grey, fossiliferous Frosterly marble,” quarried from Durham County, which must have had a luminescent quality when polished.\textsuperscript{20} The shrine itself was supported by eight columns, as evidenced

\begin{enumerate}
\item[]\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Chronicle of Melrose}, ed. Stevenson, s.a. 1239.
\item[]\textsuperscript{15} Anderson, \textit{Early Sources}, 2.86, n. 1.
\item[]\textsuperscript{18} Watt, \textit{Scotichronicon}, 5.296-67.
\item[]\textsuperscript{19} Yeoman, “Saint Margaret’s Shrine at Dunfermline Abbey,” 84.
\item[]\textsuperscript{20} Yeoman, “Saint Margaret’s Shrine at Dunfermline Abbey,” 84-85, with a picture of the base on 84.
\end{enumerate}
by the shallow depressions which still exist in the base. These columns served to elevate
the shrine so that it was more visible, and it also allowed objects and people greater
proximity to the supernatural aid offered by the relics. The shrine was perhaps in the
shape of a church as shown on a thirteenth-century seal of the abbey.21

Nevertheless, despite all the evidence, doubts persist concerning whether or not
Margaret received official papal recognition of her sanctity. The first and most
significant stumbling block is the absence of a surviving bull of canonization. The usual
procedure would have been to issue an official notice confirming the saint’s status in the
form of such a papal bull. First, the investigation into Margaret’s life, virtues, and
miracles would have been read in a secret consistory of cardinals summoned by the pope.
Then, the pope would have consulted with those bishops and archbishops present and
pronounced the verdict. Finally, the judgment would have been announced in a third,
public consistory and confirmed through the liturgical celebration of the new saint and
the promulgation of one or more official papal bulls.22 The Utrecht Legendary had once
contained a narrative account of the proceedings, but all that remains today is a fragment
recorded in the Acta Sanctorum. Although far from conclusive, there is nothing in the
language of the surviving text that indicates anything other than a positive outcome. The
Abbot of Dunfermline advanced the case for Margaret’s sanctity, pointing out that Jesus
Christ himself had recognized it by working miracles through her. The Pope, convinced
by these arguments, orders a formal inquiry. Here the text ends. Throughout this
abbreviated record, however, the language is affirmative.23

Many thanks to Mrs. Margaret Dean for a tour of the Abbot House at Dunfermline Abbey, which contains
reproductions of the marble.

21 Yeoman, “Saint Margaret’s Shrine at Dunfermline Abbey,” 87 with a picture of the seal on p. 85, and a
hypothetical depiction of the shrine on p. 86.

22 For the history of the development of this process see Vauchez, Sainthood, 33-57.

23 BHL, 5328; AASS, June 2, 338: Historia Translationis, eamque prægressæ Canonizationis, olim fideliter
descripta habebatur, ut dixi, in Ms. Legendario Ultrajectino S. Salvatoris; sed ejus solum ibi initium
legebatur hoc tenore: Gloriosam venerabilis & a Deo dilectæ Beatae Margaritæ Scotorum Regiæ
Translationem, Procanonizationis causa Romam profectus Abbas Dunfermelinen succincto sermone
percurrire cupientes, ipsius adjutierium imploramus, qui per eam occidentales tenebras lucifluis praeclæræ
fidei radiis serenavit. Et licet sancti Patres, prædecessores nostrí, tempus vocationis vel translationis
dictæ Sanctæ ardentis desiderio concupierant, indigressam tamen omno viam hoc opus aggrediendi,
posteris relliquerunt. Vidimus enim diem illum, & gavisí sumus. Largiente igitur ad hoc, tempus acceptabile
& dies salutis, illo qui nec locorum ambitu nec valet metis temporum circumcludi; Abbas domus de
A successful conclusion to the proceedings is suggested in the letter from the papacy dated 16 September 1249, as noted above, in which Pope Innocent IV confirms the cardinal’s positive conclusion, and writes the letter as evidence of his “benevolent will.” Krafft takes exception to the interpretation of David McRoberts and Robert Folz of this sentence as papal confirmation of the Cardinal’s recommendation to proceed with the canonization. Paciocco contends that although this letter indicates that the Pope was favorably inclined toward acknowledgement of Margaret’s sanctity, something happened that stymied any further progress toward her canonization. The Cardinal’s positive findings and the Pope’s benevolence suggest but do not verify papal recognition of Margaret’s sanctity.

The solemn translation of her remains following receipt of the pope’s letter is another possible but inconclusive indication of papal approval. In the thirteenth century, this ceremony typically followed and confirmed papal recognition of the saint’s sanctity.

---

Dymfermelyn, ad Apostolicæ Sedis Antistitem cum precibus regis, testimonio Prelatorum, & precibus cleri ac populi praefectus est, de Sancta sua seriem rei relatus.

Proposuit namque diligenter in ejus auditorio, Senatu Apostolico considerante, eandem Beatam in terrestri regno tam religiosam & Deo placitam vitam duxisse, quod nemini dubium sit, in Pontificio Consistorio exponit Margaritae Sanctitatem quin propter expertissima merita sua premium gloriae & honoris sibi in celestibus comparasset. Adject etiam idem Abbas, ad persuasionem suam, absque diffidentiae scrupulo, affirmandum; Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui in Sanctis suis semper est mirabilis, illam, dum in hujus incolatu exilii moraretur, signis & virtutum prodigiis multiforme perlustrasse: ac demum a die transitus temporalis, usque ad tempora hodierna, variis morborum generibus lactessit, miraculis in Vita & a morte testatam, ad sepulcrum ejus sospitata, ad gratiam Dei indulsiisse. Unde dignissimum, voluntate divinae consonatam & testatam, in corde terræ digressionem, ac si lucrernam modo contingente submissam, candelabro superimponi debere; & de humili mausoleo super altitudine terra eminentius elevatum, in hierotheca spectabili decentissime collocari.

Auditis his & intellectis, summus Pontifex, directis inquisitioriis quibusdam Episcopis, mandavit, ut super vita, meritis & miraculis predictae Sanctae cognita diligentius veritate, Pontifex, processus formari jubet: que fidei digna relatu reperirent, sub sigillis suis, per fidelem nuntium Apostolatui suo remittere non tardarent. Dicti vero Episcopi, velut viri cordati & ejusdem Sanctae devoti zelatores, negotium sibi creditum exequi studiose affectantes; certis die & loco testes admiserunt; de illorum attestationibus, juxta suum, aliquid redigentes in scriptis, eidem Abbatii committebant, summno Presuli presentanda.

24 Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, no. 290, p. 185; Regesta, ed. Potthast, no. 13800: Cum ergo dilectus filius H. tit. Sancte Sabine presbiter cardinalis cui inquisitionem inquisicionem habite super vita et miraculis beate memoriae margarite Regina Sco. Commisimus [...], nos tuis supplicationibus inclinati, ne super hiis que idem cardinalis scribit, positi ab aliqua quibus dubitari [...] has litteras tibi duximus in testimonium concedendas.


26 Paciocco, Canonizazzioni, 303.
although the translation of a local, popularly recognized saint was not uncommon.\textsuperscript{27}

Finally, the fact that indulgences for visiting Margaret’s shrine was limited to only forty days has been interpreted as evidence of her lack of standing within the community of saints.\textsuperscript{28} Typically, such indulgences amounted to papal recognition of sanctity, especially as the papacy sought to increase its oversight of confession and penance.\textsuperscript{29} The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 limited the average episcopal indulgence to maximum of forty days, but in practice these indulgences often accumulated, reaching extravagant durations in excess of a year.\textsuperscript{30} This was not, however, always the case. For example, Pope Innocent IV granted indulgences of a year and forty days for all those visiting the shrine of Edmund of Abingdon.\textsuperscript{31} It was only toward the end of the following century, however, that the Church “showered indulgences” on saints, particularly those venerated in areas that remained loyal during the Great Schism.\textsuperscript{32} From these observations it can be surmised that, with specific regard to the thirteenth century, it was not necessarily common papal practice to grant the remission of sins to the faithful visiting the shrines of locally-venerated saints, and that when these indulgences were granted the number of days tended to be more conservative.

The cult of Edward the Confessor offers a comparative case study fairly coincident with Margaret in terms of both time and place. In a letter dated 26 July 1245, Pope Innocent IV granted a remission of enjoined penance amounting to twenty days for all inhabitants of the dioceses of London, Lincoln, and Winchester who contributed to the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey.\textsuperscript{33} A few days later, in a letter dated 31 July 1245, the

\textsuperscript{27} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 32.
\textsuperscript{28} Paciocco, \textit{Canonizzazioni}, 303-04.
\textsuperscript{30} Vincent, \textit{Holy Blood}, 158
\textsuperscript{31} Krafft, \textit{Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung}, 456.
\textsuperscript{32} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 90. From this observation it can be further extrapolated that in the thirteenth century it was not necessarily common papal practice to grant indulgences to locally-venerated saints, although it should be cautioned that a grant of indulgences might have simply been recognizing a saint of long-standing. Vauchez also notes that while indulgences tended to increase through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, they varied widely. Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 74, fn. 37. In the final analysis, it is probably best to caution that we should not jump to conclusions regarding the status of a saint based on such a moving target.
\textsuperscript{33} Westminster Abbey Muniment, MS Domesday, fo. 406r.
Pope granted a more liberal indulgence of a year and forty days for all who attended the proposed translation of the relics of Edward the Confessor. The disparity between a papal indulgence of twenty days and another in excess of a year bears further investigation.

Nicholas Vincent, in his study of the Holy Blood relic at Westminster Abbey, demonstrates the existence of an inverse relationship between the duration of the indulgence and the popularity of the shrine. He observes that:

the greater the number of indulgences, the more anxious a church must have been to attract pilgrims to a particular relic or enterprise, and hence, we may assume, the less appeal such a relic or enterprise might have commanded on its own merits alone. To this extent, the more extensive indulgences often accompany innately unpopular, rather than innately popular, relics. It is remarkable, for instance, that during its most successful years the enormously prestigious shrine of St Thomas at Canterbury appears to have attracted only a handful of indulgences, virtually none of them episcopal, whereas there are large numbers for shrines, relics and churches that commanded little of Canterbury’s prestige.

The papal grant of the standard forty days of remission of enjoined penance for all who visited the shrine of St Margaret therefore could be more indicative of the established popularity of her cult rather than any papal reservations regarding her sanctity.

Some scholars remain troubled by the fact that the papal inquiry into Margaret’s sanctity was ordered to be repeated. Second investigations were not unusual in practice, and were regarded as evidence of both the papacy’s authority and an indication of the solemnity of the process. Vauchez notes that with few exceptions, “the canonization

---

34 Vincent, Holy Blood, 2 n. 3 citing Westminster Abbey Muniment, MS Domesday, fo. 386v, letters of Innocent IV 31 July 1245: Eius licet immeriti ... idem rex devotionis ardore succensus corpus beati Edwardi regis Anglie gloriosum de loco ad locum honori fac sollemniter transferre proponat. For a discussion of the motivations behind these indulgences see Paul Binski, Westminster Abbey, and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400 (New Haven, CT and London: the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1995), 11-12. By way of comparison, Matthew Paris records that in October 1247 the Bishop of Norwich announced indulgences amounting to six years and one hundred and sixteen days to all who visited Westminster Abbey to visit the relic of the Holy Blood. See Vincent, Holy Blood, 156.


36 In contrast, on 8 October 1290 Pope Nicholas IV granted an indulgence of one year and forty days to those who visited Margaret’s shrine on her feast day. Anderson, Early Sources, 2.87, s.a. 1093.
processes of this period were all characterized by a two fold investigation into the life and the miracles.\textsuperscript{37} Between 1198 and 1276, the papacy ordered a repeat of the process in eighteen out of the forty-eight enquiries conducted.\textsuperscript{38} The saints whose repeat investigation resulted in canonization include such well-regarded models of sanctity as Gilbert of Sempringham, William of York, Edmund of Abingdon, Stanislas of Cracow, and Hedwig of Silesia.\textsuperscript{39} A repeat investigation is therefore not an indication of papal ambivalence, but could instead be more properly viewed as evidence of papal interest.

One additional objection will be treated in passing here, since it is outside the timeframe of this study but does reflect somewhat on the question of Margaret’s canonization. It has been suggested that the late fifteenth-century request by the Scottish monarch that Margaret be included in Universal Calendar of Saints is evidence that she had not been canonized in the thirteenth century. However, there are other instances in which saints who were undoubtedly canonized were not necessarily immediately included in the Roman calendar of saints. In 1228, Henry III wrote to the pope asking that Edward the Confessor be recognized in the calendar.\textsuperscript{40} Her omission from the calendar is therefore not conclusive proof. More than anything, this request probably reflected the fact that the Scottish monarchy wanted to promote their ancestress at a time when Margaret’s cult remained localized.

Finally, the absence of a miracle collection had been considered by some as evidence that a dossier had not been prepared for Margaret’s canonization. However, its discovery in the Dunfermline Manuscript, and its subsequent translation by Robert Bartlett, now renders that argument moot. Bartlett surmises that the collection might have been written for the canonization process but notes some inconsistencies. A miracle referring to the Battle of Largs in 1263 provides a terminus ante quem for the date of completion of the compilation. On the other hand, the author also claims as his source the testimony of a man who was miraculously healed in 1180, indicating the possibility of an earlier date of composition. Above all, there is no mention of Margaret’s

\textsuperscript{37} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 47.
\textsuperscript{38} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 51.
\textsuperscript{39} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 53, Table 2.
\textsuperscript{40} Binski, \textit{Westminster Abbey}, 52; Vincent, \textit{Holy Blood}, 1. However, it should be noted that Edward was canonized when the papal process was in its infancy and some might therefore have concluded that it would benefit from ratification.
canonization in 1249 and the translation of her relics in 1250, which amounts to “an astonishing silence,” to quote Bartlett. Bartlett hypothesizes that “the bulk of the collection was assembled before 1249 and that the chapters demonstrably later than that date are interpolations.”

In support of this possibility, I would also add that the papal letter of 27 July 1245 mentions that Margaret’s remains were the site of innumerable miracles, perhaps referring to an existing miracle collection.

The surviving evidence therefore demonstrates that the canonization process was requested by the Scottish king and given serious consideration by the papacy, without however, offering conclusive proof that she ever received papal recognition of her sanctity. In order to avoid having to make repetitive disclaimers, for the remainder of this analysis I will assume, like Vauchez, that she was indeed canonized.

The Nature of Her Sanctity

Margaret’s sanctity remains somewhat unique, especially in terms of Vauchez’s collective observations. To begin with, Margaret’s cult was located on the periphery of Europe. Vauchez states that from the mid-thirteenth century popes were less inclined to canonize locally recognized saints, especially those from the countries on the margin of Europe. In such cases, the pope needed to be “persuaded that the cult was deep rooted and extended to the whole of the country.” It helped, however, if the request was made by a person of elevated rank, such as an archbishop or, in Margaret’s case, a ruling king. Margaret also did not benefit from the advantage of being a recently deceased saint. From 1198-1304, only 20.4 percent of the saints canonized died more than 100 years prior to the beginning of the inquest. The majority of those considered for canonization (71.4
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41 Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xxxiv-xxxvi, quotes on xxxv.
42 Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, no. 281, p. 181; Regesta, ed. Potthast, no. 11753: Ex parte karissimi in Christo filii nostri regis Scoiae illustris fuit nobis humiliter supplicatum ut, cum corpus clare memorie Margarite regine Scoiae choruscet miraculis infinitis, ipsam aggregari sanctorum cathalago faceremus.
43 Vauchez, Sainthood, 68-70, quote on 70. I would also add that some of this disproportionate representation might have been the result of a more general reluctance on the part of the papal commissioners to travel to such remote territories. Note for example, the assertion of Gerald of Wales that the appointed commissioners destroyed the papal bull ordering an inquiry into the sanctity of the Welsh hermit, Caradoc, in order to avoid the process.
44 These included Cunegund (d. 1040, inquest 1199), Wulfstan (d. 1095, inquest 1201), Procopius (d. 1053, inquest 1203), Osmund of Salisbury (d. 1099, inquest 1228), Virgil of Salzburg (d. 784, inquest 1230), Bruno of Wurzburg (d. 1045, inquest 1238), Stanislas of Cracow (d. 1079, inquest 1250), and of course Margaret. Between 1305 and 1431 that number dropped precipitously to only 4.5 percent of all inquests.
percent) had died less than 60 years before the beginning of the inquest. The Roman Church preferred to endorse models of more current, readily-imitable models of sanctity.\footnote{Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 110.}

Furthermore, Margaret was a relatively rare female saint. From 1198-1431 only 19.4\% of the processes and 18.9\% of the canonizations involved women.\footnote{See also P. Jounel, \textit{Le culte des saints dans les basiliques du Latran et du Vatican au XIIe siècle}, Collection de l’École française de Rome 26 (Rome, 1977), 12.} Among the laity, however, women accounted for 58.8\% of the processes and 55.5\% of the canonizations during this period. Still, “at the end of the Middle Ages, canonization remained essentially a male prerogative.”\footnote{These percentages differ somewhat from those arrived at by Vauchez only because Hedwig of Silesia had been inadvertently omitted from this particular calculation. Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 268-69, fn. on 269.} The fourteen women who were the subject of a process included, in chronological order of the proceedings: Cunegund, Elizabeth of Hungary, Hildegard of Bingen, Margaret of Scotland, Rose of Viterbo, Clare of Assisi, Hedwig of Silesia, Margaret of Hungary, Clare of Montefalco, Delphine of Sabran, Bridget of Sweden, Dorothy of Montau, Catherine of Siena, and Ingrid of Skänninge. The six who were canonized are: Cunegunde, Elizabeth of Hungary, Margaret of Scotland, Clare of Assisi, Hedwig of Silesia, and Bridget of Sweden, with Catherine of Siena added later (1461).

Finally, Margaret was the only lay saint from the British Isles canonized during the period considered by Vauchez.\footnote{Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 269. For further discussion of the “increasing feminization of sanctity” in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries see: Jane Tibbetts Schulenburg, “Sexism and the Celestial Gynaecum from 500-1200,” \textit{Journal of Medieval History}, 4 (1978): 117-33; Michael Goodich, “The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century” 20-21; Michael Goodich, \textit{Vita Perfecta: The Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century} (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1982), 173.} Lay sanctity was least successful in the British Isles where “the only two British lay saints whose cult was recognized by the Roman Church between 1198 and 1431 were a Welsh hermit of the early twelfth century and a queen of Scotland of the eleventh century.”\footnote{As discussed in the previous chapter, Edward the Confessor was canonized during a period in which the papacy was only beginning to assert control over the canonization process. Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 265.} The inquiry into the sanctity of the Welsh hermit, Caradoc (d. 1124), was abandoned after Innocent III’s bull ordering the inquiry (8 May 1200) was allegedly destroyed by the two commissioners in their desire to avoid having...
to proceed with the investigations. The papacy rejected outright the requested inquiries regarding Thomas of Lancaster (d. 1322, requested in 1327-31) and Edward II (d. 1327, request in 1386). None of the other saints of the British Isles canonized during this period were lay persons. In general, only about one quarter of the processes for canonization were conducted for member of laity, but the number increased steadily from the twelfth through the fifteenth centuries. It should be noted, however, that Margaret’s cause was probably aided by that fact that she was royal. Vauchez observes that, with “almost only one exception” (the merchant from Cremona, Homobonus), all lay saints belonged to royal families. Therefore, given the fairly exceptional nature of Margaret’s sanctity, it is worth considering who was interested in promoting her sanctity and why.

Three pieces of evidence indicate that the Scottish monarchy played an active role in promoting Margaret’s cult. First, the inquiry into her sanctity was initiated by her descendant, Alexander II. In a letter dated 27 July 1245, Pope Innocent IV indicated that he had received a request from the king to consider Margaret’s sanctity. Second, the solemn translation of her relics was attended by the newly-crowned king, Alexander III, his mother, prelates and nobles, showing universal support among the magnates of the realm. Finally, royal interest in the promotion of Dunfermline Abbey, the focal point of
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52 Gilbert of Sempringham (can. 1202), Wulfstan of Worcester (can. 1203), Hugh of Lincoln (can. 1220), Lawrence O’Toole (can. 1226), William of York (can. 1226), Edmund of Abingdon/Canterbury (can. 1247); Richard of Chichester (can. 1262); Thomas Cantilupe of Hereford (can. 1320); John of Bridlington (can. 1401); Osmund of Salisbury (can. 1457). See Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 252-55.
53 For the processes conducted on behalf of members of the laity see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 256, table 10. For the increased percentage over time see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 263-65.
54 Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 283.
Margaret’s cult, was made evident on 24 April 1245 when Alexander II obtained a papal grant authorizing use of the episcopal mitre and ring for the Abbot of Dunfermline. The beneficiary of such papal largesse, Robert Kenleith, Abbot of Dunfermline, was later made royal chancellor early in Alexander III’s reign and “charged with bringing the canonization process of Margaret to a successful conclusion.”

Such royal interest is particularly relevant because in the absence of an archbishop the effort had to be championed by secular authority. In general, the primary advocate for saints’ cults depended on the relative strengths of the prevailing political structure: where there was a strong monarchy, the cults benefited from a royal advocate (France); where there was a strong episcopate they benefited from ecclesiastical advocates (England); and where the political power of the people was strong, they benefited from lay advocates (Italy).

The acephalous nature of the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots meant that Margaret’s case had to be championed by royal authority in conjunction with the Abbot of Dunfermline.

It is also worth noting that the canonization process bridged the final years of a strong ruler, Alexander II, and the minority of his young heir, Alexander III, suggesting that it was concluded for reasons that might not have been entirely congruent with those for its initiation. Michael Penman has suggested that Alexander II’s expression of piety might have been motivated by his desire both to imitate Henry III and to express his hostility toward the English. Like Henry, he was interested in the relics of the Passion, although such devotion, Penman advises, really dates back to Margaret’s relic of the Cross. On the other hand, Alexander observed the feast days of the royal bête noir.

---

57 Regesta, ed. Potthast,11632a; Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. Innes, no. 279, p. 180-81; Baker, “A Nursery of Saints,” 120-21; Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom, 558-59. From the 1170s the abbots of Westminster Abbey also were mitred. See Binski, Westminster Abbey, 53; W. Holzmann, Papsturkunden in England, I. Bibliotheken und Archive in London, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 25 (Berlin 1930): 389, no. 118 (for the prerogative of wearing mitre and rings in 1176); 414-15 no. 143 (for use of gloves in 1177); 599-601 nos. 300-01 (for grants of further privileges in 1192). The mitre is still very much a part of Dunfermline’s identity as evidenced by its depiction in both a stained glass window and an iron gate. Many thanks to Mrs. Margaret Dean for pointing these out to me during a visit to the Abbey.

58 Ash, “The Church in the reign of Alexander III,” 37. His tenure was short-lived, however. He was forced out of office in 1252 after a rival faction had gained power. Ash, “The Church in the reign of Alexander III,” 37-38.

59 For illustrative examples see Vauchez, Sainthood, 218-45.
Thomas Becket, rather than Edward the Confessor. Penman concludes, therefore, that the initial motivation for Alexander II’s interest in Margaret was more political than pious. Like Becket, Margaret was a valuable “dynastic challenge” to the Plantagenets. Her particular value lay in her association with Durham and St Cuthbert, which facilitated Alexander’s effort to reclaim the northern English counties. Finally, a political rather than pious agenda is further suggested by the absence of Alexander’s personal involvement in her cult; none of the miracles collected during the process involved members of the royal family, and the king chose to be buried at Melrose rather than Dunfermline.60

Alexander III, however, tended to model his personal piety on that of King Henry III of England. Henry was his powerful and influential father-in-law during his malleable minority, a mentor whom he visited at the English court quite regularly. Like Henry, he seems to have observed Edward the Confessor’s feast days. His devotion also spilled over to his own ancestral saint, St Margaret. He observed the twinned feast days of Sts Margaret and Edmund of Abingdon. Later in his reign, he added the Lady Chapel at Dunfermline, where his wife, Queen Margaret, was probably buried, along with their two sons, in addition to Alexander himself, most likely before the high altar. During his reign Margaret’s dynasty also benefited from her supernatural intervention, such as the miraculous vision of her that resulted in a Scottish victory at Largs in 1263.61 Finally, Margaret’s “serk” began to be used to assist Scottish queens in childbirth, much as, Penman notes, the “Virgin’s girdle” at Westminster.62

Margaret’s canonization could also be viewed as evidence of the continued policy from one reign to the next that existed, if only briefly, with particular regard to the effort to achieve papal recognition of Margaret’s sanctity. The two most readily recognizable common denominators between the two reigns are the dowager Queen Marie and the royal chancellor, Robert of Kenleith, former Abbot of Dunfermline.

---


61 Bartlett, Miracles, 86-89.

However, two years into the new king’s reign, Marie had retired to France and Robert had been forced from power.63

Renewed interest in Margaret’s cult might have been part of an attempt to connect with Scotland’s sacred, ancient past.64 This “ecclesiastical antiquarianism” in the mid-thirteenth century resulted in increased attention to the cults of Sts Kentigern and Duthac of Tain, for example, and the *invenio* of St Nicholas’s cross.65 During the translation ceremony Margaret’s cult was linked with that of St Cuthbert, a saint particularly patronized by Margaret’s dynasty, through a common hagiographic trope. When Margaret’s remains were being removed they became unbearably heavy, refusing to be moved past the tomb of King Malcolm until his remains accompanied hers.66 Similarly, after years of being carried around Northumbria, Cuthbert’s relics had selected Durham as their ultimate resting place by becoming inordinately heavy.67 Perhaps this reflects not only a more general ecclesiastical antiquarianism, but also an effort to associate with past, established authorities. The Scottish ruling dynasty might also have been seeking reauthorization of Margaret’s cult. As we saw in the previous chapter, by the middle of the thirteenth century “papal canonization far outclassed episcopal translation, which lost its decisive and definitive character.”68

Finally, Alexander II’s initial interest might have been partly in response to English royal interest in Edward the Confessor.69 The devotion of Henry III to Edward

---


64 In general, I have noticed that royally-sponsored canonizations seemed to take place toward the end of a reign, perhaps when the throne was more secure from immediate challenges or as an older ruler naturally began to ponder such concerns as his own mortality and dynastic continuity. This broad theme, however, must remain the subject of a future study.


67 For the connection with Cuthbert see also Ash, “The Church in the Reign of Alexander III,” 31-32.


69 It should be cautioned, however, that this relationship is more complicated than often assumed. Paul Binski infers a causal relationship between Henry’s reconstruction of his ancestor’s shrine and Margaret’s canonization: “At Dunfermline in the late 1240s, for example, St Edward’s royal kinswoman, St Margaret, was to be canonized and translated rapidly in the wake of Henry’s actions at Westminster.” Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, 4. D. A. Carpenter, however, speculates that devotion to Margaret in Scotland might
has been well documented and thoroughly investigated. D. A. Carpenter reasons that Henry’s devotion to Edward began between 1233 and 1238. As early as 1227, however, Henry III had secured a bull from Pope Gregory IX recommending that the feast of Edward’s translation be observed by the Church in England as a solemn holiday. This papal bull was then publicized at the legatine council in London on 9 November 1227. In 1241, Henry III began rebuilding Edward’s shrine at Westminster Abbey. Renovation of the Abbey itself followed in 1245 along with Henry’s announcement in 1246 that he intended to buried beside the Confessor. In 1243 the prior and convent of Christ Church Canterbury acquiesced to Henry’s request and agreed to celebrate the anniversary of the translation of Edward the Confessor’s relics (13 October) with all the ceremony typical for feast of the Ascension. In July 1246 the Bishop of Salisbury ordered his dean and chapter to hold special celebrations of the feasts of both the translation and the deposition of St Edward (5 January). During this same period, sometime between Henry’s marriage in 1236 and the 1250s, Matthew Paris composed a French vernacular life of St

---


71 Carpenter, “King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor.”


74 For Henry’s role in initiating both these actions see: Westminster Abbey Muniments MS Domesday fos. 388v-9r; Vincent, Holy Blood 11. For the tepid reception of both these feasts see: Vincent, Holy Blood, 11; Barbara Harvey, Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 43 n. 3 noting that the Pope had to renew the earlier papal order that the feast of the translation be observed. Pope Innocent IV, Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis, 10 January 1249 (Westminster Abbey MS Domesday fo. 406r).
Edward, dedicated to Eleanor of Provence, wife of Henry III.\textsuperscript{75} Henry’s devotion soon assumed dynastic dimensions. The heart of Henry of Almain, nephew of Henry III, was placed in the shrine of Edward the Confessor at Westminster.\textsuperscript{76} Of greater significance for this study, however, is the fact that he named his oldest son Edward (b. 17/18 June 1239), and his oldest daughter Margaret (b. 29 September 1240).\textsuperscript{77} In Henry’s mind, at least, the cults of Edward and Margaret were associated.

One more possible indication of the existence of Margaret’s cult in England involves the early-thirteenth-century wallpainting at Horsham St Faith in Norfolk.\textsuperscript{78} The priory was founded in the early-twelfth century by Robert Fitzwalter and his wife Sybilla in gratitude to the saint. The couple had been captured while on pilgrimage to Rome, but the saint appeared to them in a vision and freed them from their prison. This tale is depicted in a series of wallpaintings on the east wall of the Refectory, which date to the late-thirteenth century. On the upper part of this wall is a painting of a crowned female figure. She holds a book in her left hand, and in her right hand a staff or scepter on top of which sits a small bird. Donovan Purcell observes that this painting might be assumed to be of St Faith, except that it does not include the instrument of her torture, the grill, with

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{76}] Vincent, \textit{Holy Blood}, 150 n. 43.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
which she is usually depicted. He suggests instead that the figure might be Margaret. He notes that she is usually portrayed holding a book and scepter, as on the seal of the Prior of Plascadine, and that the paintings were undertaken in the half-century after her canonization. I would also add that the little bird might be an early reference to the heraldic device associated with Edward the Confessor and then Margaret. A carved shield in Westminster Abbey dating to the mid-thirteenth century shows the arms of Edward, a cross and five birds, perhaps doves, which later evolved into martlets. The possible reason for a connection between Horsham St Faith and Margaret warrants further investigation.

The cult of Edward the Confessor was, in turn, fostered in Scotland. Sometime before her death in 1233, the widow of William the Lion and mother of Alexander II, Ermengarde de Beaumont, made a gift to a hospital dedicated to Edward located on the bridge at Berwick. She also founded, together with her son, a Cistercian house at Balmerino in Fife, which she dedicated to Edward the Confessor and the Virgin. Notably, this recognition of Edward the Confessor occurred at a time when he was otherwise fairly ignored. Perhaps, like many immigrants, Ermengarde was inordinately attached to her native heritage. It should also be noted that Ermengarde and William named not one, but two of their daughters Margaret! Perhaps, as “the first queen of Scotland since St Margaret to have a son who became king,” the couple was keen to articulate an association with both Edward and Margaret, the two royal saints.

The connection between the cults of Edward the Confessor and Margaret was furthered by dynastic affiliations. Alexander II married Joan, sister of Henry III, at York

---

80 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 76-78 and fig. 115 on 79.
83 For the quote see Nelson, “Scottish Queenship in the Thirteenth Century,” 67.
in June 1221. Alexander II had hoped to secure a reciprocal agreement in which his sister, the younger Margaret, married Henry III. While that plan was never realized, his son, Alexander III, married Margaret, the oldest daughter of Henry III, 26 December 1251 at York.

In the final analysis, the congruent interests between these two dynasties and the perceived link between Edward the Confessor and Margaret indicate a symbiotic relationship between the cults of the two saints. At the very least, this meant that Henry III would not have objected to Margaret’s canonization. More probably, he would have supported it as a corollary to the advancement of Edward’s cult.

In addition to the English and Scottish ruling dynasties, the papacy was also favorably disposed toward recognizing Margaret’s sanctity, motivated by an element of opportunism in terms of both the practical and theological utility of her cult. Vauchez observes that prior to 1270 the pastoral function of a saintly exemplar typically dominated papal considerations, but after that time “the papacy only followed up on requests concerning saints recommended by reigning dynasties or orders which gave unreserved support to the Holy See in political and religious matters.” Margaret’s case marks this transition, reflecting both the pastoral and political interests of papacy.

The papacy had a direct and vested interest in the health and well-being of the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots, which remained the only ecclesiastical province without an archbishop. In the latter half of the thirteenth century this position as “an
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86 Chronicle of Melrose, ed. Stevenson, 178-79; Anderson, Early Sources, 2.269-70. Their first child, a daughter also named Margaret, married Eric of Norway, and their only child, Margaret, Maid of Norway, was the last of Margaret’s direct descendants to be offered the throne of Scotland.

87 Vauchez, Sainthood, 82.
acephalous church meant that the relationship between Scotland and the Papacy was extremely close.”

The bishop of St Andrews elected to remain abroad after attending the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, possibly spending time at the papal court where he might have been instrumental in the re-issuance of the *Cum Universi* bull in 1218.

More importantly, it is also possible that he began “negotiations for the issue of the bull *Quidam vestrum* of 1225, which allowed the Scottish church to govern itself as an autonomous national church by the remarkable device of a national provincial council with the nine Scottish bishops responsible for carrying out the council’s mandates within their respective dioceses.”

The Church in the Kingdom of the Scots would remain without an archbishop, but its autonomy from York was ensured, and it remained accountable directly and solely to Rome.

This close association naturally resulted in Rome’s intervention in the affairs of the Church. The double-edged nature of the papacy’s patronage is best illustrated by the selection of bishops. After the death in 1253 of the Archbishop of St Andrews, David de Bernham, the king opposed the election of Robert de Stuteville and instead sent his own candidate, Abel, Archdeacon of St Andrews to argue successfully his case in the papal curia. However, in December 1258 the pope rejected the nomination of Nicholas de Moffat for the bishopric of Glasgow, instead selecting and consecrating “an officious English pluralist John de Cheam.”

A logical corollary to such papal interest in the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots was its corresponding interest in the affairs of the Scottish monarchy. At the
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89 Originally issued in 1189 or 1192 by Pope Celestine III, this bull established the Church in the Kingdom of the Scots as a special daughter of Rome, specifying that it was subject only to the pope or a papal legate (read, not York). See Part 3, Chapter 3.
91 Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, 278.
Council of Lyons in 1245 Scotland had committed to contributing financially to the reconquest of the Holy Land and the Latin Empire of Constantinople. According to Matthew Paris, a papal envoy named Goffredo was then sent to Scotland in October 1247 specifically to collect these revenues. This action was followed in 1250 by a papal letter instructing the Bishops of St Andrews and Aberdeen to collect contributions to the cause in the Holy Land, adding that any funds not used by the Scottish crusaders would be given to the King of England.

The papacy’s interest in the Kingdom of the Scots should not, however, be interpreted as purely pecuniary. Above all else, a saint was intended to present a papally-endorsed model of behavior for the faithful. The fragment of the inquiry contained in the Utrecht Legendary focused on Margaret’s reforming activities, colorfully asserting that she cleared up the darkness in the West with light-filling rays of shining faith. In this particular instance, papal support for Margaret’s model of piety might have been intended to counterbalance heretical models of extreme asceticism. Vauchez notes that “to combat dualistic doctrines and demonstrate to the masses the superiority of orthodoxy, the Church was in dire need, in the first two-thirds of the thirteenth century, of Christian perfection. It appealed to the witness of recent saints to counter the influence of the boni homines, whose simple life and austere morals had won them great popular prestige.” It is no coincidence then that, as Vauchez further observes, the majority of saints recognized during this period were opponents of the Cathars, the heretics who, by
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95 Acta Sanctorum, June 2, 358: … qui per eam occidentales tenebras lucifluis praecelaeae fidei radiis serenavit.
abjuring the material world and this earthly life, lent themselves to practices of extreme physical deprivation.\textsuperscript{96}

A key component of this heretically-charged asceticism was expressed as lay celibacy. The institute of marriage had already suffered, as Dyan Elliott contends, at the hands of the reformists of the eleventh century and their effort to promote clerical celibacy. This further challenge from heretics prompted the Church to elevate marriage to a sacrament while continuing to enforce strict celibacy for clerics. Lay chastity, even within marriage, was increasingly suspect.\textsuperscript{97}

The primary model of a married saint, one which was intended by the Church to be admired but not imitated, was the Blessed Virgin Mary. She was praised for her chastity, but her virginity was interpreted in such a way, as the result of divine selection, that it could not foster heretical emulation. This elevation of a maternal saint later resulted in mystical motherhood motifs in female spirituality, but in the immediate moment of the thirteenth century perhaps Rome was looking for other, more imitable, exemplary matrons.\textsuperscript{98}

First, the examples of saints of antiquity were reinterpreted to include consideration of the salvific nature of marriage. Whereas the female saints of late antiquity were usually cast as virgin martyrs who suffered torments inflicted on them by pagan suitors, post-Conquest hagiography witnessed a feminizing or romancing of the virgin heroine in a reinscription of courtly desire. The heroine is depicted, like her classical counterpart, as young, beautiful, and noble and the object of a male, usually


pagan, suitor’s desire. The difference is that in this case the heroine follows the command of her bridegroom-hero (Christ) by converting the pagan suitor, in a sense offering herself as sacrifice.\textsuperscript{99} Such reinterpreted examples of late antiquity were incorporated into contemporary pastoral use. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century confessional manuals offered methods which priests could propose to wives in order to enable them to persuade their husbands to adopt more Christian practices.\textsuperscript{100} Thus it was manifestly possible to observe the orthodox penitential practices of antiquity within the sacrament of marriage. Finally, in the Dominican treatise, \textit{Somme le roi}, written in 1279 as an instruction manual for the laity at the request of King Philip III of France, chastity is one of the seven conditions on a path toward God. Seven degrees of chastity are outlined, the third of which is marital, which Elliott describes as “fidelity to the marriage contract and observance of church guidelines for marital usage.”\textsuperscript{101}

In the late-twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the prescribed model of penitential married life centered not only conjugal chastity but the mendicant ideals of poverty and charity. The asceticism of the desert fathers as delineated in the \textit{vitae patrum} became “associated with female pious lives, even and especially the lives of married women,” including the penitential practices of prayer vigils and fasts.\textsuperscript{102} Physical deprivation – fasting, extended prayer vigils, physical hardship, and illness – was assimilated to martyrdom.\textsuperscript{103} Charity toward the poor and tending to the sick were highlighted in the Mendicant tradition of \textit{imitatio Christi}.\textsuperscript{104} Devotional reading and the image of reading as a form of eremitic enclosure, particularly for women, came to be equated with the solitude of the desert.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{102} Wogan-Browne, \textit{Saints’ Lives}, 135.
\textsuperscript{104} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 199-207.
\textsuperscript{105} Wogan-Browne, \textit{Saints’ Lives}, 34-40.
This new emphasis on orthodox sanctity, however, was defined more by the qualities of new saints than a redefinition of the old, the most prominent examples of which include married penitents. As Elliott notes:

Penitential life laundered secular life, especially matrimonial sex, sufficiently that the laity was admitted into the hierarchy of saints in an unprecedented way. Until the end of the twelfth century, married individuals who partook of normal marital relations – who were not founders of monastic institutions and had missed out on martyrdom – had practically no chance of being considered saints.\(^{106}\)

Homobonus (d. 1197/8) is one of the earliest examples of these married penitents. This merchant of Cremona, married and the father of two sons, was canonized by Pope Innocent III in 1199.\(^ {107}\) Vauchez observes that the hagiographical treatment of this man minimized his roles as tradesman, father, and husband. Instead the pope chose to recognize his penitential practices – his dedication to prayer, charity toward the poor, efforts to establish peace in his town of Cremona – and, importantly, his battle against the Cathar heretics who were so active in the towns of Lombardy in the late-twelfth century.\(^ {108}\) Elliott asserts, however, that Innocent III deliberately recognized this married layman “to lessen the attraction of heretical validation” in the face of such threats.\(^ {109}\)

This new focus on marital chastity as an ideal was especially defined by papal endorsement of female sanctity, primarily Elizabeth of Hungary and Hedwig of Silesia, each of whom bear striking resemblances to Margaret and the interpretation of her piety. Elizabeth, born 1207, was the daughter of King Andrew II of Hungary.\(^ {110}\) She married

---

\(^{106}\) Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, 196-205, quote p. 204.

\(^{107}\) For the bull, *Quieta pietas*, dated 12 January 1199, see O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher, *Die Register Innocenz’ III*, I (Graz and Cologne, 1964), 761-64.


\(^{109}\) Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, 204.

\(^{110}\) There is a wealth of documentation regarding the life and cult of Elizabeth, foremost of which are the materials prepared for the canonization inquiry, her life, and a collection of eye-witness accounts. See the compilations edited by A. Huyskens: *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth Landgräfin von Thüringen*, (Marburg, 1908); *Der sogenannte Libellus de dictis quattor ancillarum s. Elisabeth confectus*. 
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Louis, the Landgraf of Thuringia, in 1221. By all accounts, the marriage was a happy partnership, resulting in three surviving children. Her piety was increasingly influenced by the mendicant example, especially under the tutelage of her spiritual adviser, the uncompromising Conrad of Marburg. Under his guidance she adopted an extreme ascetic model of poverty, self-mortification, and charity to the poor. Some notable similarities to Margaret’s example include her personal attendance to the sick and the hungry. After the death of her husband in 1227, Elizabeth placed herself completely under the authority of Conrad, renouncing her family, her children, and her own will, and adopting the grey habit as evidence of her entry into the penitential order. When she died on 17 November 1231, she was already widely venerated as a saint. She was rapidly canonized in 1235 by Pope Gregory IX, who had also endorsed the mendicant sanctity of St Francis of Assisi.

Papal interest in her cult continued; in 1249 Pope Innocent IV ordered a new translation of her relics to a more appropriate place in order to accommodate the number of pilgrims to her shrine. Finally, it is worth noting that in The Golden Legend Jacobus de Voragine (d. ca. 1298) chose to include Elizabeth of Hungary as the single example of a matron saint.

Hedwig of Silesia (d. 1243, can. 1267) was the maternal aunt of St Elizabeth through her sister, Gertrude, the wife of Andrew II of Hungary. She was born 1174/8,
the daughter of Berthold XI of Andechs, raised at the Benedictine monastery of Kitzingen, and around 1186/90 married Henry I, Duke of Silesia. Like Elizabeth, she was known for her penitential qualities of poverty, charity, humility, and conjugal chastity. Her marriage was also said to have been harmonious, resulting in seven children, only two of whom survived. She and her husband later took a vow of continence before a bishop, unlike Elizabeth, who never had the opportunity since she was pregnant with her third child when her husband died. After being widowed, Hedwig left the ducal palace and resided near the monastery of Trzebnica, which she had founded in 1220, without taking monastic vows, but dedicating herself even more assiduously to living according to the penitential ideal.

Margaret’s canonization in 1249 is bracketed, not coincidentally I believe, by Elizabeth’s in 1235 and Hedwig’s in 1267. As Vauchez notes, the canonizations of Elizabeth and Hedwig were intended by the Roman Church to establish that “the practice of charity and the search for poverty now constituted the ‘royal way’ of lay sainthood, especially for women.” Gábor Klaniczay further asserts that Elizabeth served as a model for other princesses (e.g. Margaret of Hungary), but did she also act as model for the interpretation of previous examples of sanctity? In other words, did Margaret’s sanctity fit comfortably within the papally-endorsed model defined by Elizabeth’s example? Like Elizabeth and Hedwig, Margaret was married, a mother, known for her charity and good works. Rather, Turgot had been interested in portraying these aspects of her character which had at the time, in the late eleventh century, accorded with the new hermit ideal and now, in the thirteenth century, were reinterpreted as the mendicant ideal.

Margaret might also have been intended as part of the Cistercian answer to the proliferation of lay saints affiliated with Mendicant orders. Vauchez observes that Cîteaux was active in promoting the sanctity of the order’s monks, nuns, lay brothers and
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Schlesien (Köln: Böhlau, 1964). For her life and cult see: Folz, Les saintes reines, 129-44; Krafft, Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung, 588-624

114 Cunegund was another married saint, but her sanctity was characterized more by her chaste marriage.

115 Vauchez, Sainthood, 375-76.

116 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 240-43.

117 For the Cistercian response to saints of Mendicant orders see Vauchez, Sainthood, 124-25.
recluses in the first half of the thirteenth century. Notable examples include the Abbots Hugh of Bonnevaux and Maurice of Carnoët (d. 1191), in addition to Robert of Molesme (d. 1111), Archbishop William of Bourges (d. 1209), John of Montmirail (d. 1217), and even the Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund of Abingdon (d. 1240), who had been buried at the Cistercian foundation of Pontigny. Elizabeth, although choosing to adopt the habit of a penitent and claimed by the Mendicant orders, was celebrated by the Cistercians as early as 1236, a year after she was canonized. A life of St Hedwig, now lost, was written by a Cistercian, probably in 1262, the year in which the canonization proceedings commenced, which is perhaps understandable since she is also credited with founding the Cistercian abbey of Trzebnica, as mentioned before. Towards the end of her life, however, she had become more closely associated with the Franciscans. It seems that the older, Cistercian order was staking its claim to female lay sanctity by embracing these women whose piety had so clearly been rooted in Cistercian principles but flowered in the thirteenth-century Mendicant orders.

Within this context, it is therefore interesting to consider the history of Cistercian interest in Margaret. Her daughter, Edith/Matilda, was an active patron of the precursors to the Cistercians in England, the Augustinians. Aelred of Rievaulx, a prolific hagiographer himself, was evidently familiar with a version of Margaret’s Life, using it as a source in the composition of his Genealogia Regum Anglorum. Bernard of Clairvaux praised her son David, whose behavior had imitated his mother’s. Finally, the Acta Sanctorum version of her Vita is derived from a now low manuscript originally at the Cistercian Abbey of Vaucelles in northern France. Vauchez ascribes the unique model of sanctity demonstrated by Elizabeth and Hedwig as a blend of the “dual influence” of an archaic, or Cistercian, tradition and the emerging modern, or Mendicant, interest in Margaret. Her daughter, Edith/Matilda, was an active patron of the precursors to the Cistercians in England, the Augustinians. Aelred of Rievaulx, a prolific hagiographer himself, was evidently familiar with a version of Margaret’s Life, using it as a source in the composition of his Genealogia Regum Anglorum. Bernard of Clairvaux praised her son David, whose behavior had imitated his mother’s. Finally, the Acta Sanctorum version of her Vita is derived from a now low manuscript originally at the Cistercian Abbey of Vaucelles in northern France. Vauchez ascribes the unique model of sanctity demonstrated by Elizabeth and Hedwig as a blend of the “dual influence” of an archaic, or Cistercian, tradition and the emerging modern, or Mendicant,
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118 Vauchez, Sainthood, 124-25.
119 Folz, Les saintes reines, 125. On Elizabeth’s association with the Mendicant orders see Vauchez, Sainthood, 374-75.
120 Folz, Les saintes reines, 130.
121 Vauchez, Sainthood, 374.
122 Huneycutt, Matilda of Scotland, 107-09.
ideal. Margaret’s example, of course, predates even the Cistercian, but it was easily reinterpreted within those parameters. Margaret should perhaps be seen as bridge between the Martinian example of late antiquity, as exemplified by St Radegunde, and the Mendicant ideals of Sts Elizabeth and Hedwig.\textsuperscript{126}

Local interest in Margaret’s cult complemented royal and papal interests. Robert Bartlett’s analysis of Margaret’s miracle collection demonstrates that it reveals a great deal about those who patronized her cult. The supplicants at Margaret’s shrine were largely male (61%), represented diverse social groups, and most sought healing miracles.\textsuperscript{127} Her cult remained centered on her shrine at Dunfermline. Of the 31 supplicants whose geographic origins are identified, ten were monks of Dunfermline (including one convert), nine came from the area around the abbey, six from other parts of Scotland, and seven from England.\textsuperscript{128} I would only add that of those identified as coming from England, two are from Northumbria and one had settled in Lothian, areas that belonged to that culturally unique border area. Furthermore, Margaret is especially protective of the monks at Dunfermline. She comes to the aid of nine monks, some of whom are specifically identified as monks of Dunfermline, although Bartlett surmises that it is most probable that they all were monks of Dunfermline even when not explicitly stated.\textsuperscript{129} He concludes that “the cult of St Margaret is thus a typical regional cult with a strong monastic core.”\textsuperscript{130}

The localized focus of Margaret’s cult is corroborated by the distinctive nature and number of visions in her miracle collection.\textsuperscript{131} The miracle collection describes 46 events within 45 miracle accounts involving 44 persons. Of these 46 events, 27, or 59

\textsuperscript{125} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 374.
\textsuperscript{126} Paciocco, however, argues that Margaret’s model of piety as portrayed in her \textit{Vita} stands in contrast to that endorsed by Pope Innocent IV in that she is not described as poor, indigent, or ill. Paciocco, \textit{Canonizzazione}, 298.
\textsuperscript{127} Bartlett, Introduction, \textit{Miracles}, xxxviii-xl.
\textsuperscript{128} Bartlett, Introduction, \textit{Miracles}, xl-xl.
\textsuperscript{129} Bartlett, Introduction, \textit{Miracles}, xli.
\textsuperscript{130} Bartlett, Introduction, \textit{Miracles}, xli.
percent, include a vision of Margaret.\textsuperscript{132} This high percentage of visions contrasts starkly with other cults. For example, the eleventh-century collection of miracles performed by St Foy indicates an appearance of the saint in only 32 percent of the 123 cases recorded.\textsuperscript{133} Even this percentage is high when compared with a collective analysis of 2050 posthumous healing miracles collected from 76 Saints’ Lives and 166 miracle compilations from eleventh- and twelfth-century France, only 255, or twelve percent, involved a vision of the saint.\textsuperscript{134} Collections contemporary with Margaret’s typically involve a similarly low percentage of visions. Of the 161 miracles performed by Thomas Becket and recorded by William of Canterbury, only fourteen percent, or 22, described a visionary experience.\textsuperscript{135} At the inquest into the sanctity of Elizabeth of Hungary, the testimony of about 800 witnesses involving 129 miracles revealed only six, less than five percent, that involved a vision of the saint.\textsuperscript{136} Although St Stanislaus, bishop of Cracow, was martyred in 1079 his cult flourished in the thirteenth century with the elevation of his relics in 1243. Two investigations into his miracles, in 1250 and again in 1252, resulted in his canonization in 1253. Here is an example of a saint whose holy career roughly parallels that of Margaret; they both lived in the second half of the eleventh century and were canonized in the middle of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{137} Despite these surface similarities, however, only six out of the 52 documented miracles described a vision of the saint – only eleven percent.\textsuperscript{138}

Although Margaret’s cult did not conform to the practices of the time, it certainly accorded more with the practices of the place. A comparably high percentage of visions

\textsuperscript{132} The prominence of visions is also noted by Bartlett. His numbers differ slightly, however, identifying 29 visions in 46 events. Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, 1.
\textsuperscript{134} Pierre-André Sigal, \textit{L’homme et le miracle dans La France médiévale, Xle – XIIe siècle} (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 134. Although it should be cautioned that only healing miracles were considered in this study.
\textsuperscript{136} For her life and miracles see above. See also Gábor Klaniczay, “Dream Healing and Visions in Medieval Latin Miracle Accounts,” in \textit{The "Vision Thing". Studying Divine Intervention}, ed. William A. Christian, Jr. and Gábor Klaniczay (Budapest: Collegium Budapest Workshop Series 18, 2009), 37-64.
\textsuperscript{138} Gábor Klaniczay, “Dreams and Visions in Medieval Latin Miracle Accounts.”
is found in the miracle accounts of St Aebbe who was, like Margaret, a woman of the Anglo-Saxon nobility, specifically a sister of Oswiu, King of Northumbria in the seventh century. Her cult was located, like Margaret’s, in what was southern Scotland, centered on the priory of Coldingham, near the original site of Aebbe’s monastery on land granted to the monks of Durham in 1107 by, somewhat fittingly, King Edgar, the son of Saint Margaret. Of the forty-three recorded miracles, twenty-four or fifty-six percent involved a vision of the saint, a number which approximates the fifty-nine percent of miracles in Margaret’s collection which involved a vision. The probable author of St Aebbe’s miracle collection, Reginald of Durham, writing in the second half of the twelfth century, also compiled a collection of miracles performed by the saintly hermit Godric of Finchale, a majority of which are visions. Godric (d. 1170) was an English merchant who often traded with St Andrews in Scotland, stopping at Lindisfarne along the way and meditating on the eremitic example of Saint Cuthbert. Before long, he abandoned his mercantile pursuits and became a hermit in the marshes of Finchale near Durham. I have suggested elsewhere that this emphasis on visions is perhaps a faint reflection of a Celtic past which still lingered in northern England and southern Scotland. The Irish influence on Scotland has long been recognized and increasingly the specific border between northern England and southern Scotland has been viewed as a unique geo-political and cultural entity. In this specific milieu saints were perhaps expected to

139 Details regarding the historical life of Æbbe are found in Bede, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 4:19, 25; Vita S. Cuthberti auctore anonymo, in Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. Colgrave, 2:3; Bede, Vita S. Cuthberti in Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. Colgrave, c. x; The Life of Bishop Wilfrid, ed. Colgrave, c. xxxix.
140 Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, nos. xv, xix-xxi. For the authenticity of the charters see Duncan, “Yes, the Earliest Scottish Charters,” 1-35.
141 Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, 1.
142 The miracle collection was composed in the twelfth century and exists only in the fourteenth-century Durham compilation MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax 6, fos. 164r-173v. The text has been translated and edited by Robert Bartlett in Miracles, 2-67.
143 Benedicta Ward, Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record and Event 1000-1215, revised ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 79. However, Finucane notes that “about three dozen dreams and visions were recorded” out of the 222 healing miracles attributed to Saint Godric, amounting to about 16%. Again, perhaps the discrepancy is the result of considering specifically healing miracles. R. Finucane, “The Posthumous miracles of Godric of Finchale,” Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland, 3 (1975): 47-50.
144 Reginald of Durham. Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici.
traverse the threshold between the supernatural and natural worlds in their active role as intercessors.

Further evidence of the regionalized interest in Margaret is indicated by what is missing. I have not been able to find her mentioned in any Anglo-Norman collection of saints’ lives, for instance. Neither is she depicted as acting in the more typically reginal role of intercessor by freeing political prisoners in the manner of Sts Faith, Aethelthryth (who was now known by the Norman name Audrée), and Osith, for example.\textsuperscript{146}

Chapter 7 of the miracle collection records a vision in which the functions of Margaret as married saint and royal dynast come to full fruition in the second half of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{147} As King Alexander III is preparing to go to war against the invading army of King Haakon of Norway, one weary and ailing knight, John of Wemyss, falls asleep and dreams that he is standing outside the church of Dunfermline.\textsuperscript{148} In his dream, he sees a beautiful lady coming out of the church, leading by her right hand a fully-armored knight, with three more following behind. When the understandably frightened knight asks who she is she replies, “I am Margaret, queen of Scots. This knight I am leading by the hand was my husband, King Malcolm by name. The three following are my three sons, kings who lie with me in this church….. I am hurrying with them to Largs, to bring victory over that tyrant who is attempting to subject my kingdom to his power.” Here we have a dream-vision so typical of the border area, immediately recognizable and memorable to the audience, both demonstrating and encouraging popular support for Margaret’s cult. There is no doubt that it was intended to bolster support of Margaret’s dynasty; she is seen leading her husband, King Malcolm, and her three sons who ruled in succession, Edgar (1097-1107), Alexander (1107-1124), and David (1124-1153). Moreover, she makes it clear that God has entrusted the Kingdom of the Scots to her and her descendants forever, in perpetuity; a definite case of divine right. Margaret is therefore firmly identified as the protectrix of her dynasty

\textsuperscript{146} For St Faith see Sheingorn, \textit{The Book of St Foy}; for St Audrel/Aethelthryth see Blanton, \textit{The Cult of St Aethelthryth}; for St Osith see Wogan-Browne, \textit{Saints’ Lives}, 216.

\textsuperscript{147} Bartlett, \textit{Miracles}, 86-89.

\textsuperscript{148} Alexander III asserted his right to rule the Western Isles, leading to armed conflict with King Haakon IV of Norway in 1263. After some inconsequential skirmishes, Haakon died in Kirkwall, Orkney. See Duncan, \textit{Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom}, 577-80; Barrow, \textit{Kingship and Unity}, 117-18.
through her intercession. The authenticity of the dream is confirmed according to two common hagiographic tropes. First, the knight relates it to the Prior of Dunfermline who states that “it was not the type of dream by which we are often deluded but a sign from heaven.” Such clerical corroboration was deemed to be reliable because as a holy man he was invested with the ability to discern divine from demonic visions. Final confirmation comes when the events foretold by the saint come true. In this case, the knight is cured of his illness and the king of Norway is defeated and dies.

In this regard Margaret is situated squarely within the tradition of the protective saint, but with a nuanced interpretation. Saints were frequently cast as active defenders of their communities, beginning most notably with the Blessed Virgin as the protector of Constantinople.149 Closer to Margaret’s cult in time and space, Saint Cuthbert was responsible for creating a dense fog to protect Durham from the famous wrath of William the Conqueror.150 In another instance, Cuthbert’s personal antipathy caused William to be prevented by “an intolerable heat” from seeing the body of the saint, forcing him to flee the church and the city of Durham, not stopping until he had crossed the river Tees.151 In 1164, Saint Kentigern assisted in the defeat of Somerled according to a Latin poem composed by a clerk at the cathedral of Glasgow who witnessed the conflict.152

The image of Margaret presented in this particular miracle, however, reflects a shift in emphasis toward the royal warrior-saint, the chivalric saint, the *athleta patriae*.153 Beginning in the twelfth century, such saints were increasingly given the distinctively military caparison and demeanor of the warrior saint. As Gábor Klaniczay explains, when the polar ideals of royal sanctity, of the “priest-king” on the one hand and the “archaic concept of sacral kingship” on the other, came into contact with the emerging court culture of the twelfth century, the result was “the holy ruler’s metamorphosis into an
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intrepid knight.”154 Thus, the Anglo-Saxon king, Edmund, although initially remembered as a royal martyr, evolved into a warrior saint fighting for his country. He is credited, for example, with protecting the ships carrying crusaders, including Richard Lionheart.155 By the twelfth century King Wenceslas was known more for his divine intercession on the field of battle than his passive martyrdom. According to an account written in 1142, Wenceslas appeared at the Battle of Kulm (1126) in support of Sobeslav I against Emperor Lothar III dramatically dressed in white, riding a white horse, and carrying his holy lance.156 In 1260, he intervened at the Battle of Marchfeld against the Hungarians, wearing a suit of armor, helmet, a gilded gauntlet, carrying his sword and his standard, and leading Saint Adalbert, Abbot Prokop, and five martyr brothers.157 Margaret is portrayed here as the female chivalric ideal, leading her husband and sons in their noble defense of their kingdom. The chivalric ideal of the warrior hero would later be embodied, of course, by Robert the Bruce.

This, the latest known miracle in Margaret’s miracle collection, indicates a change in the perception of Margaret. The miracle in 1263, following her canonization in 1249 and the translation of her relics in 1250, marks the transition of her cult from locally centered to national, from Margaret as a protector of her dynasty and monks to a protector of the kingdom, from Margaret as a healing saint to a chivalric saint.

* * * * *

Margaret’s cult benefited from a fleeting moment in time when the interests of the Scottish monarchy, the abbey of Dunfermline, the English monarchy, and the papacy all aligned. The Scottish monarchy was keen to promote its royal connection to a sacred past in order to bolster a precarious minority rule. It was supported in this endeavor by the abbot of Dunfermline. Henry III of England favored the memory of Margaret

---

154 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 155-58.
155 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 163.
inasmuch as she was associated with his favorite saint, Edward the Confessor. In one stroke, the papacy was able to succor the fledgling ecclesiastical hierarchy in Scotland, without offending an English king, while at the same time proferring a model of the married, penitential ideal.
Conclusion

While Margaret’s canonization provides a natural break, it is by no means the end of her story. The value of her memory was recognized by Edward I when he seized the fragment of True Cross, with which she was so closely associated, along with other symbols of nationhood: the Stone of Destiny, the crown jewels, and the records and rolls of government preserved in Edinburgh Castle. Robert the Bruce chose to align his dynasty with hers, first by naming his son and heir David, and then by electing to be buried at Dunfermline, although his heart was enshrined at Melrose. In 1379 the monks of Durham were charged with secretly absconding with the relics of Sts Aebbe and Margaret from Coldingham. Presumably, these were the same items which later were inventoried at Durham, identified as the relics “of the flesh and hair of Margaret, glorious queen of Scots.” Another list compiled at Durham in 1383 referred to “a cross called that of St Margaret queen of Scotland,” perhaps the same one identified during the time of the Reformation as “the Cross of St Margaret, supposed to be good for those lying-in.”

Similar assistance was provided by her “sark” or chemise to assist Scottish queens in childbirth, most notably the births of James III (1451) and James IV (1512). Devotion to St Margaret is evidenced by her inclusion in a prayer book, dating to the second half of the fifteenth century, created for Robert Blackadder, Archbishop of Glasgow (1483-1508). The book focuses on Scottish saints Ninian, Cuthbert, Kentigern, Duthac, Kessog,
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1 For neat synopses of Margaret’s later cult see: Folz, Les saintes reines, 103-104; Bartlett, Introduction, Miracles, xlv-xlvi; McRoberts, Margherita, regina de Scozia, in Biblioteca Sanctorum, 8,781-86.
2 Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 164.
Columba, and Ternan and includes a precious miniature depicting St Margaret at prayer.\(^7\) She should however be viewed more as the patron saint of the dynasty than the kingdom. Instead, St Andrew evolved into the “focus of national devotion.”\(^8\)

Through the later Middles Ages it appears that her cult remained at least insular in its scope. According to an inventory of 1344, the King of England’s treasury contained among other precious relics “the bones of the blessed Margaret, queen of Scotland.”\(^9\) Sometime between 1384 and 1410 an inventory was made of the relics in St George’s Chapel, Windsor that lists “a bone of St Margaret, queen of Scotland.”\(^10\) A relic from Margaret’s head is located at Worcester during approximately the same time period.\(^11\) Folz notes a paucity of liturgical sources, citing only the inscription of her name in the *Necrologium scoticum*, the martyrologies, and certain Scottish calendars on the date of the celebration of her feast, 10 June.\(^12\) Bartlett also notes that she is included in the sixteenth-century Aberdeen Breviary.\(^13\)

With the Counter-Reformation, Margaret entered the international arena as an example of a royal, Catholic saint. Dunfermline Abbey had been destroyed, including Margaret’s elaborate shrine, but Mary Stuart took the head reliquary to Edinburgh for safe-keeping.\(^14\) From there, it was eventually entrusted to the Jesuits and taken to France, where it was maintained at the Scots College at Douai until lost during the French Revolution. Other relics were acquired by Philip II of Spain, who added them to his vast accumulation in the Escorial Palace. The collection had begun with an assortment of precious relics sent by his sister, Maria, Queen of Hungary, and augmented with those his
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14 A recreation of the reliquary is displayed at the Abbot House of Dunfermline Abbey.
agents had rescued from destruction in Protestant Germany. He especially collected the relics of royal martyrs, such as those of St Hermenegild, the eighth-century Visigothic prince whose death was perceived as martyrdom for his conversion from Arianism to the Catholic faith. Phillip viewed the execution of Mary Stuart as a royal martyrdom, and treasured the ring which she had sent him from the scaffold.\(^\text{15}\) It is tempting to view Philip’s endorsement of Margaret’s cult through the acquisition of her relics as an attempt to counter-balance the growing Protestant movement in Scotland and England and to bolster beleaguered Catholic monarchies.\(^\text{16}\) Pope Innocent XII lent his support to the Scottish Catholic royal family in 1693 by changing Margaret’s feast day to 10 June as an intended recognition of the birthdate of the son of James VII of Scotland and II of England.\(^\text{17}\) With the end of the Stuart line, Margaret fell out of fashion until she was reinterpreted in the nineteenth and early-twentieth century zeitgeist as a romanticized Victorian heroine, with an emphasis on her function as the ideal wife and mother, morally upright and virtuous.\(^\text{18}\)

All these interpretations have affected our understanding of Margaret. The purpose of this study has been to redirect our attention to the context in which Margaret lived and those forces that initially shaped the interpretation of her sanctity. It began with an investigation into the foundations of Margaret’s life – her ancestral origins and early years in Hungary and Anglo-Saxon England – in an effort to gain some insight into the roles and expectations which she might have inherited. Her father bequeathed the rich heritage of the House of Wessex, expanded by a life spent in the Scandinavian orbit of Sweden and Kievan Rus’. Her mother’s origins remain obscure, which in itself perhaps indicates her dynastic marginality. In Hungary, Margaret had the opportunity to witness on some level the intermingling of Greek and Latin Christianity, communal and reclusive monasticism, and Western and Eastern models of eremitism. Benedictine influences were present, but the complete picture of religious expression was multi-faceted. In Hungary as well as Anglo-Saxon England she would have moved in an international,

\(^{15}\) For more on Philip and his collection see Henry Kamen, The Escorial: Art and Power in the Renaissance (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).
\(^{17}\) Raine, North Durham, 103, n. 591.
\(^{18}\) See the biographies by Cowan (1911), Barnett (1926), and Henderson-Howatt (1948).
polyglot world comfortable and familiar with a multiplicity of cultural orientations. Both kingdoms also drew on a tradition of queenship which evaluated past queens and imposed expectations on current ones. In England, Maragaret, as a member of the royal family, might have benefited from formal instruction at Wilton Abbey centered on the legendary example of St Edith and the living one of Queen Edith. The world Margaret inherited was both vast in its scope and intricately connected.

The second part of the study looked at Margaret’s life once she begins to enter the historical record as the wife of Malcolm III, King of the Scots. The royal family’s flight to Scotland can be seen as more deliberate, perhaps even interpreted by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as an attempt to preserve a dynastic challenge to the Normans. It was only later hagiographic traditions that made it necessary to interpret it as a desperate attempt to flee which was then re-directed only by Divine Providence. Likewise, the suppositions that Margaret intended to take the veil and that Malcolm’s first wife had already died are later re-interpretations. As a queen, she was active in attending to the affairs of the kingdom: managing the court, dispensing patronage with practical purpose, and taking care to ensure the well-being of her family. Her efforts to reform the Church might have reflected more pragmatic interests as much as the religious zeal which later accounts ascribe to her. Her piety, as depicted by her hagiographer, Turgot, was certainly unusual for her status in this time and place. It is likely that she had adopted a form of personal devotion modeled on the practices of the new hermits that were beginning to permeate Europe. Accordingly, she focused on such personal ascetic practices as fasting, strenuous prayers, and private nocturnal vigils in conjunction with public works of charity, almsgiving and hospitality. In part these might be a reflection of Turgot’s own piety, but the fact that she chose him to be her confidante and that he wrote soon after her death within living memory of her makes it less likely that his treatment of her is simply hagiolotrous invention.

Part 3 began with a detailed analysis of the first step in the evolution of her cult, the *Vita* composed by the Benedictine monk Turgot between 1100 and 1107. An analysis of a hypothetical “original” text leads to the conclusion that Turgot’s primary hagiographic influence was Bede, and those authors transmitted by Bede such as Gregory the Great. Turgot, forced to reconcile Margaret’s sanctity with her royalty, opted to
portray her as an ideal Bedan abbot, and he might have viewed himself as heir to the apostolic mission of Gregory the Great. The analysis then progressed to a comparison between the two versions of the *Vita* contained in the Dunfermline and the Cotton Tiberius Diii manuscripts. A comparison of textual analogues leads to the conclusion that nothing in the text of the Dunfermline *Vita* places it after the twelfth century, which conforms with the current opinion of scholars that the *terminus ante quem* for the *Vita* as it exists in the Dunfermline manuscript is 1285. I further suggest that the relationship of the Dunfermline *Vita* with its closest analogues, the works of Aelred of Rievaulx, warrants further scrutiny. The Cotton manuscript stresses an Anglo-Norman genealogy, restricts Malcolm’s role to that of a doting spouse, and retains the focus on Margaret’s piety and charitable good works. The Dunfermline *Vita*, on the other hand, dwells exclusively on Margaret’s detailed Anglo-Saxon genealogy, includes lengthy passages dedicated to highlighting Malcolm’s character, and portrays Malcolm and Margaret as royal partners in the governance of the realm.

The final three chapters assessed the evolution of Margaret’s cult chronologically. In the half century following her death, her children were the driving force behind the preservation of her memory; Edith/ Matilda commissioned the *Vita* and David transformed Margaret’s foundation at Dunfermline into an Abbey that was structured literally and metaphorically around her tomb. Most importantly, each of her children became a living memorial to their mother in the sense that they sought to emulate her example.

Toward the end of the twelfth century Margaret’s cult was fashioned by both political considerations and devotion to her memory as saints’ cults were employed to bolster or counteract political power. On the one hand, the translation of Margaret’s remains in 1180 might have been an attempt to redress the diminished standing of Scotland after the surrender of William I to the English at Falaise. On the other hand, William embraced the cult of Thomas Becket as a check on the authority of the English monarchy. Additionally, Margaret’s name begins to permeate the Scottish royal family tree.

The final chapter began by addressing the controversy regarding whether or not Margaret was canonized. An explanation can be found to counter each argument.
Although the absence of a papal bull makes it impossible to reach a definitive conclusion, the existing evidence strongly suggests a favorable conclusion to the canonization proceedings. Her specific case benefited from the brief coincidence of Scottish, English, and Papal interests.

Here our study of Margaret has come full circle. We began by looking at those models and expectations that might have influenced Margaret. With her canonization, the life and memory constructed from those complex and diverse influences becomes a model for others. Even today, organizations are dedicated to following the example set by St Margaret: the Queen Margaret of Scotland Girls’ Schools Association is an international association of schools dedicated to promoting the ideals fostered by St Margaret; and the St Margaret’s Chapel Guild engages in numerous charitable activities throughout the year, notably bringing children from Chernobyl to Scotland for medical, dental, and optical treatments. If Margaret’s example is one still worth emulating, then it is worth understanding.

*   *   *   *   *

The purpose of this study was to arrive at a better understanding of those forces that shaped Margaret’s life and early interpretations of her sanctity, thereby gaining a more accurate perception of Margaret. She existed within a framework of expectations, molded by examples and standards of behavior familiar to her. Those forces instrumental in shaping the memory of her likewise imposed their expectations, beginning with her hagiographer and her children, and continuing with the papacy, the monks and supplicants at Dunfermline, and the English and Scottish monarchies. These multiple agendas become apparent through a comparative and contextual analysis, an approach which is especially rewarding when studying a person such as Margaret, whose world – those models, perspectives, and interpretations – was both varied and complexly interconnected. What emerges, I hope, is a more informed understanding of Margaret, her life, and her sanctity.
APPENDIX: Translation of the Dunfermline Vita

Translation Notes: Letters and words that are illegible in the manuscript are placed in parentheses. Differences between the Vita and its analogues are highlighted in bold. The English translation is intentionally more literal than elegant. The Diii manuscript was not available since it is in the process of being restored, so I have relied on the printed edition by J. Hodgson Hinde, cited by chapter. The differences between the Diii manuscript and the Acta Sanctorum version are italicized in the text and then detailed in the footnotes. The differences between the Patrologia Latina edition of Aelred of Rievaulx’s Genealogia and the Bodleian Laud manuscript are italicized in the text and then detailed in the footnotes. John of Fordun’s work is not, strictly speaking, a possible analogue since it was written later, but passages that correspond with the Dunfermline Vita are noted for future reference.

Abbreviations:


Diii: British Library, Cotton Tiberius Diii, late twelfth century manuscript version of Turgot’s Vita Margaretae. Cited by chapter according to Hinde’s edition.

Dunfermline Vita: Madrid, Biblioteca del Palacio Real, II. 2097, fos. 1r-17v.


Laud MS: Bodleian Laud Miscellaneous 668, late 12th century manuscript version of Aelred of Rievaulx’s Genealogia Regum Anglorum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dunfermline Vita</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Analogous Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[fo. 1ra] Incipit <em>epistola turgoti episcopi quam transmisit matilde regine anglorum.</em></td>
<td>Here begins the letter of the bishop Turgot, which he sent to Matilda the queen of the English.</td>
<td>Diii: Incipit *(translat)*io et vita sancte Margaret(e).1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auctore, ut quibusdam videtur, Turgoto Monacho Dunelmensi2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellenter honorabil et honorabiliter excellenti regne anglorum matilde. <em>Turgotus sancti cutberti servus</em> in presenti pacis et salutis bonum et in futuro bonorum omnium bonum.</td>
<td>To the excellently honorable and honorably excellent Matilda queen of the English, Turgot a servant of Saint Cuthbert, the blessing of peace and health in the present and in the future the good of all goods.</td>
<td>Diii, Prologus: Excellenter honorabili, &amp; honorabiliter excellenti, reginae Anglorum, Mathildae, T., 3 servorum S. Cutberti servus, in presenti, pacis &amp; salutis bonum; et in futuro, bonorum omnium bonum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venerandae memoriae matris vestre placitam Deo conversationem, quam consona multorum laude sepis predicari audieratis, litteris traditam ut vobis offerrem et postulando iussistis, et iubendo postulastis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Incipt prologus in vita sancte margarite scotorum regine.</strong></td>
<td>Venerandae memoriae matris vestre placitam Deo conversationem, quam consona multorum laude sepis predicari audieratis, litteris traditam ut vobis offerrem et postulando iussistis, et iubendo postulastis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here begins the prologue in the life of Saint Margaret Queen of the Scots.</td>
<td>Venerandae memoriae matris vestre placitam Deo conversationem, quam consona multorum laude sepis predicari audieratis, litteris traditam ut vobis offerrem et postulando iussistis, et iubendo postulastis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hold you have asked and by asking you have ordered that I should offer to you an account in writing of your mother of venerable memory, a pleasing way of life to God which you have often heard proclaimed by the harmonious praise of many.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scilicet mihi precipue in hoc credendum dicebatis, quem gratia magne apud illam familiaritatis magna ex parte secretorum illius conscium esse audieratis.</td>
<td>Scilicet mihi precipue in hoc credendum dicbatis, quem gratia magne apud illam familiaritatis magna ex parte secretorum illius conscium esse audieratis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These orders and desires I freely embrace, embracing I venerate greatly, venerating I congratulate you, that having been established Queen of the English by the King of the Angels, you wished not only to hear what is correct but to contemplate a written life of your life.</td>
<td>Hæc iussa et hæc vota ego libens amplector, amplectens multum veneror, venerans vobis gratulator, quae a rege Angelorum constituuta regina Angelorum, vita matris <em>vestre</em> regine que semper ad regnum anelabat Angelorum, 4 non solum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Note that the rubric of the Diii MS alludes to a *translatio*.
3 AASS: *Theodricus*.
4 Bede was particularly fond of juxtaposing *anglorum* with *angelorum*. See for example, Beda Venerabilis, Vita Beatorum abbatum Benedicti, Ceolfridi, Eosterwini Sigfridi et Hwaetberti (BHL 8968), Cl. 1378, cap.: 1, pag.: 364, linea: 19: *Nobili quidem stirpe gentis Anglorum progenitus, sed non minori*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>audire <strong>verum</strong> eciam litteris impressam <strong>jugiter inspicere desideratis</strong>.</td>
<td>mother the queen, who always longed for the kingdom of the angels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut que faciem matris parum noveratis, virtutum eius noticiam plenius habeatis.</strong></td>
<td>So that although you little knew the countenance of your mother, you might have full notice of her virtues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Et quidem imperata perficiendi prona est mihi voluntas, sed fator deest facultas.</strong></td>
<td>And indeed it is my wish thoroughly to complete your orders, but I must admit that my ability is lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fo. 1r.b] <strong>Major est quippe huius negotii materia, quam mihi sit vel loquendi vel scribendi efficacia:</strong></td>
<td>In fact, this matter exceeds my skill either in speaking or in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duo sunt itaque que pacior, quibus hinc inde trahor.</strong></td>
<td>And so there are two things from which I suffer, by which I am drawn here and there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propter magnitudinem rei obedire formido, propter iubentis auctoritatem, et illius de qua dicendum est memoriam, contradicere non audeo.</strong></td>
<td>Because of the magnitude of the task I am terrified to obey, but because of the authority of the one who commands, and of the memory of her who is to be spoken of, I do not dare to contradict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sed quamvis sicut dignum esset tantam rem non valeam explicare, quantum tamen possum prout eis suggerit dilectio, et vestra exigit iussio intimare debo.</strong></td>
<td>But, although I cannot explicate such a matter as it deserves, your order nevertheless compels me to reveal, and I ought to reveal, what I am able, accordingly as her love subjoins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gratia namque sancti spirtus que illi dederat efficaciam virtutum; mihi ut spero ennarandi eas sumministrabit auxilium.</strong></td>
<td>And so the grace of the Holy Spirit, which had given to her an efficacy of virtues, will administer help to me, I hope, for narrating them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominus enim dabit verbum evangelizantibus:</strong></td>
<td>For the Lord will give the word to those preaching, and Scripture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 AASS: *quae.*  
6 AASS: *itaque.*  
7 AASS: *haec.*  
8 AASS: *subministrabit.*  
9 Psalms 67:12.
Aperi os tuum, et adimplebo illud.\(^{10}\)

Neque enim poterit deficere verbo, qui credit in verbo: In principio re vera erat verbum, et deus erat verbum.\(^{11}\)

In primis igitur cupio et vos et alios scire per vos, quod si omnia que de illa novi predicanda dicere conarer, vobis, propter regie dignitatis apicem in matris laude putarer adulari:

Sed procul absit a mea canicie, virtutibus tante femine mendacii crimen admiscere.\(^{13}\)

In quibus exponendis deo teste ac iudice profiteor me nihil, supra id quod est nichil addere, sed ne incredibilia videantur multa silentio supprimere; ne, juxta illud Oratoris, cornicem dicar cignaeis coloribus adornare.\(^{14}\)

Explicit prologus.

---

Aperi os tuum, et ego adimplebo illud.

Nor will he be able to fail by the word, who believes in the word: In the beginning matter was the word, and God was the word.

In the first instance, therefore, I desire that both you and others through you know that if I were to try to tell everything that was to be told concerning her I would have been thought to be flattering you through praise of your mother because of your royal dignity.

But far be it from my gray hairs to mix together the virtues of such a woman with the crime of falsehoods:

In setting these things forth I declare with God as my witness and my judge to add nothing beyond that which is, but to suppress many things lest they seem incredible, and lest I might be said in the words of the orator that I adorned a crow with the colors of a swan. Here ends the prologue.

Here begins the Life of Saint Margaret, Queen of Scots.

Many, as we read, would derive the origin of a name from the quality of a mind, so that in these

---

\(^{10}\) Psalms 80:11.

\(^{11}\) John 1:1.

\(^{12}\) AASS includes: & Deus erat Verbum.

\(^{13}\) The author is writing as an old man, which would be congruent with the supposition that Turgot wrote the Vita between 1100 and 1107.

\(^{14}\) Here the author is not referring to Cicero, as might be thought, but to one of Aesop’s fables as transmitted most probably by either Jerome or Bede. Jerome, Epistulae 108.15: et ne apud detractatores et genuino me semper dente rodentes fingere puter et cornicem aesopi alienis coloribus adornare Bede, De tabernaculo, 3.1346: Quibus apte congruit illa aesopi fabula qua refert cornicem inuolatis paut pennis exornatam frustra de sua esse pulchritudine gloriatam immo postmodum zelo exardescente pauonum omni pennarum uirtute et ipsa uita esse spoliatam. Many thanks to Cristian-Nicholae Gaspar for this insight.

\(^{15}\) These chapter headings were added by the editor of the Diii manuscript, J. Hodgson Hinde.
pretenderet, quod gratie quam acceperunt conveniret: qualities the word demonstrated and harmonized with the Grace they received.

Sic denique petrus a petra christo ob fidei firmitatem, sic iohanes quod est dei gratia ob divinitatis contemplacionem et divini amoris privilegium; & filii zabedei, id est, filii tonitrii sunt dicti propter evangelice predicacionis tonitruum.

And so Peter was called the rock by Christ because of the firmness of his faith, and John was called the grace of God, because of his contemplation of the divine and the privilege of divine love, and the sons of Zebedee were called the sons of thunder because of their thunderous preaching of the Gospel.

Quod quidem in hac virtutis femina invenitur, que decorum quem nomine preferebat, maiori anime pulcritudine vincebat.

Indeed, the same was found in this woman of virtue, in whom the beauty which was revealed by her name was surpassed by the greater beauty of her spirit.

Margarita namque vocabatur ab hominibus et ipsa in conspectu dei fide atque opera ut preciosa margarita habebatur.

For she was called Margaret by men since she was considered a precious pearl in the sight of God for her faith and works.

Itaque margarita vestra, mea, nostra, ymmo Christi, et quia Christi idcirco plus nostra, iam nos reliquit ad deum assumpta.

And so your Margaret, my Margaret, our Margaret, or rather Christ's Margaret, and since Christ's therefore even more ours, has now left us to be taken up to God.

Assumpta est inquam margarita de mundi huius sterquilinio, et rutilat nunc in eterni regis celesti ornamento.

Margaret has been taken up I say from the sewer of this world, and now shines among the heavenly decoration of the Eternal King.

16 Matthew 16:18.
18 Mark 3:17.
19 Greek for thunder. It is not included in the Cotton MS although Hinde includes it in his edition.
20 AASS: nomine.
21 Note that the Dunfermline Vita highlights the connection between the name she was given by men, and how she was perceived by God.
22 Matthew 13:45-46.
23 See Gregory the Great, Homiliae in evangelia, Cl 1711, Book 2, homily 40: Assumpta est ergo margarita quae iacebat in sterquilinio, et posita in caelestis regis ornamento, iam inter supernos ciues emicat, iam inter ignitos illos lapides aeterni diadematis coruscat. See also Peter Damian, Sermons, no. 22: Hi profecto nunc micantes gemmea et rutilantes sunt margaritae, quae uidelicet in imperatoris aeterni diademate pollucibiliter radiant, et inter ignitos supernae Hierusalem lapides inextinguibili splendore coruscant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inde ut reor nemo</th>
<th>So I say that no one will doubt when he has heard fully about her life and the end of her life.</th>
<th>Inde enim nemo, ut reor, dubitabit, cum ejus vitam et vita finem paulo post audierit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuius me cum colloquia sale sapientie condita24 dum recolo, dum lacrymas qua...</td>
<td>When I recall her speech with me filled with the salt of wisdom, when I consider the tears which...</td>
<td>Cuius mecum colloquia, sale sapientiae condita, dum recolo; dum lacrymas, qua...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeo quia ad deum quem suspiraverat, transiit.</td>
<td>I rejoice since she has passed on to God, for whom she longed.</td>
<td>Gaudeo, quia ad Deum, quem suspiraverat, transiit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugeo, quia in celestibus cum illa non gaudeo.</td>
<td>I grieve because I do not rejoice with her in heaven.</td>
<td>lugeo, quia cum illa in celestibus non gaudeo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illi inquam gaudeo, quia que crediderat iam nunc videt bona domini in terra vivencium.25</td>
<td>I rejoice for her I say, since she who had believed now sees the good of the Lord in the land of the living.</td>
<td>Illi, inquam, gaudeo; quia quae crediderat, jam nunc videt bona Domini in terra viventium:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michi autem lugeo, quoniam in terra mortuorum dum mortalis vite pacior misieras cotidie clamare compellor.</td>
<td>However I grieve for myself, since while I suffer the miseries of mortal life in the land of the dead I am compelled to cry daily:</td>
<td>mihi autem lugeo, quoniam in terra mortuorum, dum mortalis vitae misieras patior, quotidie clamare compellor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infelix ego homo, quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus.26</td>
<td>I unhappy man, who will free me from the body of this death?</td>
<td>Infelix ego homo, quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam nobili de prosapia regum genealogiam duxerit.</td>
<td>How she will lead her genealogy to fame from the lineage of kings.</td>
<td>Dii, 2: Quam nobili prosapia genealogiam duxerit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoniam igitur de illius quam in Christo habuerat mentis nobilitate michi vobis est dicendum, de illa quoque qua secundum seculum clariaratur videtur aliquid praemittendum, 27</td>
<td>Since, therefore, I must speak to you about the nobility of her mind which she had held in Christ, and which also had illuminated all the world, it would seem that something must be put forth, so</td>
<td>Quoniam igitur de illius, quam in Christo habuerat, mentis nobilitate mihi est dicendum, de illa quoque, quo 28 secundum seculum clariaratur, videtur aliquid præmittendum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 A not uncommon phrase, but a particular favorite of Bede’s. See Epistula ad Egburtum (ep. 2); In primam partem Samuhelis, libri iv, 1, 5; In proverbia Salomonis, libri iii, 3, 31. See also Caesar of Arles, Sermones, no. 126; Peter Damien, Sermones, nos. 48, 64; Bernard of Clairvaux, Sermones super Cantica Canticorum, no. 50.


26 Romans 7:24.

27 The following genealogy is not included in the other Vitae of St Margaret, but bears striking similarities to Aelred of Rievaulx’s Genealogia Regum Anglorum. He introduces the genealogy of kings of England after his eulogy to King David, and dedicates the work to Duke Henry, the future Henry II of England:
that when we see how greatly the probity and virtue of her ancestors shone forth and how much her piety did as well, we indeed acknowledge how natural it was for her to be abundant in riches, to flourish with virtues, to be illuminated by good character, and before all these things to shine forth in the Christian religion and the prerogative of justice.

---

**AR, 716:** … ut cum *viderimus* quanta *fuerit* antecessorum suorum probitas, *qualis in eis virtus* *innituerit*, 29 *qualis splenduerit pietas*, etiam quam naturale *tibi* sit abundare divitiis, florere virtutibus, *victorius* illustrari, et quod *his* omnibus praestat, *Christiana religione* et justitiae praerogativa fulgere.

---

Quoniam de optimis moribus religiosi regis David paucis descriptimus, dignum duxi genealogiam, quae et tua est, dux illustrissime Henrice, breviter veraciterque subtexere,

28 AASS: quae.

29 Laud MS, fo. 47r: *enituerit*.

30 Origenes sec. translationem Rufini – *De principiis*, 1.8; Cesarius Arlensis, *Sermones Caesari vel ex aliis fontibus hausti*, no. 22.

31 Laud MS, fo. 47r: *adoptimos*.

32 Probably referring to a version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which the following closely but not exactly parallels.
deperisse, eamque pro vite meritis celeste praemium quod perire non poterit meruisse, discamus semper divitios gloriaeque mundi praemier justicia, ut post vitam temporalem, perveniamus ad eternam.

earned a celestial reward which cannot perish; let us learn to prefer always justice to the riches and glory of the world so that we might pass from the temporal life to the eternal.

vetustas ipsa delevit per excellentiorem Angliae reges, eorum sublimiora quaeque gesta summatim tangendo redeamus, ut cum videris tantam eorum gloriem morte ac vetustate perisse, eosque pro vitae meruisse, discas semper divitiosi gloriaeque mundi praemier justicia, ut post vitam temporalem pervenias ad eternam. Amen.

Narratione genealogie seth filii ade patris omnium.35

The story of the genealogy of Seth the son of Adam the father of all:

Igitur a seth filio ade qui ei

So, from Seth the son of Adam

AR:36

33 Laud MS, fo. 47r: poterit.
34 Laud MS, fo. 47r: does not include Amen.
35 Cf. Genesis 5-6.

Here the Genealogia inserts an abbreviated list of Anglo-Saxon kings, from Henry’s mother the Empress Matilda back to Adam, probably derived from some version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. This list after King Alfred closely parallels the one included by Asser in his Life of King Alfred written in 893. See Alfred the Great, Asser’s Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources, trans. with introduction and notes Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge (London: Penguin Books, 1983), 67. The only surviving manuscript of the work, written c. 1100, is British Library Cotton Otho A.xii. The work seems to have been familiar to chroniclers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, notably: Byrhtferth of Ramsey writing in the late tenth or early eleventh century; the anonymous author of the Encomium Emmae writing in the early 1040s; John of Worcester writing in the early twelfth century; an anonymous author at Bury St Edmunds who wrote the Annals of St Neots in the second quarter of the twelfth century; Gerald of Wales writing his Life of St Aethelberht in the 1190s. See Alfred the Great, trans. Keynes, 57.

36 The lineage of Henry is here encapsulated and then repeated and expanded upon below. Genealogia, 195: 716d-717a: Tu igitur, vir optime, filius es gloriosissimae imperatricis Mathildis, cujus fuit mater christianissima et excellentissima Anglorum regina, filia sanctissimae feminae reginae Scotorum Margaretae, quae nominis sui splendori morum sanctitatem praeferebat. Hujus pater Edwardus, qui fuit filius Edmundi regis invictissimi, cujus pater Edelred, cujus pater Aedgarus pacificus, cujus pater Eadmundus, cujus pater Edwardus senior, cujus pater nobilis Aluredus, qui fuit filius Adelwlf regis, qui fuit regis Egbrichti, cujus pater Alchmundus, cujus pater Effa, cujus pater Ingles, cujus frater fuit famosissimus rex Ine nomine, quorum pater Ceonred, qui fuit filius Ceolwulf, qui fuit Cuthwine, qui fuit Cheulin, qui Cheuric, qui fuit Creoda, qui fuit Creodic, qui fuit Elesa, qui fuit Eda, qui fuit Gewis. Iste fuit caput gentis sae, a quo et tota gens illa nomen accepit. Hujus pater fuit Wig, cujus pater fuit Frewine, cujus pater Freedgar, cujus pater Brand, cujus pater Bealdag, cujus pater Woden. Qui fuit filius Frederwald, qui fuit Freolof, qui fuit Frederwlf, qui fuit Fingondwlf, qui fuit Geta, qui fuit Gearwa, qui fuit Beu, qui fuit Celdva, qui fuit Heremod, qui fuit Iermod, qui fuit Hatha, qui fuit Walia, qui fuit Beadwlg, qui fuit Sem, cujus pater Noe, cujus pater Lamech, cujus pater Mathusa, cujus pater Enoch, qui fuit filius Malaleel, qui fuit Caine, qui fuit Enos, qui fuit Seth, qui fuit filius Adam patris omnium.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Aramaic Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natus est pro abel, ducitur genealogia huius sancte generationis usque ad enoch qui vivus a domino translatus cum sancto helia antichristi prestolatur adventum.</td>
<td>who was born to him in place of Abel, proceeds the genealogy of the holy progeny up to Enoch who, taken up alive by God with the holy Elias, stands ready to await the arrival of the Antichrist.</td>
<td>Abel quem occidit Cain. Sicut autem in Abel Christi passio, ita et in Seth Christi est resurrection figurata. Seth enim Hebraicum nomen est, et lingua Latina dicitur resurrectio. Ab hoc igitur Seth ducitur generatio usque ad Enoch, qui vivus a Domino translatus cum sancto Elia, Antichristi praestolatur adventum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inde venitur ad noe, qui solus cum filiis et uxoribus meruit mundo pereunte salvari.</td>
<td>Next we come to Noah, who alone with his sons and wives deserved to be saved from the perishing world.</td>
<td>AR: Inde venitur ad Noe, qui solus cum filiis et uxoribus meruit mundo pereunte salvari, Cuius primogenitus sem a patre meruit benedici.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuius primogenitus sem a patre meruit benedici.</td>
<td>His first born Sem deserved to be blessed by his father.</td>
<td>AR: …cujus primogenitus Sem a patre meruit benedici. Dicunt Judaei hunc fuisset sacerdotem summi Dei, et postea Melchisedech fuisset vocatum qui in figura sacerdotii nostri panem offerebat et vinum, unde in psalmis Christo dicitur: Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sem vero ducitur genealogia usque ad woden, qui tante fuit auctoritas apud suos, ut feriam quartam quam romani gentiles diem mercurii appellabant, euis nominis consecrarent, que consuetudo usque hodie servatur ab anglis.</td>
<td>From Sem in truth the genealogy proceeds up to Woden who, so great was his standing among them, that they consecrated the fourth day, which the gentiles at Rome called the day of Mercury, in his name, and the custom is preserved to this day by the English.</td>
<td>AR: Ab isto igitur Sem genealogia ducitur usque ad Woden, qui tantae auctoritas fuit apud suos, ut feriam quartam quam Romani gentiles diem Mercurii appellabant, ejus nominis consecrarent; quae consuetudo ab Anglis hodie servatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocant eius eundem diem Wodenesday, id est, diem Woden.</td>
<td>They call his own day Wodensday, that is, the day of Woden.</td>
<td>AR: vocant enim eundem diem Wodensdei, id est diem Woden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porro a woden tenditur linea [fo. 2r.b] usque ad getam, qui et ipse tante sapientia et virtutis habitus est ut a paganis pro deo coleretur.</td>
<td>Thereafter a line from Woden stretches forth to Geta, who himself was considered to be of such wisdom and virtue that he was worshiped by the pagans as a god.</td>
<td>AR: Porro a Woden linea cognitionis tuae tenditur usque ad Getam, qui et ipse tante sapientiae et virtutis habitus est, ut a paganis pro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

340
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inde</strong> proceditur ad christianissimos reges Anglie scilicet <em>Ingles</em> et <em>Ine</em>.</td>
<td>Next we move to the most Christian kings of England, Ingles and <em>Ine</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quorum *yne* cum potentissimus regum Anglie esset, relicto regno *peregre* profectus est Romam, ibique feliciter peregrinans, tandem ad celestem mansionem felicius *ascendit*: | Of these two, *Ine*, although he had been the most powerful of the kings of England, left behind his kingdom, and hastened abroad to Rome, and there happily continuing a pilgrimage, finally ascended more happily to his heavenly mansion. |

| AB *Ingles* vero linea cognacionis tenditur usque ad *egbriht*, qui tante fuit probitatis, ut universam Angliam ex australi parte humber que pluribus regibus eatenus divisa subiacuerat, suo subiugaret imperio, et ita primus omnium [monarchas] Anglie diceretur. | And from *Ingles* indeed the line of family descent reaches to Egbert, who was so honest that he subjected all England, from the south part to the Humber, which had been divided by many kings until then, and he subjected it to his rule in order that he might be called the ruler of all England. |

| Huius filius *ethelvold* futuri generis sui [splendissimum] caput, et de qua sanctissimi fructus orirentur *radix preciosa*: | His son *Aethelwulf* was head of his splendid future race and a precious root from which these most holy fruits arose. |

| Hic in regno terreno semper meditabatur celeste, et *ideo in senectute bona* collectus est ad patres suos, regnum *mutans non amittens*, temporale deserens et eternum adipiscens. | He was always meditating on the heavenly kingdom while in this earthly realm, and at a good old age, he was gathered to his fathers, changing but not losing his kingdom, leaving the temporal for |

---

37 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: *Inde*.
38 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: *Ingels*.
39 Egbert d. 839.
40 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: *Ingels*.
41 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: does not include *tuæ*.
42 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: *monarchas*.
43 *Laud MS*, fo. 48r: *huius*.
44 Genesis 15:15.
45 Aethelwulf d. 858.
46 Here the *Genealogia* includes extended praise for *Aethelwulf*, portraying him as charitable, a defender of churches, widows, and orphans, a patron of the church and monasteries, and a pilgrim to Rome. *Genealogia*, PL 195.718a-b: … ut manifeste daretur intelligi eum non victum cupiditate, sed charitate provocatum, alienae necessitati regnando consulere, non suae voluntati dominando satisfacere. Erat enim pater orphanorum et judex viduarum, ecclesiarum defensor, propagator monasteriorum. Eleemosynis sane
Narratio genealogie aluredi filii ethelvolfi regis anglie

The story of the genealogy of Alfred to the son of Aethelwulf the king of England.

AR: De piissimo rege Alfredo

Huius filius fuit illud anglorum decus, regum gemma virtutum exemplar, aluredus nomine, ceteris fratibus etate minor sed annosior virtute.

Aethelwulf’s son, Alfred by name, was that glory of the English, the jewel of the realm, the model of virtue, certainly the youngest in age among his brothers but older in virtue.

AR: Cujus filius fuit illud Anglorum decus, regum gemma, virtutum exemplar Aluredus, ceteris fratibus suis junior aetate, sed annosior virtute, …

Cum vero post mortem fratrum suorum cum quibus aliquo tempore regnavat, ad eum totum regnum devenisset, ut videretur omnium hominum moribus ac nature congruere, omnibus utilis ac necessarius esse satagebat.

But indeed after the death of his brothers, with whom he was ruling for a time, the rule of the entire kingdom devolved to him; since he seemed to be in agreement with the customs and nature of all the men, he strove to be useful and necessary to all.

AR, 719: …Cum vero post mortem fratrum suorum, cum quibus aliquo tempore regnavit, ad eum totum regnum haereditario jure transisset, sublimior omnibus factus est omnium servus, ut posset dicere cum Prophetae: Exaltatus autem humiliatus sum, et non sum confusus.

sic operam dabat ut totam terram suam pro Christo decimaret, et partem decimam per ecclesias monasteriaque divideret. Tandem cum multo apparatu Romam profectus, integro anno ibi perendinavit, loca sancta frequentans, vigiliis et orationibus vacans, eleemosynas multas pauperibus erogans. Sed et ecclesiis beatissimorum Petri et Pauli, ipsique summum pontifici pro regia munificentia plurima largitus est munera. Et sic cum multarum virtutum stipendiis reversus in Anglia, post biennium regnum inter filios sapienter divisit. Per singula territoria sua pauperes alendos ac vestiendos distribuit, thesauros suos misericorditer dispersit et dedit pauperibus; ex quibus non modicam portionem ecclesiis apostolorum Romae et summae sedis episcopo delegavit, …

Here the Genealogia includes an extended passage delineating Alfred’s piety, virtue, and spirituality. Genealogia, PL 195.718c-719a: …unde et a patre plus cunctis fratibus amabatur, ob morum scilicet suorum similitudinem, et spiritualis cujusdam gratiae privilegium quae in eo adhuc puer ro mirabiliter refulget. Unde eum pater cum adhuc puellus esset, cum multis militibus maximisque donariis Romam misit, ut sanctissimorum apostolorum precibus commendaretur, et a summo pontifice benedicetur; venerabilis autem summus sacerdos Leo qui tunc Ecclesiae Romanae praefuit, vultum et statum pueri contemplatus, cum in eo divinae praesentiae majestatis scintillantium virtutum indicibus persensisset, tempus et aetatem regnandi regiae uctionis sacramento praeviens, sicut quondam Samuel puerum David, ita eum in regem sanctissimam praesul devotissime consecravit. Verum postmodum cum patre Romam repetens, paternorum bonorum in omnibus cooperator et adjunctus esse promeruit. Hic ab ipsa pene infantia sua legere et discere dulce habuit, circa ecclesias assiduus, in orationibus frequentissimus, obediens parentibus, sociis humilis ac devotus. Ista meditabatur in aetate pueri loquela quod senex devotus impleret. Denique portionem psalterii in qua maxime delectabatur parvo volumine scriptam in sinu semper circumferebat, ut quod pectus illud interius ruminabat, ab exterioris sui hominis pectore recederet.

Aethelbald, d. 860; Aethelred, d. 871.

Laud MS, fo. 49r: does not include non sum, a more accurate reflection of Psalms 87:16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ita se bonis amabilem, impiis terribilem ecclesiarum ministris pavidum, amicis et sociis jucundum, pauperibus mitem et largum exhibuit, ut videretur omnium hominum moribus ac naturae congruere, omnibus utilis ac necessarius esse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Et quod nunc raro invenitur in terris illam <strong>maxime</strong> regis credidit dignitatem, nullam in ecclesiis Christi habere potestatem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And what rarely now is found on earth, he believed strongly that royal dignity had no power in the churches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Et quod nunc raro invenitur in terris, illam <strong>maximam</strong> regis credidit dignitatem, nullam in ecclesiis Christi habere potestatem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumque inter clericos vel religiosos de aliqua inhnonestate litigium audisset, illos modeste redarguere consuevit dicens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And since he would not hear any dispute about corruption among clergers and monks, he was accustomed to reprove them modestly saying:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: <strong>Illa,</strong> regnantis dignitas si se in regno Christi quae est ecclesia, non regem sed civem cognoscat, si non in sacerdotes legibus dominetur, sed Christi legibus quas promulgaverunt sacerdotes humiliter subjiciatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego certe si quempiam <strong>vestrum sive de sancto</strong> ordine vestro cernerem cum muliere peccantem, proprio <strong>meo pallio illos</strong> operirem, ne qua religioni vestrae impiis detrahendi daretur occasio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly if I should perceive any of you or any from your holy order sinning with a woman, I would cover them with my own pallium (cloak) lest the occasion might be given for impious people to detract from you the religious order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Ego quitiam <strong>certe si de ordine vestro cernerem cum muliere peccantem,</strong> proprio <strong>eos pallio operirem</strong>, ne qua religioni vestrae impiis detrahendi daretur occassio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

52 Laud MS, fo. 49r: includes *est inquit vera.*
53 *Genealogia*, PL 195: 719b-c: *Porro Constantini imperatoris piissimi imitabatur exemplum, qui, cum urbi praefuisset et orbi, ad Christi fidem conversus tantam sacerdotibus reverentiam exhibebat, ut, cum ad eum aliquando episcopi scriptas chartulis quaerimonias adversus invicem detulissent convolvens eas in sinu jussit igne consumi: Non est meum, inquit, de sacerdotibus judicare, vocansque episcopos, inquit: *Patres sanctissimi, nolite judicio contendere, praeertim apud nos, de quorum erratibus vestrum est judicare. Sed si quid inter vos ortum fuerit quaestionis, modestes tractetur in ecclesia, ne aliquid quod vestram sanctitatem dedeceat ad eorum qui foris sunt notitiam transferatur.*
54 Cf. Rufinus, *Church History* 1.2; Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, 78, n. 15. A similar account is related in Helgaud of Fleury, *Vie de Robert le Pieux*, chapter 18.
55 Laud MS, fo. 49r: includes *sancto.*
56 Here the *Genealogia* includes a very lengthy passage: Alfred is tested by the Danes and Frisians as Satan tested Christ; miraculous sharing of bread, wine, and fish; vision of St Cuthbert who promised rule over all England for Alfred and his line under his patronage; Christians defeated pagans; Alfred ruled wisely, justly, charitably; he gave generously to Durham. The vision of St Cuthbert is first recorded in the mid-eleventh century account (although it might be a later interpolation) in the anonymous *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*. See Symeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, 1.204-6. It is
Rex vero aluredus cum regnasset annis vigenti novem et mensibus sex, de regno terreto ad regnum celeste transcendit, edwardum filium suum regni morumque suorum relinquentes heredem. But when King Alfred had ruled 29 years and 6 months he went from his earthly realm to the heavenly kingdom, leaving behind his son Edward heir of the kingdom and his traditions.

AR: Rex igitur Aluredus cum regnasset novem et viginti annis et mensibus sex, de regno terreto ad regnum celeste transcendit: Aedwardum filium suum, regni morumque suorum relinquentes haeredem.

Erat enim iste edwardus in scientia litterarum patre minor, sanctitate vero non multum inferior, sed regia potestate valde superior, multo enim laciis quam pater suus dilatatit regni sui fines, et urbes novas condidit, et dirutas renovavit. For Edward was less than his father in the study of letters, not much inferior in sanctity, but indeed superior in royal power, for he extended the boundaries of his kingdom far more widely than his father, as well as founding new cities and restoring destroyed ones.

AR: Erat autem in scientia litterarum patre minor, sanctitate vero non multum inferior, sed superior potestate. Multo enim latius quam pater regni sui fines dilatatit, et novas condidit, et dirutas renovavit.

Ipse insuper novum monasterium wintonie fundavit, sed et mater eius sanctissima femina alfwyda monasterium virginum in eadem civitate construxit. Moreover, he founded a new monastery at Winchester, and his mother, the very holy woman Alfwyda, also built a monastery for virgins in the same city.

AR: Ipse novum monasterium Wintoniae fundavit, et mater ejus sanctissima femina Elswida monasterium virginum in eadem civitate construxit.

Vixit autem in regno viginti quatuor annis et genuit filios et filias. He lived in the kingdom 24 years and produced sons and daughters.

AR: Vixit autem rex Aedwardus in regno viginti quatuor annis: et genuit filios et filias.

Scilicet ex nobilissima femina egwyna filium suum primo [fo. 2v.b]genitum ethelstanum, ex edytha vero regina edwynum, edmundum et quator filias quaram prima edburga in Namely that from the most noble woman Ecgwynn (he had) his first born son, Athelstan, and from Edgtha (Eadgifu), indeed a queen, Edwin, Edmund and four daughters of which the first,

AR: Ex nobilissima femina Egwina filium suum primogenitum Adelstanum. Ex regina Aedgiva, Aedwini, Edmundum, Edredum, et quatuor filias;

57 Alfred d. 899. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that Alfred ruled for 28 and a half years (version D) or one and a half years less than thirty (version C). Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 900. Whitelock notes that both versions C and D place events one year ahead of their occurrence from 891 to 914. Whitelock, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 53, n. 5. It is easy to see, therefore, how the authors of the Genealogia and the Vita, working off a version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, could have thought they were correcting the length of Alfred’s reign to reflect the date of Alfred’s death mistakenly given in the Chronicle.

58 Laud MS, fo. 51v: regnasset annis viginti novem.

59 Laud MS, fo. 51v: includes urbes.

60 Here the Genealogia inserts details: Edward defeated the remaining Danes; his sister Aethelflaed constructed cities; he ruled Scots, Cumbrians, Welsh, Northumbrians and loyal Danes; he was a just ruler.

61 Edward, d. 924.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sponsam dei eligitur et consecratur.</th>
<th>Edburna was chosen and consecrated a bride of God.</th>
<th>quarum prima Edburna in Dei sponsam eligitur et consecratur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altera vero ab othone romanorum imperatore in matrimonium sumitur</td>
<td>Another one was taken in marriage by Otto the emperor of the Romans.</td>
<td>AR: Altera ab Ottone Romanorum imperatore in matrimonium sumitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertia ad Carolum regem francorum ab eo ducenda destinatur et quartam rex northanhumborum sortitur in matrimonium.</td>
<td>A third was sent to Charles the king of the Franks in order to be married to him and a fourth the king of the Northumbrians had the fortune to take in marriage.</td>
<td>AR: Tertia ad Carolum regem Francorum ab eo ducenda destinatur. Quartam rex Northanhumborum in matrimonium sortitur….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormivit igitur rex edwardus cum patribus suis, et regnavit primogenitus eius ethelstanus pro eo, ambulans in viis priorum suorum omni virtute repletus.</td>
<td>Then King Edward went to sleep with his ancestors, and his firstborn, Athelstan, reigned for him, walking in the ways of his ancestors, filled with every virtue.</td>
<td>AR, 724: …Dormivit autem cum patribus suis rex Edwardus, et regnavit Edelstanus filius ejus pro eo; ambulavitque in viis patrum suorum, non declinavit ad dextram neque ad sinistram; eamdem in Deo fidem, in subditos gratiam, circa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 Curiously, the *Vita* omits Eadred, although admittedly there is much confusion regarding the number of children Edward had by his three wives, Egwina, Aelflaed, and Edyth/Edgifu/Edgiva. Both the *Vita* and the *Genalogia* omit Edward’s second wife, Aelflaed of Bernicia, perhaps because she produced no sons who became kings. Schwennike lists eleven children, Freeland identifies fourteen, and Whitelock notes ten. For our purposes it is enough to note that Edward had three sons who became kings: Aethelstan (924-939), Edmund (939-946), and Eadred (946-955). The *Vita* mistakenly lists Edwin instead of Eadred. Both the *Vita* and the *Genalogia* mistakenly include Edwin, who is probably a conflation of Edwin, the son of Edward who died in 933 and never ruled, and Eadwig, the son of Edmund, who ruled 955-959. Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 207; Freeland, 88, n. 27; Schwennike, Table 78. See Symeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*, in *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia*, ed. Arnold, s.a. 933; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, ch. 139.

63 The four daughters mentioned are: Edburna, a nun at Winchester (d. 960); Edith (d. 947), the first wife of the Holy Roman Emperor Otto I; Eadgifu/Eadgiva (d. 953), the second wife of Charles the Simple, King of the Franks; and another daughter, perhaps named Edith (d. 927), wife of Sihtric Cacoch, King of York.


65 3 Kings 2:10; 11:43 among others.

66 Athelstan d. 939. The *Genealogia* spells his name Edelstanus. Instead of *ambulans in viis priorum suorum omni virtute repletus* (see Jerome, *Dialogi Contra Pelagianos*, book 2, para. 21): *qui ambulavit in uis dauid patris sui prioribus*, the *Genealogia* quotes: *ambulavitque in viis patrum suorum, non declinavit ad dextram neque ad sinistram* (See 4 Kings 22:2); *eaudem in Deo fideim, in subditos gratiam, circa ecclesiis devotionem, circa pauperes misericordiam, circa Dei sacerdotes retinens reverentiam*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contra eum vero relique dacorum more suo nefandum erigunt caput, sed contriti sunt sub pedibus euis, et redacti in pulverem.</td>
<td>Against him indeed the rest of the Danes raised up their nefarious head, as is their way, but they were ground down under his feet, and reduced to dust.</td>
<td>AR: Contra hunc reliquiae Dacorum more suo nefandum erigunt caput, sed contriti sunt sub pedibus ejus et redacti in pulverem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum autem vixisset in regno suo sexdecim annis mortuus est, et regnavit edmundus frater eius pro eo.</td>
<td>When, however, he had lived in his kingdom 16 years he died, and his brother Edmund reigned after him.</td>
<td>AR, 725: Cum vixisset postea sexdecim annis regnando mortuus est; et regnavit Edmundus frater ejus pro eo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erat autem patris sui edwardi iste edmundus in omnibus imitator, homo simplex et rectus timens deum et usque in finem permanens innocentia sua.</td>
<td>This Edmund was, however, an imitator in all things of Edward his father, a simple and just man, fearing God and remaining steadfast in his guiltlessness until the end.</td>
<td>AR: Erat autem patris edwardi in omnibus imitator; homo simplex et rectus, et timens Deum, et usque ad finem vitae suae permanens in innocentia sua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qua impii abutentes pagani, quia religioni christiane quam excolebat rex deo dilectus, et illi se subdere contradicentes, mortis eius qualcumque modo insidias moliantur.</td>
<td>The king, beloved by God, was cultivating this innocence in his Christian religion but the impious pagans were abusing it, and these opponents planned the treachery of his death in such a way to subdue him.</td>
<td>No analog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ille autem quem illorum minime potuit latere abominabil(it)e propositum, nimiris egreferens eorum cultura ydolorum regni sui fedari decorum, quinque nobilissimas civitates quas tunc incolebant, id est, linconiam, laicestriam, [fo. 3r.a] stanfordiam, snettingham, et dereby, de</td>
<td>However, he was least able hide the abominable plan of theirs, taking it very ill that the beauty of his kingdom was being defiled by their cultivation of idols, he wrested away from their hands the 5 most noble cities in which they then dwelt, that is Lincoln, Leicester, Stanford, Nottingham, and Derby, and he illuminated all</td>
<td>AR: Promotus vero in regnum zelo zelatus est pro fide Christi, nimirque aegre ferens paganorum reliquias cultura idolorum regni sui foedare decorum, quinque nobilissimas civitates, Lincolniam, Leicestriam, Stanfordiam, Snotingaham, Derebt, quas eactenus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Here the Genealogia inserts a passage: the king prays to St John of Beverly, Archbishop of York (705-718); is promised victory in a vision of the saint; and defeats the Scots in the Battle of Brunanburh in 937. In Symeon of Durham, however, the king prays to St Cuthbert prior to ravaging Scotland in 934. Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a.934.

68 Edmund, d. 946.
69 Laud MS, fo. 53: does not includes regnando.
70 Laud MS, fo. 53v: includes sui.
71 This version of Edmund’s death is unique to this text. In contrast, for example, William of Malmesbury states that Edmund was killed while defending his steward against a criminal who had recently returned from banishment. William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. Mynors, 1.159.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>eorum manibus, et incolatu potenter extorsit</strong>, omnique infedelitate abrasa, christiane fidei lumine illuminavit.</td>
<td>with the Christian light of faith, all religious infidelity having been expunged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum igitur sub tanto patre magis quam rege tota anglia pace magis floreret, immatura eius morte quia exactis in regno annis quinque et septem mensibus nefanda prodicione incurrerit, subito dolore <em>et passione inopinata</em> emerguit.</td>
<td>So although all England flourished greatly in peace under such ruler, a father more than a king, suddenly it was marked by unmatched sorrow and passion, since his early death by a nefarious treachery occurred after he had ruled for 5 years and 7 months.</td>
<td>AR: <em>Purgato autem ab alienigenis regno, et sibi in omni parte</em> subjecto, monasteriorum et ecclesiarum maxime curam habuit, consilio sanctissime Dunstani, et statuenda statuit, et corrigenda corregit. Hic Clasingberi beato Dunstan ut in monachorum habitationem fundaretur commisit, et multa alia bona, sancto Dunstano cooperante, dispositu. Cum igitur Anglia sub tanto patre magis quam rege pace magna et gloria floreret, immatura ejus morte, quam exactis in regno quinque annis et septem mensibus nefanda prodigione incurrerit, subito dolore <em>et timore emarcuit</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Narracio genealogie ethredi filii eduardi regis** | Narration of the genealogy of Eadred the son of King Edward: |
| Successit illi in regnum frater suus *ethredus*, et ambulavit in viis *patris sui edwardi* et fratrum suorum, in omnibus beati dunstani consiliis adquestens atque mandatis. | His brother Eadred succeeded him to the realm, and walked in the ways of his father Edward and of his brothers [Aethelstan and Edmund], seeking in all things the counsels and orders of the blessed Dunstan. | AR: *Successit ei in regnum frater suus Edredus*, et ambulavit in viis *fratris sui*; beati Dunstani consiliis in omnibus obediens, et justissimis legibus subditos regens. *Enim* tantae probitatis, ut rebellantes sibi Northymbros et Scotos facile |

---

72 Laud MS, fo. 53v: includes *potenter*.
73 Laud MS, fo. 53v: does not include *parte*.
74 Laud MS, fo. 53v: does not include *et gloria*.
75 Laud MS, fo. 53v: *in matura*.
76 Eadred, d. 955.
77 Aethelstan and Edmund.
78 St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury 960-988, who features very prominently in the *Genealogia*.
79 Laud MS, fo. 53v: *Erat etiam*.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Huius vero laudabilem vitam mors preciosa conclusit.</th>
<th>Indeed his precious death concluded an honorable life.</th>
<th>AR: Hujus laudabilem vitam mors pretiosa conclusit. <em>Cum enim ad regem aegrotantem beatus Dunstanus vocaretur, in ipso itinere audivit vocem angelorum in coelo dicentium: Rex Edredus nunc obdormivit in Domino.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post quem regnavit <em>edwynus</em> filius edmundi regis, nec ambulavit in viis patrum suorum, sed in <em>tota</em> illa sancta progenie, novus quidam herodes emersit <em>atque sancto dunstano multas intulit injurias, quia illum ab adulterinis amplexibus coercens redarguebat.</em></td>
<td>After him reigned Edwin the son of King Edmund; he did not walk in the ways of his fathers, but in all this holy progeny, he emerged as a new Herod and bore many injuries to Saint Dunstan, because he (Dunstan) reproved him (Edwin), forcing him from adulterous embraces.</td>
<td>AR: Post quem <em>suscepit regnum Anglorum Edwinus</em> filius Edmundi regis, nec ambulavit in viis patrum suorum, sed in sancta illa progenie novus quidam Herodes emersit, <em>qui cujusdam Herodiadis mulieris, videlicet impiissimae contra Deum, contra leges, contra ipsius jura naturae adulterinis abutebatur amplexibus, et consilia nequissima sequeratur.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem, <em>tum sancti dunstani reprehensionibus, tum admonicionibus, tum precipue apud deum pro illo piis obscearacionibus</em> compunctus, renunciavit adultere <em>cui adheserat inconsulte</em>, et consiliis utebatur sanioribus.</td>
<td>Finally, first by the censures of St Dunstan, then by warnings, then compelled by pious entreaties, he renounced the adultery to which he had ill-advisedly adhered and made use of healthier advice.</td>
<td>AR: 726: Tandem compunctus renuntiavit adulterae, et consiliis sanioribus utebatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recordatus <em>est enim</em> dominus patrum suorum regum, *id est, christianorum, et ne quis de <em>illa sancta</em> stirpe periret, <em>[fo. 3r.b]</em> occupationem qua salvaretur <em>adinvenit.</em></td>
<td>For the Lord was mindful of his fathers, that is, of the Christian kings, so that none should perish from that holy stock, he offered an opportunity by which the king might be saved.</td>
<td>AR:  Recordatus <em>enim est</em> Dominus patrum suorum regum, <em>scilicet Christianissimorum,</em> <em>et ne quis de sacra illa</em> stirpe periret, occupationem qua salvaretur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

80 Edwin, really Eadwig, d. 959.
81 The *Genealogia* amplifies this account of Eadwig’s questionable morals and rule, drawing upon the biblical story of Jezebel.
82 Laud MS, fo. 54r: *christianorum.*
Cum rex edwynus naturae debitum persolvisset in fata cedendo, et immundis spiritibus quorum suggestionibus in carne penitus satís fecerat traheretur ad poenam: sanctus Dunstanus nichil de morte eius adhuc sciens, et ecce cohors tartarea sub eius aspectu veluti de capta preda letas cepit victorias agere.83

When King Edwin had paid in full the debt of nature by yielding to fate, and he was being drawn away to punishment by the filthy spirits, whose suggestions he had done fully enough in the flesh: St Dunstan, knowing nothing about his death up until then, and behold, a hellish cohort below his sight began to act as though they were celebrating their victories over their captive.

AR: Cum enim defunctus ab immundis spiritibus traheretur ad poenam, quidam daemonum mortem ejus quasi de infelicitate persecutoris sui gavisuro84 sancto nuntiat Dunestano.

Perscrutatur sanctus causam leticie, audit regem obisse, atque eius animam penis traditam esse. As the saint searches for the cause of joy, he hears that the king has perished, and that his soul had been surrendered to punishment.

Qui mox resolutus in lacrimas tam diu ante misericordem Jesum pro illo supplicans et plorans procuruit, donec a demonibus liberatus, veniam quam sanctus peciit optineret. He soon lay down, dissolved in tears and stretched himself out before the mercy of Jesus for a long time, beseeching and praying for Edwin until he was freed from demons; and so the saint obtained the favor which he had sought.

AR: Qui mox resolutus in lacrymas tam diu ante misericordem Jesum pro eo supplicans, et plorans procuruit, donec a daemonibus liberatus veniam quam sanctus petiit obtineret.

Hec icciraci diximus, ut perpendamus quis sit iusti oracio assidua.85 We have told these things for this reason, that we might weigh carefully what the assiduous prayer of the just man should be.

Defuncto igitur rege edwyno, frater eius edgarus successit in regnum. After King Edwin died, his brother Edgar succeeded to the realm.

AR: Defuncto igitur rege Edwino86, frater ejus Edgarus successit.

De edgaro primo filio: primi edmundi regis:87 About Edgar, the first son of the first King Edmund:

Iste edgarus erat filius edmundi This Edgar was the son of the most

83 Significantly perhaps, in the Vita Dunstan perceives the demons, whereas in the Genealogia they announce themselves to him, a dramatic difference in terms of agency. Cohors tartarea is an unusual and highly descriptive term.
84 Laud MS, fo. 54r: gavisurus.
85 James 5:16. See Equippius, Abbot of Castellum Lucullanum (d. after 535), Commemoratorium de vita Sancti Severini, Cl. 0678, chap. 30, para. 5, p. 258: Iacobo apostolo protestante: "multum", inquit, "ualet oratio iusti assidua." The same, or similar, phrase was also quoted by Gregory the Great (although the attribution is questionable), In librum primum Regum expositionum, libri vi, Cl. 1719, book 2, chap. 105; Bernard of Clairvaux, Sententiae, series 1, no. 42, vol. 6,2, pg. 22. I have not found any instances in which Aelred used the phrase.
86 Laud MS, fo. 54: edwio.
87 Edgar, d. 975, was in fact the younger brother of Edwin/Eadwig and therefore the second son of King Edmund, as the previous sentence indicates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nobilissimi regis, qui fuit edwardi senioris christianissimi principis, qui fuit aluredi victoriosissimi ducis.</td>
<td>noble King Edmund, who was the son of the most Christian prince, Edward the Elder, who was the son of the most victorious leader Alfred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erat etiam anglis non minus memorabilis, quam cyrus persis, karolus francis, romulus romanis.</td>
<td>He was furthermore no less memorable for the English than Cyrus for the Persians, Charles for the Franks, Romulus for the Romans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ipsius naitivitate audivit beatus dunstanus angelos cantantes et dicentes: Pax anglorum ecclesie, huui sueri [fo. 3v.a] qui natus est tempore.</td>
<td>At his birth the blessed Dunstan heard the angels singing and saying: Peace to the church of the English, in the time of this boy who has been born.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

88 Laud MS, fo. 54: *nulla*.  
89 The internal quotes reference Ecclesiasticus 50:6. Aelred also uses this quote in the prologue to his *Vita sancti Edwardi*, likening King Henry II of England to a morning star.  
90 Laud MS, fo. 54: *Ipse*.  
91 Laud MS, fo. 54: *federis lege*.  
92 Aelred also likens Edward the Confessor to Solomon in his *Vita sancti Edwardi*, chap. 5.  
93 Adalardus Blandiniensis, *Vita Dunstani Cantuarensis*, in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, in *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores*, 63 (1874), 56: *cum autem eidem regi regina suae aelfgeua filium genuisset regem uidelicet pacificum nomine edgarum sanctus dunstans in cella suae is quae ad deum pertinent ex more intendebat et auduit quasi in sublimi uoces psallentium atque dicentium: pax anglorum ecclesiae exorti nunc pueri et dunstani nostri tempore.* Written between 1006 and 1011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iste edgarus per angliam quadraginta construxit monasteria.</td>
<td>This Edgar built forty monasteries throughout England.</td>
<td>AR’s passage is longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparaverat autem naves robustissimas numero tria milia trescentas, in quibus redeunte estate omnem insulam ad terrem extraneorum et ad exercitacionem suorum cum maximo apparatu navigare consueverat.</td>
<td>He also prepared 3300 very robust ships, in which, at the return of the summer he was accustomed to sail around the entire island in order to strike fear in the foreigners and to energize his own people with this very great display.</td>
<td>AR, 727: Preparaverat naves robustissimas, numero tria millia sexcentas; qubis redeunte aestate omnem insulam ad terrem extraneorum, et ad suorum exercitacionem cum maximo apparatu circumnavigare provincias consueverat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ut noverimus quanta eum deus etiam in hac vita bonorum operum mercede donaverit, cum aliquando ad maximam eius festivitatem, reges, comites,</td>
<td>And so that we might know how great is the reward that God gave him for good works even in this life, when other kings, counts and nobles of many provinces had</td>
<td>AR: Edgar’s Speech to the Clergy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

94 Because of his goodness, the entire island submitted to him, including Scotland, Cumbria, and Wales. He built monasteries and churches including Glastonbury, which his father had founded, Abingdon, Peterborough, Thorney, Ramsey, and Wilton. *Genealogia*, PL 195:726C-727A. Aelred describes the prosperous peace of Edward the Confessor in similar terms in his *Vita sancti Edwardi*, chap. 5.

95 Laud MS, fo. 54v: includes in.

96 Laud MS, fo. 54v: does not include provincias.

97 Edgar’s lengthy speech to the clergy in which he castigates the Church for its laxity, authorizes Dunstan to make the necessary reforms, and urges cooperation between secular and ecclesiastical authorities. *Genealogia*, PL 195:727B-729C. The passage bears similarities with some of Aelred’s other works, namely: *Vita Sancti Niniani* chap. 5; *Sermo ad clerum in synodo Trecensi*, 28-33; and *De bello standardii*, chap. 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>multarumque provinciarum proceres convenissent, ipse cum octo regibus sibi subditis navem intravit.</td>
<td>come together to the greatest festival, he himself, with eight kings having been subjected to him, entered the boat.</td>
<td>98 See Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reyes, comites multarumque provinciarum proceres convenissent, quadam die naves jussit parari, gratum habens ecclesiam Beati Joannis Baptistae orationis obtentu navigio petere. Cum igitur comitibus et satrapis naves plurimas delegasset, ...</td>
<td>With eight kings having been assembled each at an oar, himself sitting in the stern, he acted as steersman.</td>
<td>99 Laud MS, fo. 56v: fungebatur officio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad octo autem remos totidem regibus collocatis, ipse in puppe sedens, gubernatoris fungebatur officio. 98</td>
<td>With eight kings having been assembled each at an oar, himself sitting in the stern, he acted as steersman.</td>
<td>100 Edward the Martyr, d. 978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR:... ipse cum octo regibus sibi subditis navem unam intravit; ad octo autem remos regibus totidem collatis, ipse in puppe sedens gubernatoris officio fungebatur. 99</td>
<td>Dici sane non potest cum quanta gloria, cum quibus divitiis celebrata est illa festivitas, cum viderentur ipsa elementa ejus nutui deservire, quem creatoris sui cernebant cum maxima devotione imperii obedire; sed heu! nihil in terrenis aeternum, nihil in caducis stabile, nihil in mortalibus immortale.</td>
<td>101 Laud MS, fo. 56v: necis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo non multum post ad celestia regna translato, successit in regnum filius eius Edwardus, qui iniuste ab impiis interfectus, tum ob vite sanctitatem, tum ob necis acerbitatem, sancti nomen et meritum accepit. 100</td>
<td>Not much later he was taken up to the celestial realm. His son Edward, who had succeeded to the realm, was unjustly killed by impious men. He received the name and the reward of sanctity first because of the sanctity of his life, then because of the bitterness of death.</td>
<td>102 Aethelraed, d. 1016, the son of King Edgar and his second wife, Aelfthryth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Translato enim ad coelestia regna rege Aedgaro, in regno terreno filius ejus Edwardus successit, qui injuste ab impiis interfectus, tum ob vitae sanctitatem, tum ob mortis acerbitatem sancti nomen et meritum Deo donante promeruit.</td>
<td>His brother Aethelraed succeeded him, and he was anointed and consecrated by archbishop St.</td>
<td>103 Ms Laud, fo. 56v: ethelredus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consecratur.</td>
<td>Dunstan.</td>
<td>successit, et a sancto Dunestano alisque Anglorum episcopis inungitur et consecratur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui a beato dunstano tale fertur accepisse oraculum.</td>
<td>He is reported to have received the following oracle from the blessed Dunstan.</td>
<td>AR: Qui a beato Dunestano tale fertur accepisse oraculum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoniam angli in sanguine fratris tui conspiraverunt, non deficiet ab eis gladius, donec superveniens populus populus ignotae linguæ, eos in exterminium et in ultimam redigat servitutem.</td>
<td>Since the English have conspired in the blood of your brother, conflict will not cease among them, until the people with an unknown language will dominate, to reduce them to extermination and in the end to slavery.</td>
<td>AR: Quoniam Angli in sanguine fratris sui regis sanctissimi conspiraverunt, non deficiet ab eis sanguis et gladius, donec superveniens populus ignotae linguæ eos in exterminium et in ultimam redigat servitutem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novissime [fo. 3v.b] tamen visitabit eos Dominus.</td>
<td>Nevertheless the Lord will visit them at the end.</td>
<td>AR: Novissime tamen visitabit eos Dominus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regnante igitur predicto rege, Daci supervenientes magnam parte terre igne ferroque vastaverunt.</td>
<td>While the aforementioned king was reigning, the dominating Danes ravaged a great part of the land with fire and sword.</td>
<td>AR: Regnante igitur rege praedicto, Daci supervenientes magnam terrae partem igne ferroque vastaverunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc rex missis in normanniam nuncius, emmam filiam Ricardi ducis normannorum sibi in uxorem dari petiit et accepit, cum iam de filia Thorethi nobilissimi comitis filium habuisset Edmundum.</td>
<td>Then the king, having sent messengers to Normandy, asked to be given and received as wife Emma, the daughter of Richard, the Duke of Normandy, although he already had a son Edmund from the daughter of Thored, the most noble count.</td>
<td>AR: Tunc rex missis in Normanniam nuntiis Emmam filiam Richardi ducis sibi in uxorem dari et petiiit, et accepit, cum jam de filia Torethi nobilissimi comitis filium suscepisset Edmundum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deinde ex Emma duos suscepit filios, id est, Aluredum et Edwardum, de quibus postea dicemus.</td>
<td>Thereafter he received two sons from Emma, that is, Alfred and Edward, about whom we will speak later.</td>
<td>AR: Ex Emma deinde duos habuit filios, Edwardum et Alfredum, de quibus postea dicemus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc rex solito fortior factus, omnes per Angliam Dacos una die sabbati eadem hora missis epistolis iussit interfici.</td>
<td>Then the king, made stronger than usual, ordered that all the Danes be killed throughout England on a Sunday at the same hour, by dispatching messages to that effect.</td>
<td>AR: Tunc rex fortior solito, omnes per Angliam Dacos una die eademque hora missis epistolis iussit interfici.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod et ita factum est.</td>
<td>And so it was done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

104 Laud MS, fo. 56v: includes archiepiscopo.
105 Prophesying the invasion of the Danes.
106 Laud MS, fo. 57r: tui.
107 Laud MS, fo. 57r: thorethi.
108 Laud MS, fo. 57r: eluredum et edwadrum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>AR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quod daci transmarini audientes in furorem versi, duce sivano cum innumerabili exercitu angliam intrantes, diffusi sunt per provinciam et dispersi, non ordini non sexui, not etati parcentes, nec ab ecclesiariam vel monasteriorum incendiis manus sacrilegas continentes. <strong>109</strong></td>
<td>Hearing this, the Danes across the sea turned in fury, entering England with Swein as leader and a countless army. They were diffused and dispersed throughout the province, sparing neither rank, nor gender, nor age, not restraining sacrilegious hands from the burning of churches and monasteries.</td>
<td>Quod Daci transmarini audientes in furorem versi, duce Suano cum innumerabili exercitu Angliam intrantes, diffusi sunt per provincias et dispersi, non ordini, non sexui, no aetati parcentes, nec ab ecclesiariam vel monasteriorum sacris et sanctuariis manus sacrilegas continentes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibus cum strenuissimus ethelredus sepius restitisset, tandem prodicione suorum factus inferior, reginam cum puerulis filii suis misit in normanniam, quos ipse postmodum exutus regno secutus est. <strong>110</strong></td>
<td>Although that most vigorous Aethelraed had very often resisted them, finally he was made weaker by the betrayal of his own. He sent the queen and his young sons to Normandy, whom he shortly followed, having been divested of his kingdom.</td>
<td>Quibus cum rex strenuissimus saepius restitisset, prodicione tandem (suorum) factus inferior, reginam cum puerulis suis Normanniam misit, quos ipse postmodum exutus regno secutus est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed sivanus dacus vel subita morte preventus, vel a sancto edmundo invisibili pena percusssus, cum apud inferos crudelitatis sue stipendia recepisset, revocatus [fo. 4r.a] ab anglis ethelredus, regni infilis reinduitur, et iterum contra dacos virtute potens erigitur. <strong>111</strong></td>
<td>But the Dane Swein either suddenly prevented by death or struck by an invisible punishment from Saint Edmund, when he had received the wages of his cruelty in hell; Ethelred, recalled by the English, was covered again with the badge of honor of the realm, and again rose up against the Danes, mighty in his courage.</td>
<td>Sed Suanus Dacus vel subita morte praeventus, vel a sancto Edmundo invisibili poena percusssus, cum apud inferos crudelitatis suae stipendia recepisset, revocatus ab Anglis Edelredus regni infilus sublimatur, et iterum contra Dacos virtute potens erigitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra quem cnucht filius sivani rex dacorum primum odium exercere non desit, ethelredus cum laboriosissime sed strenuissime regnasset tringinta annis et septem, Londoniis obit, edmundum filium suum primogenitum laboris et regni relinquiens <strong>112</strong></td>
<td>Against him Cnut, the son of Swein, the first king of the Danes, did not cease to exercise his earlier hatred. Aethelraed, having ruled with great effort and bravery for 37 years, died in London, leaving Edmund, his firstborn son, heir to his work and kingdom.</td>
<td>Contra quem Cuuth filius Suani rex Dacorum paternum odium exercere non desit. Edelredus autem eum laboriosissime sed strenuissime regnasset tringinta et septem annis, Londoniis obit, Edmondum filium suum laboris et regni relinquiens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**109** This language is similar to Symeon of Durham’s depiction of Malcolm III in Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1070.

**110** Laud MS, fo. 57r: includes Adelredus.

**111** The printed PL version reads cuorum, which surely is a misspelling of suorum. Laud MS, fo. 57r: suorum.

**112** Laud MS, fo. 57r: includes filii.

**113** Laud MS, fo. 57r: reinduitur.

**114** Laud MS, fo. 57r: cuuht.

**115** Laud MS, fo. 57r: cum.
| heredem. | Sed morte regis nondum propalata, furtur a quibusdam reginam emmam ut erat mulier summe calliditatis pepegisse fedus clam cum ipso cnucht, ut ei regem et regnum traderet, si eam cum liberis et suis libere abire et repatriari permitteret. | haeredem. | [To my knowledge, there is no analog to the following account of Emma’s behavior.] |
| Quo facto, et hinc inde perscita omni securitate, rem regina retulit, et rege mortuum detexit. | That having been done, the queen preserved her affairs with all mutual securities, and she exposed the dead king. |
| Sic plerumque solet ars deludi. | Thus it is often the case that art is deluded by art. |
| Quomodo in angliam regnavit edmundus cui nomen yrnsyd. | How Edmund who is called Ironside ruled in England: |
| Regina itaque cum omnibus ad se pertinentibus in normanniam transvecta, regnum et regni protectio in edmundum accidit, sed et ipsum pondus belli insedit: | And so, after the queen carried all her possessions to Normandy, the kingdom and the protection of the kingdom fell to Edmund, and the weight of war sat upon him. |
| De cuis mirabilis fortitudine quicquid dicerem minus esset. | Whatever I might say about his wonderful fortitude would be too little. |
| Unde ob invincibile robur corporis, yrnsyd, id est ferrei lateris nomen accepit. | Because of his invincible, strong physique he received the name Yrnsyd, that is, the side of iron. |
| Sagitta eius numquam abiit | His arrow never turned back, and |

---


117 Edmund, d. 1016. For a comparative analysis of the following see Wright, *Cultivation of Saga*, 183-212; Wilson, *Lost Literature of Medieval England*, 56-60. The Old English version of Edmund’s cognomen is unusual, since it largely discarded in favor of the Latin after the early twelfth century. For example, John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1016, refers to the king as “Eadmundus, cognomine Ferreum Latus.” The Old English version of his cognomen is not included in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the 1016 entry, but is included in the 1057 interpolation that is probably derived from an existing hagiography of Margaret, perhaps the same one used by Aelred.

118 Laud MS, fo. 57r: *ireneside*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| abiit retrorsum, et gladius ejus non est reversus inanis.            | his sword was not returned empty; against the enemy he was of lionlike ferocity; towards his own he was dovelike in candor; no one was stronger, more temperate in good fortune. | 119 Cf. 2 Samuel 1:22.  
120 Matthew 10:16.  
121 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *nullus*.  
122 Proverbs 20:2 comparing the roaring of a lion to the anger of a king; Isaiah 5:29 describing the righteousness of those supported by God’s wrath. However, not all biblical references to a roaring lion are positive: Psalms 21:14 referring to tribulations; Ezekiel 22:25 describing predations of false prophets; 1 Peter 5:8 comparing the devil to a roaring lion.  
123 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *quociens*.  
124 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *quoties*  
125 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *fuderit*.  
126 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *quociens*.  
127 Laud MS, fo. 57v: *quociens*. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>commiscere.</th>
<th>much to mix into this little work.</th>
<th>sed et Virgilianus, vel etiam Homer sub tanta materia sensus deficeret. Saepissime enim convenientibus cum magno exercitu utrisque regibus in pugnam Edmundus semper vicit vel nullus. Nonnunquam quippe a mane usque ad vesperam Marcio campo certantes, cum Cnuth multitudine, viribus praestaret Edmundus, irrudentibus tenebris caecis utrinque innumerabilibus sine victoria recedebant, ad simile ludum eundemque exitum die crastina reversuri. Pertaesus tandem uterque exercitus, cum vicerentur quotidie vires Edmundo, numerus ex partibus transmarinis accrescere Cnutho, qui et hoc ipsum sibi timens astue machinabatur, …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglicus tandem exercitus cum suo edmond ab excercitu dacio et illorum rege cnuchto nulla vised voluptate in partes tum proximas tum voluntarias se divertit, pars vero adversa, id est, dacia, tum fortuna, tum manu multa in se confisa, vel mortis vel fortis praestolatur adventum quamvis incertum.\textsuperscript{128}</td>
<td>Finally the English army with their Edmund turned away from the Danish army and their king Cnut not by force but first by will into parts nearby and then where they wished. However, the opposing party, that is the Danish one, then regaining trust in themselves as much by fortune as by significant military force, waited for the arrival, however uncertain, of either death or of a strong man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem utriusque \textbf{partis} proceres ad colloquium \textit{convenient}, inter quos cum quidam ceteris maiore natur</td>
<td>At last, the leaders of each party came together for a meeting, when a certain one older that the others arose and asked for silence.</td>
<td>AR: … utriusque\textsuperscript{129} proceres ad colloquium cogunt. Inter quos cum quidam caeteris major natu surrexisset dari sibi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{128} Note the similarity to the description of the traitor who murders Malcolm III, fo 17ra-b: \textit{Unus ante pre ceteris in dolo peritus, fortis robore et audax in opera, se mortis discriminí obtulit, ut vel se morti traderet aut suos a morte liberaret.}

\textsuperscript{129} Laud MS, fo. 57v: includes \textit{partis}.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surrexisset, dari sibi silencium postulavit.</td>
<td>He said: O spirited but especially warlike men, desiring, I wish to offer a plan regarding these dangers of ours. I am less than you in wisdom but more in age, silentium postulavit.</td>
<td>AR: <em>Cupio, inquiens.</em> o viri cordati, his periculis nostris praebere consultum, qui quidam vobis sapientia minor sum, sed <em>ut hae rugae et hic cani testantur</em> aetate superior, Cato, inquit desidero o viri animosi, sed praecipue bellicosi hiis nostris periculis prebere consultum, qui quidam sapientia vobis minor sum, sed etate superior. Perhaps what natural talent did not possess, practice has learned, and what knowledge has denied, experience has granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et forte quod ingenium non habuit, usus docuit, et quod negavit scientia, contulit experiencia.</td>
<td>He said: O spirited but especially warlike men, desiring, I wish to offer a plan regarding these dangers of ours. I am less than you in wisdom but more in age, silentium postulavit.</td>
<td>AR: et forte quod ingenium non habuit, usus docuit; et quod negavit scientia, contulit experiencia. <em>Multa certe vidimus et cognovimus,</em> multa insuper patres nostri narraverunt nobis, et non immerito exigimus audientiam, ut de certis et apertis non dubiam proferamus sententiam. Periculosa res agitur; mala patimur, pejora cernimus, pessima formidamus. Perhaps what natural talent did not possess, practice has learned, and what knowledge has denied, experience has granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotidie pugnamus nec vincimus, sed nec vincimus quidem.</td>
<td>Daily we fight but we neither conquer nor are we conquered.</td>
<td>AR: Quotidie pugnamus nec vincimus, sed nec vincimus, <em>imo vincimus et nemo vincit.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogo que est ista insolencia, immo violencia, sed potius insania?</td>
<td>I ask what is this insolence, or rather violence, or more likely insanity?</td>
<td>AR: Rogo quae est ista insolentia, imo violentia, imo insania?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglia quondam multis subjacula regibus, et gloria floruit et diviciis habundavit.</td>
<td>England once was subject to many kings, and glory flourished and riches abounded.</td>
<td>AR: Anglia quondam multis subjecta regibus, et gloria floruit et diviziis abundavit. <em>O ambitio! quam caeca semper, quae totum cupiens totum amittit!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quare igitur ad praesens tempus duobus non sufficit, quod quinque aut eo pluribus olim satis fuit?</td>
<td>How, then, is there not enough now for two, when once there was enough for five or more?</td>
<td>AR: Quare, rogo, non duobus sufficit quod quinque olim regibus satis fuit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod si tanto eis inest dominandi libido, ut edmundus parem habere designetur, et cnucht nullum velit habere se superiorem, queso pungen soli,</td>
<td>So, if there is in them such lust for ruling that Edmund would disdain to have a peer, and Cnut would want to have no one above him, then they desire to rule alone</td>
<td>AR: Quod si eis tanta inest dominandi libido, <em>ut</em> Edmundus parem, Cnuth designetur superiorem; pungen, <em>quaeso,</em> soli que soli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130 The speech continues. *Genealogia,* PL 195:731C-D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>transl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qui soli cupiunt dominari.</td>
<td>Certent pro corona soli, qua soli desiderant insigniri.</td>
<td>should fight alone. Let them compete alone for the crown, who alone desire to be distinguished by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: certent pro corona soli qui soli cupiunt insigniri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineant duces duellum, ut vel sit alter aut vincat aut vincatur.</td>
<td>Let the leaders enter into a duel, so that one would either conquer or be conquered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR, 732: Ineant ipsi duces duellii discrimen, ut vel sic alter vincatur, ne si saepius pugnent exercitus, omnibus interfectis non sint quibus imperent milites, non sint qui adversum estraneos regnum defendant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia illo adhuc loquente, omnis et populus consentit dicens:</td>
<td>With that one speaking in such a way up to that point, the entire people agree saying:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Parante illo adhuc plura proferre, in mediis, ut ita dicam, faucibus totus ei populus verbum obcludit, vociferans et dicens:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut secundum verbum tuum pugnent aut componant.</td>
<td>Let them either fight according to your proposal or unite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Aut pugnent ipsi aut componant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quid igitur.</td>
<td>The kings approve the proposal of the nobles brought to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Delatam ad ipsos sententiam procerum reges probant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenientibus utrisque partibus super ripam sabrine fluminis, Edmundus cum suis in occidentali plagam, Cnuth cum suis in orientali ripa consedit.</td>
<td>Both sides come together on the bank of the Severn river, Edmund with his own army on the western shore, and Cnut on the eastern shore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Convenientibus itaque utrisque cum exercitu suo super ripam Sabrinae fluminis, Edmundus cum suis in occidentali, Cnuth cum suis in orientali ripa consedit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est autem insula in medio ipsius fluminis que olenege ab illis gentibus appellatur in [quo] reges transvecti, armis protectis splendidissimis, utroque spectante populo certamen ineunt singulare.</td>
<td>So it is an island in the middle of this river, which is called by the local people Olney, across which the kings are carried, having been protected by the most splendid weapons, and each force witnessed the single combat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Est autem insula in ipsius fluminis medio sita quae armis utroque spectante populo ineunt singulare certamen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

131 Note that the Genealogia does not include the phrase secundum tuum verbum, which is rife with biblical meaning: Psalms 118:25, 65, 107, 116, 169 and Luke 1:38 and 2:29. Aelred himself used it in such a context: Sermon 19 and 58 in Sermones I - LXXXIV (Collectiones Claraeuallensis prima, Claraeuallensis secunda et Dunelmensis, sermones Lincolnienses et sermo LXXIX a Matthaeo Rieuallensi seruatus), CM2A (G. Raciti, 1989), CM 2B (G. Raciti, 2001).

132 Note that the Genealogia uses ripa instead of plaga perhaps because plaga had multiple meanings including a plague sent by God as divine punishment.

133 Laud MS, fo. 58v: exercitus.

134 Laud MS, fo. 58v: plaga.

135 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1016 states that they met at “Alney,” and the D version adds “by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>En</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At hastarum robur tam virtute impingencium quam fortissimorum objectu clypeorum deperiti extractis gladiis sese cominus impetunt.</td>
<td>And when their strength failed from the power of thrusting spears as well as the throwing of the very strong shields, they attacked each other with their drawn swords.</td>
<td>AR: At ubi hastarum robur tam virtute impingementium quam fortissimorum objectu clypeorum deperiti, extractis gladiis, sese cominus impetunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugnatum est acriter dum edmundum virtus (_ _) adiuvaret, et cnuchtum fove(ret) fortuna.</td>
<td>The fight is bitter with courage helping Edmund and fortune favoring Cnut.</td>
<td>AR: Pugantum est acriter dum Edmundum virtus, Cnuth fortuna juvaret;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa galeata capita gladii tinniunt, collisione metallorum scintille prorumpunt.</td>
<td>Swords rang around their helmeted heads, and sparks of metal burst from the collision.</td>
<td>AR: circa galeata capita gladii tinniunt, collisione metallorum scintillae prorumpunt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi vero robustissimum illud pectus edmundi ex ipso ut assolet bellandi motu ira incanduit, sanguine incalescente factus robustior, dexteram elevate vibrat ensem, ac tanta vehemencia in caput obstantis ictus iterat, ut spectantibus non tam percutere quam fulminare videretur.</td>
<td>When anger inflamed Edmund's strong heart, he was made even stronger by his blood growing warmer, as is usual for fighting. He shakes his sword, raising his right hand, and he strikes over and over again his opponent's head with such violence that it seemed to the spectators that he did not so much strike as hurl lightning.</td>
<td>AR: 137 vero robustissimum illud pectus Edmondii ex ipso ut assolet bellandi motu ira incanduit, sanguine incalescente fit138 robustior, dexteram elevate, vibrat ensem, ac tanta vehemencia in caput obstantis ictus iterat, ut spectantibus non tam percutere quam fulminare videretur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad singulos enim ictus inter ensem et galeam ignis erumpens, non modo apparere sed insuper incendere videretur.</td>
<td>For it seemed that the single strokes between the sword and the helmet were erupting in fire, not only in appearance but kindled from above.</td>
<td>Ad singulos enim ictus inter ensem et galeam ignis erumpens, non modo apparere sed insuper accendere videbatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciens autem cnucht breviori alitu sibi vires deficere cogitate</td>
<td>For Cnut, knowing from his shorter breath that his strength is</td>
<td>AR: Sentiens autem Cnuth breviori halitu sibi vires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Deerhurst.” See also William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, 2.180; John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1016: *Eadmundus cum suis in occidentali ripa Sabrine, Canutus vero in orientali cum suis consedit. Dein uterque rex in insulam que Olanege appelatur et est in ipsius fluminis medio sita ...*”. The earliest account of a suggested single combat between Edmund and Cnut is given in the nearly contemporary *Encomium Emmae* (1026): 2.13 followed by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Mynors, 2.180. The first recorded instance of an actual combat is given by Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, 6, 13 c. 1130, an account to which both the *Vita* and the *Genealogia* bear similarities. Wright surmises that Henry of Huntingdon’s version is “a genuine historical tradition, which like all traditions may have turned what was only a possibility or a suggestion into an actual fact.” Wright, *Cultivation of Saga*, 193.  

---

136 Laud MS, fo. 58v: includes *que olenge appellatur ad quam reges transvecti splendidissimis protecti armis.*  
137 Laud MS, fo. 58v: includes *Ubi.*  
138 Laud MS, fo. 58v: *factus*  
139 Laud MS, fo. 58v: *incendere*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Archaic Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de pace iuvenem convenire.</td>
<td>failing, thought about meeting with the young man about a peace.</td>
<td>deficere, cogitate de pace iuvenem convenire;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed ut erat astutus sibi prec(a)ns timuit, ne si defectus suus iuveni innotesteret, pacis verbum non audiret, totum in se spiritum colligens, quicquid virium habuit [fo. 5r.a] omni conatu intendens, virtute mirabili uno impetu irruit in edmundum, et flectere eum fecit.</td>
<td>But since he was shrewd he feared that if implored him then his defeat would be known to the young man and then he would not hear the word of peace. Collecting all his courage, he gathered all his strength, intending to try with everything, he rushed at Edmund with amazing courage in one charge, and made him bend.</td>
<td>AR: sed ut erat astutus, timens ne si defectus suus innotesceret juveni, pacis verbum nec audiret quidem; totum intra se colligens spiritum, et quicquid habuit virium omni conatu intendens, virtute mirabili uno impetu irruit in Edmundum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed mox se paululum retrahens, rogat iuvenem subsistere modicum, et sibi dicere volenti praestare auditum.</td>
<td>But soon, retreating a little, he asks the young man to stop for a bit, and to speak with him, as he had something he wanted him to hear.</td>
<td>AR: et mox se paululum retrahens rogat juvenem subsistere modicum, et sibi dicere volenti praestare auditum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ille autem ut erat suavis animi, demissa ad terram parte scuti inferiori, leviter/leniter procubuit in superiori, ac supinato in dextera gladio, ad verba loquentis attendit.</td>
<td>So Edmund, as he was of a gentle spirit, lowered the bottom of his shield to the earth, gently leaned on the top, and lowering his sword in his right hand, he attends to the words of the one speaking.</td>
<td>AR: Ille ut erat suavis animi, demissa ad terram scuti parte inferiori, leniter in superiori procubuit, ac supinato in dextera gladio ad verba loquentis attendit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc cnucht ait,</td>
<td>Then Cnut said:</td>
<td>AR: Tunc Cnuth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hactenus regni tui cupidus extiti, sed o virorum fortissime tui certe ipsius cupidior sum, quem non dicho regno anglorum sed universo utique orbi video praeferendum.</td>
<td>Thus far I remained eager for your kingdom but, O bravest of men, I certainly desire you more, whom I see should be placed above not just the kingdom of the English, but the entire world.</td>
<td>AR: Hactenus, inquit, regni tui cupidus, nunc, virorum fortissimo, tui certe ipsius cupidior sum, quem non dicho regno Anglorum, sed universo utique orbi video praeferendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michi dacia cessit, michi norwagia succubuit, michi sivanorum rex manus dedit, et mei conatus impetum quem nullum mortalium sustinere posse credebam, tua mirabili virtus iam plus semel eludendo illusit.</td>
<td>Denmark yielded to me, Norway succumbed to me, the king of the Swedes gave me his hand. I used to believe that no mortal could withstand an attack attempted by me, but your admirable courage now mocks that belief by parrying my attack more than once.</td>
<td>AR: Michi Dacia cessit, mihi succubuit Norwegia, mihi rex Suavorum manus dedit, et mei conatus impetum quem nullum mortalium sustinere posse credebam, tua mirabili virtus jam plus semel elusit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quocirca licet me circum quaque et ubicumque me diverto, me victorem futurum fortuna promittens animosum fecerit, ita tamen tua iuventutis prolata probitas</td>
<td>Wherefore, although I was turned whenever and wherever, promising fortune would have made me the spirited future victor, nevertheless the revealed probity of your youth so attracted favor</td>
<td>AR: Quocirca, licet me ubique victorem futurum fortuna promiserit, ita tamen me tua mirabilis probitas illexit ad gratiam, ut supra modum te et amicum cupiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illexit ad gratiam, ut supra modum te amicum cupiam, et regni consortem exoptem;</td>
<td>that I desire your friendship above measure, and I wish to rule together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utinam et tu de me idem cupidias, idemque accipias ut ego tecum in Anglia regnem, tu vero mecum in dacia velis conregnare.</td>
<td>O would that you might desire the same from me, and that you might accept the same so that you and I might rule with you in England, and you with me in Denmark if you wish to rule together.</td>
<td>AR: utinam et tu mei cupidus sis, ut ego tecum in Anglia tu mecum in Dacia regnes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certe si fortune mee tua se virtus adiunxerit, pavebit [fo. 5r.b] norwagia, timebit sivania, ipsa etiam bellis assuecta gallia trepidabit. Quid plura?</td>
<td>Certainly if your strength would attach itself to my fortune, Norway will dread, Sweden will fear, even Gaul, itself accustomed to wars, will fear. What more?</td>
<td>AR: Certe si fortunae meae tua virtus accesserit, pavebit Norwegia, tremebit Suavia, ipsa assueta bellis Gallia trepidabit. Quid plura?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuit Edmundus ut erat benigne mentis, et cnuchto de regni participio consentit.</td>
<td>Edmund agreed as he had a kind disposition, and he consented to the partition of the realm with Cnut.</td>
<td>AR: Annuit Edmundus et Cnuth de regni divisione consentit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atque cedit verbis qui non cesserat gladiis, et amica flectitur allocucione, qui inimica flecti non potuit debellacione.</td>
<td>And he who had not yielded with swords is bent by friendly speech, and he who was not able to be bent to hostile attack is worn down.</td>
<td>AR: Cessit enim verbis qui non cesserat gladiis, et oratione flectitur qui armis flecti non poterat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositis itaque armis, in oscula ruunt, utroque exercitu exsultante, clero etiam canticum laudis et graciarum clara voce personante.</td>
<td>And they put down their weapons and rush forward to exchange a kiss, with both armies rejoicing, and also the clergy sounded a song of praise and thanks in the clear night.</td>
<td>AR, 733: Depositis itaque armis, in oscula ruunt, utroque exercitu exsultante, clero etiam Te Deum laudamus clara voce personante.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deinde in signum federis et fraternitatis, vestem mutant et arma, reversisque ad suos modum pacis sue et amicicia declarant, et sic cum gaudio inopinato ad propria unius quisque regeditur.</td>
<td>Then in a sign of agreement and brotherhood, they exchange their weapons and clothing, and return to their people declaring the way of their peace and friendship. And so with unimaginable joy each returns to his own.</td>
<td>AR: Deinde in signum foederis vestem mutant et arma, reversisque ad suos modum amicitiae pacisque praescribunt, et sic cum gaudio ad sua quisque reveritur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiis ita gestis et hiis cum maximo amore et honore regibus sese pervenientibus quidam partis danice proditor volens se gratissimum ex ingrato regi cnuchto reddere, regi edmundo mortis molitur insidias.</td>
<td>So with these deeds and these kings anticipating the greatest affection and honor, a certain traitor of the Danish party returns wishing for himself great appreciation from the ungrateful King Cnut, and he attempts a deadly betrayal toward King</td>
<td>AR: His ita gestis, quidam proditor partis Danicae volens se gratum Cnutho praestare, regi Edmundo molitur insidias.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

140 Note the difference between “canticum laudis et graciarum” and “Te Deum laudamus.”
| **Edmund.** |  
| Nec oportunum quo regem **occidere casum sive** locum inveniens, nefandissimum **sed** turpissimum insidiarum **mortalium** genus excogitat. | He considers the opportunity by which to kill the king, finding a cause if not a place, and he carefully plots the most horrible and foul type of deadly treachery. |
| **AR:** Nec opportunum quo regem **occidet** locum inveniens, nefandissimum ac turpissimum insidiarum excogitat genus. |  
| **Prohpudor,** sub purgatoria domo se occultans **oculus malicie dacus,** regem ad requisita nature nudatum inter celanda percussit **ferro nefario,** eoque relictö scelestissimus homicida **exinde cucurrit,** veniensque ante [fo. 5v.a] regem cnuchtum, **stetit et ait,** Salve rex, salve solus rex. | For shame, hiding himself under the toilet in the house, this Danish eye of evil struck the king, who had stripped to do as required by nature, in the private parts with the horrible sword, and, leaving it behind, the most wicked murderer ran out, and coming before King Cnut, he stood and said: Hail king, hail only king. |
| **AR:** Sub purgatoria namque domo sese occultans, regem ad requisita naturae nudatum inter celanda percussit, relictöque ferro scelestissimus ac turpissimus homicida confugit. Stansque ante regem Cnuthum 141: Salve, inquit, rex solus. |  
| **Cnuchto vero ex huiuicemodi salutacione incognita et insueta admirante et quasi indignante, rei reus nefarie seriem miseram enarravit.** | Indeed, the accused impiously told the wretched sequence of the affair to Cnut, who was wondering at and resenting the unknown and unaccustomed greeting of this type. |
| **AR:** Sciscitanti cur eum tali salutatione salutasset 142, rem intulit. |  
| **Cui cnucht subintulit. Unusquisque secundum suum laborem mercedem accipiet.** | To which news Cnut added: Each one receives a reward according to his work. |
| **Et quia te michi tali obsequio pre cunctis gracirem exhibere existimasti, et proinde memetipsum tibi et tuis conciliis adquiescentem credidi, ecce sustollam caput tuum supra omnes proceres anglie et dacie, sed in ulcione talis facinoris perhennis memorie decus, et in caucione proditorum omni perpetuum dedecus.** | And since you estimated that by such service to me you exhibit more gratitude than the rest, and consequently you believed that I agreed with you and your plans, behold! I will place your head above all the English and Danish nobles, but in vengeance as an ornament in memory of such a deed and in warning about the perpetual infamy of all traitors. |
| **AR:** Cui rex: Quoniam, inquit, me tali obsequio gratificandum putasti, sustollam caput tuum super omnes proceres Angliae. |  
| **Hiis dictis, iusset rex sub omni festinacione caput eius abstidi, et in superiori porta londininarum ad ostentacionem mercedis debite suspendi.** | Having said these things, the king ordered his head to be removed with all haste, and that it be suspended on the uppermost gate of London to show the wages owed. |
| **AR:** Jussitque abcdi caput eius et in sublimiori porta Lundoineae suspendi. |  

---

141 Laud MS, fo. 60r: does not include Cnuthum.  
142 Laud MS, fo. 60r: dignasset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi diceret et factum est.</th>
<th>As he said, so it was done.</th>
<th>AR: Mortuus est itaque strenuissimus rex Edmundus et in Clastingeberi cum avo suo Edgardo sepelitur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortuus est itaque strenuissimus rex edmundus, et cum avo suo edgaro pacifico in glastengbery sepelitur. 143</td>
<td>Thus died the most valiant King Edmund, and he was buried with his grandfather Edgar the Peaceful in Glastonbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volens deinde cnucht tam fratres Edmundi qui in normannia exsulabant, quam filios eius parvulos, id est, edmundum et edwardum spe regni penitus privare, iubet adesse summos regni procurers, queritque ab eis que fuerat inter illum et edmundum in regni divisione convencio.</td>
<td>Then Cnut wanting to deprive completely the brothers of Edmund who were exiled in Normandy [Edward and Alfred], and his little sons, that is, Edmund and Edward, of any hope of the realm, he orders the highest nobles of the realm to come, and asks them what had been the agreement between him and Edmund in the division of the realm;</td>
<td>AR: Volens deinde Cnuth tam fratres Edmundi qui in Normannia exsulabant quam filios ejus puerulos Edmundum et Edwardum spe regni penitus privare, iubet adesse summos regni procurers quae fuerit inter ipsum et Edmundum in regni divisione conventio, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quem etiam sibi designavit [fo. 5v.b] heredem, quemque filiis suis ad huc infantibus custodem deputaverit, quid de fratribus suis aluredo et edwardo prescripserit.</td>
<td>Whom Edmund had designated the heir, and who he had charged as guardian of his sons who were still infants, and what he had dictated regarding his brothers Alfred and Edward.</td>
<td>AR:… quem scilicet sibi designaverit rex Edmundus haeredem, quem filii adhuc infantibus custodem deputaverit de fratribus suis Aluredo et Edwardo praeciperit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac illi ut regi placerent insurrexerunt in innocentes testes iniqui, et mentita est iniquitas sibi. 148</td>
<td>And those unjust witnesses, in order to please the king, rose up against the innocent ones and iniquity lied to itself.</td>
<td>At illi ut regi placerent mendacium praefertur veritati, oblitique justitiae oblitique naturae insurrexerunt in innocentes testes iniqui, et mentita est iniquitas sibi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaque proprii sanguinis prodiiores dicunt regem edmundum enuchto potius curam regni et filiorum suorum</td>
<td>And so the betrayers of their own blood said that King Edmund had rather delegated the care of his kingdom and his sons to Cnut, and</td>
<td>AR: Itaque proprii sanguinis prodiiores dicunt regem Edmundum sibi potius curam regni filiorumque suorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143 This statement closely follows the account given in ASC, s.a. 1016, which also states that he died on St Andrew’s Day: John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, s.a. 1016 adds that the date was about (circa) the feast of St Andrew; both John of Worcester and Hermann the Archdeacon (*Memorials of St Edmunds*, 1.39) identify London as the place of his death.

144 Laud MS, fo. 60r: fuerat

145 Laud MS, fo. 60v: includes quid

146 Laud MS, fo. 60v: mistakenly identifies Edmund rather than Edward.

147 Note that the Genealogia includes: mendacium praefertur veritati, oblitique justitiae oblitique naturae. Aelred uses a similar phrase, mendacium praefertur veritati, in *Dialogus de anima*, bk. 2, line 687.

Psalms 26:12.
| Delegasse, et fratres suos heredes designasse. | had designated his brothers his heirs. | Delegasse, cum ipse fratres suos haeredes designaverit et eis puerulorum custodiam deputaverit. |

| Quoniam igitur adulantes regi mentiti sunt in caput suum, gladius eorum intravit in corda eorum et a cnuchto quem alienigenam dominis suis naturalibus preferebant, contractus est arcus eorum. | Since therefore the sycophants had lied to the king to his face, their sword entered into their hearts and their bow was broken by Cnut, a foreigner they preferred to their own natural lords. | AR: Quoniam igitur adulantes regi mentiti sunt in caput suum, gladius eorum intravit in corda eorum, et a Cnutho quem alienigenam naturalibus dominis praetulerunt, contractus est arcus eorum. |

| Cum enim monarchiam insule illis faventibus optinuisset, omnes qui primi fuerit in illo consensus consilii exterminavit, et quotquot de regio semine remanerant, vel regno expulit vel occidit. | For when he was chosen the monarch of the island by those favoring him, he exterminated any who would have been first in agreement in this plan, and however many remained from the royal seed he either banished from the kingdom or killed. | AR: Cum enim monarchiam insulae faventibus illis obtinuisset, omnes qui primi in illo fuere consilio exterminavit, et quotquot de regio semine superstites reperit, vel regno pepulit vel occidit. |

| Ac filios edmundi ferire pre pudore metuens, ad regem sivanorum socerum suum transmisit quasi alendos, sed pocius interficiendos. | Fearing to strike the sons of Edmund for the shame of it, he sent them to his relative, the king of the Swedes, as though for raising, but more probably for killing. | AR: At puerulos filios Edmundi ferire metuens prae pudore, ad regem Suavorum eos interficiendos transmisit. |

| Rex autem sivanorum nobilium puerorum [miser]atus [iniu]stam miseriam, convertit se ad [misericordiam] et ad regem hungariorum eos destinavit fovendos alendos, in hiis que eos decebat informandos et instruendos. | However the king of the Swedes, deploring the unjust misery of the noble boys, became merciful and sent them to the king of the Hungarians for fostering; in these things it was proper that they were formed and instructed. | AR: Rex vero Suavorum nobilium puerorum miseratus aerumnam, ad Hungariorum regem eos destinat nutriendos. |

| Quos ipse benigne suscepit, benignissime sibi in filios [fo. 6r.a] adoptavit. | He supported them kindly, fostered them with more kindness, and most kindly adopted them as his sons. | AR: Quos ipse benigne accept, benignissime sibi in filios adoptavit. |

| Processu vero temporis cum adulti fuisse, edmundo filiam suam dedit uxorem, et edwardo | Indeed, when they had become adults with the advance of time, he gave Edmund his daughter as wife | AR: Porro Edmundo filiam suam dedit uxorem; Edwardo filiam germani sui Henrici |

149 Note that Aelred attributes custody of the children not to Cnut, but to the treacherous magnates: *Itaque proprii sanguinis prodores dicunt regem Edmundum sibi potius curam regni filiorumque suorum delegasse, cum ipse fratres suos haeredes designaverit et eis puerulorum custodiam deputaverit.*  
150 Psalms 36:15.  
151 Laud MS, fo. 60v: *suscepit.*
filiam germani henrici
imperatoris in matrimonio
copulavit. \(^{152}\)

and he joined in marriage to
Edward the daughter of a blood
relative of the emperor Henry.

imperatoris in matrimonium
junxit. \(^{152}\)

Sed paulo post edmundus de
temporalibus ad eterna
transfertur, et edwardus sospitate
et prosperitate perfuitur.

But after a little while Edmund
was transported from the temporal
to the eternal, while Edward fully
enjoyed health and prosperity.

AR: Sed paulo post Edmundus
de temporalibus ad aeterna
transfertur: Edwardus sospitate
et prosperitate perfuitur. \(^{153}\)

Interea mortuo cnuctho et filiis
eius qui post eum regnaverunt,
accersitur ad regnum anglorum
edwardus frater edmundi
yrniside filius ethelredi qui in
normannia exulabat.

In the meantime, after the death of
Cnut and his sons who had reigned
after him, Edward [the Confessor],
the brother of Edmund Ironside
and the son of Aethelraed, who
had been exiled to Normandy,
gained the kingdom of the English.

AR, 734: Interea mortuo
Cnuth et filiis ejus qui
regnaverunt post eum,
accersitur ad regnum
Anglorum Edwardus frater
Edmundi, filius Edelredi qui,
sicut diximus, in Normannia
exulabat.

Nam frater ejus aluredus
prodicione godwyni in anglia
dum matrem suam emmam
quia cnucth in uxorem duxerat
visaret, crudeli morte
interierat.

His brother Alfred, however, had
perished in a cruel death dealt by
the traitor Godwyn in England
when Alfred had visited his
mother Emma, since Cnut had
married her.

AR: Nam frater ejus Alfredus
proditione, ut putatur, Godwini
in Anglia crudeli morte perierat.

Non tamen impune.

Nevertheless, this did not happen
with impunity.

Nam sequenti tempore cum
idem rex quadam die quo
populo celebris habebatur
presente eodem comite godwyno
proditore cuius filiam ipse
duxerat in uxorem, cum
virgine permanens virgo,
mensis regalis assideret, inter
prandendum unus ministerum
in obitem aliquem uno pede
immoderatus ingens pene
lapsum incurrit, quem cum pes
alius recto gressu procedens,

Subsequently, a crowd assembled
on a certain day, including the
traitor Earl Godwin, whose
daughter the king had married, the
virgin remaining with a virgin.
When the king sat at the royal
table, one of the servants ran in
during the meal, and with one
more impetuous foot running into
another, he almost fell. Once the
other foot corrected the step he
proceeds, but again he was not
able to support his stance with his

AR, Vita S. Edwardi Regis, PL
195.766d-767b: Die itaque
quadam quae populo celebris
habebatur, cum rex, praesente
Godwino, mensis regalis
assideret, inter prandendum
unos ministerum in obicem
aliquem immoderatus uno
pede impingens pene lapsum
incurrit, quem tamen pes alius
recto gressu procedens iterum
in statum suum nihil injuriae
passum erexit.

\(^{152}\) Compare with fo. 16va and Aelred’s *De sancto rege Scottorum David* (PL 195 col. 715B) which both
state that Margaret was descended *de semine regio Anglorum et Hungariorum.*

\(^{153}\) Laud MS, fo. 60v: *perfiuitur.*

\(^{154}\) Note that Aelred does not include a reference to Emma. Also see earlier in the *Vita sancti Edwardi,*
BHL 2424: *Alfredus demum Eduardi frater in Angliam transuestus, inaudita crudelitate ab hostibus
ceiusbusque perimitur.* However, Aelred does implicate Emma in the *Vita S. Edwardi Regis,* PL 195. 744B:
*Emenso autem tempore Alfredus, Eduardi frater, ob maternum colloquium in Angliam transuestus,
audita crudelitate ab hostibus ceiusbusque perimitur.*
iterum in statum suum nichil inurie passum sustinuit.\textsuperscript{155}

De hoc autem casu pluribus inter se loquentibus, et quem pedum sustinuerit iocantibus, comes quasi ludendo sub intulit.

However, with many speaking jokingly among themselves, that the foot should have supported the foot, the earl added regarding this fall as if playing:

AR, Vita: De hoc eventu pluribus inter se loquentibus, et quod pedi subenerit gratulantibus, comes quasi ludendo intulit:

[fo. 6r.b] Sic est frater fratrem adiuvans,\textsuperscript{156} et alter alteri in necessitate subveniens.

Thus the brother helps a brother, one supporting the other in need.

AR, Vita: “Sic est frater fratrem adjuvans et alter alteri in necessitate subveniens.”

Et rex ad ducem.

And the king said to the duke.

AR, Vita: Et rex ad ducem:

Hoc inquit meus michi fecisset, si Godwinus permisisset.

This my brother would have done for me, if Godwin had allowed.

AR, Vita: “Hoc, inquit, meus mihi fecisset si Godwinus hoc permisisset.”

Ad hanc itaque vocem male mentis conscius Godwinus expavit, et tristicia vultum pallidum pretendens subintulit.\textsuperscript{157}

And so the conspirator Godwin was very afraid of the king’s hostile tone, and his obvious sorrow made him go pale.

AR, Vita: Ad hanc vocem Godwinus expavit, et tristem admodum praeferen vultum:

Scio inquit scio o rex quam adhuc de morte fratris tui tuus me apud te animus accusat, nec eis adhuc estimas discredendum, qui vel eius vel tuum me menciuntur proditorem.\textsuperscript{158}

I know, he said, I know, O king, that even now your mind accuses me of the death of your brother, nor do you think they should not be believed, those who lie, calling me a traitor to both him and you.

AR, Vita: “Scio, ait, o rex, scio, adhuc de morte fratris tui tuus me accusat animus, nec adhuc eis aestimas discredendum, qui me vel ejus, vel tuum vocant proditorem;”

---

\textsuperscript{155} The following is not included in the \textit{Genealogia}. For a similar account see Aelred of Rievaulx’s \textit{Vita S. Edwari Regis}. See also William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.26 for a similar story involved King Aethelstan and his cup-bearer. Alice Taylor concludes that this story was inserted into the Dunfermline \textit{Vita} by the Dunfermline Continuator, the person responsible for compiling the three portions of Dunfermline manuscript known as the \textit{Vita}, the Dunfermline Continuations, and the Dunfermline Chronicle. Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 232-33, 242.

\textsuperscript{156} See Bernard of Clairvaux, Sermon no. 244 in \textit{Bernardi Opera}, ed. J. Leclercq / H.M. Rochais, 1974-1977, vol. 7-8;

\textsuperscript{157} The following story of Godwin’s “ordeal by bread” is found by the early twelfth century: William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.197: Henry of Huntingdon, \textit{Historia Anglorum}, ed. Greenway, 6.23; and the \textit{Liber Monasterii de Hyda}, in addition to Aelred of Rievaulx, \textit{Vita sancti Edwardi}, 299. The story as told in the \textit{Vita} and Aelred’s \textit{Vita sancti Edwardi} is most similar to the Hyde Abbey account: Godwin slips coming into the king’s hall stating “thus a brother helps a brother;” Edward take the opportunity to accuse Godwin in the murder of his brother; Godwin offers to submit to the ordeal by blessed morsel and dies.

A more succinct account is given by John of Fordun: \textit{Godwinus comes ac proditor, cuus filiam rex duxerat in uxorem, feria secunda Paschae, ad mensam iuxta regem consedens, buccella gutturi adhaerente semissuffocatus est, a filiis ad cameram exportatus, quinta post hoc feria decessit: modum autem hujusmodi vindictae latius suo loco inferius recitabimus. Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.12.

\textsuperscript{158} Compare with William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}, ed. Mynors, 2.197: ‘Tu,’ [Godwinus] inquit, ‘rex, ad omnem memoriam germani rugato me vultu video quod aspitias; sed non patiatur Deus ut
Sed secretorum omnium conscientis deus, *rem veram inde iudicet et sic bucellam hanc quam gluciandam manu teneo, guttur meum pertransire faciat et me servet illesum et non suffocatum, sicut nec de tua prodicione reum me sencio, nec de fratris tui interitu michi conscientia existo.*

But God the keeper of all secrets reveals the truth; and so may my throat swallow this small morsel which I hold in my hand, saving and not choking me. I feel that I am not guilty of your betrayal nor am I implicated in the death of your brother.

**AR, Vita:** sed secretorum omnium conscientis Deus *judicet*, et sic bucellam hanc quam manu teneo guttur meum faciat pertransire et me servet illesum, sicut nec tuae proditionis reus, nec de fratris tui nece mihi conscientia existo.“

---

**Dixit et bucellam a rege benedictam**

He spoke, and he put the small morsel blessed by the king into his mouth, and drew it into the middle of his throat.

**AR, Vita:** *Dixerat*, et bucellam inferens ori, usque in gutturis medium protraxit.

---

**Tunc ulcione divina inibi firmiter hesit sed inhesit, temptat interius semisuffocatus attraxhere, set adhesit firmius, temptat emittere sed cohesit firmissime.**

Then it stuck firmly within by divine vengeance but unstuck; half suffocated, Godwin tried to draw it in, but it stuck more firmly; he tried to spit it out, but it stuck even more firmly.

**AR, Vita:** *Tentat interius trahere, nec valuit; tentat emittere, sed haesit firmius.*

---

**Quid plura inde? Mox meatus quibus ducebatur spiritus obcluduntur, enascuntur oculi, brachia cum tibiis rigescunt, totum corpus frigescit et denigrescit.**

What more then? Soon he was led to the motions by which all his breathes were blocked; his eyes bulged, his arms and his legs became stiff, his entire body turned cold and very black.

**AR, Vita:** Mox meatus quibus ducebatur spiritus *occluduntur, evertuntur* oculi, brachia rigescunt.

---

**Intuetur rex infeliciter morientem et ulcionem divinam in eum sensciens processisse, astantibus dixit:**

The king considers the man dying so unhappily. Perceiving that divine vengeance has taken place, he said to those standing by:

**AR, Vita:** Intuetur rex infeliciter morientem, et ulcionem sentiens in eum processisse divinam, *astantes alloquitur:*

---

**Extrahite istum canem hinc, extrahite.**

Drag this dog out from this place, drag him out.

**AR, Vita:** “Extrahite, inquiens, canem istum.”

---

**Manifestavit deus opera sua que deo teste negando etiam detestatus est in internicione fratris mei, vel prodicione mea.**

God has shown His works; with God as a witness, he was confounded in his denial of involvement in the murder of my brother or in my betrayal.

---

*Note that in the Vita the morsel is blessed by the king.

159 For a comparison see Liber Monasterii de Hyda, 289: bucellam ori impositam, urgente eum divino judicio, nec glutere potuit, nec revertere, sed in amentiam versus terribiliter coepit expirare. Discussed in Freeman, Norman Conquest, 2.429-32.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrunt filii mortui patris protractum que de sub mensa thalamis inferunt, ubi post modicum intervalum debitum proditori finem sortitus est.</th>
<th>The sons of the dead father hasten forward and pull him from underneath the table and take him to bed, where, after a little while, the traitor received his end.</th>
<th>AR, Vita: Occurrunt filii, protractumque de sub mensa thalamis inferunt, ubi post modicum debitum proditori sortitus est finem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sed nunc ad narracionem nostram revertamur de qua paulisper digressus sumus.</td>
<td>But now let us return to our story from which we have digressed a little.</td>
<td>AR, 734: Veniens igitur in Angliam Edwardus ab universo clero et populo cum maxima exultatione suscipitur, et Wintoniae die sancto Paschae ab archiepiscopis Cantuariensi et Eboracensi cunctisque fere regni episcopis in regem ungitur et consecratur, et ambulavit viis patris sui Edgari, homo mansuetus et pius, magis pace quam armis regnum protegens, habebat animum irae victorem, avariae contemptorem, superbiae expetet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igitur in angliam primo veniens rex edwardus cum in die sancto pasche, wintonie ab archiepiscopis, id est, cantuariensi et eboracensi, cunctis quoque regni episcopis ungeretur in regem et consecratur a cunctis regni proceribus omnique populo debito cum honore suscipitur et honoratur. So coming first to England, King Edward was anointed and consecrated as king on the holy Pascal Day (Easter) at Winchester by the archbishops, that is of Canterbury and York, and also by all the bishops of the realm; he was raised up and honored by all the nobles and the people of the realm with the honor that he was owed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui cum pacem tam a suis quam ab extraneis obtinuisset, et vicinis regibus ac principibus gratus et amabilis extitisset, eo que magis pace quam armis regnum suum protegeret, dirigit nuncios ad henricum imperatum romanum rogans ut nepotem suum edwardum filium Edmund ferrei lateris debiti sibi regni futurum heredem mittite dignaretur. When he had attained peace from his own people as well as from foreigners, and stood out as agreeable and likeable to the neighboring kings and princes, by which means he protected his kingdom more by peace than by arms, he sent messengers to Henry the Emperor of the Romans asking if he might think it deserving that his relative Edward, the son of Edmund Ironside, be sent as the future heir to the realm.</td>
<td>AR: Qui cum pacem tam a suis quam ab extraneis obtinuisset, et vicinis regibus et principibus gratus et amabilis extitisset, dirigit nuntios ad Romanum imperatorem, rogans ut nepotem suum scilicet, filium fratris sui Edmundi ferrei lateris, debiti sibi regni futurum haeredem mittere dignaretur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

161 The Cotton Vita, the Dunfermline Vita, and Aelred use these same words to describe Edward.
162 Laud MS, fo. 61r: contencorem (?) avariae expertem superbiae.
163 See n. 161.
164 Emperor Henry III (d. 1056). Note that Aelred does not mention the emperor by name. John of Fordun quotes Turgot stating: Rex Edwardus ... misit ad regem Hunorum, sed Turgotus dicit ad imperatorem. Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.11.
165 Laud MS, fo. 61r: edmundi ferreum latus.
Imperator autem regis nuncios gratanter excipiens, non parvo tempore [fo. 6v.b] summo cum honore detinuit. And so, the emperor, graciously receiving the messengers of the king, detained them not for a little time but with the greatest honor.

Tandem paratis navibus et omnibus que navigaturis erant necessaria illatis, edwardum cum uxore sua Agatha germani sui filia cum liberis suis, id est, edgaro etheling, margarita atque christina cum magna gloria ac multis diviciis sicut rex petierat ad angliam mittit. At last, with ships having been prepared and with all things that would be necessary for sailing on board, he sent to England Edward with his wife Agatha, the daughter of his relative, and their children, that is Edgar the Ætheling, Margaret, and Christina, with great glory and many riches just as the king had asked.

Qui prospero cursu in angliam veniens, tam regem quam populum suo letificavit adventu. His arrival, coming to England after a favorable journey, delighted the king as well as the people.

Quem rex maximo cum honore suscepit, atque secum ut regni sui futurum heredem honorifice detinuit. The king received him with the greatest honor, and kept him with him honorably as the future heir of his kingdom.

Sed iuxta illud salomonis, extrema gaudii luctus occupat, post modicum dierum tempus immature morti cedens, gaudium mutavit in luctum, et risum in lamentum. But in accordance with the saying of Solomon, sorrow seizes extremes of joy; joy changed into sorrow and laughter into mourning when Edward succumbed to an early death after a few days.

Nec multo post ipse rex cum nobile monasterium quod in occidentali parte londoniaram in honorem beati Petri fundaverat maxima cum gloria fecisset dedicari, in regno vigintiannis et mensibus sex et viginti septem diebus in vigilia epiphanie, felici morte vitam terminavit, totamque insulam lacrimis et dolore replevit. Not much later the king himself ended his life with a happy death in the famous minster, which he had founded in the west part of London and had dedicated with the greatest glory in honor of the Blessed Peter; he died after having ruled 20 years, 6 months, and 27 days, during the vigil of the Epiphany, and the entire island was filled with sorrow and tears.

AR: Imperator autem regis nuntios gratanter excipiens, non parvo tempore summo cum honore detinuit.

AR: Tandem paratis navibus et omnibus quae navigaturis necessaria videbantur allatis, Edwardum cum uxore sua Agatha germani sui filia liberisque ejus, Edargo Edeling, Margaret, atque Christina, cum magna gloria ac divitis sicut rex petierat ad Angliam mittit.

AR: Qui prospero cursu in Anglaim veniens, tam regem quam populum suo laetificavit adventu.

AR: Quem rex maximo cum honore suscepit, atque secum ut regni sui futurum heredem honorifice detinuit.

AR: Sed post paucos dies vita discedens, gaudium in luctum, risum mutavit in lacrymas.

AR: Nec multo post ipse rex cum nobile monasterium quod in occidentali parte Lundoine in honore beati Petri fundaverat cum maxima gloria dedicari fecisset, exactis in regno viginti tribus annis et mensibus sex et viginti septem diebus, in vigilia Epiphaniae felici morte vitam laudabilem terminavit, totamque insulam lacrimis ac

166 Laud MS, fo. 61r: illatis.
167 Laud MS, fo. 61r: letificavit.
169 The Vita mistakenly claims that Edward ruled for 20 rather than 23 years, possibly a scribal error.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quo in predicto monasterio ut tantum virum decebat tumulato quidam Edgarum Etheling cui regnum hereditatio iure debebatur regem constituere moliiuntur.</td>
<td>It is fitting that such a man is buried in the aforementioned minster, in which certain men begin to work to establish Edgar Ætheling as king, who is owed the kingdom as his inheritance by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Quo in praedicto monasterio ut tantum virum decebat tumulato, quidam Edgarum Edeling cui regnum jure haereditario debebatur, regem constituere moliiuntur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed quia [fo. 7r.a] puer tanto oneri minus idoneus videbatur, haraldus comes filius Godwyni cuius et erat mens astucior et crumena fecundior et miles copiosior, sinistro omne regnum optinuit.</td>
<td>But since such a boy seemed less fit for such a burden, Earl Harald the son of Godwin, whose mind was cleverer, and purse wealthier, and who was a better-supplied soldier, obtained the entire kingdom by inauspicious means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Sed quia puer tanto honorë minus idoneus videbatur, haraldus comes de genere proditorum, cuius erat et mens astutior et crumena fecundior et miles copiosior, sinistro omne regnum obtinuit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**De adventu Wilhelmi bastard in angliam.**

Concerning the arrival of William the Bastard in England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiens itaque Wilelmus dux normannorum cui cognomen bastard, nullum de regio semine sed haraldum consobrini sui regis edwardi regnum invasisse, quod ei et iure consanguinitatis, et antique inter ipsum et edwardum convencionis, sed et ipsius haraldi cum sacramento sponsionis iustius debebatur, contracto a partibus transmarinis innumerabili exercitu in angliam venit, et dei judicio ipsum haraldum regno simul et vita privavit.</td>
<td>And so William, the Duke of the Normans, whose cognomen was “the bastard,” hearing that there was no one from the royal stock, but Harald had invaded the kingdom of his cousin King Edward, which was owed to him by right of consanguinity and by an ancient agreement between himself and Edward, but more lawfully by the sacrament of a solemn promise of this Harald. He came to England with a large overseas army, and by the judgment of God deprived this Harald of his kingdom and his life at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Audiens namque Wilelmus dux Normannorum nullum de regio semine, sed haraldum consobrini sui regis Edwardi regnum invasisse, quod ei et jure consanguinitatis et antiquae inter ipsum et Edwardum conventionis, sed et ipsius Haraldi cum sacramento sponsionis justius debebatur, contracto a partibus transmarinis innumerabili exercitu in Angliam venit, et Dei judicio ipsum Haraldum regno simul et vita privavit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


170 Laud MS, fo. 61r: oneri.

171 William was known to cotemporaries as “the Bastard” and after his death as “the Great” to distinguish him from his successor, William Rufus. E.A. Freeman asserts that the earliest use of the cognomen “Conqueror,” or more specifically, “Conquæstor” occurs in Orderic Vitalis. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, 2.409-11.

172 Both Symeon of Durham and Aelred of Rievaulx offer abbreviated versions of this account of Margaret’s arrival in Scotland, while John of Fordun’s account closely follows the Dunfermline *Vita*,

---

172 Cernens itaque edgarus And so Edgar, perceiving that the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>etheling res anglorum undique perturbari, ascensis navibus cum matre sua et sororibus reverti in patriam in qua natus fuerat conabatur, et hoc consilio matris que cum liberis suis insidias adversariorum suorum sub protecctione patrui, scilicet, imperatoris studuit declinare.</th>
<th>affairs of the English were troubled everywhere, tried to return to the country in which he was born with his mother and his sisters, and by this plan of his mother and with her children he was eager to avoid the treachery of their adversaries under the protection of (her) paternal uncle, namely the emperor.</th>
<th>Edgarus Edeling res Anglorum undique perturbari, ascensa navi cum matre et sororibus reverti in patriam qua natus fuerat conabatur,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But the greatest emperor who commands the winds and the sea, moved the sea and stirred it up, and the waves were raised in the breath of his storm.</td>
<td>Sed summus imperator qui imperat ventis et mari, conmovit mare et conturbavit illud, et in spiritu procelle exaltati sunt fluctus eius.</td>
<td>AR, 735: sed orta in mari tempestate in Scotia applicare compellitur. Hac occasione actum est ut Margareta regis Malcolm nuptis traderetur, cujus laudabilem vitam et mortem pretiosam liber inde editus satis insinuat…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And so, with the storm raging violently, and with everyone in desperation for their lives, they commend themselves to God and entrust the little boat to the open sea.</td>
<td>Deseviente itaque [fo. 7r.b] tempestate, omnibus in desperacione vite positis sese deo commendant, et puppim pelago committunt.</td>
<td>JF, 5.9-10:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| After many more dangers and enormous efforts, God pitied his desolate family, since where there is no human help, it is necessary to | Igitur post plurima pericula et immanes labores misertus est dominus desolate familie sue, quia ubi humanum deest | stating that his material is derived from a “vetusta chronica,” perhaps a version of this Vita. See Symeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera omnia, ed. Arnold, s.a. 1070; John of Fordun, Scotichronicon, 5.16. For John of Fordun’s source see Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea, ed. Hinde, 86, note u.  
173 For this and the following lines, see John of Fordun, in which he cites Turgot as his source in Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed. Skene, 5.14 followed by Walter Bower, in Scotichronicon, ed. Watt, 3.48-51. See also Watt’s notes, 3.204-5.  
174 Compare with Symeon of Durham’s description of the flight of Bishop Egelwin in Symeonis Dunelmensis opera, ed. Hinde, 86: Videns namque res Anglorum undique turbari ...  
175 This is the only instance that I am aware of in which Agatha is identified as the one responsible for the plan.  
176 The emperor is identified as Agatha’s kinsman, her paternal uncle, meaning her father’s brother.  
178 Note Aelred’s reference to an existing version of Margaret’s Vita. At this point, Aelred sums up his work with a brief Life of Margaret. Genealogia PL 195:735A: Hac occasione actum est ut Margareta regis Malcolm nuptis traderetur, cujus laudabilem vitam et mortem pretiosam liber inde editus satis insinuat; soror ejus Christiana in Christi sponsam benedicitur. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>auxilium, necesse est subvenire divinum.¹⁷⁹</th>
<th>come under divine (aid).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quassati pelogo, tandem in scotiam coacti sunt applicare.</td>
<td>Shaken by the open sea, they were at last compelled to land in Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicuit itaque illa sancta familia in [quodo] loco, tunc vero loco horro ris et vaste solitudinis, nunc vero pro nimia tranquillitate sua sinus sancta margarite regine ab incolis appellatur.¹⁸⁰</td>
<td>And so this holy family came to a certain place, truly then a place of horror and a desert of loneliness, but now named for its very great tranquility the Bay of Queen Saint Margaret by the locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hoc autem sinu eiusdem ut credimus matrone a periculo maris multi postea liberati sunt.</td>
<td>For, as we believe, many were afterwards freed from the danger of the sea in this bay of the matron. [Not included in JF]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et merito, ut illa que tot et talia naufragia maris passa est naufragantibus subvenire non desistat.¹⁸²</td>
<td>And deservedly, so that she who had suffered so many and such shipwrecks of the sea did not desist from helping those shipwrecked. [Not included in JF]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ideo non hoc casu contigisse, sed summa dei providencia illam ibi credimus applicuisse.¹⁸³</td>
<td>And therefore we believe that she did not touch this bay by chance, but that she landed there by the great providence of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam sicut ninivite quondam in predicacione ione penitenciam egerunt, simul modo erudicione huius sancta regine et exemplo, barbara scotorum gens</td>
<td>For just as the Ninivites once chose penance in the teaching of Jonah, in the same way, by the learning and example of this holy queen, the barbaric people of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹⁸⁰ Deuteronomy 32:10.

¹⁸¹ Probably the place now called St Margaret’s Hope, just west of North Queensferry on the North side of the Firth of Forth. D.E.R. Watt notes that the use of the word “hope,” derived from the Old Norse hop, ‘a sheltered bay,’ in a Fife place-name is “exceptional.” Watt, *Scotichronicon*, 3. 204.

¹⁸² Perhaps referring to reported miracles. See for example miracle chapter 40 in Bartlett, *Miracles*, 138-39.

¹⁸³ Watt notes that this idea that Margaret’s landing in Scotland was an act of Divine Providence is more fully developed in the D Version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, causing him to speculate that the Chronicle was used as a source by Turgot. I would only add that since, as Whitelock suggests, the D version might have been derived from an existing hagiography, the D chronicler could have used an existing *Vita* of Margaret as a source. Watt, *Scotichronicon*, 3.205, notes on lines 14-15; Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, s.a. 1067 and xvi. See also Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 690.

¹⁸⁴ Jonas 3:1-10, especially since this reference follows Jonas 1:1-16 in which Jonas and others survive a divinely –manifested tempest at sea by divine intervention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fidem catholicam que adhuc novella satis et rudis ibi fuit, plenius susceperunt sicut in sequentibus declarabit.</td>
<td>Scots, who were up until then new enough and untutored, supported the Catholic faith more fully, as will be made clear in the following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igitur in <strong>predicto litore</strong> prefata <strong>familia commorante, omnibus rei finem in timore domini [fo. 7v.a]</strong> <strong>expectantibus</strong>, nunciatum est regi <strong>scotie</strong> malcolmo <strong>filio duncani de eorum adventu</strong>, qui tune ab eodem loco <strong>haut</strong> procul cum suis manebat.</td>
<td>So, with the predestined family waiting on the aforementioned shore, and with everyone expecting the end of the matter in fear of God, their arrival was announced to the king of Scotland, Malcolm the son of Duncan, who then was staying hardly far away from them with his (retinue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qui directis nunciis</strong> rem veram siscitabatur.</td>
<td>He sent out his messengers so that he might discover the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuncii autem illuc venientes, et navis magnitudinem, preter solitum <strong>videntes et</strong> admirantes, regi que viderant quantocius <strong>festinant indicare</strong>.</td>
<td>However, the messengers, coming to that place, and seeing and marveling at the unusually great size of the ship, hurried as quickly as possible to the king to relate what they had seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quibus auditis, rex plures et prudenciores prioribus de summis suis proceribus illac direxit.</strong></td>
<td>After hearing these things, the king ordered thither many of his the highest nobles, who were wiser than the previous ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac illi <strong>ut</strong> nuncii regie maiestatis suscepti, virorum proceritatem mulierum venustatem ac <strong>tocius familie unitatem et</strong> industriam, non sine admiracione diligentius considerantes, gratum apud semetipos inde colloquium conferunt.</td>
<td>And these, having been received as messengers of the royal majesty, noting carefully the nobility of the men, and the beauty of the women, and the uniformity and diligence of the entire family, not without admiration, engaged in pleasant conversation among themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quid plura?</strong></td>
<td>What more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventum rei et rerum seriem et causam nuncii ad hoc destinati, dulci <strong>alloquo</strong> et eloquenti dulcedine investigant.</td>
<td>Those destined for this duty investigate the event and the series and cause of events with sweet speech and pleasant speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illi autem ut novi hospites et</td>
<td>While they, as new guests and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advene, causam et modum suorum applicatum, verbis plica carentibus eloquenter exponent.</td>
<td>foreigners, lacking words, eloquently explain the cause and means of their landing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversi autem nuncii cum seniorum reverenciam iuvenum vero prudenciam, matronarum maturitatem et iuvencularum venustatem sue regi nuncissent, quidam subintulit dicens.</td>
<td>After the messengers had announced to their king the reverence of the elder men, the prudence of the younger, the maturity of the matrons, and the beauty of the young women, a certain one added saying:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidimus ibiquamdam ob forme incomparatam speciem et eloquentie [fo. 7v.b] facunditatem iocundam, tum ob ceterarum fecunditatem virtutum, iudicio meo dominam illius familie suspicans tibi hoc annuncio, et de cuius mirabilis venustate et moralitatemagis est admirandum quam narrandum.</td>
<td>We saw there a certain woman who, because of her incomparable beauty of form, and the pleasant eloquence of her speech, and an abundance of other virtues, I announce this to you suspecting, in my judgment, that she is the mistress of this family, whose wonderful beauty and morality ought to be more admired than talked about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec mirum si illam dominam crediderint quam dominam non solummodo illius familie, sed etiam totius regni reginam, immo et regni sui participem divina praedestinaverit providencia.</td>
<td>It is no wonder that they would have believed her to be the mistress since she was mistress not only of this family, but divine providence preordained that she would even be queen of the entire realm, or rather a partner in his rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex autem malcomus audiens anglos illos esse et ibi adesse, in propria persona illos visitat et alloquitur et unde venerunt aut quo vadant plenius explorat.</td>
<td>King Malcolm, however, hearing that those English had arrived and were present, personally visits and speaks with them, and explores more fully where they came from and where they are going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicam enim linguam simul et romanam equo ut propriam perfecte didicerat, cum propatresu obses esset in anglia, ubi forte de cognatione huius sancta familie</td>
<td>For he had learned the English language at the same time as the Roman as equally and as perfectly as his own, since he had been a hostage in England for his father. While there, he had happened to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

187 While the *Vita* does not mention the duration of Malcolm’s stay in England, John of Fordun and Walter Bower both claimed that he remained there fourteen years. See Watt, *Schotichonicum*, 3.205, notes to lines 48-50.
aliqvid audierat, quare cum eis mitigius ageret, et benignius se haberet. hear something about the relatives of this holy family, so he would act more gently with them and consider them more kindly.

At ubi margaritam viderat, eamque de regio semine simul et imperiali esse didicerat, ut eam in uxorem duceret, peciit et optimatur, tradente eam edgar etheling frater suo, magis tamen suorum quam sua voluntate, imno dei ordinacione. And when he had seen Margaret for himself, and he had learned that she was from royal as well as imperial stock, he asked and received her in marriage, with her brother Edgar Ætheling surrendering her, more by the will of his people than by his own, or rather by the decree of God.

Nam sicut bester olim assuero regi pro salute civium suorum, ita et hec illustissimo malcolmo regi scotorum regis duncani filio [fo. 8r.a] in coniugium copulatur. For just as Esther once was joined in marriage to King Ahasuerus for the well-being of her countrymen, so Margaret was joined in marriage to this most illustrious king of the Scots, Malcolm the son of King Duncan.

Nec tum quasi captiva, immo multis habundans diviciis quas patri suo edwardo tanquam heredi suo sanctus edwardus rex anglie delegaverat, quasque ipse etiam romanus imperator sicut paulo ante prediximus non minimis honoratum muneribus in angliam transmiserat. Not, however, as a captive, but rather abounding in many riches which the holy Edward, King of England had given to her father Edward as his heir, and which even the Roman Emperor just as we said a little before, had sent to England with not less honor than gifts.

Quarum partem permaximam hec sancta regina secum in scotiam portavit. The holy queen carried the best part of these with her into Scotland.

Attulit eciam plurimas sanctorum reliquias omni auro et lapide preciosiores, inter quas fuit illa crux quam nigrum crucem nominant, omni genti scotorum non minus terribilem She brought many relics of the saints, more precious than any gold or jewel, among which was that cross which they call the Black Cross, not less feared than loved by all the people of the Scots.

---

188 Again asserting that Agatha was related to the Emperor.
189 This phrase is included later in the Cotton Vita, ed. Hinde, chapter 6.
190 See Esther 1-16. Esther was the Jewish queen of the Persian king, Ahasuerus, who used her influence to intercede on behalf of her people.
191 This treasure can be viewed as her dowry, underscoring the formal, diplomatic nature of the meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>quam amabilem pro sanctitatis sue reverencia.</em></td>
<td>for reverence of its holiness.</td>
<td>192 This is the same relic she asks for on her death bed. See Dunfermline <em>Vita</em>, fo. 16va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quam magnanimus atque benignus fuit Malcolm rex scotie.</em></td>
<td>How great and kind King Malcolm of Scotland was.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Igitur de hac virtutis femina locuturi quia caput mulieris vir sicut et viri christus, ideo de viro suo tanquam de capite duximus aliquid praetermittendum, ut cuius fuerit cordis quanti ne animi, unum opus eius hic exaratum legentibus declaret.</em></td>
<td>Since it will be said about this woman of virtue that man is the head of woman just as Christ is the head of man, so we deem that something should be put forth for those reading regarding her husband as the head, so one work of his, whose heart would be worth not less than his soul, was declared here revealed.</td>
<td>AR, 735: … <em>Cujus sane cordis fuerit rex iste Malcolmu, unum ejus opus quod nobili rege David referente cognovi, legentibus declarabit.</em> 193 This story is also followed closely by John of Fordun, who cites Turgot as his source. <em>Johannis de Fordun Chronicca Gentis Scotorum</em>, ed. Skene, 5.9-10. Watt observes that Aelred of Rievaulx derives this story from this version of Margaret’s <em>Vita</em>. Watt, <em>Scotichronicon</em>, 3.193. Note that throughout this <em>Vita</em>, the author does not refer to Malcolm’s later cognomen, “Canmore.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Relatum est ei aliquando quemdam de summis proceribus suis de eo occidendo cum suis hostibus convenisse.</em></td>
<td>It was reported to him that a certain one of his greatest nobles had met with his enemies to kill him.</td>
<td>AR: <em>Delatum est ei aliquando quemdam de suis proceribus summis de eo occidendo cum suis hostibus convenisse:</em> 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imperat rex hec nuncianti silencium, siluit et ipse, proditoris qui forte tunc alerat expectans adventum.</em></td>
<td>The king ordered this one delivering the message to silence, and he himself was silent, expecting the arrival of the traitor who then, by chance, was absent.</td>
<td>AR: <em>imperat rex delatori silentium, siluit ipse, proditoris qui forte tunc abierat exspectans adventum.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Qui cum ad curiam cum magno apparatu regi insidiaturus venisset, rex [fo. 8r.b] ei suisque vultum solitum atque iocundum pretendens, finxit se nichil audisse nichil scivisse que mente recolbat.</em></td>
<td>When the traitor had come to court with great provision to set an ambush for the king, the king pretending to him and his men a relaxed and happy countenance, collected himself so that no one heard or knew what he was thinking over in his mind.</td>
<td>AR: <em>Qui cum ad curiam cum magno apparatu regi insidiaturus venisset,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quid plura?</em></td>
<td>What more?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iubet ipse rex omnes venatores suos summno mane convenire cum canibus.</em></td>
<td>The king himself orders all his hunters to come together with the dogs in the early morning.</td>
<td>AR: <em>jubet summo mane rex omnes venatores adesse cum canibus.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et iam noctem aurora abegerat, cum rex vocatis ad se cunctis</em></td>
<td>And already the dawn had dispelled the night, when the king.</td>
<td>AR: <em>Et jam aurora noctem abegerat cum rex vocatis ad se</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proceribus et militibus in venando spaciatum ire festinat.</td>
<td>having called all the nobles and soldiers to himself, hurries to go to the space for hunting.</td>
<td>cunctis proceribus et militibus, venatum ire festinat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venit ad quandam planiciem latam, quam in modum corone densissima Silva cingebat, in cujus medio colliculus unus quasi turgesere videbatur, qui diversorum colorum floribus pulcre quadradi varietate depictus, fatigatis quandoque militibus ex venatu igitur prebebat accubitum.</td>
<td>He came at a certain time to a broad plain, which a very dense forest ringed in the manner of a crown, in the middle of which a small hill seemed to rise up, painted with flowers of diverse colors in a certain beautiful variety; and since his soldiers were tired from the hunt, he then offered to rest.</td>
<td>AR: venitque ad latam quandam planitiem quam in modum coronae densissima Silva cingebat. In cujus medio colliculus quidam quasi turgesere videbatur, qui diversorum colorum floribus pulcre quadradi varietate depictus, fatigatis venatu militibus gratum singulis diebus praebebat accubitum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In quo cum rex ceteris superior constitisset, secundum legem venandi quam vulgus tristram vocant, singulis cum canibus et sociis singula loca delegat, ut obsessa undique bestia, ubicumque eligeret exitum, inveniret exitium.</td>
<td>While the king stood on the hill above the rest, following the law of hunting which in local tongues call tryst, he assigns each with a dog and companion in a single location, so that with the animal having been blocked on every side, wherever it chooses an exit it would find its destruction.</td>
<td>AR: In quo rex cum caeteris superior constitisset secundum legem venandi quam vulgus tristam vocat, singulis proceribus cum suis canibus singula loca delegat, ut obsessa undique bestia ubicumque eligeret exitum, inveniret exitium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipse vero suum retinens secum proditorem seorsum ab aliis solus cum solo abcessit.</td>
<td>But he, keeping the traitor with him, went separately from the others, one with one.</td>
<td>AR: Ipse vero suum secum proditorem seorsum ab aliis solus cum solo abcessit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab omnium vero aspectu et auditu remoti rex subsistit, et vultu volvente pugnam in hec verba prorupit.</td>
<td>So, removed from the sight and hearing of everybody, the king makes a firm stand; turning his face, he broke into the fight in these words.</td>
<td>AR: Ab omnium vero remotus aspectu, substitit rex, et aspiciens in eum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce inquit ego et tu mecum solus cum solo armis similibus protecti, equisque similibus vecti, non est qui mihi licet regi assistat, [fo. 8v.a] nec tibi subveniat, nec est qui videat aut audiat.</td>
<td>Behold, he said, myself and you with me, one on one, protected by similar weapons, carried by similar horses; there is nobody allowed to assist the king, nor to aid you, nor either to see or to hear.</td>
<td>AR: Ecce, inquit, ego et tu mecum solus cum solo, similibus protecti armis, equis vecti similibus. Non est qui videat, non est qui audiat, non est qui alteri nostrum suffragium ferat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc si vales, si audes, si habes cor, imple quidem opera quod</td>
<td>Now, if you are strong, if you dare, if you have the heart, indeed</td>
<td>AR: si igitur vales, si audes, si cor habes, imple quod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

196 For a discussion of this type of hunting strategy see Part 3, Chapter 1.
197 Laud MS, fo. 61v: tristuram.
198 Laud MS, fo. 61v: seorsum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in corde concepisti, et redde hostibus meis quod promisisti.</th>
<th>satisfy by deed what you conceived in your heart, and return to my enemies what you promised.</th>
<th>proposuisti, redde hostibus meis quod promisisti;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si me occidendum putas quando melius quando securius, quando liberius, quando tandem virilius.</td>
<td>If you think to kill me, when would be better, and safer, and more free, and finally more manly.</td>
<td>AR: si me occidendum putas, quando melius, quando securius, quando liberius, quando tandem virilius?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An venenum parasti?</td>
<td>Or rather, did you prepare poison?</td>
<td>AR: An venenum parasti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed hoc muliercularum esse quis nesciat?</td>
<td>But who does not know that this is girlish?</td>
<td>AR: Sed muliercularum hoc est, quis nesciat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An insidiaris lectulo?</td>
<td>Or do you lie in ambush in a bed?</td>
<td>AR: An insidiaris lectulo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc possunt et adultere.</td>
<td>Even adulteresses are able to do this.</td>
<td>AR: hoc possunt et adulterae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ferrum ut occulte ferias occultasti?</td>
<td>Or rather, do you hide so that you might secretly strike with the sword?</td>
<td>AR: An ferrum ut occulte ferias occultasti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc sicarii non militis esse nemo qui dubitet.</td>
<td>Let no one doubt that this is the work of an assassin not a soldier.</td>
<td>AR: hoc sicariorum, non militis est, nemo est qui dubitet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age pocius quod militis est et non proditoris, age quod est viri et non mulieris, atque solus cum solo congredere, ut saltem proditio tua turbidum videatur carere, que infidelitate carere non potuit.</td>
<td>Do rather what a soldier does and not a traitor, do what is manly and not womanly, and come together one on one, so that at least treason might seem to be free from your depravity, since it cannot be free from disloyalty.</td>
<td>AR: Age potius quod militia, age quod viri et solus cum solo congredere, ut saltem proditio tua turbidum careat quae infidelitate carere non poterat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hactenus vir ille iniquus hec vix sustinuit, et mox verbis eius quasi gravi percussus fulmine, de quo cui insidebat citissime descendit, proiectisque armis ad pedes regis corruit, cum lacrimis atque tremore cordis ita dixit.</td>
<td>So far, this iniquitous man hardly bore these things, and soon struck by his words as if by a heavy thunderbolt, he very quickly descended from his horse which he was riding, and having thrown down his weapons, he ran to the feet of the king and said with tears and a tremor of the heart:</td>
<td>AR: Hactenus vir ille sustinuit, et mox verbis ejus quasi gravi percussus fulmine de quo corruit, projectisque armis ad pedes regis cum lacrymis ac tremore cucurrit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine mi rex ignoscat michi ad presens hoc meum velle iniquum regia potestas tua, et si usque modo aliquid super huiuscemodi tradicione tui corporis cor meum malignum</td>
<td>“O my lord king, may your royal might forgive my iniquity for the present, and if until now my evil heart had conceived something before of this type of betrayal of your body, it will be destroyed</td>
<td>[Not included in AR, but in JF, 5.10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

199 Laud MS, fo. 62r: esse.
200 Laud MS, fo. 62r: esse.
201 Laud MS, fo. 62r: includes est.
202 Laud MS, fo. 62r: regios.
conceperit, amodo delebitur, et in futuro contra omnes fidelissimum [fo. 8v.b] in omnibus me tibi futurum, deo (et) sua genitrice teste promitto: henceforth, and in the future I promise God and his mother as witness that I will be the most faithful of all to you in all things against all men.”

| Cui ait rex, Noli amice timere, noli pavere, a me nichil nec per me mali pro re ista sustineb(is). | To whom the king said, “Do not be afraid, friend. Do not be scared. You will sustain nothing evil by me or through me for this affair. |
| Obsides tamen in pacis pignere (iu)beo ut michi nomines atque adduca(s). | “Nevertheless, I order you to stay near as a hostage of peace and also so that you might bring me names (of your fellow conspirators). |
| Quibus nominatis et adductis, (in) regis verbo tibi dico, res ante promissa stabit. | “When those named have been brought, I say to you in the word of the king, the matter will stand as promised before.” |
| Ille vero autem proditor regis volunati in hiis que premisimus satisfaciens in tempore oportuno, et sic revertuntur ad socios, que fecerant vel dixerant nulli loquentes. | Indeed, in due time, when the traitor had satisfied the wishes of the king in these matters, they returned to their companions, speaking to nobody about what they had done or said. |
| Huic igitur magnanimo viro regi malcolmio margarita est desponsata, nuptiis haut procul a litore celebratis. | Margaret was married to this magnanimous man, King Malcolm, and the wedding was celebrated not far at all from the shore. |
| Hoc itaque exemplo nu(lli) ex | And so they were bound together |

---

203 What follows is a brief account of Margaret’s children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, and the conclusion of this work. *Genealogia*, PL 195: 735D-738A.
gente illa scoticana ab illa cito coniugio hucusque ibidem hab(itum) recesserunt, seseque legalibus matrimoniis constringerunt.

in legal matrimony, and with this example none of the Scottish people returned from this union to the custom which they had followed until now.

Hec a(d) facta sunt in loco qui nunc dic(itur) dunfermelyn, quem tunc temporis rex habebat pro opido.

These things were done in the place which now is called Dunfermline, but at that time the king held as a town.

Erat (enim) locus ille in se naturaliter munitissimus, densissima silva circ(cum)datus, preruptis rupibus premun(_ _)tus.

That place was naturally very fortified in itself, surrounded by a very dense forest, and protected in front by steep rocks.

In cuius medio erat venusta planicies, ita rupibus et rivi( lus) circumdata, quidam de ea dictum esse putaretur.

In the middle of it was a lovely plain, surrounded by rocks and little brooks. Indeed it was thought to be said about it:

Non homini facilis vix adeunda feris.

It was not very easily entered by man or beasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualiter in prima (__) ceperit et in honorem sublimata delect(aret).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[fo. 9r.a] Dum igitur in primeva etate adhuc floreret, vitam sobrietatis ducere ac deum super omnia cepit diligere, in divinarum lectionem assiduitate sese occupare, et in his animum delectabiliter exercere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While therefore she still flourished in her early age, she began to lead a life of sobriety and to desire God above all things, to occupy herself earnestly with divine reading, and to delightfully exercise her spirit in these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum ergo in primæva adhuc floreret ætate, vitam sobrietatis ducere, ac Deum super omnia cepit diligere; in divinarum lectionum studio sese occupare, &amp; in his animum delectabilirer exercere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erat ei ad intelligendum quamlibet rem acuta ingenii subilitas, ad retinendum multa memorie tenacitatis, ad proferendum gratia verborum facilitas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was in her an acutely keen talent for understanding, a tenacity for retaining many memories, and a facility for offering pleasant words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerat ei ad intelligendum quamlibet rem acuta ingenii subilitas, ad retinendum multa memoriae tenacitatis, ad proferendum gratiosa verborum facilitas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

204 The reference to the legality of the ceremony perhaps reflects Turgot’s espousal of the Gregorian reform sentiment.

205 Note the reference to the physical location of the center of Margaret’s cult.

206 This description of the natural fortifications, still evident to this day, suggests the author’s familiarity with the terrain. Compare with the earlier description of the place where Malcolm confronted the traitor: Dunfermline Vita, fo. 8rb.

207 Cf. Ovid, Fasti, Book 4, verse 495.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Et quamvis ea quae sunt mundi compelleretur agere, mundi tamen rebus ex desiderio contempsit inherere, plus enim delectabatur in bono opere quam diviciarum possessione.</th>
<th>But although she was compelled to do wordly things, she disdained to cling from affection to these things of the world, and she delighted even more in good work than the possession of riches.</th>
<th>Sed quamvis ea quae sunt mundi compelleretur agere, mundi tamen rebus ex desiderio contempsit in herere: plus enim delectabatur bono opere, quam divitiarum possessione.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De temporalibus eternam sibi mercedem parabat, quia in celo ubi erat thesaurus eius, cor suum locaverat.</td>
<td>From temporal things, she was preparing for herself the eternal reward, since her treasure was in heaven where she had placed her heart.</td>
<td>De temporalibus eternas sibi mercedes parabat; quoniam in caelo, ubi erat thesaurus ejus, cor suum locarat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quia precipue regnum dei et iusticiam eius quaerebat,210 larga omnipotentis gratia honores ei et divicias affluenter adiciebat</td>
<td>And since she primarily sought the kingdom of God and his justice, the generous grace of the Almighty abundantly added honors and riches to her.</td>
<td>Et quia precipue regnum Dei et justitiam Eius quaeret, larga Omnipotentis gratia honores ei et divitas affluenter adiciebat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnia que decebant prudentis regine imperio agebantur, eius consilio regni jura disponebantur,211 illius industria religio divina augebatur, rerum prosperitate populus letabatur.</td>
<td>All things proper were led by the rule of the prudent queen; by her counsel the laws of the realm were dispensed, and by her work the divine religion was bolstered and the people rejoiced in the prosperity of their affairs.</td>
<td>Omnia que decebant212 prudentis Regine imperio agebantur. Eius consilio regni jura disponebantur; illius industria religio Divina augebatur, rerum prosperitate populus letabatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichil illius fide firmius, vultu constancius, pac(ient)ia tolerabilius, consilio gravius,</td>
<td>Nothing was more firm than her faith, more constant that her countenance, more tolerant than</td>
<td>Nichil illius fide firmius, vultu constantius, patientia tolerabilius, consilio gravius,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

208 This phrase, “magis quam sua voluntate, imo Dei ordinatione,” is included earlier in the Dunfermline Vita, fo. 7rb.
209 AASS: Regis Scotorum.
210 Matthew 6:33.
211 See Dunfermline Vita, fo. 11va-vb for the five laws proposed by Malcolm following the advice and counsel of the queen. These laws are not included in the other Vitae, although they are alluded to here (eius consilio regni jura disponebantur).
212 AASS: decebant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sententia iustius, colloquio iucundius.</th>
<th>her patience, more grave than her counsel, more just than her pronouncements, or more pleasant than her speech.</th>
<th>sententia iustius, colloquio iucundius.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quomodo loco [nupciarum] ecclesiam ererexerit et ecclesiarum ornamenta studiose preperi fecerit.</td>
<td>How she would erect a church in the place of her wedding and eagerly prepare decorations for the churches.</td>
<td>Diii, 4: Quod in loco nupciarum ecclesiam ererexerit, et ecclesiarum ornamenta quam studiose preperi fecerit, quantoque moderamine se suosque gubernaverit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postquam ergo culmen honoris ascenderat, mox in loco ubi [fo. 9r.b] eius nuptiarum celebratae, eternum sui nominis et religiositatis erexit monumentum.</td>
<td>After she had achieved the height of honor, she soon built in the place where her nuptials were celebrated an eternal monument to her name and religiosity.</td>
<td>Postquam culmen honoris ascenderat, mox in loco ubi ejus nuptiae fuerant celebratae, eternum sui nominis &amp; religiositatis erexit monumentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripii enim salutis intencione nobilem ibi ecclesiam in sancta trinitatis honore edificavit, ob anime videlicet regis et sue redemptionem, atque ad obtinendam sue soboli vitæ presentis et futuræ prosperitatem.</td>
<td>For she built there the noble church in honor of the Holy Trinity with the intention of three salutary wishes; namely for redemption the king’s soul and her own, and in order to obtain prosperity for her offspring in the present and the future life.</td>
<td>Tripii enim salutis intentione, nobilem ibi ecclesiam in Sanctæ Trinitatis edificavit honore; ob anime videlicet regis et sue redemptionem, atque ad obtinendam sue soboli vitæ presentis et futuræ prosperitatem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam ecclesiam diversæ ornamentorum specie decoravit, inter que ad ipsum sacrosanctum altaris ministerium non pausa ex solido ac puro auro vasa fuisse noscuntur.</td>
<td>She decorated the church with many types of ornaments, among which, it is known, were not a few vases of solid and pure gold for holy service of the altar.</td>
<td>Quam ecclesiam diversa ornamentorum specie decoravit: inter que, ad ipsum sacrosanctum altaris ministerium, non pausa ex solido ac puro auro vasa fuisse noscuntur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que tanto cerius nosse poteram, quanto cuncta ego ipse iubente regina diuciis ibidem servanda susceperam.</td>
<td>About which I most certainly was able to know much, since for a long time I myself, when the queen ordered, undertook the care for all of them.</td>
<td>que tanto certius nosse poteram, quanto cuncta iubente regina ego ipse diuciis ibidem servanda susceperam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucem quoque incomparabilis preci ymaginem salvatoris habentem, quam auro purissimo et argentio interlucentibus gemmis vestiri fecerat ibidem collocavit, que intuentibus palam</td>
<td>And also she placed there a cross of incomparable worth having an image of the Savior, which she had made to be covered with purest gold and silver and studded with gems, which shows publicly to</td>
<td>Crucem quoque, incomparabilis pretii, imaginem Salvatoris habentem, quam auro purissimo &amp; argentio interlucentibus gemmis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

213 AASS includes: ergo.
214 AASS: parissimo.
215 AASS: intercurrentibus.
fidei eius devocionem hodieque demonstrat. | those contemplating it even today the devotion of her faith. | vestiri fecerat, ibidem collocavit, quæ intuentibus palam fidei ejus devotionem hodieque demonstrat.

Similiter et in aliis quibusque ecclesiis sacre devocionis et fidei signa reliquit, quod ecclesia sancti andree contestata crucifixi venustissimam quam ibidem ipsa erexerat sicut hodie cernitur servat ymaginem. | Likewise, signs of her holy devotion remain in other churches, to which the church of St. Andrew attests; there she erected a most beautiful crucifix, as can still be seen today, it preserves the image. | Similiter etiam in aliis quibusque ecclesiis sacræ devotionis et fidei signa reliquit: quod ecclesia S. Andreæ contestata, crucifixi venustissimam, quam ibidem ipsa erexerat, sicut hodie cernitur, servat imaginem.

| Has duas cruces coronis aureis lapidibusque preciosissimis decoravit. | She decorated these two crosses with gold crowns and the most precious stones. | Hiis rebus, id est, quæ ad divine servitutis cultum pertinebant numquam vacua fuerat eius camera, que [fo. 9v.a] ut ita dicam quedam celestis videbatur esse officina.

Hiis rebus, id est, que ad divine servitutis cultum pertinebant numquam vacua fuerat eius camera, que [fo. 9v.a] ut ita dicam quedam celestis videbatur esse officina. | Her vault was never void from these things, that is, these things which pertained to the cult of holy service, which as I will tell, seemed to be the office of a certain heavenly one. | Hiis rebus, id est quæ ad Divinæ servitutis cultum pertinebant, numquam vacua erat illius camera; quæ, ut ita dicam, quedam cælestis artificii videbatur esse officina.

Ibi cappe cantorum, casule, stole, altaris pallia, alia quorum vestimenta sacerdotalia, et ecclesie semper videbantur ornamenta. | Copes of the cantors, chasubles, stole, cloths for the altar, other priestly vestments, and church decorations were always seen there. | Ibi cappæ cantorum, casulæ, stolæ, altaris pallia, alia quoque vestimenta sacerdotalia, et ecclesiae semper videbantur ornamenta.

Alia manu artificum parabantur, alia autem iam parata admiracione digna habeabantur. | Some were being prepared by a skilled hand, while others were considered fittingly prepared with admiration. | Alia manu artificum parabantur, alia jam parata admiratione digna habeabantur.

Hiis vero operibus femine deputabantur, que natu nobiles et moribus probabiles interesse obsequiis regine digne iudicabantur. | Indeed, women were charged with these works who by virtue of their noble birth and probity were deemed to be among those obedient to the worthy queen. | His operibus feminæ deputabantur, quæ natu nobiles, & sobriis moribus probabiles, interesse Reginæ obsequiis dignæ iudicabantur.

Nullus ad eas virorum introitus, nisi quos ipsa cum interdum ad illas intraret: secum intrare permettebat. | No men were introduced to them, except those whom she herself allowed to accompany her when she occasionally visited them. | Nullus ad eas virorum introitus erat, nisi quos ipsa, cum interdum ad illas intraret, secum introire permettebat.

Nulla eis inhonestæ cum viris familiaritas, nulla umquam cum petulancia levitas. | None were inappropriately familiar with men; there was never any impudent frivolity. | Nulla eis inhonestæ cum viris familiaritas, nulla umquam cum petulancia levitas.

Inerat enim reginæ tanta cum iocunditate severitas, tanta cum... | For there was in the queen such severity with rejoicing, such... | Inerat enim reginæ tanta cum iocunditate severitas, tanta...
severitate iocunditas, ut omnes qui erant in eius obsequio viri et feminine illam et timendo diligerent, et diligendo timerent.

rejoicing with severity, that all who were in her service, men and women, loved her while fearing her and feared her while loving her.

cum severitate iocunditas, ut omnes qui erant in ejus obsequio, viri & femine, illam et timendo diligerent, et diligendo timerent.

Quare in presencia illius non solum vel execrandum facere, sed nec turpe quidem verbis quisquam fuit ausus pronunciare.

For which reason, in her presence a person not only did not dare to do anything inappropriate, but indeed not even to pronounce any unseemly words.

Quare in presentia ejus non solum nihil execrandum facere, sed ne turpe quidem verbum quisquam ausus fuerat proferre.

Ipsa enim universa in semetipsa vicia reprimens: magna cum gravitate letabatur, magna cum honestate irascebatur.

For she, repressing all vices in herself, was joyful with great gravity and angered with great respectability.

Ipsa enim universa in sementipsa vicia reprimens: magna cum gravitate letabatur, magna cum honestate irascebatur.

Numquam hilaritate nimia in cachinnium soluta, numquam irascendo in furorem est effusa.

She was never given over to excessive hilarity in unchecked laughter; never throwing a temper in her anger.

Numquam hilaritate nimia in cachinnium soluta, numquam irascendo fuerat in furorem effusa.

Interdum aliorum peccatis, semper vero suis irascebatur.

Occasionally she was angered by the sins of others, always by her own.

Interdum aliorum peccatis, suis vero semper irascebatur,

[fo. 9v.b] Ira illa laudabilis et iusticie semper amica, quam semper habendam preceptit prophetarum precipuus.

Her anger was always praiseworthy and her justice always friendly, which she anticipated by considering always the foretelling of the prophets:

Ira illa laudanda, et justitiae semper amica, quam habendam præcepit Psalmista,

Irascimini inquit et nolite peccare.

Be angry, it said, and do not sin.

Irascimini, inquit, et nolite peccare.

Omnis vita eius summo discretionis moderamine posita, quedam erat forma virtutum.

Her entire life, placed in the greatest control of discretion, was a certain model of virtue.

Omnis vita ejus, summo discretionis moderamine composita, quedam erat virtutum forma.

Sermo eius sale sapientie conditus, silencium eius plenus erat bonis (me)ditacionibus.

Her speech was seasoned with the salt of wisdom; her silence was filled with good meditations.

Sermo ejus, sale sapientiae conditus; silentium, erat plenum bonis cogitationibus.

Sobrietati morum ita eius persona conveniebat, ut ad solam vite honestatem nata credi potuisset.

Her person conveyed such gravity of character that it was possible to believe that she was born solely for a deserving life.

Sobrietati morum ita ejus persona conveniebat, ut ad solam vite honestatem nata credi potuisset.

---


217 The disparity between the texts probably is the result of the fact that this quote is not attributed to any of the Old Testament prophets but to the Psalmist in Psalms 4:5 and St Paul in Ephesians 4:26.

218 Bede, Letter to Egbert, PL, 94. 657.

219 Meditatio is employed much less frequently than cogitatio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ut autem multa breviter includam, in omnibus que loquebatur, in omnibus que agebat, celest(ia) se cogitare oscendebat.</th>
<th>However, so that I might conclude briefly, in all things that she said and did, she showed that she was thinking about heaven.</th>
<th>Ut autem multa breviter dicam, in omnibus que loquebatur, in omnibus que agebat, celestia se cogitare ostendebat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quam sollicita fuerit ut filii sui et filie honest(a)te nutrireuntur</td>
<td>How she ensured that her sons and daughters would be raised with honor.</td>
<td>Diii, 5: Quomodo filii honeste nutriti sunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec minorem quam sibimet filiis custodie impendebat ut videlicet omni diligencia nutrireuntur</td>
<td>Nor did she impose less care on her children than on herself, evidently so that they would be raised with every care.</td>
<td>Nec minorem quam sibimet, filiis curam impendebat; ut videlicet cum omni diligentia nutrireuntur, et quam maxime honestis moribus instituerunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde quia sciebat scriptum, qui parcit virgae filium suum odibilem facit;220 familiari ministro iniunxerat ut quoties infantili lascivia delinquerent, sicut etas illa solet, eos ipse minis et verberibus coerceret.</td>
<td>Whence, since she knew the Scripture, “who spares the rod, makes his son unlikeable,” she instructed the servant of the family to restrain the children himself with threats and rods, however many times they descended into impudence, as a childish age is accustomed.</td>
<td>Unde quia sciebat scriptum, Qui parcit virgae odit filium; familiari ministro injunxerat, ut quoties infantili lascivia delinquerent, sicut etas illa solet, eos ipse minis et verberibus coerceret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo religioso matris studio, multos qui provectiores etate fuerant, morum honestate infantes transcendebant.</td>
<td>By this religious zeal of the mother, the children transcended by their worthy character many who were more advanced in age.</td>
<td>Quo religioso matris studio, multos qui provectiores aetate fuerant, morum honestate infantes transcendebant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semper inter se benivolii permanebant pacifici, et minor ubique honorem exhibebat.</td>
<td>Among themselves, they always remained kind and peaceful, and the younger exhibited respect to the older ones everywhere.</td>
<td>semper inter se benevoli existebant et pacifici, et minor ubique honorem exhibebat majori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde et inter missarum solemnina cum post parentes ad offerendum incederent [fo. 10r.a] junior maiorem nullo modo praevenir presumpsit, sed secundum etatis ordinem major minorem precedere consuevit.221</td>
<td>Wherefore, during the service of the Mass, when they marched along after their parents for the offering, the younger in no way presumed to precede the older, but the older was accustomed to precede the younger following the order of their age.</td>
<td>Unde et inter missarum solemnina, cum post parentes ad offerendum procederent, junior majorem nullo modo praevenir sed secundum ætatis ordinem major juniqremp precedere consuevit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quos sepius ante se adductos, christum et fidem Christi iuxta</td>
<td>They who were often brought to her so that she could inform them,</td>
<td>Quos saepius ante se ducos, Christum et fidem Christi,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

220 Proverbs 13:24. The phrasing included in the Diii manuscript — qui parcit virgae odit filium — is the more common by far.

221 This description bear similarities to the instructions given in the Rule of St Benedict for the procession of monks according to their date of entry into monastic life. Rule of St Benedict, chapter 63.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quod illorum etas capere poterat, informare, et ut semper timerent, diligenti admonicionе satagebat admonere. Dixit enim.</th>
<th>whose maturity could comprehend it, about Christ and faith in Christ, and so that they might always fear, she did enough to admonish them with earnest warnings, for she said:</th>
<th>juxta quod ætas illa capere poterat, docere; et ut Eum semper timerent, diligenter studebat admonere.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O pii filii mei, o mea desiderata et dilecta pignora, timete deum.</td>
<td>O my pious children, o my desired and esteemed children, fear God since those fearing him will not want,</td>
<td>Timete, inquit o filii, Dominum, quoniam non erit inopia timentibus Eum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et si eum perfecto corde dilexeritis, ipse vobis quia dilegit diligentes se, et presentis vitae prosperitatem, et cum electis suis eternam reddet felicitatem.</td>
<td>And if you will have loved him with a perfect heart, and him you, since he loves those loving him, then he will return prosperity in this life and eternal happiness with his chosen ones.</td>
<td>et si Eum dilexeritis, ipse vobis, o viscera mea, et presentis vitae prosperitatem, et cum Sanctis omnibus æternam reddet felicitatem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec illorum matris benigna desideria, hoc admonicio, hoc pro sua posteritate die noctu quoque fuerat cum lacrimis oratio, ut suum Creatorem in fide quæ per diligitionem operatur agnoscerent, agnoscedo coherent, colendo in omnibus et super omnia diligenter, et diligendo ad celestis regni felicem gloriam pervenirent.</td>
<td>This kind desire of their mother, this admonition, was her prayer day and night with tears for her offspring, that they might know their Creator in the faith that works through love, that by knowing Him they might worship Him, that by worshipping Him they might love Him in all things and above all things, and that by loving Him they might attain the auspicious glory of the heavenly kingdom.</td>
<td>Hæc matris desideria, hæc admonitio, hæc pro sua sobole die noctuque cum lacrymis oratio, ut suum Creatorem in fide quæ per diligitionem operatur agnoscerent, agnoscedo coherent, colendo in omnibus et super omnia diligenter, et diligendo ad celestis regni felicem gloriam pervenirent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam studiosa fuerit in lectione divina: in ea quercendo suam et aliorum salutem.</td>
<td>How she was eager in the holy reading, seeking in it her own salvation and the salvation of others.</td>
<td>Diii, 6: Quam studiosa fuerit in lectione, quæ rendo in hac non solum suam sed etiam aliorum salutem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec mirandum quod sapiens regina tanto se suosque regimine moderabatur, que sapientissimo semper sacre scripture magisterio regebatur.</td>
<td>It should not be wondered that the wise queen moderated herself and her own people so much, since she was always governed by the very wise counsel of the sacred Scripture.</td>
<td>Nec mirandum, quod sapiens regina tanto se suosque regimine moderabatur, quæ sapientissimo sacre semper Scripturæ magisterio regebatur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

222 Psalms 33:10.
223 This play on words – *diliget diligentes* – is typical of the language seen throughout the *Vita*.
224 Galatians 5:6.
225 AASS does not include: *felicem*.
226 AASS: *sapiente se suosque regimine moderabatur Regina*. 

---

387
Nam quod ego in illa multum admirari solebam, inter causarum tumultus, inter multiplices regni curas, miro studio divine lecioni operam dabat, de qua cum doctissimis assidentibus viris, subtiles sepius questiones conferebat.

For what I was accustomed to admire greatly in her was that amid the tumult of cases and the the multiple cares of the realm, she attended to her holy reading with wonderful eagerness, about which she would confer with the most learned men sitting, often about delicate questions.

Nam, quod ego in illa multum admirari solebam, inter causarum tumultus, inter multiplices regni curas, miro studio Divine lecioni operam dabat, de qua cum doctissimis assidentibus viris etiam subtiles sepius questiones conserebat.

Sed sicut inter eos nemo illa ingenio profundior, ita nemo aderat eloquio clarior.

Evenit itaque sepius ut ab ea ipsi doctores mutuo quam ad venerant, abcederent doctores.227

And so often it happened that these teachers went from her more learned than when they had come.

Evenit itaque sepius, ut ab ea ipsi, doctores228 mutuo quam ad venerant abscederent doctores.

Plane sacrorum voluminum religiosa nec parva illi aviditas inerat in quibus sibi acquirendis familiaris ejus caritas et caritativa familiaritas, meipsum inde fatigare cogebat.

Clearly she had not a little religious zeal for the holy volumes, so that her intimate friendship and friendly intimacy compelled me to tire myself by procuring them for her.

Plane sacrorum voluminum religiosa, nec parva illi aviditas inerat, in quibus sibi acquirendis familiaris ejus caritas et caritativa familiaritas meipsum me fatigare plerumque cogebat.

Nec in his solummodo suam, sed et aliorum quesitiv salutem, primoque omnium ipsum regem ad iusticie et misericordiae eleemosinarum aliarumque opera virtutum, ipsa cooperante sibi deo fecerat obtemperantissimum.

Nor did she seek only her own salvation in these things, but also other’s. First of all, by cooperating with God, she made the king himself very attentive to works of justice and mercy and alms-giving and virtues.

Nec in his solummodo suam, sed etiam aliorum quesitiv salutem: primoque omnium ipsum regem, ad justitiae, misericordiae, eleemosynarum, aliarumque opera virtutum, ipsa, cooperante sibi Deo, fecerat obtemperantissimum.

Didicit ille ab ea vigilias noctis frequentee orando producere, didicit euis ortatu et exemplo cum gemitu cardis et lacrimis deum orare.

He learned from her to promote nightly vigils by praying frequently, and he learned to pray by her exhortation and example with a groaning of the heart and with tears.

Didicit ille ab ea etiam vigilias noctis frequentee orando producere; didicit, ejus hortatu et exemplo, cum gemitu cardis et lacrymarum profusione deum orare.

Fateor magnum misericordie dei mirabar miraculum, cum viderem interdum tantam orandi regis intentionem.

I admit that I wondered sometimes at the great miracle of the mercy of God when I saw such yearning of the king for praying, and such

Fateor, magnum misericordiae Dei mirabar miraculum, cum viderem interdum tantam orandi regis intentionem,229

---

227 Note the play on words again: doctores – doctoriores.

228 AASS: rectores.

229 AASS does not include: tantam orandi regis intentionem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Latin Text</strong></th>
<th><strong>English Translation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Latin Text</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tantam inter orandum in pectore viri secularis compunctionem.</td>
<td>compunction in the heart of a secular man while praying.</td>
<td>tantam inter orandum in pectore viri secularis compunctionem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsam tam venerabilis vitae reginam quia in eius corde christum veraciter habitare perspexerat, ille quoquomodo offendere formidabat, sed pocius votis eius et prudentibus consiliis celerius per omnia obedire properabat.</td>
<td>He perceived that since Christ truly lived in her heart, he dreaded to offend this queen whose life was so venerable in any way, but rather he hastened to obey more quickly her wishes and prudent counsels in all things.</td>
<td>Ipsam tam venerabilis vitae reginam, quoniam in ejus corde Christum veraciter habitare perspexerat, ille quoquomodo offendere formidabat; sed potius votis ejus &amp; prudentibus consiliis celerius per omnia obedire properabat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que ipsa respuerat eadem et ipse respuere, et quæ amaverat amore amoris illius amare.</td>
<td>That which she had rejected he likewise rejected, and that which she had loved, he loved for the love of her love.</td>
<td>Quæ ipsa respuerat, eadem et ipse respuere; et quæ amaverat, amove amoris illius amare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde et [fo. 10v.a] libros in quibus ipsa vel orare consueverat vel legere, ille licet ignarus litterarum sepe manu versare solebat et inspicere, et dum ab ea quis eorum esset carior audisset, hunc et ipse cariorem habere cepit, et sepius deosculari et contractare.</td>
<td>Wherefore the books with which she was accustomed either to pray or to read, this man, although illiterate, was accustomed to turn often by hand and to inspect, and when he had heard from her which of them was dearer, this he chose to consider more dearly, and often kissed and handled.</td>
<td>Unde et libros, in quibus ipsa vel orare consueverat, vel legere; ille, ignarus licet litterarum, sepe manuversare solebat &amp; inspicere; &amp; dum ab ea quis illorum esset ei carior audisset, hunc &amp; ipse cariorem habere, deosculari, sepius contractare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliquando eciam advocato aurifice ipsum codicem auro gemmisque perornari precepit, atque perornatum ipse rex ad reginam quasi sua devotionis indicium referre consuevit.</td>
<td>And sometimes, after summoning the goldsmith, he took this book to be decorated with gold and jewels, and the king himself was accustomed to offer the decorated (book) to the queen as an indication of his devotion.</td>
<td>Aliquando etiam advocato aurifice ipsum codicem auro gemmisque perornari præcepit, atque perornatum ipse rex ad reginam, quasi suæ devotionis indicium, referre consuevit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantum decoris et glorie hec sancta regina regno scotorum contulerit.</td>
<td>How much esteem and glory this holy queen brought to the realm of the Scots.</td>
<td>Diii, 7: Quantum decoris et glorie regno Scottorum contulerit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecerat enim ut mercatores terra et mari de diversis regionibus</td>
<td>For she had provided that merchants from diverse regions</td>
<td>Fecerat enim ut mercatores, terra marique de diversis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin TEXT</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venientes, rerum venalium <em>quam plures</em> et preciosas species, <em>et varietates que</em> ibidem adhuc ignote fuerant adveherent.</td>
<td>Coming by land and by sea carried many and precious types of things for sale, and varieties which were unknown up until then.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter quas cum diversis coloribus vestes variaque vestium ornamenta indigenae <em>emerent, rege tum instructu regine compellente, et sic</em> diversis vestium cultibus incedebant compositi, ut tali decore quodammodo crederentur esse renovati.</td>
<td>Among these things the local people bought were robes with diverse colors and a variety of clothing and ornaments, and with the king having instructed and the queen urging, they paraded in a succession comprising diverse, highly cultivated clothing, so that they were believed to have been renewed in a certain way by such beauty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsequia eciam regis <em>ampliora solito</em> et sublimiora constituit, ut eum <em>equitantem vel [fo. 10v.b] procedentem</em> multa cum grandi honore agmina constiparent et hoc cum tanta censura, ut quocumque <em>venientes diverscissent</em>, nulli cui quam aliquid liceret rapere, nec rusticos aut pauperes <em>quos libet quisquam illorum modallo opprimere sive ledere auderet.</em></td>
<td>She even established grander and more lofty custom for the servants of the king, so that they crowded him when he was riding, advancing in a great crowd with great honor; and this with such discipline that wherever those coming along had diverted, no one was allowed to seize anything, nor were any of them allowed to oppress or dare to strike either country folk or poor people in any way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regalis quoque aule ornamenta multiplicavit, ut non tantum diverso palliorum decore niteret, sed etiam auro argentoque domus tota resplenderet.</td>
<td>Also she multiplied the ornaments of the royal palace, so that it shone not only with the different beauty of cloths, but even the entire house was resplendent with gold and silver.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut enim aurea vel argente aut deaurata vel deargentata fuerant vasa quibus regis &amp; regni proceribus dapes inferebantur aut potus <em>porrigebantur.</em></td>
<td>The vessels which were brought in to the king and nobles of the realm for feasts and were offered for drink were either in gold or silver or goldplated or silverplated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et <em>quamvis ob honestatem ista</em></td>
<td>And however much she had done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

230 Such behavior is legislated in the king’s reforms. See fo. 11rb-11vb.

231 The multivalent meaning of this word – *pallium* – could hardly have been lost on a twelfth-century audience. It could mean a monk’s habit, a nun’s veil, a bishop’s mark of office, a sacred altar-cloth, or something as mundane as a tapestry, silk or brocade material, or a piece of cloth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fecerat, non <strong>cum que</strong> mundi honore aut <strong>fastu</strong> delectabatur, sed quod regia dignitas ab ea exigebat, persolvere cogebatur.</td>
<td><strong>Nam cum precioso ut reginam decebat cultu induta procederet, omnia ornamenta velut altera hester mente calcavit,</strong> se que sub gemmis et auro <strong>nil alius</strong> quam pulverem et cinerem indicavit.</td>
<td><strong>non quia</strong> mundi honore delectabatur; sed, quod regia dignitas ab ea exigebat, persolvere cogebatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from honorable consideration, it was not that she was delighted by worldly honor or pride, but she was mindful to comply completely because the royal dignity required it from her.</td>
<td>For when she went forth adorned in precious, highly cultivated apparel as a queen, she spurned all ornaments in her mind just as another Esther, and she revealed nothing under the gems and gold than dust and ashes.</td>
<td><strong>Nam cum pretioso ut reginam decebat cultu induta procederet, omnia ornamenta velut altera Esther mente calcavit; seque sub gemmis et auro nil</strong> alius quam pulverem &amp; cinerem consideravit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanto enim facilius omnem ex mundiali <strong>honore tumorem superbiae</strong> reprimebat, quanto fragilis vite transitura <strong>condicio illius mentem</strong> numquam deserebat.</td>
<td>She was always reminded of this thought, in which the unstable state of human life is described thus:</td>
<td>**Tanto enim facilius omnem ex mundiali <strong>honore superbiae tumorem</strong> reprimebat, quanto fragilis vitae transitura conditio <strong>mentem illius</strong> numquam fugerat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For she easily repressed any swelling of haughtiness from worldly honor, since the transitory nature of this fragile life never deserted her mind.</td>
<td>Homo natus de muliere brevi vivens tempore, repletur [fo. 11r.a] multis miseriis, <strong>et cetera ut in sequentibus continentur.</strong></td>
<td>Homo natus de muliere, brevi vivens tempore repletur multis miseriis; <strong>qui quasi flos egreditur et conteritur, et fugit velut umbra, et numquam in eodem statu permanent.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man is born of woman, living for a brief time, filled with many miseries, and so continues it is continued in the following.</td>
<td>Illud quoque beati iacobi apostolic semper mente versabat, Que est inquit vita nostra? Vapor est ad modicum parenst, deinceps</td>
<td>Illud quoque beati Jacobi Apostoli semper in mente versabat; Quæ est, inquit, vita nostra? Vapor est ad modicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| She was also always turning over in her mind that saying of the Blessed Apostle James: What is, he said, our life? It is a vapor, | **232** Esther 14:16.  
**231** AASS: *nihi.*  
**234** Job 14:1. The Diii version also includes verse 2, perhaps correcting the Dunfermline *Vita’s* obvious (**et cetera**) omission. See also Psalms 101:12, Wisdom 2:5, Ecclesiastes 2:23. |

---

232 Esther 14:16.
231 AASS: *nihi.*
234 Job 14:1. The Diii version also includes verse 2, perhaps correcting the Dunfermline *Vita’s* obvious (**et cetera**) omission. See also Psalms 101:12, Wisdom 2:5, Ecclesiastes 2:23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unde me crebro rogabat, ut quicquid in eius verbo vel facto reprehendendum iudicarem, id reprehendens secreto illi indicare non dubitarem. Wherefore she was asking me repeatedly, to judge anything reprehensible in her word or deed, and not to hesitate to indicate it by reproving her in private.</td>
<td>Unde crebro me rogabat, ut quicquid in ejus verbo vel facto reprehendendum perviderem, id reprehendens secreto illi indicare non dubitarem. Corripiat me inquit iustus et increpet me oleum autem, id est, adulacio peccatoris non impinguat caput meum, meliora sunt amici castigantis vulnera quam inimici blandientis oscula.</td>
<td>Corripiat, inquit, me justus in misericordia et increpet me; oleum autem, id est adulatio, peccatoris non impinguat caput meum: meliora enim sunt vulnera diligentis, quam inimici blandientis oscula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod dum rarius et tepidius facerem quam vellet, importunam se mihi ingerebat dormientem et velut sui negligentem me arguebat. I did this less often and more tepidly than she wished, so she hurled herself at me, ruthless, and argued that I was sleeping as if nelecting her.</td>
<td>Quod dum rarius &amp; tepidius quam vellet facerem, importunam se mihi ingerebat; dormientem &amp; velut sui negligentem me arguebat: Hæc dicens reprehensionem quam quilibet alius deputare poterat ad obprobrium, ipsa ad virtutis appetebat profectum.</td>
<td>Hæc dicens, reprehensionem sui, quam quilibet alius deputare poterat ad obprobrium, ipsa ad virtutis appetebat profectum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec dicens reprehensionem quam quilibet alius deputare poterat ad obprobrium, ipsa ad virtutis appetebat profectum. By saying these things, which some might see as a reproof, she strove for progress of virtue.</td>
<td>Quomodo ea que contra fidem et sancte ecclesie consuetudinem agebantur ad fidem correxerit. How she corrected those against the faith and custom of the holy church and they were led to constant faith.</td>
<td>Diiii, 8: Quomodo ea que contra fidem et sancte ecclesie consuetudinem agebant eradicaverit, et ad regulam reducere consueverit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosa igitur margarita et deo digna regina, mente verbo et</td>
<td>Religiosa et Deo digna regina, mente verbo, eet factis a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factis cum ad celestem patriam tenderet, eciam alios secum [fo. 11r.b] in via immaculata invitabat ut irent.</td>
<td>the heavenly home with her mind, word, and deeds; she even invited others with her so that they might go on the immaculate way, so they might attain true blessedness with her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malum cum videbat admonuit ut bonus fieret, bonum ut melior existeret, meliorem ut optimus esse studeret.</td>
<td>When she saw the wicked, she warned so they might become good, and the good become better, and she urged the better to become the best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam re vera tude apostolica ferventem, zelus domus dei que est ecclesia comedit, unde ilicit que in ea pululaverant eradicare penitus elaboravit.</td>
<td>The zeal of the house of God, which is the Church, consumed her, whence; burning with apostolic faith, she also labored to eradicate completely those illicit things which had sprouted in it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum enim contra recte fidei regulam, et sanctam universalis ecclesie consuetudinem multa in gente scotorum fieri perspexisset, inde doluit, crebra consilia statuit, ut quoquomodo vale ret ad veritatis viam errantes Christo donante revocaret.</td>
<td>For when she had seen many among the people of the Scots go against the rule of the correct faith, and the holy custom of the Universal Church, then she suffered. So she established frequent councils, so that she might be strong in whatever way necessary to recall the errant ones back to the way of truth through the giving Christ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum consiliorum illud ceteris principalius fuisse constat, in quo sola cum paucissimis suorum contra perverse consuetudinis assertores gladio spiritus quod est verbum dei quando(que) biduo, queque triduo dimicabat.</td>
<td>Of these councils, this was to remain the first among others, in which she alone with very few of her own contended for two and even three days against the proponents of perverse custom, with the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crederes autem ibi alteram helenam residere, quia sicut illa quondam sentencis scripturarum</td>
<td>You would have believed another Helen resided there, since just as she once had overcome the Jews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Cf. Psalms 100:6: *ambulans in via immaculata, hic mihi ministrabat.*

239 Here, the Diii version seems to be more grammatically correct.

241 See earlier use of *revera:* Dunfermline *Vita,* fo. 1rb.

242 AASS: *Quoniam.*

243 Note that the Diii version is made more universal by leaving out the reference to the Scots.

244 Ephesians 6:17.

245 AASS: *perversae.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iudeos convicerat similiter nunc et hec regina convicerit illius gentis erroneos.</td>
<td>with the meanings of the Scripture, now similarly this queen overcame the errors of this people.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed in hoc conflictu rex ipse adiutor ei praecipuus residuebat, et quodcumque in hac causa illius jussisset, ista dicere et facere esset paratissimum.</td>
<td>But in this debate the king himself was present as the chief advisor to her, and whatever she ordered in this cause he was most prepared to say and do.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui quoniam perfecte anglorum linguam noverat, [fo. 11v.a] vigilantissimus in hoc consilio utriusque partis interpres excitet.</td>
<td>Since he knew the language of the English perfectly, he came forth as a most vigilant interpreter of each party in this council.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde et ipse rex quedam iniqua et regali pietati contraria que ab antecessoribus suis contra omnem pietatis iusticiam usurpata fuerant, pro dei amore et regine obsecracione penitus delevit, insuper et peticiones.</td>
<td>And from which the king thoroughly annulled certain unjust practices contrary to royal piety, which had been done inappropriately by his ancestors against all pious justice. He did so for love of God and at the queen’s</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Ergo & Mater & filius consurgunt edificare Ecclesiam Christi in omnibus gentibus, [statum.] filius contra hostes Ecclesiae bellum sumens, multa fortitudine, & ad vires hereticorum proterendas accedens, fretus Catholicæ & Apostolice fidei veritate; & Mater ad Judaœorum umbras repellendas procedens fortissima & virili constantia.

247 Repeats claim of Malcolm’s fluency in English made earlier, Dunfermline *Vita*, fo. 7vb. Compare with: Oswald acting as interpreter for Aidan, Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, Book 3, chapter 3; Bishop Cedd who acted as interpreter for both parties at the Synod of Whitby in 664 which sought to resolve differing Roman and Irish practices concerning the dating of Easter and tonsure. Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, Book 3, chapter 25.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Footnote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quas ipsa multo tempore postulaverat, ei in aure omni benigne concessit.(^{248})</td>
<td>entreaty, for the petitions which she had urged on him for a long time, he conceded to her in the hearing of all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prima (autem) peticio fuit, ut omnis homo a rege usque ad unius habitatorem domus qui voluerit liberare servos aut ancillas, libere ei liceret.</td>
<td>The first proposition was that every man, from the king to even an inhabitant of a single house, who wanted to free his male and female slaves was freely allowed to do so by the king.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cui bono operi quidam ante contradicebant.</td>
<td>However, certain people had previously objected to this good work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secunda peticio fuit, ne rex accipiat pretium a furibus aut latronibus qui pecunia a proximis extorsa furo vel vi vel mendatio, per eam regi datam sese reconciliarent.</td>
<td>The second petition was that the king may not receive a bribe from thieves or robbers who, having extorted money from neighbors through robbery or strength or deceit, try to reconcile themselves by giving it to the king.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tercia fuit, ne quicumque exules a rege effecti postmodum pacificati aliquem criminaentur, regi illum accusando, de quocumque crimine prie acto sine idoneis testibus, aut singulari certamine duelli.</td>
<td>The third petition was, that any people exiled by the king who are afterward pardoned not bring charges against somebody, the one making the accusation to the king, regarding any previous criminal action without fitting witnesses, or by the contest of single combat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante enim rex iuxta verba huiusmodi reconciliatorum sine  ullis testibus domus eorum depopulabat.</td>
<td>Previously, however, the king had destroyed the homes of people according to the verbal account of this type of reconciled person without any witnesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod valde iniustum fuit cum huiusmodi viri cicius contradictores quam fautores suos accusare consueverint.</td>
<td>For it was indeed unjust when men of this sort had been in the habit of accusing their opponents more swiftly than their supporters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarta fuit hec, ut quociens viri vel femine divites in terra mortui fuisse, rex nullatenus contendedat se ab illis (\text{fo. 11v.b}) in adoptivum filium fuisse susceptum, et sic sub hoc fuco totam hereditatem vel aliquam a</td>
<td>The fourth petition was that whenever rich men or women in the land had died, the king in no way strive to have himself accepted as an adopted son by them and in this disguise then seek to win by force their entire or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{248}\) These five laws are the subject of a forthcoming article by Robert Bartlett.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>propriis heredibus sibi violenter vendicaret (vindicaret).</td>
<td>partial inheritance for himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod se facturum non esse cum iuramento devovit.</td>
<td>And with an oath he swore that he himself would not do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc enim quam dui factum est, nec eo nec hominibus acceptabile fuit.</td>
<td>For it was acceptable that this custom, however long it had been done, be done neither by him nor by any man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinta fuit hec, si que haberet rex cum aliquo homine causam, nullo modo in propria persona coram iudice cum illo contendeter, nec eciam sublimiorem reo personam ad iudicium destinaret.</td>
<td>The fifth item was that, if whenever the king had a case with any man, he in no way contend with him in his own person before the judge nor indeed would he send to the court a person higher in rank than the accused person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sic enim quandoque inferiorum iura tum honore cum amore subvertebantur.</td>
<td>For thus quite often the rights of lesser men had been subverted by rank as well as by affection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod iusticie et equitati omnimodo inimicum fuisse quis dubitet?</td>
<td>Because who could doubt that they were hostile to any sort of justice and equity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec autem et plurima hiis similia veritati et iuri repugnancia non tantum rex et regina, sed eciam episcopi, prelati duces et tocius regni magnates clero assenciente, populo acclamante unanimiter se observaretur, et legem dei et ecclesie sancta catholice consuetudinem.</td>
<td>These things and many others similar to them, which are repugnant to truth and justice, not only the king and queen, but also with the assent of the bishops, leading nobles, magnates of the entire realm, the clergy and the acclaim of the people, unanimously declared that they would observe them along with the law of God and the custom of the Holy Catholic Church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Venerabilis igitur regina de premiissis secura prefectione premissa factoque silicio clara voce dixit.** 249 Omnes qui in ecclesia catholica in una fide uni

Then the venerable queen, with silence having been imposed, spoke in a clear voice about the aforementioned with a composed introduction having been sent in

**Igitur regina, praefatione praemissa, ut qui cum catholica ecclesia in una fide uni Deo servirent, ab eadem ecclesia novis quibusdam et peregrinis**

---

Everyone who is devoted to one God and in one Catholic faith, ought not to disagree at all by new and strange institutions contrary to the truth.  And so in the first place she proved that they did not properly observe the fast of Lent, since they were accustomed to begin this everywhere not with the Holy Church from the Wednesday on the beginning of the fast, but on the Monday of the following week.

Against this they said: the fast which we observe we direct by the Gospel authority, which relates the fast of Christ through six weeks.

For it is read there that the Lord had fasted forty days, which it is manifested that you do not.

For when six days of the Lord [Sundays] are subtracted from the six weeks of the fast, then thirty-six days remain to establish the fast.

However, the Gospel authority establishes the fast for forty days, not the thirty six days which you observe.

And so it remains that you should begin to fast four days before the

---

250 Compare this discussion of the dating of Lent, one of the key distinctions between the practices of the Roman Church and the Church in Northumbria, with Bede’s preoccupation with the same subject. See especially Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, book 3, chapters 4 and 25.

251 AASS includes: a feria quarta.

252 AASS: sed sequenti.

253 AASS: hebdomas.

254 AASS includes: ab.

255 Matthew 4:2.

256 AASS: hebdomas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ieiunare nobiscum incipiatis, si riti sancta ecclesiadebus velitis ieiunare.</td>
<td>Start of Lent with us, if you want to fast for forty days according to the custom of the Holy Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alioquin contra ipsius domini autoritatem, et tocius sancta ecclesie tradicinem vos soli repugnabitis.</td>
<td>Otherwise you alone will be resisting against the authority of the Lord himself, and the tradition of the Holy Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hac illi persicua veritatis racione convicti, deinceps sicut sancta ubique solet ecclesia, sacrorum ieiuniorum ceperunt inchoare solemnia.</td>
<td>Having been convinced by the clear rationale of this truth, they then began to start the solemnities of the sacred fasts as the Church is accustomed to do everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quomodo in scotia corporis domini et sanguinis percepcionem in die sancto pasche percipi fecerit.</td>
<td>How the reception of the body and blood of the Lord on the Holy Day of Easter was understood in Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliud quoque proponens regina iussit ut ostenderent, qua racione die sancto Paschæ, secundum morem sanctæ et Apostolice ecclesie sacramenta corporis et sanguinis sumere negligent:</td>
<td>And also the queen ordered another proposal so that they might show by what reason they neglected to take up the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ on the holy day of Easter according to the custom of the Holy and Apostolic Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondentes illi apostolus inquint de hiis loquens dicit.</td>
<td>They said responding: the Apostle says speaking about these things:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui manducat et bibit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit.</td>
<td>He who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde quia nos peccatores et indignos recognoscimus, ne iudicium nosis manducemus et bibamus, ad tantum mysterium accedere formidamus.</td>
<td>Wherefore, since we recognize that we are sinners and unworthy, we fear to approach such a mystery, lest we eat and drink judgment to ourselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibus regina, Quid igitur inquit?</td>
<td>To which the queen said: What then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnes qui peccatores sunt sacrosanctum mysterium non gustabunt?</td>
<td>All who are sinners are not to taste of the holy mystery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemo igitur illud sumere debet, quia nemo sine sorde peccati, nec infans cuius est unius diei</td>
<td>Therefore, no one ought to take it, since no one is without the soil of sin, not even an infant whose life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

257 AASS: quadrinigata.
258 1 Corinthians 11:29.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vita super terram.</th>
<th>is but one day on this earth.</th>
<th>Vita super terram.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si autem nemo illud percipere debet, cur domino dicente clamat evangelium, nisi manduceveritis carmen filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis.</td>
<td>If however no one ought to receive it, why did the Lord when proclaiming the Gospel declare: unless you have eaten the flesh of the Son of Man and drunk his blood, you will not have life in you?</td>
<td>Si autem nemo illud percipere debet, cur Domino dicente clamat Evangelium? Nisi manduceveritis carmen Filii Hominis et biberitis Ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed plane sentenciam quam de apostolo profertis, secundum patrum orthodoxorum sentenciam, aliter necesse est ut intelligatis.</td>
<td>But in order that you might clearly understand the meaning of Apostle, following the orthodox fathers, it is necessary for you to understand it in a different way.</td>
<td>Sed plane sententiam, quam de Apostolo profertis, secundum Patrum intellectum aliter necesse est intelligatis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non enim omnes peccatores sacramenta salutis sumere indigne deputat.</td>
<td>For the Apostle does not unworthily deprive all sinners from receiving the sacraments of salvation.</td>
<td>non enim omnes peccatores sacramenta salutis indigne sumere deputat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum enim dixisset iudicium sibi manducat et bibit, addidit, non diiudicans corpus Domini (hoc est, non separans illud in fide ab escis corporalibus, ille inquam iudicium scilicet damnpnacioni)261 sibi manducat et bibit.</td>
<td>For although it is said that a sinner eats and drinks judgment to himself, the Apostle adds: not distinguishing the body of Christ, that is, not separating it in faith from bodily foods, he evidently, I must say, eats and drinks the judgment of damnation to himself.</td>
<td>Cum enim dixisset, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit: addidit, non dejudicans corpus Domini (hoc est, non separans illud in fide ab escis corporalibus) judicium sibi manducat et bibit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insuper et illi qui absque confessione et penitentia cum suorum sordibus scelerum ad sacramentum eucharistic accedere (presumpt), illi revera iudicium damnpnacionis sibi sumunt et mortem.</td>
<td>Moreover, those who receive the sacrament of the Eucharist with their stains before confession and without penance yield to their wickedness; they receive the judgment of damnation to themselves and death.</td>
<td>Sed et ille qui absque confessione et penitentia, cum suorum inquinamentis scelerum, ad sacra mysteria accedere, præsimpserit ille, inquam, iudicium sibi manducat &amp; bibit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos vero qui multis ante diebus facta peccatorum [fo. 12v.a] confessione, et subsecuta penitutine cum satisfaccione, et ieiunis attenuamur, elemosinis emundamur, et lacrimis rigamur, et sic eo</td>
<td>Indeed we who made confession of our sins many days before, followed penance with satisfaction, were reduced by almsgiving and washed by tears, so that we might be reconciled to he whom we</td>
<td>At nos, qui multis ante diebus, facta peccatorum confessione, penitentia castigamur, jejunis attenuamur, eleemosynis et lacrymis a peccatorum sordibus abluimur; in die</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

259 John 6:54.
260 1 Corinthians 11:29.
261 The phrase used in the Dunfermline Vita – iudicium damnpnacioni – differs from the biblical verse, but is in agreement with the following line of the text. The full verse reads: qui enim manducat et bibit indigne iudicium sibi manducat et bibit non diiudicans corpus.
262 AASS: diiudicans.
263 AASS: præsimpserit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quem deservimus reconsiliamur, in die resurrectionis dominice ad eis mensam in catholica fide accedentes ibique corpore Christi et sanguine reficimitur, non ad judicium illud sumimus, sed ad omnium peccarorum virorum remissionem, et eternae vitae preparationem.</td>
<td>deserve, then on the day of resurrection we might dine with the Lord at his table in the Catholic faith, thereby attaining the body and blood of Christ. We do not receive it through judgment, but through the remission of all men’s sins, and preparation of eternal life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiis ab ea intellectis, nil ultra scientes respondere, agnitis sancta ecclesie institutis deinceps consenserunt, et fidem orthodoxam in eucharastie percepcione observaverunt.</td>
<td>They agreed to these arguments from her, not knowing how to respond otherwise, and understanding now the institutions of the Holy Church; and they observed the orthodox faith in observing the Eucharist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterea tunc temporis in genti illa quidam sacerdotes nescio quo barbaro ritu minus compositi contra ecclesie consuetudinem missas celebrabant, quod ut novit regina et audivit illos ita coercuit, et informes fecit rectam formam exercitare, ut ultra quisquam de talibus presumptuosis unquam in regno illo compueret.</td>
<td>Moreover, in these times the priests were celebrating Masses among these people with a certain less composed barbarous rite, which I do not know, against the custom of the Church. When the queen knew and heard them, she limited them, and so she trained the misshapen to assume proper form, in order that she might appear beyond anybody at anytime regarding such types of preconceptions in this realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De dominice diei solempinate: quam constituit observari ab omnibus:</td>
<td>Regarding the solemnity of the day of God, which is well-known to be observed by all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebant eicam scoti neglecta dominicorum dierum reverencia, in operibus terrenis ut in aliis diebus sic et in illis perpedire.</td>
<td>The Scots were accustomed to neglect the reverence of the Lord’s days, shackled to earthly works on these days just as on other days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod illa nullo modo licere, racione et autoritate sic ostendebat</td>
<td>Which she in no way allowed, as she showed by reason and by authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominicum inquit diem celebrum habemus ab omni</td>
<td>She said, “We have the Lord’s Day for celebrating by leaving all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacantes servili opera, propter domini resurrectionem in eo faciamus [fo. 12v.b] in cuius resurrectione nos a servitute diaboli novimus esse redemptos.</td>
<td>servile works, because of the resurrection of the Lord on it, in whose resurrection we know that we are redeemed from service of the devil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc ipse precipuus papa gregorius confirmat dicens. Dominico die a labore terreno cessandum est omnio, atque in eo est summa cum devocione oracione insistendum, ut quicquid negligencie seu cure terrene per sex dies impensum debitum non fuerit, per diem illum resurrectionis piis precibus apud (nostrum) redemptorem satis fieri credatur.</td>
<td>“This the foremost Pope Gregory confirms saying: It is by ceasing from all earthly labor on the Lord’s Day, and by insisting on the greatest devotion to prayer during it, that whatever negligence or earthly care should be imposed during the six days will not be owed; it is believed that this day of resurrection in pious prayers is enough for our redemption.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idem quoque pater gregorius quendam propter opus terrenum quod die dominico fecerat, districta increpacione feriens, eos quorum consiliis hoc egerat duobus mensibus excommunicatos esse decretuit.</td>
<td>“And also the same Father Gregory, reprimanding a certain man because he had done an earthly work on the day of Lord, decreed that those by whose counsels he had done this be excommunicated for two months.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His sapientis regine rationibus contraire non valentes, ita postmodum reverenciam dominicorum dierum, eius instancia observarunt, ut nec onera quelibet hiis diebus quisquam portare, nec alius alium ad hoc auderet compellere.</td>
<td>Not strong enough to contradict the arguments of the wise queen, they afterwards observed reverence of the Lord’s days by her insistence, so that everyone was allowed neither to carry burdens on these days, nor dared to compel another to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicita eciam novercarum coniugia cum primigenis, sed et</td>
<td>She even demonstrated that the unlawful marriages of step-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

264 AASS: habeamus: et.
265 AASS: affirmat.
266 AASS: omnimodo.
267 Gregory the Great, Registrum epistularum, Cl. 1714, SL 140A, Book 13, letter 1: Dominorum uero die a labore terreno cessandum est atque omnimodo orationibus insistendum, ut, si quid negligentiae per sex dies agitur, per diem resurrectionis dominicae precibus expietur. Note that again the Dii manuscript version is a more accurate quote of the source.
268 AASS: affirmat.
leviri cum glore incestus excecrandos esse demonstravit, et prius facta dissoluit et in postera ne fierent, tanquam mortem devitarent.

mothers with firstborns and of a brother-in-law with a sister-in-law were abominable incest; first she dissolved those already made, and then lest they should happen in the future she declared that they should be avoided as death.

fratris defuncti fratrem superstitem ducer, quæ antea fiebant, nimis ostendit execranda, et a fidelibus velut ipsum mortem devitanda.

Multa quoque alia que contra fidei regulam et ecclesie consuetudinem catholice institutam ibi inolverant, ipsa in eodem consilio dampnare, et de regni sui finibus fecit proturbare.

And she also condemned many other things in this same counsel, which had evolved contrary to the rule of the faith and the custom of the Church and the Catholic institution, and drove them out from the boundaries of her kingdom.

Multa quoque alia, quæ contra fidei regulam et ecclesiasticum observationum instituta inolverant, ipsa in eodem Concilio damnare, et de regni sui finibus curavit proturbare.

Universa enim quoque alia quæ contra fidei regulam et ecclesiasticarum observationum instituta inolverant, ipsa in eodem Concilio damnare, et de regni sui finibus curavit proturbare.

For all things which she proposed, she so corroborated with the testimonies of the Holy Scripture and the arguments of the Holy Fathers, that no one was strong enough to respond to these things in any way at all, but that having put down their strong obstinacy, adquiesing to reason, they freely supported all her proposals to the utmost.

Quantum compunctioni et orationi iejuinii quoque et misericordiæ operibus dedita fuerit.

How much she would devote herself to fasts and works of mercy with contrition and prayer.

Venerabilis itaque regina que domum dei deo cooperante sordibus atque erroribus purgasset, atque in aliis sordes errorum eliminasset, in se templum fundans iusticie, in se templum deiecit, dignius de die.

And so the venerable queen, although she had purged the house of God from stains and errors by cooperating with God, and had eliminated the stains of error in others, founding her temple in

Venerabilis itaque regina, quæ domum Dei, Deo se adjuvante, sordibus atque erroribus purgare studuerat; ipsa, Spiritu Sancto cor ejus irrigante, dignius de die.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non est fastu dignitatis elata, non est diviciis blandientibus delectata, non est deliciarum contagio erupta.</th>
<th>justice, was not elevated by arrogance of dignity, not bound by caressing riches, not puffed up by the contagion of delights.</th>
<th>in diem Dei templum fieri meruit: quod eam veraciter esse optime novi, quia et exteriora ejus opera vidi, et conscientiam, ipsa mihi manifestante, cognovi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum enim mecum de vite eternae verbis condisseret, crebris interpulsata suspiriis, foris tota in lacrimis effluvat, ut ab exteriori gestu satis innotesceret quanto animi fervore ad celestia anelaret.</td>
<td>When she condescended to speak with me about eternal life, her entire being flowed in tears, interspersed with copious sighs, so that it was sufficiently known by her outside appearance how great was the fervor of her spirit for heaven.</td>
<td>Cum enim mihi de animae salute, et de perennis vitae loqueretur dulcedine, verba omnis gratiae plena proferebat, quae vere inhabitator cordis ejus Spiritus Sanctus per os illius sonabat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre cunctis vero quos nunc novi mortalibus, oracionem et ieiuniorum studiis, misericordiae quoque ac eleemosinarum dedita erat operibus.</td>
<td>Indeed beyond all the mortals who I now know, she was dedicated to her efforts of prayers and fasts, and also to works of alms-giving.</td>
<td>Tantum vero inter loquendum compungebatur, ut tota in lacrymas resolvenda putaretur, atque illius compunctione, mens mea in fletus compungeretur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut igitur primum de oracione dicam, in ecclesia nemo illa quiecerit, sed orando nemo illa erat intencior.</td>
<td>Let me say first, regarding her prayer, that no one was more at peace in church, but when praying no one was more intense than she.</td>
<td>Ut ergo primum de oratione dicam, in ecclesia nemo illa silendo quietior, sed orando nemo aderat intentior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemo enim unquam in domo dei illam seculare aliquis loquitur, vel vidit aliquid agere terrenum, sed tantum orare et</td>
<td>For no one ever heard her speak about anything secular in the house of God, or saw her do anything earthly, but she was</td>
<td>Nihil enim unquam in domo Dei seculare loqui, nihil terrenum agere, sed tantum consueverat orare, orans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


273 AASS: *ergo*.

274 AASS: *orationum*. 
| orando lacrimari consueverat. | accustomed to pray and while praying to weep. | lacrymas fundere; |
| Solo quidem corpore in terra, sed mente deo proxima. | Indeed only her body was bound to the earth, but her mind was next to God. | solo quidem corpore in terra, sed mente Deo proxima: |
| Nam preter deum et que deierant nichil eius pura [fo. 13r.b] quesivit oracio. | For besides God and those things which are God’s, she sought nothing in her pure prayer. | nam preter Deum, et quæ Dei erant, nil ejus pura quesivit oratio. |
| De ieiunio autem quid dicam, nisi quod per nimiam eius abstinentiam gravissimæ infirmitatis incurrit molestiam? | What will I say about her fast except that through her excessive abstinence she would incur a very serious illness? | De jejunio autem quid dicam? nisi quod per nimiam abstinentiam gravissimæ infirmitatis incurrit molestiam. |
| Hiis duobus, id est, oracioni et abscinencie, mel ad lunxit miseriacordie. | To these two things, that is, to her prayer and abstinence, she added the sweetness of mercy. | His duobus, id est orationi et abstinentia, beneficia copulavit misericordiæ. |
| Quid enim illius peccore clemenciae? Quid erga egentes benignius? | For what was more merciful than her heart? What was more kind toward those suffering? | Quid enim illius pectore clementius? Quid erga egentes benignius? |
| Non solum sua sed eciam seipsam si liceret pauperi impenderet. | If allowed, she would spend not only her own things but even herself on the poor. | Non solum sua, sed etiam seipsam si liceret, pauperi libenter impenderet. |
| Omnibus suis pauperibus erat illa pauperior, illi enim non habentes habere cupiebant, illa vero que habuerat dispergere non cessabat. | She was poorer than all her poor, for they, not having, desired to have, whereas she, who had possessed, did not cease to dispose (of what she had). | Omnibus suis pauperibus erat ipsa pauperior; illi enim non habentes, habere cupiebant; ista vero, quæ habuerat dispergere studebat. |
| Cum autem in publicum procederet aut equitaret, miserorum, orphanorum, viduarum conventicule quasi ad matrem piissimam confluxerunt, quorum nulli unquam ab ea spe vacua ab abcesserunt. | However, when she went out in public either on foot or by horse, a small assembly of poor, orphans and widows streamed together, as to a most pious mother, none of whom ever went away from her void of hope. | Cum in publicum procederet vel equitaret, miserorum, orphanorum, viduarum greges quasi ad matrem piissimam confluxerunt, quorum nulli ab ea sine consolatione abscesserunt. |
| Et cum omnia que secum ad usus egencium circumtulerat distribuisset, vestes vel qualescumque res quas tunc habebant divites secum concomitantes vel ministri famulantæ, pauperibus dandas ab eis accepit, ne aliqui egenus ab ea sine consolacione tristis abiret. | And when she had distributed everything which she had brought with her for the use of the needy, she received from her wealthy companions and attending servants the clothing and the other things which they had with them then, in order to give to the poor, lest anybody depart from her sorrowfully without consolation. | Et cum omnia, quæ secum ad usus egentium circumtulerat, distribuisset; vestes vel quascumque res, quas tunc habebant qui et divites vel ministri aderant, pauperibus dandas accipere solebat, ne aliquando egenus tristis abiret. |
| Nec hoc quidem illi ferebant | They did not bear this with | Nec hoc illi moleste ferebant, |
molesté, quin poecius illi sua offerre certabant, quoniam omnia sibi ab illa *dupla* reddenda pro certo sciebant.

annoynce, rather they competed to offer more to her, since they knew for certain that she would return everything to them twofold.

Interdum eciam quodcumque esset regis proprium, *egenis* tribuendum *tulerat, ille pius* 275 *rapinam illam pietatis omnino gratam semper habuit et acceptam.*

Sometimes she even took something that was the property of the king to apportion to the needy, and this pious man always considered this theft of piety wholly acceptable and agreeable.

Et sepe quidem cum *ipse rex hoc sciret, simulans tum se nescire in huiusmodi* ream esse iocabatur.

Indeed, although the king himself often knew this, pretending that he did not know what was happening, he joked that she was guilty.

Nec solum indigenis egentibus,

Nor did she show her generosity of charity with a joyfulness of heart only to the local poor, but indeed even to those coming from almost every country toward the fame of her mercy.

**Note** that the Dunfermline *Vita* acknowledges Malcolm’s piety.


**Psalms 111:9** and 2 Corinthians 9:9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dato precio libertati restituerit, quos de gente anglorum abducens captivos violencia hostilis redegerat in servos.</td>
<td>to liberty by having ransomed those whom hostile violence had reduced to slavery, taking captives from the people of the English.</td>
<td>quantos dato pretio libertati restituerit, quos de gente Anglorum abducens captivos violencia hostilis redegerat in servos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam et occultos exploratores quaquaversum per provincias scotorum emiserat, ut videlicet qui captivorum duriori premerentur servitute, et inhumanius tractarentur, ubique perquierebant ubi et a quibus affligentur nunciarent.</td>
<td>And so she sent forth secret spies everywhere through the provinces of the Scots, evidently in order to enquire everywhere about that those in captivity who were pressed more harshly and dragged off more inhumanely, and they reported plainly to her where they were and by whom they were oppressed.</td>
<td>Nam et occultos exploratores quaquaversum per provincias Scottorum miserat, ut videlicet qui captivorum durorii premerentur servitute, et inhumanius tractarentur, ubique perquirebant ubi et a quibus affligentur renuntiant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talibus ipsa ex intimis visceribus compaciens, celerius subveniens, redemptos ad libertatem festinavit revocare.</td>
<td>Suffering for such people from her innermost being, and aiding them more quickly, she hurried to recall those redeemed to liberty.</td>
<td>talibus ipsa ex intimis visceribus compatiens, celeriter subvenire et redemptos ad libertatem festinavit renovare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo tempore in regno scotorum plurimi per diversa loca separatis inclusi cellulis, per magnam vitæ distictionem, in carne non secundum carnem vivebant: Angelicam enim in terris conversacionem ducendo.</td>
<td>At this time in the kingdom of the Scots in diverse places separately in cells, through great discipline of life, hermits were living in the flesh not according to the flesh by engaging in angelic conversation while on the earth.</td>
<td>Quo tempore in regno Scottorum plurimi, per diversa loca separatis inclusi cellulis, per magnam vitæ distinctionem, in carne non secundum carnem vivebant: Angelicam enim in terris conversationem ducendo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hiis regina christum venerari et diligere, suo crebrius adventu et alloquio visitare, sed precipue illorum se precibus satagebat commendare.</td>
<td>In these the queen did enough to venerate and love Christ, and to visit them frequently by her presence and speech, but chiefly to commend herself to their prayers.</td>
<td>In his regina Christum venerari, diligere, suoque crebrius adventu et alloquio visitare, atque illorum se precibus satagebat commendare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et cum non posset impetrare, ut ab ea terrenum aliquid vellent accipere, petebat obnixius ut ei aliquid elemosine vel</td>
<td>And since she was not able to persuade them to want to receive anything earthly from her, she would ask more firmly that they</td>
<td>Et cum non impetrare posset, ut ab ea terrenum aliquid vellent accipere; petebat obnixius, ut ei aliquid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>misericordie faciendum preciperent.</td>
<td>might prescribe some work of alms-giving or mercy for her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec mora quicquid illorum voluntatis erat, devota implevit, vel pauperes ab egestate recreando, vel quosque afflictos a miseriis quibus oppressi fuerant relevando.</td>
<td>Without delay the devoted woman fulfilled whatever they wished, either by rescuing the poor from want or relieving the afflicted from the miseries by which they had been oppressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec mora: quicquid illorum voluntatis erat, devota implevit; vel pauperes ab egestate recreando, vel quosque afflictos a miseriis quibus oppressi fuerant relevando.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quoniam sancti andree ecclesiam adveniencium undique populorum religiosa frequentat devotion, super utraque litora maris quod laudonianum dividit et scotiam habitacula construxerat, ut post laborem itineris peregrini et pauperes illuc requieturis divertere ibique omnia ad corporis refectionem necessaria pro vita ac parata invenirent.</td>
<td>And since the religious devout of the people frequented the church of Saint Andrew, arriving from all directions, she built little dwellings on the other shore of the sea which divides Lothian and Scotia, so that after the labor of the journey, paupers and pilgrims going different ways could rest there and find everything needed for the refreshment of the body provided and prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quoniam Sancti Andreæ ecclesiam adveniencium undique populorum religiosa frequentat devotion, super utraque littora maris, quod Lodoneianum dividit et Scotiam, habitacula construxerat; ut post laborem itineris, peregrini ac pauperes illuc requieturis divertere possent; ibique omnia, quæ reificendi corporis necessitas exposceret, parata invenirent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siquidem ministros ad hoc solum ibidem constituerat, ut queque advenientibus necessaria essent, semper prompta haberent, eisque cum magna sollicitudine ministrarent.</td>
<td>Indeed, she arranged for servants for this alone; that whatever things were necessary for those arriving, they might always have at hand, and that they might serve the pilgrims with great care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siquidem ministros ad hoc solum ibidem constituerat, ut queque advenientibus necessaria fuisserint, parata semper haberent, eisque cum magna sollicitudine ministrarent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quibus et naves delegaverat, ut euntes et redeuntes transerrent, nec aliquod transvectionis sue premium ab his qui transvehendi [fo. 14r.a] (erant) unquam exigerent.</td>
<td>And for which she designated ships, so that they might transfer those coming and going, nor did they ever exact any reward from those who were carried across.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibus etiam naves delegaverat, ut euntes, et redeuntes transerrent, nec aliquod transvectionis sue pretium ab his qui transferendi fuerant unquam exigerent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quia scriptum est qui pro aliis orat, pro seipso laborat.</td>
<td>And since it is written that he who prays for others, also works on his own behalf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et alibi: Eadem mensura qua mensi fueritis remecietur vobis.</td>
<td>And elsewhere: You will be measured by the same standard of measurement by which you have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

282 I was not able to find the reference.
283 See: the Cistercian, Peter the Chanter, writing in the second half of the twelfth century, *Summa quae*
regina ob reverenciam sancti apostolici andree fecerat, iam in proprium cessit honorem, et (quae) illi miseris compaciendo exhibuerat, iam nunc cum eo communicat reverencia.

measured others. What the venerable queen had done out of reverence for the Holy Apostle Andrew, now conferred honor on her, and that reverence which she had shown by her compassion for those wretched ones, she already now shares with Him.

Nemo enim in peregrinacione sua sancto andree se satisfecisse existimat, nisi locum ubi misericordie sanctum corpus margarite regine requiescat, vel in eundo vel redeundo cum summa reverencia devote visitaverit.⁵⁸⁴

For no one considers himself to have been completely satisfied in his own pilgrimage to Saint Andrew unless he has visited, either in coming or in going, with great reverence, the holy place of mercy where the body of Queen Margaret rests.

Et merito, quia sicut in vita sua nullus egens ab ea unquam vacus abcessit, nec ab eius tumba sine consolacione aliquid eger rediit, si (tum) in fide nichil hesitans iuste postulaverit.⁵⁸⁴

And deservedly, since just as in her life no one needy ever went away from her empty-handed, neither did anyone needy return from her tomb without consolation, if he has asked without hesitating in true faith.

Unde de illa scriptum est.

Whence it is written about her:

Hec subventu meritorum et precis per precium spes confirmans infirmorum devote clamancium, quot sunt morbi tot morborum impetrans remedium.⁵⁸⁵

This hope of reward through prayer, that a cure can be sought for every disease, was confirmed by coming to the aid of the deserving, of the sick, and of those shouting with devotion.

Qualiter ante dominicum natale et in quadragisima vitam ducere consueverat:

How she had been accustomed to lead her life before Christmas and during Lent.

De venerabilis regine cotidiana conversacione, atque cotidianis

We already spoke concerning the daily conduct of the queen, and her

De Venerabilis reginae quotidiana conversatione⁵⁸⁶, de

---

⁵⁸⁴ Note the textual connection between St Andrews and Dunfermline, the two sancti loci of Margaret’s cult.

⁵⁸⁵ Perhaps this is a reference to miracles at her shrine. These passages seem to be a later interpolation, referencing sites and miracles of an established cult.

⁵⁸⁶ AASS includes: [explicata].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eius misericordie operibus, aliqua utcumque iam diximus, nunc vero qualiter ante dominicum natale dies quadraginta duxerit, et quomodo totum quadregesime tempus observaverit [fo. 14r.b] breviter enarrare curabo.</td>
<td>daily works of mercy; I will now take care to narrate briefly how she conducted the forty days before Christmas and the entire time of Lent.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum in principio noctis paululum requievisset, ecclesiam ingressa primum matutinas de sancta trinitate, deinde de sancta cruce, postmodum de sancta maria ipsa sola complevit.</td>
<td>When she had rested for a little while at the beginning of the night, she went into the church alone and first completed the Matins of the Holy Trinity, then the Matins of the Holy Cross, and after a little while the Matins of the Virgin Mary.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiisque finitis, officia mortuorum inchoavit, et consummavit, et de hinc psalterium usque ad finem complevit.</td>
<td>Having finished these, she began and completed the Office of the Dead and from there she completed the Psalter up to the end.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrantibus hora congrua presbiteris laudes matutinas, interim ipsa psalterium inceptum finivit, vel uno finito alterum jam incepit.</td>
<td>With the priests celebrating Matins and Lauds at the proper hour, she either finished the Psalter she had begun or began another having already finished one.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peracto autem matutinorum officio, rediens in cameram pedes sex pauperum cum rege ipsa lavare et aliquid quo paupertas solarentur solebat erogare.</td>
<td>Having finished the Office of Matins however, and returning to her bedchamber, she was accustomed to wash the feet of six paupers herself along with the king, and to bequeath something with which to console the poor.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa quippe cura fuit camerario, ut ante introitum regine per singulas noctes pauperes introduceret. quatinus ad serviendum eis immo christo in eis. 291</td>
<td>Indeed it was with great care that the Chamberlain would lead in the paupers each night before the arrival of the queen, so that she might find them ready when entering to serve them, or rather</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

287 AASS: tentabo.  
288 AASS includes: deinde.  
289 AASS: eisque.  
290 AASS: ipso.  
291 Note the theological distinction; Margaret is not serving the poor, but Christ in them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin passage</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiis peractis quieti se ac sopori contulit.</td>
<td>Having finished these things, she took herself off to rest and sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His peractis quieti se ac sopori contulit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum vero mane facto de lecto surrexisset, precibus et psalmis diu insistebat, et inter psallendum misericordiae opus peragebat.</td>
<td>Indeed, when she had risen from her bed in the morning, she used to apply herself to prayers and the Psalms for a long time, and to complete her work of mercy between the psalms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum vero mane facto lecto surrexisset, precibus et psalmis diu insistebat, et inter psallendum misericordiae opus peragebat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novem enim infantulos orphans omni auxilio destitutos prima diei hora ad se fecit introduci reficiendos.</td>
<td>And she had nine little children, abandoned by every aid, brought in to her on the first hour of the day for nourishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novem enim infantulos orphans, omni auxilio destitutos, prima diei hora ad se introduci fecit reficiendos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iusserat namque cibos molliores quibus infantilis etas delectatur illis cotidie preparari, quos allatos ipsamet flexis genibus illis apposuit, sorbiciunculas eis facit, et coclearibus quibus ipsa utebatur, cibos illis in ora mittere dignabatur.</td>
<td>And so she had ordered to be prepared daily the softer foods by which this young age was delighted. She herself put them on her bent knees (lap) for feeding, and she made little drinks for them, and she deemed it worthy to place food for them in their mouths with spoons which she herself used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jusserat namque cibos molliores, quibus infantilis etas delectatur, illis quotidie praeparari; quos allatos illa flexis genibus apponere, sorbitionculas eis facere, et, quibus ipsamet utebatur cochlearibus, cibos illis in ora mittere dignabatur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita regina que ab omnibus populis honorabatur, pro christo et ministre officio solicite, et matris dulcissime fungebatur pietate.</td>
<td>So the queen, who was honored by all the people, carefully discharged for Christ her office both of a servant and of a pious and most sweet mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita regina, que ab omnibus populis honorabatur, pro Christo et ministrae et matris piaissimae officio fungebatur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poterat satis congrue illud beati iob dicere. Ab infancia mea crevit mecum miseracio, et de utero matris mee egressa est mecum.</td>
<td>It was possible to say fittingly enough this of the Blessed Job: From my childhood mercy grew with me, and it went out with me from my mother’s womb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poterat satis congrue illud beati Job dicere, Ab infancia mea crevit mecum miseratio, et de utero matris mea egressa est mecum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter hec trecentos pauperes in regiam aulam consuetudo erat introduci, quibus per ordinem circumsexentibus cum rex et regina ingrederentur, a ministris ostia claudabantur.</td>
<td>Between these happenings, it was customary to lead three hundred paupers into the royal hall, so that when they were sitting around in order, the king and queen entered, and the doors were closed by the servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter haec trecentos pauperes in regiam aulam consuetudo erat introduci; quibus per ordinem circumsexentibus, cum rex et regina ingrederentur, a ministris ostia claudabantur;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptis enim capellanis quibusdam religiosis et aliquibus ministris, illorum elemosine</td>
<td>For, with chaplains, certain religious, and other servants excepted, no one was allowed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptis enim capellanis quibusdam religiosis et aliquibus ministris, illorum elemosine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

292 Job 31:18.
293 AASS: meae.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operibus interesse nulli licuerat.</td>
<td>attend their works of alms-giving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex ex una, regina vero ex altera parte christo in pauperibus servierunt,</td>
<td>The king on one side and the queen on the other served Christ in these poor, and with great devotion they offered foods and drink specially prepared for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnaque cum devocione cibos et potum specialiter ad hoc preparatos(^{294}) optulerunt.</td>
<td>Rex et una, regina vero ex altera parte, Christo in pauperibus servierunt, magnaque cum devocione cibos et potum, specialiter ad hoc preparatos, obtulerunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo facto <strong>regina ecclesiam</strong> consuevit intrare, ibique prolaxis precibus et lacrimarum <strong>singtibibus</strong> semetipsam deo sacrificium immolare.</td>
<td>When this was done, the queen was accustomed to enter church, and there to offer herself as a sacrifice to God in extended prayers and in sobs of tears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quo facto ecclesiam regina</strong> consuevit intrare, ibique prolaxis precibus et lacrymarum <strong>gemitibus</strong> semetipsam Deo sacrificium immolare.</td>
<td>For she completed the Psalter two or three times on these holy days between the space of a day and a night, with the hours of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Cross, and the Holy Mary excepted, and before the public celebration of Mass, she had five or six Masses sung to her privately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptis enim horis de sancta trinitate, de sancta cruce de sancta maria, intra diei et noctis spaciunm duo vel tria hiis sanctis diebus psalteria complevit, atque ante publice celebracionem misse quinque vel sex privatim sibi missas decantari fecit.</td>
<td>Exceptis enim omnibus <strong>supra memoratis</strong> elemosinis, istius numeri, id est, viginti quatuor pauperes ante [fo. 14v. b] refectionem suam ipsa humiliter ministrando refecit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His expletis, cum reficiendi tempus instaret viginti quatuor pauperes ante [fo. 14v. b] refectionem suam ipsa humiliter ministrando refecit.</td>
<td>When these things were completed and the time for refreshment was near, before taking her own meal she herself refreshed twenty four poor by serving them humbly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeptis enim omnibus <strong>supra memoratis</strong> elemosinis, istius numeri, id est, viginti quatuor quam diu vixit per <strong>totum annum sustentabat</strong>, quos ipsa quocumque in loco maneret, iuxta manere, et quocumque <strong>pergendo divertere</strong>, illos <strong>secum</strong> comitari statuerat.</td>
<td>For, with all things relating to alms-giving being excepted as mentioned above, she sustained such a number, that is, twenty four, for an entire year while she lived. She kept them next to wherever she went, and wherever she diverted in her travels, she placed them with her in order to be attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In quorum refectio postquam christo in illis esurienti</strong> ministraverat, suum quoque corpusculum reficere consuevit.</td>
<td>In this refreshment when, in this refreshment when, in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In qua refectione cum secundum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quæ, postquam in illis Christo devote ministraverat, suum quoque corpusculum reficere consuevit.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{294}\) Probably a scribal error for *preparatos*. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>apostolum <strong>paulum</strong> curam carnis non faceret in concupiscenciis, vix tum habuit in vite necessariis.²⁹⁵</th>
<th>accordance with the Apostle Paul, she took care of the flesh not in fleshly desires, but she scarcely submitted to the necessities of life carnis, secundum Apostolum, non faceret in concupiscentiis, vix habuit in vitae necessariis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comedebat enim ut tantum vitam servaret, non ut delectationi adquiesceret.</td>
<td>For she ate so that she might preserve life, not so that she might yield to delight. Comedebat enim ut tantum vitam servaret, non ut delectationi acquiesceret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refectio tenuis et sobria incitabat <strong>magis esuriem</strong> quam restringebat.²⁹⁶</td>
<td>Such meager and temperate refreshment incited greater hunger than it restrained. Refectio tenuis et sobria, incitabat esuriem magis quam restrigebat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustare videbatur cibum, non sumere.</td>
<td>She seemed to taste rather than to consume the food. Gustare videbatur cibum, non sumere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinc rogo hinc perpendatur quanta et qualis eius continencia fuerit ieiunando, cuius tanta exciterat abstinentia convivando.</td>
<td>Hence I ask, hence it is weighed, how great and what sort was her continence while fasting, when she exercised such abstinence while feasting. Hinc rogo, hinc perpendatur, quanta et qualis ejus continencia fuerit jejunando, cuius tanta extiterat abstinentia convivando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quamvis totam in magna continencia vitam duxerit, his tamen id est <strong>quadragesima diebus ante pascha et atque totidem ante dominicum natale</strong>, incredibili abstinentia se affligere consuevit.</td>
<td>And although she conducted her entire life with great restraint, she was, however, accustomed to burden herself with incredible abstinence during these periods, that is, the forty days before Easter and as many before Christmas. Et quamvis totam in magna continencia vitam duxerit, his tamen, id est quadragesima ante Pascha et Natale Domini diebus, incredibili abstinentia se affligere consuevit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unde propter nimium ieiunii rigor, acerrimum usque <strong>ad exitum de corpore</strong> passa [fo. 15r.a] est stomachi dolorem.</td>
<td>Whence, because of the very great rigor of her fast, she suffered a bitter sickness of the stomach up to the exit from her body (her death). Unde, propter nimium rigorem jejunandi acerrimum usque finem vitae passa est stomachi dolorem,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec tamen infirmitas corporis, virtutem <strong>boni debilitavit.</strong></td>
<td>However, her physical infirmity did not diminish her virtue of goodness. nec tamen infirmitas corporis virtutem debilitavit boni operis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sacra <strong>namque</strong> lectione studens, in <strong>operibus divini cultus</strong> persistens, in eleemosinis indeficiens, prorsus in omnibus que dei erant se vigilanter exercens.</td>
<td>Indeed, applying herself in holy reading, persisting in works of divine worship, unfailing in almsgiving, exercising herself vigorously and completely in God’s works. In sacra lectione studens, in orationibus persistens, in eleemosinis indeficiens, prorsus in omnibus quae Dei erant se vigilanter exercens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quia sciebat scriptum, quem diligat dominus corripit, flagellat</td>
<td>And since she knew the Scripture, “Who the Lord loves he chastens. Et quia sciebat scriptum, Quem diligat Dominus corripit,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁹⁶ Comparing Margaret here to the “hungering Christ” mentioned above?
²⁹⁷ AASS includes: *in.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>autem omnem filium quem recipit,\textsuperscript{298} carnis sue dolores quasi clementissimi patris flagellum, cum patiencia et gratiarum actione libens amplectitur.</th>
<th>He scourges each son whom he received,” she freely embraced the sorrows of her flesh with patience and gratitude, as if they were her most merciful father’s whip.</th>
<th>flagellat autem omnem filium quem recipit; suecarnis dolores, quasi clementissimi patris flagellum, cum patientia et gratiarum actione libens amplectitur.</th>
<th>Diíi, 11: Quod in testimonium sancte conversationis ejus quiddam Dominus ostenderit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum igitur hiis et huiusmodi dedita esset operibus, et continuis laboraret infirmitatibus, ut iuxta apostolum virtus in infirmitate perficeretur,\textsuperscript{299} de virtute transiens in virtutem melior reddetur.</td>
<td>Since, therefore, she was devoted to these works and others of this kind, she labored with continual illnesses, so that, according to the Apostle, virtue might be perfected in her sickness, and crossing from virtue to virtue she was rendered better.</td>
<td>Cum ergo his et hujusmodi dedita esset operibus, et continuis laboraret infirmitatibus, ut iuxta Apostolum virtus in infirmitate perficeretur; de virtute transiens in virtutem de die in diem melior reddetur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrana omnia mente deserens, toto desiderio ardentem celestia sititebat, et cordis amore oris que clamore dicebat.</td>
<td>Deserting in her mind all things earthly, she ardently thirsted for heaven with complete longing, and she said with love in heart and a cry from her mouth:</td>
<td>Terrana omnia mente deserens, toto desiderio ardentem, celestia sittens;\textsuperscript{300}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitivit anima mea ad deum fontem vivum, quando veniam et apparebo ante faciem dei?\textsuperscript{301}</td>
<td>My spirit thirsted for God, the living font; when will I come and appear before the face of God?</td>
<td>Sitivit anima mea ad Deum fontem vivum, quando veniam et apparebo ante faciem Dei?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirantur alii in alii signa miraculorum, ego in margarita multo magis admiror opera misericordiarum.</td>
<td>Others wonder at signs of miracles in others; I myself admire in Margaret the many great works of mercy.</td>
<td>Mirentur alii in aliis signa miraculorum, ego in Margarita multo magis admiror opera misericordiarum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam signa bonis facta sunt communia, opera vero vere pietatis et caritatis bonorum propria.</td>
<td>For signs are common deeds in the good, but works of true piety and charity belong to good people alone.</td>
<td>nam signa bonis &amp; malis sunt communia, opera autem veræ pietatis et caritatis bonorum propria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignius inquam miremur [fo. 15r.b] in margarita facta que illam sanctam faciebant, quam signa si aliqua fecisset que eam</td>
<td>Let us wonder more fittingly, I say, at the deeds which made her a saint, than the miracles, if she had done any, which would show her</td>
<td>Dignius, inquam, miremur in Margarita facta, quæ illam Sanctam faciebant, quam signa, si aliqua fecisset, quæ</td>
<td>Illa sanctitatem interdum ostendunt, ista etiam faciunt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{298} Proverbs 3:12 and Hebrews 12:6.
\textsuperscript{299} 2 Corinthians 12:9.
\textsuperscript{300} AASS includes: & cordis atque oris clamore cum Psalmista dicens;
\textsuperscript{301} Psalm 41:3. Describing God in this psalm as fontem vivum is an older interpretation. The current reading, generally held to date after Clement VIII (antipope 1423-1429), is: sitivit anima mea ad Deum fortet vivum quando veniam et parebo ante faciem Dei.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hominibus sanctam oscenderent.                                       to be a saint among men.                                        hominibus sanctam tantum ostenderent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiddam tamen narrabo quod ad religiosae vite illius indicium pertinere non inconvenienter dixerim ut puto.</td>
<td>Nevertheless, I say that it is not inappropriate, as I think, to speak of a certain miracle that pertains to an indication of her religious life.</td>
<td>Quiddam tamen narrabo, quod ad religiosae vitae illius indicium pertinere, non inconvenienter dixerim, ut puto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habuerat librum evangeliorum gemmis et auro perornatum, in quo quatuor evangelistarum ymagines pictura auro ad mixta decorabat, sed et capitalis queque littera auro tota rutilabat.</td>
<td>She had a Book of Gospels ornamented throughout with gems and gold, in which were the decorated images of the four Evangelists painted in mixed gold, but the capital letters also shone in pure gold.</td>
<td>Habuerat librum Evangeliorum, gemmis et auro perornatum, in quo quatuor Evangelistarum imaginum pictura auro admixta decorabat; sed et capitalis queque littera auro tota rutilabat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunc codicem pre ceteris in quibus studere consueverat, carius semper amplexata fuerat.</td>
<td>She was accustomed to study this book more than the others and she had always embraced it more dearly.</td>
<td>Hunc codicem, pre ceteris, in quibus legendo studere consueverat, carius semper amplexata fuerat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quem quidam deferens dum forte per vadum transiret, liber qui minus caute pannis fuerat obvolutus, in medias aquas ce cidit, quod ignorans portitor iter quod ceperat securus peregit.</td>
<td>It so happened that while a certain person was carrying it across a ford, the book, which had been rather carelessly wrapped, fell into the middle waters, and, because he did not know, the ferryman completed his journey untroubled.</td>
<td>Quem quidem deferens, dum forte per vadum transiret; liber, qui minus caute pannis fuerat obvolutus, in medias aquas ce cidit; quod ignorans portitor, iter quod inceperat securus peregit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum autem postea librum proferre vellet tunc primum quod perdiderat agnovit.</td>
<td>After a little while, however, when he wanted to offer the book, then he understood for the first time that he had lost it.</td>
<td>cum vero postea librum proferre vellet, tum primum quod perdiderat agnovit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querebatur diu nec inveniebatur.</td>
<td>He searched for a long time but did not find it.</td>
<td>Quærebatur diu nec inveniebatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem in profundo fluminis apertus iacere reperiur, ita ut illius folia impetu aque sine cessacione agitarentur, et</td>
<td>Finally, it was found at the bottom of the river lying open, so that its pages were constantly agitated by the assault of the water, and the</td>
<td>Tandem in profundo fluminis apertus iacere reperiur, ita ut illius folia impetu aque sine cessatione agitarentur, et</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[302\] AASS: *quidam*.

\[303\] AASS: *obvolutus*. 
little coverings of silk, which were protecting the gold letters lest they bleed together from the contact of the pages, were pulled away by the force of the river.

Who would have thought the book would be intact any longer.

Who would have believed that even one letter would be evident in it?

Certainly it was extracted from the middle of the river untouched, uncorrupted, so that it seemed it had not been touched by the water.

For the brightness of the pages and the form of the letters remained untouched, just as it was before it had fallen into the river, except that barely a sign of dampness was able to be seen on the edges of part of the pages.

The loss of the book and (report of) the miracle reached the queen at the same time, who, having given thanks to God, embraced the book with more love than before.

Wherefore let others contemplate what they should then think; I do not doubt that this was a demonstrable sign from the Lord, for love of the venerable queen.

How she foresaw her own death and foretold a certain future.

In the meantime, the omnipotent God now prepared to return eternal rewards for her pious works, and she was preparing herself to enter another life more eagerly than usual.

For as it was manifested a little

AASS: [fuisse opinor].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbis manifestabitur, suum de hac vita exitum et alia quedam futura longe ante <em>prescivisse</em> videbatur.</td>
<td>Later from her words, it seemed that she had foreseen her exit from this life and certain other future things long before.</td>
<td>verbis manifestabitur, suum de hac vita exitum, et alia quedam futura, longe ante <em>prescisse</em> videbatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaque secrecius me alloquens, suam mihi ex ordine vita cepit replicare, et ad <em>verba singula fluvios lacrimarum</em> effundere.</td>
<td>And so, summoning me more privately, she began to repeat her life to me in sequence, and to pour forth floods of tears with each word.</td>
<td>Itaque secretius me alloquens, suam mihi ex ordine vitam cepit replicare, et ad <em>singula verba lacrymarum fluvios</em> effundere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanta denique inter colloquendum ejus erat compunctio, tanta ex compunctione proruperat fletuum profusio, ut sicut mihi videbatur nihil proculdubio esset, quod a Christo tunc impetrare non posset.</td>
<td>Finally, such was her compunction during her speech, such was the profusion of tears that erupted from her compunction, that, as it seemed to me that there was nothing, without a doubt, that she would not be able to obtain then from Christ.</td>
<td>Tanta denique inter colloquendum ejus erat compunctio, tanta ex compunctione proruperat fletuum profusio, ut (sicut mihi videbatur) nihil proculdubio esset, quod a Christo tunc impetrare non posset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flente ipsa flevi et ego, flentes interdum tacuimus, quoniam singultu <em>[fo. 15v.b]</em> prorumpente verba proferre nequivimus.</td>
<td>With her crying, I wept, and crying occasionally we were silent, since we were unable to offer words with our sobs erupting</td>
<td>Flente ipsa, flevi et ego: diu flentes, interdum tacuimus, quoniam singultu prorumpente verba proferre nequivimus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamma quippe compunctionis que cor illius concremaverat, ex verbis ejus spiritualibus meam quoque mentem attigerat.</td>
<td>In fact, the flame of compunction which consumed her heart also reached my mind from her spiritual words.</td>
<td>Flamma quippe compunctionis, que cor illius concremaverat, ex verbis ejus spiritualibus meam quoque mentem attigerat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuius per linguam dum verba spiritus sancti audirem et per verba conscientiam eius <em>intelligerem</em>, tanta eius familiaritatis gratia me indignum iudicabam.</td>
<td>When I heard the words of the holy spirit through her tongue, I understood her conscience through her words, and I judged myself unworthy of such grace of her familiarity.</td>
<td>Cuius per linguam dum verba Sancti Spiritus audirem, et per verba conscientiam ejus <em>perviderem</em>, tanta ejus familiaritatis gratia me indignum iudicabam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum autem de neccesseris <em>verba</em> finisset, rursus me ita <em>alloquata</em> est.</td>
<td>When however, she had finished her words regarding necessary concerns, again she spoke to me thusly:</td>
<td>Cum de necessariis <em>sermonem</em> finisset, rursus ita me <em>alloqui cepit</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale inquit <em>Ego post hec</em> in hac vita diu non subsistam, tu autem non parvo post tempore vives.</td>
<td>Farewell, she said, I will not remain in this life for much longer after this; you however will live for not a little time after me.</td>
<td>Vale, inquit, <em>Ego posthac</em> in hac vita diu non subsistam: tu autem non parvo post me tempore vives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duo <em>igitur</em> sunt que a te expostulo.</td>
<td>I ask therefore two things from you.</td>
<td>Duo <em>ergo</em> sunt que a te postulo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unum ut quam diu vixeris, anime mee in missis et orationibus tuis memineris.</td>
<td>One is that while you live you will remember my soul in the Masses and in your prayers.</td>
<td>unum, ut quamdiu vixeris animæ meæ in Missis et Orationibus tuis memineris;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliud ut filiorum meorum et filiarum curam habeas, amorem impendas, <strong>deum precipue</strong> timere <strong>doceas et amare</strong> et ab eis docendis et <strong>informandis</strong> numquam desistas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other is that you might take care of my sons and daughters, that you expend love them, teach them to fear and to love God above all and never refrain from teaching and informing them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliud,ut filiorum meorum ac filiarum curam habeas, amorem impendas, <strong>praecipue Deum</strong> timere <strong>et amare doceas</strong>, et ab eis docendis numquam desistas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cum vero volente deo quemlibet ex eis culmine honoris videris exaltari, illius maxime pater magister accedas scilicet admonendo et cum res exegerit arguendo, ne propter momentaneum honorem in superbiam tumeat, <strong>ne deum offendat</strong>, ne per mundi prosperitatem eternam negligence felicitatem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeed, when you see any one of them exalted to the height of honor, with God wishing it, approach him as his father and teacher in the highest sense, admonish him and when it is warranted by argue with him, lest he swell into arrogance because of momentary honor, lest he offend God through avarice, lest he neglect eternal happiness through worldly prosperity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et cum in culmen terrenæ dignitatis quemlibet ex eis exaltari videris, illius maxime pater simul et magister accedas; scilicet admonendo, et cum res exegerit arguendo; ne propter momentaneum honorem in superbiam tumeat, <strong>nedum</strong> per avaritiam offendat, ne per mundi prosperitatem æternæ <strong>vitæ</strong> negligat felicitatem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hec sunt inquit que ut solicite facias sub dei presence qui nunc nobis tertius assistit, mihi queso promittas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These are the things, she said, which I ask you to promise me that you will do carefully under the presence of God who now assists us as a third party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hæc sunt, inquit, quæ ut solicite facias, sub Dei præsentia, Qui nunc nobis tertius assistit, mihi quæso promittas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quibus iterum verbis ego prorumpens in fletum omnia que, rogaverat diligenter [fo. 16r.a] me promisi facturum:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I again burst into weeping with these words, and she asked me to promise carefully that all things would be done:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibus ego verbis iterum propumpens in fletum, <strong>omnia</strong> quæ rogaverat diligenter me promisi facturum:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quia illi contradicere non audebam, quam sic <strong>constanter predicere futura audiebam.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not dare to contradict her, whom I had heard predicting the future constantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non enim</strong> illi contradicere audebam, quam sic indubitanter futura predicere audieram.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Que ut predixerat ita nunc esse res ipsa comprobat, quia et ego post illius mortem vivo, et eius sobolem in dignitatem honoris aspicio sublimatam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And those things which she had predicted are now confirmed, since I am living after her death, and I see her offspring elevated to honored dignity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quæ ut praedixerat, ita nunc et res ipsa comprobat; quia et ego post illius mortem vivo, et eujus sobolem in dignitatem honoris sublimatam aspio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expleta itaque <strong>huiuscemodi</strong> collocucione, domum redivitus regime ultimum vale dixi, <strong>non</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And so, after the conversation regarding these things was completed, I said a final farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expleta itaque collocutione domum redivitus, reginæ ultimum vale dixi: <strong>non enim</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

305 Note that in composing this *Vita* Turgot fulfills both these requests; she is remembered and her children receive instruction.

306 AASS: *ne Deum.*

307 AASS does not include: *omnia.*

308 AASS includes: *esse.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enim deinceps faciem eius desiderabilem merui videre.</td>
<td>to the queen and returned home, for I did not deserve to see her desired face afterwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualiter de hac vita migraverit.</td>
<td>How she went from this life.</td>
<td>Diii, 13: Qualiter de hac vita migraverit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non multo post acriori solito infirmitate corripitur, et ante evocationis sue diem longe egritudinis igne decoquitur.</td>
<td>Not much later, she was seized by an illness more sharp than usual, and distilled by a long fire of illness before the day of her summons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuius obitum sicut ab eius presbitero didici narrabo.</td>
<td>I will tell about her death just as I heard from her priest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quem ipsa propter eius simplicitatem, innocenciam, castitatem pre ceteris familiarius dilexerat.</td>
<td>Whom, because of his simplicity, innocence, and chastity, she loved more dearly than others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ille autem post mortem matrone sue scilicet deo dilecte et hominibus regine, pro ipsius anime amore perpetuo christo servicio se tradidit, et ad sepulcrum incorrupti corporis sanctissimi patris Cuthberti suscipliens habitum monachi, semetipsum pro ea hostiam deo optulit.</td>
<td>For this priest, after the death of his lady, with the queen evidently having been loved by God and men, surrendered himself to Christ in perpetual service for love of her soul, and assuming the habit of a monk at the tomb of the uncorrupted body of the most holy Father Cuthbert, he offered himself as a sacrifice to God for her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic itaque regine in extremis vite inseparabiliter aderat, et egredientem animam illius de corpore, ipse precibus christo commendavit.</td>
<td>He came to the queen continually at the end of her life, and commended her soul to Christ with his prayers as it left her body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuius exitum ita sicut viderat per ordinem cum sepius inde a me requireretur, in hunc modum [fo. 16r.b] mihi narrare consuevit.</td>
<td>I often required him to tell me about her death just as he had seen it in sequence; he used to tell it to me in this way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domina inquit mea margarita quo ad amorem dei et honorem pocius margarita. per dimidium annum et aliquanto amplius non equo solebat assidere, rare autem valuit de</td>
<td>My lady Margaret, he said, who was more than a pearl because of love for God and honor, was not able to sit on a horse for at least half a year, and even rarely well enough to rise from her bed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

309 AASS does not include: ita.
310 AASS: quaeritur.
lecto surgere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Quarto autem</strong> ante suum obitum die cum <strong>maritus eius</strong> rex Malcolmus(^{311}) in expeditione esset, atque illa longo terrarum spacio, quid erga illum agetur ea die nullius nuncii celeritate scire potuisset, triscior solito effecta hoc nobis sibi assidentibus dixit.</th>
<th>However, the fourth day before her death, when her husband King Malcolm was on expedition, and she had not been able to know what had happened to him on this day because of the great distance, she was rendered sadder than usual and she said this to us sitting with her:</th>
<th><strong>Quarta</strong> ante suum obitum die, cum rex in expeditione esset, atque illa(^{312}) longo terrarum intervallo, quid erga ipsum ea die agetur, nullius nuncii celeritate scire potuisset, tristior solito effecta, hoc nobis sibi assidentibus dixit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forte hodie tantum mali regno scotorum accidit, quantum multis retro temporibus non evenit.</td>
<td>Perhaps today such a great evil has fallen to the kingdom of the Scots that has not happened for a long time back.</td>
<td>Forte hodie tantum mali regno(^{313}) Scotorum accidit quantum multis retro temporibus non <strong>provenit</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos igitur hec audientes, tamen eius dicta tunc <strong>parvipendentes negleximus</strong>, sed post aliquot dies veniente nuncio eodem die quo hec regina dixerat, regem fuisset occisum intelleximus.</td>
<td>So, hearing these things, we nevertheless then disregarded her speech, little considering it, but after some days, when a messenger arrived, we understood that the king had been killed on the same day in which the queen had spoken.</td>
<td>Nos vero haec audientes, ejus dicta tunc <strong>quidem negligenter acceperimus</strong>; sed post aliquot dies veniente nuncio eodem die quo haec regina dixerat, regem fuisset occisum intelleximus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quem quidem ipsa quasi futurorum prescia multum, prohibuerat ne quoquam cum exercitu iret, set nescio qua de causa contigit, ne tunc illius monitis non obediret.</td>
<td>Indeed, she had strongly prohibited him from going with the army as if she had foreknowledge of future; but, I do not know why, he did not obey her warnings.</td>
<td>Quem quidem ipsa, quasi futurorum præscia, multum prohibuerat, ne(^{314}) quoquam cum exercitu <strong>iret</strong>; sed nescio qua de causa contigit, ne tunc illius monitis obediret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum igitur quartus post regis occisionem dies instaret, illa paulisper lenita infirmitute missas auditura oratorium intravit, ibique suum exitum qui iam imminebat, sacrosancto dominici corporis et sanguinis viatico premunire curavit.</td>
<td>Therefore, when the fourth day after the death of the king approached, when her illness had calmed a little, she entered her oratory to hear Mass, and there she took care to fortify herself with the holy viaticum of the body and blood of the Lord since her departure was now approaching.</td>
<td>Cum ergo quartus post regis occisionem dies instaret; illa, paulisper levigata infirmitute, <strong>Missam</strong>(^{316}) auditura oratorium intravit: ibique suum exitum, qui jam imminebat, sacrosanctum(^{317}) Dominici corporis et sanguinis viatico praemunire curavit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum salutifero gustu refecta,</td>
<td>Having been refreshed with a</td>
<td>Quorum <strong>salutari</strong> gustu refecta,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{311}\) Note the added emphasis on Malcolm: *eius maritus malcolmus.*

\(^{312}\) AASS: *illis.*

\(^{313}\) AASS: *Regnis.*

\(^{314}\) AASS does not include: *ne.*

\(^{315}\) AASS: *ire.*

\(^{316}\) AASS: *Missas.*

\(^{317}\) AASS: *sacrosancto.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[fo. 16v.a] prioribus mox aggravata doloribus lecto proscernitur, et ad exitum crescente molestia vehementius urgetur.</th>
<th>health-bearing morsel, she is soon prostrated on her bed, aggravated by former pains, and she is urged onward to her departure more forcibly by her illness.</th>
<th>prioribus mox aggravata doloribus, lecto prostrernitur, et ad exitum, crescente molestia vehementius urgetur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Et quid faciam? Quo morer? Quasi mortem domine mee ulterior possum differre, et vitam longiorem facere, sic timeo ad ultimum ejus pervenire.</td>
<td>And what could I do? By what means can I delay? As if I was able to defer the final death of my lady and to make her life longer, so I fear to arrive at her end.</td>
<td>Et quid faciam? Quid morer? Quasi mortem Domine mee, ulterior possum differre, et vitam longiorem facere, sic timeo ad ultimum ejus pervenire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed omnis caro fenum et omnis gloria eius quasi flos feni.</td>
<td>But all flesh is as hay and all her glory as the bloom of the hay.</td>
<td>Sed omnis caro fenenum, et omnis gloria ejus quasi flos feni:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaruit fenum et decidit flos.</td>
<td>The hay withers and the flower falls away.</td>
<td>exaruit fenenum, et decidit flos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facies eius iam in mortem palluerat, cum ipsa me atque alios sacri altaris ministros mecum sibi astare suamque animam deo psallentes iubet commendare.</td>
<td>Now her face had paled in death; she orders me and other servants of the holy altar with me to stand with her and to commend her soul to God while reciting Psalms.</td>
<td>Facies ejus jam in mortem palluerat, cum ipsa me atque alios mecum, sacri altaris ministros, sibi astare suamque animam psallentes Christo jubet commendare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsa quoque illam quam nigram crucem nominare, quamque in maxima veneratione semper habere consuevit sibi afferri preceptit.</td>
<td>And also she directs that this which is called the Black Cross be brought to her, which she was accustomed to consider always in the greatest veneration.</td>
<td>Ipsa quoque illam, quam Nigram Crucem nominare, quamque in maxima veneratione habere consuevit, sibi afferri præcepit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est autem crux illa longitudinem habens palme de auro purissimo mirabili opere fabricata, que in modum thecae clauditur et aperitur.</td>
<td>This wonderful cross had the length of the palm of a hand and the work had been created of purest gold, which opened and closed in the manner of a box.</td>
<td>AR, De sancto: 714: Est autem crux illa longitudinem habens palmæ de auro purissimo mirabili opera fabricata, quæ in modum thecae clauditur et aperitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cernitur in ea quedam dominice crucis porcio sicut sepe multorum miraculorum argumento probatum esset salvatoris nostri habens ymaginem de eboe decentissime sculptam, et aureis distinctionibus mirabiliter decoratam quam hec eadem</td>
<td>A portion of the Lord’s cross is seen in this, as had often been proven by the evidence of many miracles, having an image of Our Savior sculpted of the most comely ivory, and wonderfully adorned with spangled gold, which, since this same queen of the royal seed of the English and</td>
<td>AR, De sancto: Cernitur in ea quaedam Dominicae crucis portio (sicut saepe multorum miraculorum argumento probatum est), Salvatoris nostri imaginem habens de eboe densissime sculptam, et aureis distinctionibus mirabiliter decoratam. Hanc religiosa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

318 1 Peter 1:24.
319 AASS: sacrae.
regina de semine regio Anglorum et Hungariorum orta allata in scotiam, quasi (munus) hereditarium posteris suis reliquit, omni scotorum genti non minus terribilem quam amabilem:

the Hungarians brought the heavenly body into Scotland, remained the duty of her future heirs. All of the Scottish people were not less awed than in love with it.

regina Margareta, hujus regis mater, quae de semine Anglorum et Hungariorum exstitit oriunda, allatam in Scotia quasi munus haereditarium transmisit ad filios. Hanc igitur crucem omni Scotorum genti non minus terribilem quam amabilem cum rex devotissime adorasset, cum multis lacrymis peccatorum confessione praemissa, exitum suum celestium mysteriorum perceptione munivit.

Sed cum loculus in quo fuerat clausa cicius [fo. 16v.b] aperiri non posset, regina graviter ingemiscens ait, O nos misero culpabiles, ulterius sanctæ crucis non merebimur aspectum?

But since the chest in which it had been locked was not able to be opened very quickly, the queen said groaning weightily: O how wretched and guilty we are! Will we not deserve the final sight of the Holy Cross?

Dii, XIII (cont.): Sed cum loculus, in quo fuerat inclusa, citius aperiri non posset; regina graviter ingemiscens, ait: O nos miseros, O culpabilis! ulterius sanctæ crucis non merebimur aspectum.

Quandoque tamen de loculo prlatam eique allatam cum devota reverencia suscepit, complecti, deosculari, oculos et faciem illa signare crebrius studuit.

And when it was taken from the chest and brought to her she received it with devout reverence, and repeatedly endeavoured to embrace and kiss it and to sign her eyes and face with it.

Quandoque tamen de loculo prlatam, eique allatam cum reverentia suscepit; complecti, deosculari, oculos faciem illa signare crebrius studuit.

And so with her entire body growing cold, yet while the heat of life pulsed in her breast she prayed always, and singing the fiftieth psalm in sequence, she held the cross to her again with both hands, holding it before her eyes.

Jamque, frigescente toto corpore, nihilominus tamen ipsa semper orabat; et quinquagesimum Psalmum ex ordine decantans crucem interim sibi ante oculos statuens utraque manu tenebat.

And so with her entire body growing cold, yet while the heat of life pulsed in her breast she prayed always, and singing the fiftieth psalm in sequence, she held the cross to her again with both hands, holding it before her eyes.

Interea filius eius qui post patrem regnavit reidiens de exercitu cubiculum regine ingressus est.

Meanwhile, her son who reigned after his father, returning from the army, entered the bedchamber of the queen.

Interea filius ejus, qui post patrem regni gubernacula jam in praesenti tenet, reidiens de exercitu cubiculum reginaræ intravit.

320 AASS includes: vitalis adhuc calor palpitabat in pectore.
321 Edgar, reigned 1097-1107. Note that the Dunfermline Vita does not claim that Edgar is ruling at the time the Vita was composed.
322 AASS: exercitu.
| Que illi tunc angustie, quis animi cruciatus? | What was then his agony, what tormented his soul? | Quæ illi tunc angustiæ? Quis animi cruciatus? |
| Stans ibi obstupuit, adversis undique rebus angustatus quo se verteret nesciebat. | Standing there, he was stunned; confined by adversities on every side, he did not know where to turn. | Stetit ibi adversis undique rebus angustatus; quo se verteret nesciebat. |
| Patrem namque suum cum fratre peremptum matri nunciaturus advenerat, sed illam quam præ cunctis amabat viventibus iam iamque morituram invenit. | For he had come to announce the slaying of his father with his brother, but in finding her whom he loves before others living, he found her about to die at any moment. | Patrem namque cum fratre peremptum 323 matri nunciaturus advenit; matrem, quam præcipue amaverat, jam jamque morituram invenit: quem primum plangeret ignorabat. |
| Heu heu numquam sola veniunt scandala, nec dolor morbi absque admixtione alia gravida solet raro morbidum attemptare. | Alas, alas. Disasters never come singly, and seldom does the sorrow of disease attack without another serious admixture. |  |
| Iste durus venit nuncius duorum mortem nunciaturus. | This cruel messenger comes to announce the death of two. |  |
| Sed tercium, id est, matrem suam de corpore egredientem aspiciens, quem primum plangeret ignoravit. | But he did not know about the third death, that is, seeing his mother leaving her body, which he lamented first. |  |
| Dulcissime tamen matris abcessus acriore dolore cor illius pungebat, quam ante oculos [fo. 17r.a] suos iamiam pene mortuam obcumbere videbat. | At last, the demise of his dearest mother, whom he was seeing fall towards her death almost at that very moment, pierced his heart with more bitter sorrow. | Dulcissimæ tamen matris abscessus acriore dolore cor illius pungebat, quam ante oculos suos pene mortuam jacere videbat. |
| Inter hec tamen dolorum argumenta eum cura de statu regni sollicitabat, quod revera ob mortem patris noverat pro certo perturbandum. | Amid all these proofs of sorrow, concern regarding the status of the realm was disturbing him, because he knew for certain that unrest would follow the death of his father. | Super hec omnia eum cura de statu regni sollicitabat, quod morte patris perturbandum pro certo noverat. |
| Regina vero cum velud in agonia iacens et a presentibus rapta putaretur, subito viribus resumptis filium alloquitur. | Indeed, the queen, although lying, as thought by those present, rapt in agony, suddenly her strength was restored, and she addressed her son. | Regina, cum velut in agonia iacens a præsentibus rapta putaretur, subito collectis viribus filium alloquitur. |
| Interrogabat eum de patre et de | She asked him about his father and | Interrogatur enim ab ea de |

---

323 AASS: *perempto.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fratre suo edwardo primogenito scilicet suo, quem super omnia diligebat.</th>
<th>his brother Edward, evidently her firstborn, whom she loved above all.</th>
<th>patre et fratre:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ille quidem iuxta interrogantis verba noluit rem veram indicare, ne audita morte mortuorum, et ipsa continuo moreretur.</td>
<td>Indeed, he did not want to reveal the truth by responding to her questions, lest, having heard about the death of the deceased, she might die immediately.</td>
<td>sed ille quod verum erat dicere noluit, ne audita morte illorum, continuo et ipsa moreretur:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eam respondebat eos bene valere, et illa graviter suspirans ait: Scio inquit fili scio.</td>
<td>He replied to her that they fared well, and she, sighing deeply said: I know, my son, I know.</td>
<td>nam respondebat, eos benevalere. At illa graviter suspirans, Scio, inquit, fili, scio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per hanc sanctam crucem et per nostrae consanguinitatis propinquitatem te adiuro, ut quicquid verum nosti edicas.</td>
<td>I adjure you through this Holy Cross and through the bond of our shared blood, that you speak whatever truth to us (me).</td>
<td>Per hanc sanctam crucem, per nostrae consanguinitatis propinquitatem te adiuro, ut quod verum nosti edicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ille autem sic a mater sua adiuratus et coactus, rem sicut gesta erat exposuit.</td>
<td>Coaxed and urged by his mother, he revealed the event just as it had happened.</td>
<td>Ille coactus, rem, sicut erat gesta, exposuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum rex inquit pater meus obsideret castellum de alnewyt, et obsoessos opido affliget et circumhabitantes graviter devastaret, illi qui inclusi errant ab omnia auxilio humano excludebantur:</td>
<td>He said: When the king my father had besieged the castle of Alnwick, he oppressed those in the village and seriously devastated those living around, and those who were enclosed were shut off from all human aid.</td>
<td>JF. 5.25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et cum tam impetuoso exercitu sibi vires agnoscerent deesse, inito consilio nove prodicionis ingenio in hunc modum usi sunt.</td>
<td>And when the men understood that they would fail against such a forceful army, after holding a council, they utilized a new plan of treachery in this way:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unus ante pre ceteris in dolo peritus, fortis robore et audax in opera, se mortis discrimini obtulit, [fo. 17r.b] ut vel se morti traderet aut suos a morte liberaret.</td>
<td>One who was more expert than the others in trickery, strong in vigour and daring in deeds, offered for the trial of death, so that he might either surrender himself to death or free his own from death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam regis adiit exercitum ubi nam esset rex et quis benigne interrogans, requirentibus causam inquisisionis, dixit se opidum regi traditur et in argumentum fidei claves castelli quas in hasta sua coram omnibus portavit oblatur.</td>
<td>For he went to the army of the king, asking kindly where the king was and who he was, and to those asking his purpose, he said that he surrendered the village to the the king and as evidence of good faith, he offered the keys of the castle, which he carried on his spear,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo audito rex doli vescius a tentorio suo inermis exiliens, minus proinde proditori occurrit.</td>
<td>When he heard this, the king, weakened by the trickery, leaping up unarmed and consequently less of a threat to the traitor, ran from his tent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut ille quesita oportunitate regem inermem armatus transfixit, et latibula vicine silve festinanter ingressus est:</td>
<td>Having sought the opportunity, the armed man pierced the unarmed king, and quickly hid in the neighboring wood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbae igitur exercitu, dolorem dolus accumulat, nam primogenitus regis usque ad mortem vulneratur.</td>
<td>Then, with the army having been disturbed, a trick adds to the sorrow, for the firstborn of the king is mortally wounded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His auditis regina paulisper subticuit.</td>
<td>Having heard these things, the queen fell silent a little while.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quid eam in tali casu putares acturam? Quis hominum inquam contra deum non illam crederet vel cogitaret murmuraturam?</td>
<td>What do you think she would do in such a case? Who, I say, would not believe or think that she would mutter against God in such adversities of men?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eodem quippe tempore coniugem amiserat filium perdiderat, semetipsamque infirmitas ad mortem usque cruciaverat.</td>
<td>Certainly, she lost her husband and she had lost her son, and at the same time an illness tormented her up to the point of death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed in omnibus his non peccavit labiis suis, neque stultum quid contra deum locuta est, quin pocius manus et oculos ad celos erigens, in laudem et gratiarum actionem prorupit incens.</td>
<td>But during all these things she did not sin with her lips, nor did she speak foolishly against God, rather raising her hands and her eyes to the heavens, she burst forth in praise and gratitude, saying:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracias et laudes tibi deus omnipotens pater et filius et [fo. 17v.a] spiritus sanctus offerens refero, qui me tantas in exitu huius carceris corporalits angustias voluisti tolerare, sed utinam velis me miseram in passionibus huii corporis et cordis a peccatis alicuius que</td>
<td>Offering, I return thanks and praise to God the Almighty Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, who wished me to bear such agonies at the end of this corporeal prison, but that you might wish wretched me to be healed by these sufferings of the heart and body from all sins which I have done in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudes et gratias tibi Omnipotens Deus refero, Qui me tantas in meo exitu angustias tolerare: hasque tolerantem ab aliquibus peccati maculis, ut spero, voluisti mundare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

324 AASS: cum.
| Senserat illa mortem adesse, moxque orationem illam quam sacerdos post corporis dominici et sanguinis perceptionem solet (dicere) incepit. | She sensed that she was approaching death, and soon she began the prayer which the priest was accustomed (to say) after receiving the body of the Lord. | Senserat illa mortem adesse; moxque orationem, quae post perceptionem Dominici corporis et sanguinis a sacerdote dici solet, incepit: |
| Domine inquiens ihesu christe qui ex voluntate patris cooperante spiritu sancto per mortem tuam mundum vivificasti, libera me: | Saying: Lord, Jesus Christ who, according to the will of the Father, cooperating with the Holy Spirit, through your death you have given life to the world, deliver me: | Domine, inquiens, Jhesu Christe, qui ex voluntate Patris cooperante Spiritu Sancto post mortem Tuam mundum vivificasti, libera me. |
| Ad hoc autem verbum libera me, liberata a vinculis corporis anima ad vere libertatis auctorem Christum quem semper dilexerat migravit, particeps effecta felicitatis eorum, quorum secuta est exempla virtutum. | For at this word, deliver me, her soul was freed from the chains of the body, it moved to Christ, truly the author of liberty, whom she had always loved, and by whom she was made a participant of their happiness, whose example of virtue she had followed. | Cum diceret, Libera me, liberata vinculis corporis anima, ad verae libertatis, quem semper dilexerat, auctorem Christum migravit; particeps effecta eorum felicitatis, quorum, secuta est exempla virtutis. |
| Tanta enim cum tranquillitate tanta cum quiete illius fuit exitus de corpore, ut ad eternæ quietis et pacis regionem animam illam migrasse dubium esse non debeat. | Her passing was so tranquil and quiet that it should not be doubted that her spirit passed over to the place of eternal rest and peace. | Tanta enim cum tranquillitate, tanta cum quiete illius fuerat exitus, ut, ad æternæ quietis et pacis regionem animam illam migrasse dubium esse non debeat. |
| Et quod mirum est faciem eius que more moriencium tota in morte palluerat, ita post mortem rubor cum candore permixtus perfuderat, ut non mortuam sed sopitam credere possemus. | And what marvelous is that her face, which had paled in the manner of death, when in death was suffused with red and white mingled, so that we were able to believe she was not dead, but slept. | Et quod mirum est, faciem ejus, quæ more morientium tota in morte palluerat, ita post mortem rubor cum candore permixtus perfuderat, ut non mortua, sed dormiens credi potuisset. |
| Igitur corpus ipsius honorabiliter involutum ut reginam decebat ad ecclesiam sancta trinitatis quam ipsa contruxerat deportavimus, ibique sicut ipsa ante iusserat contra altare et sancte crucis [fo. 17v.b] venerabile signum quod ipsa ibi erexerat tradidimus sepulture. | So, her body was shrouded honorably as was appropriate for a queen, and we carried it to the church of the Holy Trinity, which she had built, and there, just as she herself had previously ordered, we surrendered it to the tomb, opposite the altar and the venerable sign of the Holy Cross, which she herself had erected. | Igitur corpus ipsius honorabiliter, ut reginam decebat, involutum, ad Sanctæ Trinitatis, quam ipsa construxerat, ecclesiam deportavimus: ibique, sicut ipsa jussisset, contra altare et sanctæ crucis (quod ibidem erexerat) venerabile signum, sepulture tradidimus. |
| Atque ita corpus eius apud | And so her body rests near | Atque ita corpus ejus illo in |
| dunfermlyn requiescit, ubi illud in vigiliis, oracionibus, lacremis genuum flexionibus affligere consueverat ad laudem et gloriam ihesu christi domini nostri, qui cum deo patre vivit et gloriat in unitatis spiritus sancti deus per omnia secula seculorum. Amen. | Dunfermline, where she was accustomed to burden herself in vigils, prayers, tears, and kneeling, to the glory and praise of our Lord, Jesus Christ, who lives with God, the Father, and is glorified in unity of the Holy Spirit forever and ever, Amen. | loco nunc requiescit, ubi illud in vigiliis, orationibus, lacrymarum fusionibus, genuum flexionibus, affligere consuevit. Explicit Translatio Sanctæ Margaretæ Scottorum reginæ. Incipit prologus in Vita Sancti Niniani episcope. |
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