

**From reformed barbarian to “saint-king”: literary portrayals of King  
Malcolm III Canmore (r. 1058-93) in Scottish historical narratives, c. 1100-  
1449**

**by**

**Marian Toledo Candelaria**

**A Thesis  
presented to  
The University of Guelph**

**In partial fulfilment of requirements  
for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
History**

**Guelph, Ontario, Canada**

**© Marian Toledo Candelaria, May, 2018**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **From reformed barbarian to “saint-king”: literary portrayals of King Malcolm III Canmore (r. 1058-93) in Scottish historical narratives, c. 1100- 1449**

**Marian Toledo Candelaria**

**University of Guelph, 2018**

**Advisor:**

**Professor Elizabeth Ewan**

This dissertation examines the historiographical evolution of the literary portrayal of King Malcolm III Canmore (r. 1058-93) in the main historical narratives produced in Scotland between c. 1100 and 1449. The study considers how fundamental King Malcolm’s portrayal was to new and developing notions of Scottish kingship, sovereignty and identity, focusing on the underlying political developments that caused his portrayal to be manipulated and amended during the central and late medieval periods. It examines how King Malcolm went from being considered a barbaric king of Scots reformed by the influence of his second wife, Saint Margaret of Scotland (d. 1093), to the Scottish prince exiled in England by Macbeth (r. 1040-1057/8). It identifies three key developmental stages in the portrayal of King Malcolm and ties their development to contemporary political and dynastic circumstances. King Malcolm’s portrayal evolved because of a need to assert the sovereignty of the Scottish crown in light of internal threats to dynastic hegemony and external threats against regnal independence. After the Scottish Wars of Independence of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, historians were greatly focused on the manner in which Malcolm obtained his throne in order to assert the kingdom’s independence. Lastly, Malcolm was constantly refashioned in Scottish historical narratives to reflect changing notions of kingship and identity in the medieval period in Scotland.

## Acknowledgements

The road to completing this research has been a long one—at least ten years in the making, since my master’s degree—and during this time I have benefitted from the generosity and guidance of colleagues, friends, family, and scholars. The first acknowledgement of gratitude is to my supervisor, Elizabeth Ewan, who has provided unconditional support since I was an applicant at Guelph. My committee members, James E. Fraser and R. Andrew McDonald, have also shown enthusiasm for this project since I met them. Chris Nighman and Steve Boardman provided excellent feedback on my thesis, which has improved the quality of its contents. Lastly, I would like to thank Sarah Salih, from King’s College London, who supervised my master’s dissertation and who introduced me to the wonderful world of medieval studies.

Doctoral studies are often difficult because they tend to be isolating. However, I have found the process much more bearable thanks to my Guelph friends: Shayna Devlin, Mary Anne Gonzales, Chelsea Hartlen, Lisa Baer, Richard Griffin, Amy Poole, Christina Moss, Sierra Dye, Alice Glaze, Heather Parker, Katie McCullough, Marjorie Hopkins, Anne Vermeyden, and Jacqui McIsaac. Shayna, Mary Anne, and Chelsea are constant shoulders to lean on. Yet I have also made friends during my travels that have provided so much support and good vibes from abroad: Kylie Murray (who has given me considerable guidance, academia-wise), Kate Ash-Irisarri, Meg Oldman, Melissa Coll-Smith, Lucy Hinnie; Claire Harrill (who sent me a copy of her thesis and has provided me so many laughs!); Felicity Candy and Katie Har (my lovely friends from King’s!). A very special thank you goes to three of my closest friends: Diana Rodríguez (my best friend since third grade), Iva Yates, and José E. Toledo Vicéns. Despite being far away from each other, you are always in my heart.

Conversations with several Scottish medievalists have improved the quality of my research and arguments. I want to thank especially Alice Taylor, Lucinda Dean, Simon Taylor, Dauvit Broun, and Cynthia J. Neville for meeting with me during my research trip to Scotland. Likewise, I would like to thank the following organizations for their support: Guelph Centre for Scottish Studies and the Scottish Studies Foundation, St Andrews Society of Montréal, St Andrews Society of Toronto, and the Order of Alba. Additionally, I would like to thank the National Library of Scotland, the National Records of Scotland, the British Library, and Special Collections at the University of St Andrews Library for allowing me to conduct research of their collections, particularly of the different manuscripts of Andrew of Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl* and the Dunfermline Compilation.

Yet the most important support I have received has come from my family in Puerto Rico. Leaving one's family behind is always a difficult thing to do, but the links of love and affection between my family and me are unbreakable. I have the strongest, most supportive family I know. Thank you to my mother, Miriam; my sisters Giovanna, Claritza, and Frances; my brother-in-law Angel Luis; and my grandparents, Guillermo and Olga, for understanding the reasons why I left home to pursue further studies. Sadly, my father, Neftalí Toledo, passed away several weeks before I finished my master's degree, and he was never able to see me graduate, much less embark on my doctoral studies. But my mother told me recently that, when I initially left for England to study fashion, my father told her that he would have greatly preferred I did a PhD in History, because he believed I could do it. I did not know about this conversation until nearly finishing my PhD, but I suppose that my father did know me best.

This thesis is, therefore, dedicated to his memory.

## Table of Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>ABSTRACT .....</b>  | <b>II</b>  |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>  | <b>III</b> |
| <b>INTRODUCTION: MALCOLM III CANMORE IN MEDIEVAL SCOTTISH HISTORIOGRAPHY .....</b>   | <b>1</b>   |
| <i>Historiography.....</i>   | <i>4</i>   |
| <i>Notes on scope and choice of historical narrative material.....</i>   | <i>11</i>  |
| <i>Chapter Organization and Methodology.....</i>   | <i>14</i>  |
| <i>Contributions to scholarship on medieval Scotland.....</i>  | <i>19</i>  |
| <b>CHAPTER 1. A BARBARIAN REFORMED: MALCOLM III IN TURGOT'S <i>LIFE OF SAINT MARGARET</i> (1100 X 07), ÆLRED OF RIEVAULX'S <i>GENEALOGIA</i> (1153-4), AND THE <i>CHRONICLE OF MELROSE</i> (1173 X 4).....</b> | <b>21</b>  |
| <i>Introduction .....</i>  | <i>21</i>  |
| <i>Turgot's Life of St Margaret, Queen of Scots (1100 x 07) .....</i>  | <i>25</i>  |
| <i>Ælred of Rievaulx's Genealogia Regum Anglorum (1153 x 4).....</i>   | <i>43</i>  |
| <i>Chronicle of Melrose Abbey, first phase (1173 x 4).....</i>   | <i>51</i>  |
| <i>Conclusion .....</i>  | <i>66</i>  |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: MALCOLM III IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY: <i>CHRONICLE OF MELROSE</i>, DUNFERMLINE COMPILATION AND THE <i>GESTA ANNALIA I</i> .....</b>   | <b>69</b>  |
| <i>Introduction .....</i>  | <i>69</i>  |
| <i>Chronicle of Melrose Abbey, part 2 (ca. 1249 x 1285) .....</i>  | <i>73</i>  |
| <i>The Dunfermline Compilation (c. 1249-1286) .....</i>  | <i>81</i>  |
| <i>Gesta Annalia I (c. 1285) .....</i>   | <i>110</i> |
| <i>Conclusion .....</i>  | <i>115</i> |
| <b>CHAPTER 3: MALCOLM CANMORE IN JOHN OF FORDUN'S <i>CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM</i> (CA. 1370S).....</b>   | <b>118</b> |
| <i>Introduction .....</i>  | <i>118</i> |
| <i>Fordun's Sources.....</i>   | <i>123</i> |
| <i>Fordun's methodology.....</i>   | <i>125</i> |
| <i>Malcolm's virtue and charity: Fordun's use of the Gesta Annalia I.....</i>  | <i>129</i> |
| <i>Malcolm, Edgar Ætheling and the Normans: Fordun's use of the Gesta Regum Anglorum.....</i>  | <i>138</i> |
| <i>Macbeth the tyrant and Macduff the kingmaker: legitimizing Malcolm's bid to the throne.....</i>   | <i>143</i> |
| <i>Conclusion .....</i>  | <i>158</i> |
| <b>CHAPTER 4. MALCOLM CANMORE IN ANDREW OF WYNTOUN'S <i>ORYGYNALE CRONIKYL</i> (CA. 1408 X 1424).....</b>  | <b>160</b> |
| <i>Introduction .....</i>  | <i>160</i> |
| <i>Wyntoun's sources.....</i>  | <i>164</i> |
| <i>Manuscripts, Dating and Chapter Headings: The Cronikyl in Context.....</i>  | <i>169</i> |
| <i>Additional source(s) about Macduff of Fife .....</i>  | <i>174</i> |
| <i>Sir John Wemyss and the creation of the Orygynale Cronikyl.....</i>   | <i>181</i> |
| <i>The Albany-Rothesay conflict as a model for the Macbeth-Duncan conflict.....</i>  | <i>182</i> |
| <i>Malcolm Canmore, Illegitimacy, and Politics in the Orygynale Cronikyl.....</i>  | <i>197</i> |
| <i>Conclusion .....</i>  | <i>206</i> |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 5: MALCOLM CANMORE IN WALTER BOWER'S <i>SCOTICHRONICON</i> (1440S)</b>   | <b>208</b> |
| <i>Introduction</i> .....   | 208        |
| <i>Bower's use of the Chronica gentis Scotorum and other sources</i> .....  | 211        |
| <i>Malcolm Canmore and good kingship</i> .....  | 213        |
| <i>Malcolm, the "saint"</i> .....   | 221        |
| <i>Conclusion</i> .....   | 226        |
| <b>CONCLUSION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MALCOLM III CANMORE TO SCOTTISH HISTORIOGRAPHY</b> .....   | <b>228</b> |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....   | <b>237</b> |
| <b>PRIMARY SOURCES: PRINTED</b> .....   | <b>237</b> |
| <b>PRIMARY SOURCES: WEBSITES</b> .....  | <b>239</b> |
| <b>SECONDARY SOURCES: UNPUBLISHED PH.D. THESES</b> .....  | <b>239</b> |
| <b>SECONDARY SOURCES: PRINTED AND WEBSITES</b> .....  | <b>240</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A: BRITISH LIBRARY FAUSTINA B. IX: THE <i>CHRONICLE OF MELROSE</i>, TEXT BY SCRIBE 3 (1173 X 4)</b> .....                               | <b>249</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B: BRITISH LIBRARY FAUSTINA B. IX: THE <i>CHRONICLE OF MELROSE</i>, WITH THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ADDITIONS BY SCRIBES 27 AND 28</b> .....    | <b>251</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX C: DUNFERMLINE COMPILATION, FOS. 23R-25R</b> .....  | <b>253</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX D: COMPARISON OF CHAPTER ORDER IN THE <i>GESTA ANNALIA</i> I AND THE <i>CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM</i></b> .....                          | <b>255</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX E: CHANGES MADE TO THE <i>GESTA ANNALIA</i> I IN JOHN OF FORDUN'S <i>CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM</i>, CHAPTERS 9-16 (SELECTIONS)</b> ..... | <b>256</b> |

## INTRODUCTION: MALCOLM III CANMORE IN MEDIEVAL SCOTTISH HISTORIOGRAPHY

Malcolm III's reign (r. 1058-93) is well known because of two popular, but disparate, portrayals. King Malcolm is often known as the adoring but brutish husband of Saint Margaret of Scotland (d. 1093), whose life and miracles were recorded by her confessor, Turgot of Durham, bishop of St Andrews, shortly after her death.<sup>1</sup> King Malcolm is also known as the ferocious monarch who ruled Scotland when William the Conqueror landed in England in 1066; it was Malcolm who led five Scottish military expeditions into Northumbria that resulted in widespread devastation, pillage, and in deteriorating Scoto-Norman relations. Malcolm's devastation of Northumbria resulted in William's invasion of Scotland in 1072, which forced Malcolm to "submit" to William at Abernethy, and later in the foundation of Newcastle upon Tyne in 1080 by Robert Curthose, William the Conqueror's oldest son.<sup>2</sup>

But another image of Malcolm III prevails in popular consciousness and in Scottish historiography: that of the young prince of Cumbria exiled from Scotland by the tyrant Macbeth (r. 1040-58), raised in England at the court of Saint Edward the Confessor, and restored to his

---

<sup>1</sup> Turgot, *Life of St. Margaret Queen of Scotland*, ed. William Forbes-Leith (Edinburgh: W. Paterson, 1884), <http://archive.org/details/lifeofstmargaret00turguoft>.

<sup>2</sup> For twelfth-century Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Saxon sources pertinent to events during Malcolm's kingship, see Alan Orr Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers, A.D. 500 to 1286*, Paul Watkins Medieval Studies (London: D. Nutt, 1908). Reprinted (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1991), 85-113; Dorothy Whitelock, David C. Douglas, and Susie I. Tucker, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961); William (of Malmesbury), *William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England: From the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen. With Notes and Illustrations* (H. G. Bohn, 1847); Ordericus Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy*, trans. Thomas Forester, vol. III (London: H. G. Bohn, 1854); John Hodgson Hinde, ed., *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia: Historia Regum. Eadem Historia Ad Quintum et Vicesimum Annum Continuata, per Joannem Hagulstadensem. Accedunt Varia*, Surtees Society 51 (Edinburgh, 1865). G. W. S. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003); G. W. S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century* (Edinburgh University Press, 2003); A. A. M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002); Richard Oram, *David I: The King Who Made Scotland* (Stroud: History, 2008); and David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: The Penguin History of Britain 1066-1284* (Penguin (Non-Classics), 2005), 119-32.

throne through the help of Siward of Northumbria and Macduff of Fife. This latter image was popularized in William Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1607), written to be performed in front of James VI of Scotland/I of England, the first Stuart monarch of both countries.<sup>3</sup> The story of Macbeth's descent into tyranny and corruption, fueled by the prophecy of three witches and the ambition of his wife, has captivated readers since the seventeenth century; yet the story of Macbeth itself made its first appearance in John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, written (or compiled) in the latter part of the fourteenth century.<sup>4</sup> Malcolm III, as Shakespeare's Malcolm Canmore, is a minor character in the play but his historical counterpart was central to the construction of a Scottish kingship that was independent and stable. The paucity of eleventh-century Scottish sources, the interest in Saint Margaret as patroness of Scotland and dynastic founder, and the popularity of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* are the main factors that have limited historical analysis of how Malcolm's kingship and persona were portrayed in medieval Scottish historical narratives. Furthermore, the disparity between the image of Malcolm, the husband of Saint Margaret, and Malcolm, the prince of Cumbria exiled in England, deserves closer scrutiny. There has been, to date, no complete study of literary portrayals of Malcolm III. By focusing on the evolution of his portrayal in medieval historical narratives, this research aims to fill this historiographical gap.

Therefore, this thesis aims to explore how medieval Scottish historians viewed Malcolm III throughout the central and late Middle Ages and why. The changes in the historiographical evolution of King Malcolm's portrayal will be studied in their appropriate political and literary

---

<sup>3</sup> Edward J. Cowan, "The Historical MacBeth," in *Moray: Province and People*, ed. W. David H. Sellar (Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1993), 117–41.

<sup>4</sup> John Fordun, *Johannis de Fordun Chronica gentis Scotorum*, ed. W. F. (William Forbes) Skene (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871); and John of Fordun, *John of Fordun's Chronicle of the Scottish Nation*, ed. W. F. (William Forbes) Skene, trans. Felix James Henry Skene (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872). The Latin version will be cited as *Chronica* and the English translation as *Chronicle*. Dauvit Broun's analysis of the source?



contexts. By showing how specific political events inspired changes to the way Malcolm was portrayed in different Scottish historical narratives, this study will shed light on the ways medieval Scottish historians manipulated the portrayal of Malcolm III to fulfill specific political and literary needs. Is it easy to draw a straight line between a literary account and an immediate political context? This thesis will examine King Malcolm's portrayals in the following Scottish historical narratives: Turgot of Durham's *Life of Saint Margaret, Queen of Scots*; Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia regum Anglorum*; The *Chronicle of Melrose*; the Dunfermline Compilation; John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*; Andrew of Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl*; and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*. The historical narratives chosen for this study contain the most emblematic accounts of Malcolm III, which have been repeated throughout centuries. However, the aim of this study is not to search for the "real" Malcolm III, but to reveal how medieval interpretations of Malcolm III's character and kingship have shaped our understanding of eleventh-century Scotland, and more crucially, how they have shaped our understanding of Malcolm III himself.

By examining the appearance of Malcolm's portrayals in chronological order, it is possible to identify the turning points in the evolution of Malcolm's historiographical portrayals. As a result, this study identifies three major turning points in Malcolm's images: the earliest one corresponds to the twelfth century, from c. 1100 to c. 1173 x 4; the second one corresponds to the long thirteenth century and the last one begins in the fourteenth century and culminates c. 1449. Thus, this thesis will examine the development of the literary portrayal of Malcolm III for a span of nearly 350 years to identify the evolutionary stages in the portrayal of this king of Scots, showing how it changed over time, and how these changes represented medieval Scots' ideas of their own past, of kingship, and of identity.

## Historiography

Before assessing the historiographical evolution of portrayals of King Malcolm in Scottish sources, it is useful to present a timeline of the political events that occurred during his kingship. Most of the sources for Malcolm's reign are Irish and English annals, such as the *Annals of Ulster*, the *Annals of Tigernach*, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D*; another important annalistic source is the *Chronica* by the Irish monk Marianus Scotus, written in Mainz in the 1070s.<sup>5</sup> Two important sources were written in Scotland during the reign of Malcolm III: the *Prophecy of Berchán* and the *Duan Albanach*.<sup>6</sup> Using these sources, the events of Malcolm's kingship can be summarized as follows. Malcolm became king of Scots in 1058 after killing King Macbeth and his stepson King Lulach in separate combats.<sup>7</sup> In both the *Annals of Ulster*

---

<sup>5</sup> Gearóid Mac Niocaill, trans., "Annals of Ulster," CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010, <https://celt.ucc.ie/index.html> (hereafter cited as *AU*); Gearóid Mac Niocaill, trans., "Annals of Tigernach," CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010, <https://celt.ucc.ie/published/T100002A.html> (hereafter cited as *ATig*) *ASC D*, 1054 AD, 1057 AD, 1066 AD, 1067 AD, 1072 AD, 1074 AD, 1078 AD; for Marianus Scotus, see Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 86; and Marianus Scotus, *Mariani Scoti, poetae, mathematici, philosophi et theologi eximii, monachi Fuldensis, Historici Probatissimi, Chronica* (Basil: Apud Ioannem Oporinum, n.d.), 1057 AD; and for a biography of Marianus Scotus and the dating of the *Chronica*, see C.L. Kingsford, "Marianus Scotus [Moelbrigte] (1028–1082), Benedictine Monk and Chronicler," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18057;jsessionid=60755236C14CA09D3CE0CF45581DA587>.

<sup>6</sup> The *Prophecy of Berchán* was written by three authors across three centuries: the second and third authors were responsible for the material during Malcolm III's kingship. According to Benjamin Hudson, the second author died sometime during Malcolm's reign before his marriage to Saint Margaret ca. 1067–70, and the third author wrote during the reign of Donald III (r. 1094–7), Malcolm's brother. For dating of the *Duan Albanach* and its contents, see Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 45–9, where she argues that the *DA* took information from a DalRiata king-list and was extended to include the reign of Malcolm III, thus it was composed before his death in 1093. See Benjamin T. Hudson, *Prophecy of Berchán: Irish and Scottish High-Kings of the Early Middle Ages* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996); "The Irish Version of the *Historia Britonum* of Nennius. Appendix 1: IV. *Duan Albanach*," CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010, <https://celt.ucc.ie/published/T100028/text033.html>. Cited from here onwards as *DA*; and Dauvit Broun, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, *Studies in Celtic History* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1999), 171.

<sup>7</sup> *ATig*, 1058.1 (for Lulach's death) and 1058.5 (for Macbeth's death); *AU*, 1058.2 (for Lulach's death) and 1058.6 (for Macbeth's death); Scotus, *Chronica*, 1057 AD, in Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 86. Note that the information on Macbeth's death found in Marianus Scotus is written in the margins of MS 1 of the *Chronica*. The main body of the text reads: "Malcolm, son of Duncan, governed Scotland." See fn. 2.

and the *Annals of Tigernach*, the scribes recorded Lulach's death before Macbeth's, which has prompted Alex Woolf to argue that this order was not a scribal error, but the correct chronological order of events.<sup>8</sup> However, other sources such as the *Duan Albanach*, *Prophecy of Berchán*, and several Scottish king-lists suggest that Malcolm killed Macbeth first and then killed Lulach after the latter was made king of Scots.<sup>9</sup>

We hear little about Malcolm's reign in the 1060s in contemporary sources, but the *Orkneyinga Saga*, written during the thirteenth century, noted that Malcolm was married to a certain Ingibjorg, possibly the daughter of Earl Thorfinn "the Mighty" of Orkney. According to the saga, Ingibjorg was the mother of Earls Paul and Erlend of Orkney, Earl Thorfinn's sons; she was also the mother of Malcolm's son Duncan (future Duncan II), who is described in the thirteenth-century Dunfermline Compilation as "nothus."<sup>10</sup> However, it seems that Malcolm had other children with Ingibjorg: the *Annals of Ulster* mentioned that in 1085, Malcolm's son, Donald, died.<sup>11</sup> Thus, Malcolm and Ingibjorg had at least two sons that appeared in contemporary records (Duncan and Donald), and Duncan succeeded his father as king of Scots in 1094.

Information about Malcolm's relationship with England after the Norman Invasion was recorded by these sources and, in the twelfth century, by Symeon of Durham. The *Historia*

---

<sup>8</sup> Alex Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba, 789-1070* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 264.

<sup>9</sup> See *DA*, #25-26; and *DA*, in Anderson, *Early Sources*, 602. The original poem entry is not dated. Other king-lists, such as the *Verse Chronicle*, and king-list group X, list Macbeth's kingship first, followed by Lulach's. See Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 49 (for group X), 276 (Regnal List F), 268 (Regnal List D), 284 (Regnal List I), 288-9 (Regnal List K; only list to refer to Malcolm as "Kenmour"). For the *Verse Chronicle*, see William F. Skene, *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, and Other Early Memorials of Scottish History*. (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1867).

<sup>10</sup> Joseph Anderson, ed., *The Orkneyinga Saga*, trans. Jón A. Hjaltalín and Gilbert Goudie (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1873), 45-6. The Dunfermline Compilation is found in Biblioteca Palacio Real, Madrid II/2097, fo. 23r. See also Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 42.

<sup>11</sup> *AU*, 1085.2. The *AU* does not indicate cause of death.

*regum*, attributed to Symeon, recorded that Malcolm invaded Northumbria on five occasions: 1061, 1069-70, 1079, 1091, and 1093.<sup>12</sup> The *ASC D* mentioned that Earl Tostig of Northumbria, brother to King Harold Godwineson of England, went to Malcolm's court in 1066 after Earl Edwin drove him from his land.<sup>13</sup> In 1057, Edward the Exile arrived in England from Hungary with his family: his wife Agatha, their teenage son Edgar Ætheling and their older daughters, Margaret (the future Saint Margaret of Scotland) and Christina.<sup>14</sup> In 1067, Edgar Ætheling, son of Edward the Exile, heir to the English throne, arrived at Malcolm's court in Scotland, where, the *ASC D* narrated, Malcolm convinced Edgar to give him Margaret's hand in marriage.<sup>15</sup> Malcolm and Margaret had eight children: Edward, Edmund, Edgar (r. 1097-1107), Alexander (r. 1107-1124), Æthelred, and David (r. 1124-53), Edith (styled Matilda), queen consort of Henry I of England, and Mary, countess of Boulogne.

Both the *ASC D* and the *Annals of Ulster* noted that King William of England invaded Scotland in 1072, forcing Malcolm to make peace with the Normans. While the *ASC* only mentioned that William took Scottish hostages with him to England, the *Annals of Ulster* specified that William took Malcolm's son as a hostage.<sup>16</sup> The *ASC D*, which is interested in Saint Margaret, recorded more interactions between Edgar and Malcolm: in 1074, Edgar arrived in Scotland from Flanders, where Malcolm and Margaret received him and provided him with

---

<sup>12</sup> Anderson, *Early Sources*, 86, 89-92, 100-2, 105-6, 109-113; *ASC E*, 1079 AD and 1093 AD.

<sup>13</sup> *ASC D*, 1066 AD.

<sup>14</sup> *ASC D*

<sup>15</sup> *ASC D*, 1067 AD.

<sup>16</sup> *ASC D*, 1072 AD; and *AU*, 1072.8. The *ASC E*, which is the only manuscript of the *ASC* that records events after 1080, specified that it was Duncan who was held hostage in England: "he was at King William's [Rufus] court as his father had given him as a hostage to our king's father and so he remained there." Later, John (Florence) of Worcester stated that Robert Curthose, King William's oldest son, liberated "Duncan, son of Malcolm, king of Scots" from imprisonment. See *ASC E*, 1093 AD; and Anderson, *Early Sources*, 104 for 1087 AD (Florence of Worcester).

many gifts.<sup>17</sup> After the 1070s, the sources provide little information about Malcolm's reign. The *Historia Regum*, attributed to Symeon of Durham, narrated that in August 1093, Malcolm was present at the foundation ceremony of Durham Cathedral, along with William of St Calais, bishop of Durham, and Turgot, prior of Durham and author of the *Life of Saint Margaret*.<sup>18</sup> Later in November of the same year, Malcolm and his oldest son by Margaret, Edward, died in Alnwick, Northumbria.<sup>19</sup> Later sources, such as the *Life of Saint Margaret* and later, the Dunfermline *Vita*, elaborate on the causes of Malcolm's death; these causes will be examined in Chapter 1 and 2, respectively. Thus, contemporary sources that recorded Malcolm's kingship are mostly concerned with Anglo-Scottish and Scoto-Norman relations. They do not attest to Malcolm's supposed English upbringing, or to any events that are more associated with later medieval Scottish historical accounts of Malcolm's life.

Because of the lack of information found in contemporary sources, several historians have challenged established assumptions about Malcolm's reign and, indeed, about Malcolm's importance in Scottish historiography. Historians such as Dauvit Broun, A.A.M. Duncan, Alex Woolf and, most recently, Alice Taylor, have questioned the historical veracity of later medieval narratives about the earlier medieval Scottish past.<sup>20</sup> They have recognized the importance of

---

<sup>17</sup> ASC D, 1074 AD.

<sup>18</sup> Symeon of Durham, *Symeon of Durham's History of the Kings of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson, Church Historians of England (Lampeter: Wales: Llanerch Publishers, 1858), 1093 AD, 159. Cited from here onwards as Durham, *HR* (trans.). However, the *HR* was compiled sometime before 1129. For the attribution of the *Historia Regum Anglorum* to Symeon of Durham, see Antonia Grandsen, *Historical Writing in England, c.550- c.1307*, vol. I, 2 vols. (London: Routledge, 1997), 125-6.

<sup>19</sup> AU, 1093.5; ATig., 1093.4; ASC E, 1093 AD.

<sup>20</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292*; Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*; Alice Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland: The Dunfermline Compilation," *Historical Research* 83, no. 220 (May 1, 2010): 228–52, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2281.2009.00496.x>; and Alice Taylor, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124-1290* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

acknowledging how textual transmission and the survival of Scottish historical sources have conditioned the way we understand eleventh-century Scotland, which has important repercussions for how we understand Malcolm III. Dauvit Broun's seminal work on the Scottish origin-myth transmitted in John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum* (1370s) has transformed our understanding of Scottish historiography, challenging assumptions that the Scottish origin-myth transmitted by Fordun was of his own invention.<sup>21</sup> In fact, Broun argues, Fordun's account represented the merging of several accounts of the Scottish origin-myth, which were amended and synthesized between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Some of Broun's conclusions on the transmission of Scottish king-lists in the thirteenth century alluded to a desire by Scottish *literati* to portray Malcolm as a direct descendant of Kenneth MacAlpin, emphasizing "Máel Coluim Cenn Mór as the successor of Pictish kings."<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, historical accounts and king-lists that positioned Malcolm and his wife, Saint Margaret, as dynastic founders should be understood as propagandistic attempts at cementing the legitimacy of the claims of Malcolm and Margaret's descendants to the Scottish throne. While in *Irish Identity* Broun argued that Scottish chroniclers identified Ireland as the home of the Scots in the medieval period, leading to a self-identification with Ireland as a source of regnal identity, he recognized the existence of parallel identities, represented by the introduction of Anglo-Saxon royal blood that resulted from Malcolm and Saint Margaret's union.<sup>23</sup> Chroniclers, therefore, used Malcolm and Margaret's reign to provide a "tighter dynastic structure" for the Scottish kingship, leading to "the likelihood that a focus on Máel Coluim and Margaret as dynastic founders allowed kings of Scots to be portrayed as successors to a prestigious line of English kings—a view expressed for instance by

---

<sup>21</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*.

<sup>22</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 168.

<sup>23</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 10 and 196.

Adam of Dryburgh writing in 1180.”<sup>24</sup> Dauvit Broun recognized the use of Malcolm III’s kingship as a way to create alternative models of Scottish kingship and identity in medieval historiography.

The publication of the *Irish Identity of the Kingdom of Scots* in 1997 changed the way Scottish medievalists understand Scottish historiography and textual transmission. Scrutiny of the portrayal of Malcolm III in chronicles continued in A.A.M. Duncan’s *The Kingship of the Scots*, published in 2002. Duncan questioned the historical veracity of some elements of the Shakespearean narrative on Macbeth, particularly Malcolm’s supposed upbringing at the court of Edward the Confessor, king of England (r. 1046-1066). Basing his analysis on an examination of the account of Malcolm’s kingship in the *Orkneyinga Saga*, Duncan argued that Malcolm’s marriage to Ingibjorg of Orkney suggests that Malcolm was raised in Orkney, not in England.<sup>25</sup> Building on Duncan’s arguments, Alex Woolf re-examined the account of Macbeth’s kingship in *From Pictland to Alba* (2007). Woolf also examined the accounts of the *Orkneyinga Saga* and accounts of the Battle of Lumphanan of 1057 AD to conclude that it is possible that Malcolm used an Orcadian army to battle Macbeth and that he came with the army from the north, not from the south as if he were coming from England.<sup>26</sup> Duncan and Woolf reject the idea that Malcolm’s exile in England was a historical fact; instead, they considered this suggestion to be historiographical fabrication.

Duncan also questioned the identification of Malcolm, “son of the king of the Cumbrians,” with Malcolm III in Fordun’s *Chronica*. The source of the confusion seems to have been, according to Duncan, William of Malmesbury’s transmission of John of Worcester’s

---

<sup>24</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 196.

<sup>25</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 42.

<sup>26</sup> Alex Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba, 789-1070* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 265-9.

account of the Battle of 1054 between Siward of Northumbria and Macbeth.<sup>27</sup> The *Kingship of the Scots* also suggested that the account of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne, aided by Siward and by Macduff, was a literary fiction. Duncan further suggested that both Fordun and Andrew of Wyntoun, author of the *Orygynale Cronikyl* (c. 1408 x 24) used the same "Macbeth romance" as a source for their account of Malcolm's return to Scotland and that this anonymous saga first appeared during the reign of Alexander II (r. 1214-49).<sup>28</sup> The *Kingship of the Scots* and *From Pictland to Alba* represent an important re-examination of Malcolm's kingship from a historiographical perspective, departing from long-held assumptions that the version of events found in Scottish and English chronicles is based on historical facts.

More recent studies of the Scottish historical sources of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries help us better understand how Malcolm was portrayed in the medieval period. Catherine Keene and Alice Taylor have both examined the Dunfermline Compilation, a fifteenth-century Scottish manuscript held at the Biblioteca del Palacio Real of Madrid (II. 2097) that has shed light on additional stories about Malcolm's kingship. The Dunfermline Compilation has a unique account of Turgot's *Life of Saint Margaret* that contains several stories pertaining to Malcolm's provision of law and his supposed childhood in England. Catherine Keene argued in an article published in *Arthuriana* in 2009 that this version of the *Life of Saint Margaret* was the original version written by Turgot and that Malcolm's death in the narrative

---

<sup>27</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 40-1. Richard Oram's account of Malcolm's kingship also suggests that the Cumbrian Malcolm and Malcolm III were different men. See Oram, *David I*, 20-1.

<sup>28</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 36-7. Duncan follows F. J. Amours (the editor of Andrew of Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl*) in understanding Wyntoun's account of Macbeth, Duncan and Malcolm as representing the earliest and fullest account of this narrative; they both also argued that Fordun copied a shorter version of the narrative copied by Wyntoun. See "Introduction," in Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun Printed on Parallel Pages from the Cottonian and Wemyss Mss., with the Variants of the Other Texts*, ed. F. J. Amours, Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh: Printed for the Society by W. Blackwood and sons, 1903), I, 65, no. 1970.



was devised to mimic the death of Anglo-Saxon martyr-kings.<sup>29</sup> However, in an article published in the *Scottish Historical Review* (2011), Alice Taylor concluded that the interpolations to the Dunfermline *Vita* of Saint Margaret were added sometime between 1154 and 1286.<sup>30</sup> Taylor further argued that the Dunfermline Compilation was put together between 1249 and 1286, during the reign of Alexander III, and served to prove Alexander's sovereignty as a ruler in light of English demands of regnal submission. Claire Harrill's examination of the historiographical portrayals of Saint Margaret of Scotland (2016) also acknowledged the Dunfermline Compilation as originating in the thirteenth century; furthermore, Harrill's analysis of Turgot's *Life of Saint Margaret* concluded that "Turgot's picture of Malcolm is largely unconvincing."<sup>31</sup> Recent historiography on eleventh-century kingship has revealed the necessity to scrutinize the accounts of the Scottish past found in medieval chronicles and, in particular, to question the historical accuracy of portrayals of Malcolm III in these sources.

### **Notes on scope and choice of historical narrative material**

As the previous studies have shown, the history of the transmission of Scottish chronicle material, especially the loss of many sources at different points during the medieval period, has complicated the analysis of the portrayal of Malcolm III in medieval Scottish historiography. Furthermore, the earliest narrative portrayals are found in twelfth-century English-produced chronicles that followed a Northumbrian perspective and/or historiographical tradition. Twelfth-century Anglo-Norman chroniclers were also influenced by the emergence of new

---

<sup>29</sup> Catherine Keene, "The Dunfermline 'Vita' of St. Margaret of Scotland: Hagiography as an Articulation of Hereditary Rights," *Arthuriana* 19, no. 3 (October 1, 2009): 43–61.

<sup>30</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland," 236.

<sup>31</sup> Claire Louise Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood: Literary Representations of St Margaret of Scotland in England and Scotland from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century" (University of Birmingham, 2016), 4.

historiographical trends, such as the vilification of the Celtic peoples of Britain.<sup>32</sup> While there are several Scottish sources from the eleventh and twelfth centuries that contain references to Malcolm III, they are mostly in the form of either verse or king-lists, not narrative historical accounts.<sup>33</sup> For these reasons, this study's analysis of Scottish historiography includes historical narratives that were produced in England by Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman historians associated with the kings of Scots during the long twelfth century in either a personal or politico-religious capacity. Works such as Turgot's *Life of Saint Margaret*, Ælred's *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, and the *Chronicle of Melrose* reveal a Northumbrian perspective; the inclusion of the *Chronicle of Melrose* as portraying a Northumbrian historical perspective will be explained in detail in Chapter 1. Furthermore, Turgot and Ælred present intimate accounts of Scottish kings taken from personal experience. The portrayal of Malcolm III in these three accounts was crucial to the historiographical evolution of Malcolm III in subsequent Scottish historical works. Their familiarity with, and proximity to Scottish kings, as well as their influence in other historical works, cannot be ignored in this study.

Thirteenth-century narrative sources are indisputably Scottish in terms of content, production, and perspective. The *Chronicle of Melrose*'s mid-thirteenth-century additions are representative of this shift in national identity: in the thirteenth century, the monks of Melrose

---

<sup>32</sup> This vilification and barbarization of the Celtic peoples of Britain was tied to the introduction of chivalry and military technology into England by the Normans. See John Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), 43-55; John Gillingham, "Foundations of a Disunited Kingdom," in *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, ed. K. J. Stringer and Alexander Grant (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), 48-64; Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, Reprint edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 96-101.

<sup>33</sup> See, for example, Alan Orr Anderson, trans., *Early Sources of Scottish History, A.D. 500 to 1286*, vol. 1, 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1922); Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson, *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973); Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 177-82 for the *Chronicon Elegiacum* or "Verse Chronicle."

identified themselves as Scottish. This change in self-identification has important repercussions for the portrayal of Malcolm and Macbeth in this period, as it shows increasing interest in clarifying Malcolm's origins and right to the Scottish throne. Both the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Gesta Annalia* I, which share information on Malcolm and Margaret, were increasingly preoccupied with clarifying the events surrounding Malcolm's childhood and his connection to the House of Wessex. The fourteenth- and fifteenth-century sources, the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* and *Orygynale Cronikyl*, are also preoccupied with clarifying Malcolm's succession to the throne as a way of reflecting on the right of succession of both the Bruce and Stewart dynasties.

The study ends with Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*, written during the 1440s, and representing a unique departure from earlier depictions of Malcolm III as king of Scots. The *Scotichronicon*'s portrayal of Malcolm III as saintly contrasts with Turgot's portrayal of Malcolm as a reformed barbarian, a man improved in manners, religiosity and character by the influence of Saint Margaret. Contrary to the early twelfth century, when the succession of Malcolm's sons as kings of Scots was not entirely guaranteed, by the mid-fifteenth century, the Stewart dynasty had asserted their right to the succession to the Scottish throne.<sup>34</sup> Analyzing the portrayal of Malcolm III in historical narratives from the twelfth to the mid-fifteenth centuries allows for a thorough examination of the evolution of Malcolm's literary image, making it possible to identify the changes in Malcolm's portrayal and connect them to emerging trends in Scottish kingship and identity.

A final point to be addressed is the choice of referring to the kings of Scots descended from Malcolm and Margaret as the "Canmore" dynasty. The epithet "Canmore" originally

---

<sup>34</sup> Christine McGladdery, *James II*, The Stewart Dynasty in Scotland ; 2 (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1990), 1-4, and 148.

referred to Malcolm's great-grandson, Malcolm IV (r. 1154-65); it was not until the late thirteenth century that "Canmore" is used to describe Malcolm III. Duncan argued that "Canmore" was first used as a sobriquet for Malcolm III in the original story of Macbeth, which he dated to the late thirteenth century, although its earliest appearance in a Scottish chronicle was in Fordun's *Chronica*.<sup>35</sup> Malcolm is also called "Canmore" ("Kenmour") in king-list K, which dates to the fourteenth century and is attached to Thomas Gray's *Scalachronica*.<sup>36</sup> The choice of "Canmore" to designate the Scottish dynasty descended from Malcolm and Margaret is stylistic: while anachronistic, it facilitates the identification of Malcolm III with his descendants, his image as Saint Margaret's barbaric husband and his image as an Anglicized Scottish prince.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, this study will refer to Malcolm III as either "Malcolm," "King Malcolm," or "Malcolm III" in Chapters 1 and 2, dealing with the twelfth and thirteenth centuries respectively, and as "Malcolm Canmore" or "Malcolm" for the rest of the chapters. Although historians tend to use the original Gaelic names to refer to kings of Scots from ancient times until Malcolm III (with the exception of Malcolm IV, r. 1154-65), this study will refer to Malcolm by his Anglicized name. In this manner, this dissertation establishes that the subject of study is literary portrayals of a historical king of Scots, not biographical facts about his life and kingship.

## Chapter Organization and Methodology

Methodologically, this study conducts an in-depth textual analysis of the historical narratives containing accounts of Malcolm's kingship. Included in this analysis is the

---

<sup>35</sup> See Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 36-7.

<sup>36</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 289.

<sup>37</sup> Historians such as R. Andrew McDonald have also called Malcolm and Margaret's descendants the Canmore dynasty. See R. Andrew McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings, 1058-1266* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell, 2003).

transmission of texts—where each text obtained its information and how each historian changed the information to reflect his own views of the medieval past. The methodology takes into consideration the fact that historical information both informs and is informed by the historian, revealing an author’s interpretation and attitude towards contemporary politics and past events.<sup>38</sup> For the majority of the sources examined in this study, especially those produced from the thirteenth century onwards, it is possible to compare the Latin texts of each narrative to the Latin sources from which they obtained their information. However, as research by Broun and Taylor has shown, the complex textual history and transmission of texts such as the Dunfermline *Vita*, the *Gesta Annalia* I and Fordun’s *Chronica* complicate the analysis of the portrayal of Malcolm III. Moreover, sources such as the *Gesta Annalia* and Fordun’s *Chronica* are in need of new editions that follow more rigorous editorial standards.<sup>39</sup> This study has followed the most recent research on Scottish historiography and transmission of historical texts for the narratives used here. Each chapter contains more specific information on methodological approaches and challenges for the specific source. To facilitate the discussion of the current state of scholarship for each source or historian, the historiography for each source has been discussed per chapter. Therefore, it was possible to maintain methodological consistency throughout the study while

---

<sup>38</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (Hambledon, London, New York: A&C Black, 2004); Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1977); R. James Goldstein, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland*, Regents Studies in Medieval Culture (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993); Taylor, “Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland.”

<sup>39</sup> For this point, see Broun, *Irish Identity*, Chapter 2; and Dauvit Broun, “A New Look at *Gesta Annalia* Attributed to John of Fordun,” in *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland: Essays Presented to Donald Watt on the Occasion of the Completion of the Publication of Bower’s Scotichronicon*, ed. Barbara E. Crawford (Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1999), 9–30, for a thorough discussion of the transmission history of the *Gesta Annalia* I and the need for a new edition of Fordun’s *Chronica*.

answering specific questions about the evolution of medieval ideas on Scottish kingship, identity, and Malcolm III.

The study is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 considers Malcolm's portrayals in the twelfth-century *Life of Saint Margaret*, the *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, and the original text of the *Chronicle of Melrose*. It will be argued that the relationship between the Canmore kings and the monastic community at Durham helped shaped how Malcolm was portrayed in the first two texts, while the portrayal of Malcolm in the *Chronicle of Melrose* responded to the state of Anglo-Scottish relations during the Young King Henry's Rebellion of 1173-4. While the desire to foster stronger links between Scottish kings and Durham prompted Turgot and Ælred to present Malcolm more benevolently than other twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historians, Scottish military action in Northumbria during the last quarter of the twelfth century and the use of Northumbrian sources that vilified Malcolm resulted in a less flattering portrayal of this king in the *Chronicle of Melrose*.

Chapter 2 examines the thirteenth-century additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose*, the Dunfermline Compilation, and the *Gesta Annalia* I. The anonymous historians who composed these sources expressed anxieties about how Malcolm had been previously portrayed. Thus, in the thirteenth century, Malcolm is portrayed as a dynastic founder and as an equal "partner in rule" to Saint Margaret of Scotland. Focusing on Malcolm's provision of law, his distribution of charity, his display of mercy and his fair treatment of nobility, these sources presented Malcolm as an example that his descendant, Alexander III, should emulate. More importantly, these sources dispelled any notions of Scottish regnal inferiority or subordination to England at a time when English kings Henry III (r. 1216-72) and Edward I (r. 1272-1307) were more insistent in their demands for Alexander to acknowledge their overlordship.

Chapter 3 analyzes John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, which inaugurates a new chapter in the evolution of the historiographical portrayal of Malcolm: the first appearance of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative. Broun has argued that the *Chronica* is merely a compilation of earlier sources. However, Fordun's main source for the information on Malcolm's reign, known as the *Gesta Annalia* I, came from a longer work that Broun calls the "proto-Fordun," which was produced in the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>40</sup> Since the *Chronica* represents the earliest appearance of the Macbeth narrative, this chapter analyzes Fordun's adaptation of the material found in the *Gesta Annalia* I to determine whether Fordun made any changes to how Malcolm was portrayed in the *Gesta Annalia*, how this was accomplished, and why. The chapter establishes Fordun's method for incorporating Scottish and English sources about Malcolm into the *Chronica*, arguing that Fordun molded Malcolm's portrayal to fit with fourteenth-century notions of Scottish kingship arising from the Wars of Independence. The chapter further argues that the Macbeth narrative emerged not in the thirteenth century, but in the fourteenth, as a product of Brucean propaganda against John Balliol's kingship.

Chapter 4 examines the portrayal of Malcolm in Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*, identifying an additional source that portrayed Macduff of Fife with an enhanced political agency.<sup>41</sup> Wyntoun's portrayal of Malcolm addressed the state of politics in Scotland during the first two decades of the fifteenth century, particularly the governorship of Robert Stewart, Earl of Fife and Menteith

---

<sup>40</sup> Dauvit Broun, "The Birth of Scottish History," *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 4–22; Broun, *Irish Identity*; Broun, "A New Look;" and Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 215–28 and 236–58.

<sup>41</sup> As discussed above, Duncan had suggested that Wyntoun and Bower were both using the original version of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative, while Fordun summarized it for the *Chronica*.

and Duke of Albany.<sup>42</sup> The chapter argues that Wyntoun's particular portrayal of Malcolm Canmore was influenced by the involvement of Sir John Wemyss of Leuchars and Kincaldrum, Wyntoun's patron, in Scottish politics of the time.<sup>43</sup> Finally, Chapter 5 addresses Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*, where the author transmitted Fordun's portrayal of Malcolm without much change. Bower's innovation was the presentation of Malcolm as a saint in conjunction with, and mostly supported by, Saint Margaret. Both Wyntoun and Bower share a Fife-centric outlook on eleventh-century Scottish history that will be explored in Chapters 4 and 5.

The chronological scope of this thesis addresses one important trend in current Scottish historiography. By covering both the central and late medieval periods, this thesis tracks change over a period that is usually divided by Scottish medievalists into two. Traditionally, scholarship on medieval Scotland sees the Wars of Independence as the historical event that divides the central middle ages from the late middle ages. More recently, however, studies by Dauvit Broun, Alice Taylor, Michael Brown, and Amanda Beam, for example, have bridged the gap between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This has provided us with a more comprehensive understanding of the antecedents and repercussions of the Wars of Independence, especially in terms of textual transmission and manuscript survival. The work of Claire Harrill, whose 2016 PhD dissertation on medieval portrayals of Saint Margaret of Scotland is cited extensively in my own work, has incorporated a similar chronology to mine. By examining the portrayal of Malcolm III in a span of 350 years, this study is able to understand the evolution of Malcolm's historiographical portrayals as a continuous development. It presents Malcolm as a case study for

---

<sup>42</sup> Stephen I. Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings: Robert II and Robert III, 1371-1406*, The Stewart Dynasty in Scotland (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1996), and K. J. Hunt, "The Governorship of the First Duke of Albany" (University of Edinburgh, 1999), <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/6904>.

<sup>43</sup> William Fraser, *Memorials of the Family of Wemyss of Wemyss*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: s.n., 1888), <http://archive.org/details/memorialsoffamil01fras>.



the continuity and divergence of Scottish ideas on kingship, identity and history writing in the long medieval period. Thus the chronological span of this study is a strength that helps dissolve the boundaries between the central and late Middle Ages.

### **Contributions to scholarship on medieval Scotland**

One of the most salient contributions that my thesis makes to the field is to provide a more thorough understanding of how the eleventh century was mythologized by medieval Scots. The introduction of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative is an example of this. By portraying Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne as a matter of cooperation between Macduff of Fife and Malcolm Canmore, this narrative reimages Malcolm's kingship as a commentary on the importance of crown-magnate relations to the commonwealth of Scotland. It shows how the political community of the kingdom is involved in choosing and maintaining Scottish kings. It also portrayed Macduff of Fife as a key political agent in the kingdom, as a king-making figure. Because of this narrative, Scottish medievalists have traditionally seen the earls of Fife as inauguration officers of the Scottish kings. My thesis shows how the role of Macduff of Fife is a late medieval construct and that the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative should not be seen as evidence for the earlier eleventh-century past. It is, rather, evidence of how late medieval Scottish chroniclers constructed the eleventh-century past to reflect on contemporary ideas about Scottish kingship and crown-magnate relations. This thesis shows how Malcolm's portrayal in late medieval Scottish historiography constitutes a mythologized version of the eleventh-century past that fulfills specific political needs.

The contributions this thesis makes to medieval Scottish history are not limited to understanding the mythologization of Malcolm III. This thesis presents Malcolm as a case study for understanding the limits of the extant textual and manuscript evidence about medieval

Scotland. Part of the findings of this thesis show the importance of Fife-produced narratives, especially Dunfermline during the central middle ages and St Andrews during the late medieval period, to the production of Scottish history. While Archibald Duncan suggested that this story first emerged in the late thirteenth century as a “romance,”<sup>44</sup> this study concludes that it was conceived sometime after 1306 at St Andrews. Thus, by examining the portrayal of Malcolm III in these chronicles, paying special attention to Malcolm’s relationship with Fife in general, and with Macduff and Saint Margaret of Scotland in particular, historians are able to understand the centrality that Fife had to the production of Scottish historical accounts.

The evolution of the historiographical image of Malcolm III Canmore provides a window into the evolution of Scottish identity and kingship during the central and late Middle Ages. This study provides a point of departure for further analysis of Malcolm’s portrayal in Scottish sources by establishing the turning points in the evolution of his portrayal and the political reasons why Malcolm was reimagined throughout the centuries. In turn, this study reveals medieval misconceptions about Malcolm III and his kingship, and shows the centrality Malcolm had in the construction of a sovereign Scottish identity at times when such sovereignty was threatened. The image of Malcolm III reveals the intersection of politics, historiography and identity where Scottishness is continually negotiated and revised from the perspective of medieval Scottish historians. Thus, this study provides a better understanding of how medieval Scots viewed their eleventh-century past and how important Malcolm’s kingship was to their sense of identity.

---

<sup>44</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 36-7.

**CHAPTER 1. A BARBARIAN REFORMED: MALCOLM III IN TURGOT'S *LIFE OF SAINT MARGARET* (1100 x 07), ÆLRED OF RIEVAULX'S *GENEALOGIA* (1153-4), AND THE *CHRONICLE OF MELROSE* (1173 x 4)**

**Introduction**

The earliest historical narratives that provide a glimpse into the life and times of King Malcolm appear in the early twelfth century. These narratives do not come from Scotland, but from Northumbria,<sup>1</sup> and were written by Northumbrian clerics who were intimately acquainted with either Malcolm III himself or his immediate descendants. Because of the lack of surviving narrative sources produced in Scotland during Malcolm III's kingship, and because of the strong associations between Northumbria and the kingdom of the Scots in this period, this chapter examines the portrayal of Malcolm III in the following sources: Turgot of Durham's *Life of Saint Margaret, Queen of Scots* (1100 x 07); Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia Regum Anglorum* (1154-5); and *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey* (1173 x 4, with thirteenth-century additions, which will

---

<sup>1</sup> The territory of the king of Scots during the twelfth century included not only what Geoffrey Barrow calls "Scotland proper," but also Northumbria, forming what is known as the "Scoto-Northumbrian kingdom." David I (r. 1124-53), was awarded the Honour of Huntingdom sometime after his marriage to Matilda of Senlis, daughter of Earl Waltheof of Northumbria, in 1113. Nonetheless, he seems to have been responsible for the protection of the monastic community at Durham during Alexander I's kingship (r. 1107-1124). Before his marriage to Matilda, David held Cumbria as a *princeps* as well. David's successors, Malcolm IV (r. 1154-65) and William the Lion (r. 1165-1214) held Northumbria as an earldom. However, Dauvit Broun has argued that the inhabitants of what is now considered the Scottish Borders considered themselves English throughout the twelfth century. See Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 35; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 61-2; Dauvit Broun, "Becoming a Nation: Scotland in The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in *Nations in Medieval Britain*, ed. Hirokazu Tsurushima (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), 86-103; Oram, *David I*, 161-90; G. W. S. Barrow, "The Kings of Scotland and Durham," in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 311-23; and Paul Dalton, "Scottish Influence on Durham, 1066-1214," in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 339-52.

be discussed in Chapter 2).<sup>2</sup> These three sources constitute the first developmental phase of Malcolm's portrayal in Scottish historiography, which occurred between c. 1100 and 1173-4.

Beginning a discussion of the historiographical evolution of Malcolm's literary portrayals in Scottish historical narratives with three Northumbrian sources might appear to be an odd choice. Yet these three sources constitute the foundation of subsequent portrayals of Malcolm III in Scottish historical narratives from the thirteenth century onwards. The porosity and changeability of the Anglo-Scottish border and the status of Scottish kings as earls of Northumbria in the long twelfth century saw the Canmore kings often controlling parts of Northumbria; this makes delineating political and socio-cultural identities in this period more difficult.<sup>3</sup> The three texts in question had strong affiliations with the Canmore dynasty in one or another form. For example, Queen Edith-Matilda of England commissioned Turgot of Durham to write a biography of her mother, Saint Margaret of Scotland (r. c.1067-1093), which is the

---

<sup>2</sup> *Life*. The Latin version of the *Life of Saint Margaret*, contained in British Library Tiberius MS D iii, is found in Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et collectanea*, ed. John Hodgson-Hinde, vol. 1 (Durham; London; Edinburgh: Andrews and Co.; Whittaker and Co.; T. and W. Boone; Bernard Quaritch; Blackwood and Sons, 1868), 234-55, <http://archive.org/details/operacollect00simerich>. It will be cited from here onwards as Turgot, *Vita*. Jane Patricia Freeland, trans., *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, Cistercian Fathers Series; No. 56 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2005) [English version], cited from here onwards as Aelred, *Genealogia*; Aelredus Rievallensis, "Genealogia Regum Anglorum," in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, vol. 195, 1885, 711-38 [Latin version]; Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison, *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition. Vol. 1, Introduction and Facsimile Edition*, vol. 1, Scottish History Society (Series); 6th Ser., v. 1 (Woodbridge, England; Rochester, NY: Scottish History Society; Boydell Press, 2007).

<sup>3</sup> Dauvit Broun, "Becoming Scottish in the Thirteenth Century: The Evidence of the Chronicle of Melrose," in *West Over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300*, ed. Beverly Ballin Smith, Simon Taylor, and Gareth Williams, vol. 31, The Northern World (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 19-32; Dauvit Broun, "Becoming a Nation: Scotland in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in *Nations in Medieval Britain*, ed. Hirokazu Tsurushima (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), 86-103; Robert Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225*, The New Oxford History of England (Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press, 2000), 77; Barrow, "Scotland and Durham," 311-23; G. W. S. Barrow, *David I of Scotland (1124-1153): The Balance of New and Old*, The Stenton Lecture 1984 18 (Reading: University of Reading, 1985); Oram, *David I*, 167-89.

earliest account of both King Malcolm and Queen Margaret's reigns.<sup>4</sup> *The Life of Saint Margaret*, therefore, is an invaluable source for understanding how Malcolm III was seen by his Northumbrian and Scottish contemporaries, offering a window into eleventh-century Scottish kingship.<sup>5</sup>

Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia* was not commissioned by the king of Scots, yet it was heavily influenced by a desire to portray King David I (r. 1124-1153), Malcolm and Margaret's youngest son, in a most favourable light, highlighting his descent from the royal and saintly House of Wessex through his mother, Saint Margaret.<sup>6</sup> Ælred, who was born in Hexham but lived from the age of 14 to 24 at King David's court, counted the king of Scots, his son Prince Henry, and his stepson Waltheof, as intimate friends.<sup>7</sup> Ælred's accounts of King Malcolm were, therefore, conditioned by a deep appreciation and familiarity with Malcolm's descendants. The *Chronicle of Melrose Abbey* was also associated with the religious patronage of the Canmore dynasty, particularly of the abbey's founder, David I. A daughter house of Rievaulx, Melrose produced an annalistic chronicle based mainly on Northumbrian sources associated with Durham, such as Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the anonymous *Historia post Bedam*, and the *Historia regum Anglorum*, commonly attributed to Symeon of Durham.<sup>8</sup> As Dauvit Broun has

---

<sup>4</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003), 13; *Life*, 20-1.

<sup>5</sup> For the most recent discussion of Malcolm's portrayal in the *Life of Saint Margaret*, see Keene, "The Dunfermline 'Vita'," 43-61; Catherine Keene, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective*, The New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

<sup>6</sup> Ælred, *Genealogia*.

<sup>7</sup> Jean Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker: The Public Life of a Cistercian Abbot*, Cistercian Studies Series 251 (Collegeville, Minnesota: Cistercian Publications, 2017); "Ailred of Rievaulx," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed November 21, 2016, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8916?docPos=1>; Elizabeth Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," in *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx*, ed. Marsha L. Dutton, vol. 76, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017), 113-48.

<sup>8</sup> Broun and Harrison, *CMA*, 48-9.

suggested recently, the monks of Melrose, though living in the kingdom of Scots, might have considered themselves as English,<sup>9</sup> and this sense of Englishness, along with the proximity and accessibility to the library of Durham Priory and the state of contemporary Scoto-Northumbrian political relations, conditioned the *Chronicle of Melrose*'s portrayal of Malcolm III.

Moreover, Anglo-Scottish political relations deteriorated during the last quarter of the twelfth century. Malcolm's great-grandson William I of Scotland (r. 1165-1214, known as William the Lion) was one of Henry II's opponents in the Young King's Rebellion of 1173-4, since Henry had deprived William of the earldom of Northumbria.<sup>10</sup> William's catastrophic intervention in the Rebellion saw the king and his army devastating Northumbria, but being defeated and losing Scottish regnal sovereignty in 1174 as a result. William the Lion's acceptance of the Treaty of Falaise in 1174 was the culmination of an increasingly aggressive English program to assert lordship over the Scottish kings.<sup>11</sup> The *Chronicle of Melrose* was written in this convoluted political milieu and it was critical of both William's and Malcolm's devastating incursions into Northumbria. Thus, while the three main sources examined in this chapter are of Northumbrian extraction, the close association of the first two authors with the Canmore dynasty, and the *Chronicle of Melrose*'s association with Northumbrian identity and its status as a witness to contemporary Anglo-Scottish relations, means that these sources remain rich repositories of twelfth-century Scoto-Northumbrian attitudes towards Malcolm III.

---

<sup>9</sup> Broun, "Becoming Scottish," 19-32.

<sup>10</sup> Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery*, 223-33.

<sup>11</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 99; 112; and 122 for comparison with Alexander III's submission to Henry III.

### Turgot's Life of St Margaret, Queen of Scots (1100 x 07)

The *Life of Saint Margaret, Queen of Scots* (*Vita Sanctae Margaretae Scottorum Reginae*) remains the main source not only for the details surrounding Saint Margaret's life, but also for details about Malcolm III. Turgot knew the couple personally, which accounts for his detailed knowledge of their lives and actions.<sup>12</sup> The *Life* was commissioned by Queen Matilda of England, wife of Henry I and daughter of Malcolm III and Saint Margaret.<sup>13</sup> The *Life* has been widely discussed by scholars, especially by those concerned with the repercussions of Margaret's religious reforms and those interested in queenship and concepts of sanctity in general. Despite, or due to, academic interest in Saint Margaret, the portrayal of King Malcolm has remained mostly unexplored in medieval literary and historical scholarship. Malcolm resides in the fringes of the text; his marginal appearances in and disappearances from the narrative might explain why scholars have not paid much attention to his portrayal in this hagiography.<sup>14</sup> Yet these disappearances can offer valuable insights into the importance King Malcolm's portrayal has in sustaining Queen Margaret's sainthood and in fulfilling a political purpose.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Life*, 19-20. "... (thanks to her great and familiar intercourse with me) you [Queen Matilda of England] have understood that I am acquainted with most part of her secrets."

<sup>13</sup> The extant manuscripts of the *Life of Saint Margaret* are later than the original composition date. British Library Cotton MS Tiberius D iii, of which an edition was published in Latin by Hodgson Hinde in 1868, is dated between the last quarter of the twelfth century and the first quarter of the thirteenth; MS Tiberius E i, also at the British Library, is dated from the fourteenth century and is an abridgement of the *Life*. The *Acta Sanctorum*, edited by Daniel Papebroch in 1867, includes a transcription of the *Life of Saint Margaret* found in a now-lost manuscript originally located in Hainault monastery. Both the *Acta Sanctorum* version and Cotton Tiberius D iii are virtually identical in content. See John Hodgson Hinde, "Preface," in Durham, *Opera et collectanea*, lvii-lviii; "Vita S. Margaretae Reginae Scotiae," in Pinkerton's *Lives of the Scottish Saints*, ed. W. M. Metcalfe, 2 vols (Paisley, 1889), II, 199-209 for London, British Library [BL] Tiberius MS. E i, fos. 11v-13v. This manuscript contains a genealogy for King Malcolm and Queen Margaret's descendants in fol. 12r. See *Acta Sanctorum Bollandorum ex Latinis et Graecis, aliamque gentium antiquis monumentis* [ASB] ed. Godofrido Henschenio and Daniele Papebrochio, et. al. June, 7 vols. (Paris and Rome: Victor Palmé, 1867), II, 316-335, at 324-335.

<sup>14</sup> An exception to this is Keene, "Dunfermline 'Vita.'"

Recent studies of Saint Margaret's life have recognized the political, cultural and religious factors that shaped her portrayal in Turgot's text. Lois Honeycutt argued that the *Life* was written as a "mirror for princes," a text advising Matilda on proper queenly endeavours.<sup>15</sup> Joanna Huntingdon argued that Turgot's portrayal of Saint Margaret revealed the tensions between secular power and sanctity in the medieval period, especially in a twelfth-century Anglo-Norman and Scottish context; she suggested that the *Life* has a political purpose, but did not delve into details.<sup>16</sup> In her article "The Dunfermline 'Vita' of St. Margaret of Scotland: Hagiography as an Articulation of Hereditary Rights" (2009), Catherine Keene argued that Malcolm's portrayal in the Dunfermline *Vita* supported the claims of the Canmore dynasty to a Scoto-Northumbrian kingdom.<sup>17</sup> Keene's argument rested on the dating of the Dunfermline *Vita* to the early twelfth century and attributing the longer passages about Malcolm III to Turgot himself. Alice Taylor's research on the Dunfermline *Vita* (2010) has convincingly dated the text to sometime between 1154 and 1286; the implications of this dating will be discussed in Chapter 2.<sup>18</sup> A biography of Saint Margaret by Catherine Keene considered the influence of saints' *vitae* as models of queenly behaviour and scrutinized the gaps in the *Life of Saint Margaret*.<sup>19</sup> Keene discussed the tensions that arose between Turgot's description of Saint Margaret and notions of saintly behaviour, "suggesting that he is remembering her more truthfully than ideally by carefully skirting her perceived flaws."<sup>20</sup> Her discussion also considered Turgot's portrayal of the

---

<sup>15</sup> Lois Honeycutt, "The Idea of the Perfect Princess: The Life of St. Margaret in the Reign of Matilda II (1100-1118)," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 12 (1989): 81-97; Honeycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 13.

<sup>16</sup> Joanna Huntingdon, "St Margaret of Scotland: Conspicuous Consumption, Genealogical Inheritance and Post-Conquest Authority," *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 33, no. 2 (2013): 149-64.

<sup>17</sup> Keene, "The Dunfermline 'Vita.'"

<sup>18</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland."

<sup>19</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 2-4.

<sup>20</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 74.



relationship between Malcolm and Margaret and will be discussed more in detail later in this section. Most recently, Claire Harrill has discussed literary portrayals of Saint Margaret in Scottish and English works, stressing how “Margaret is something of a lightning-rod for ideas of good queenship and Scottish independent sovereignty, and that these ideas exist in symbiosis with her sanctity.”<sup>21</sup> Keene and Harrill have been the most recent scholars to consider briefly the portrayal of Malcolm in the *Life of Saint Margaret*; except for Keene’s study of Malcolm’s portrayal in the Dunfermline *Vita*, this section will be the first in-depth discussion of the portrayal of Malcolm III in the twelfth-century *Life of Saint Margaret*. It examines how Turgot’s portrayal of Malcolm III in the *Life of Saint Margaret* is conditioned by hagiographical conventions and literary images of Scots to fulfill specific political and literary needs.

In the *Life of Saint Margaret*, King Malcolm was praised as a paragon of dutiful Christianity, godly obedience, and devotion:

I was *astonished, I confess, at this great miracle of God’s mercy* when I perceived in the king such a steady earnestness in his devotion, and I wonder how it was that there could exist in the heart of a man living in the world such an entire sorrow for sin. There was in him a sort of dread of offending one whose life was so venerable; for he could but perceive from her conduct that Christ dwelt within her; nay, more, *he readily obeyed her wishes and prudent counsels in all things.*<sup>22</sup>

A close reading of the passage indicates, however, underlying assumptions about the king’s behaviour prior to Margaret’s intervention. While Turgot praised Malcolm’s piety, he also confessed himself “astonished” at the king of Scots’ conduct, a conduct he attributed to a “great miracle of God’s mercy.” Malcolm learned from Margaret “how to keep the vigils of the night in

---

<sup>21</sup> Harrill, “Politics and Sainthood,” ii.

<sup>22</sup> *Life*, 39 (my emphasis); Turgot, *Vita*, 241: “Fateor, magnum misericordiae Dei mirabar miraculum, cum viderem interdum tantam orandi regis intentionem, tantam inter orandum in pectore viri saecularis compunctionem. Ipsam tam venerabilis vitae reginam, quoniam in ejus corde Christum veraciter habitare perspexerat, ille quoquomodo offendere formidabat; sed potius votis ejus et prudentibus consiliis celerius per omnia obedire properabat.”

constant prayer; she instructed him by her exhortation and example how to pray to God with groanings from the heart and abundance of tears.”<sup>23</sup> Queen Margaret “by the help of God [...] made him most attentive to the works of justice, mercy, almsgiving, and other virtues.”<sup>24</sup> The king recognized “from her conduct that Christ dwelt within her” and because of this he “readily obeyed her wishes and prudent counsels in all things.”<sup>25</sup> The king mimicked Margaret’s exemplary behaviour: “whatever she refused, he refused also; whatever pleased her, he also loved for the love of her.”<sup>26</sup> Evidently, the text relied on queen-saints’ hagiographic motifs where the queen’s role is to civilize and Christianize her husband.<sup>27</sup> Another variant of this motif is the “barbaric groom” topos common to virgin-martyr legends, which Turgot used here to model his portrayal of Malcolm and Margaret’s relationship.<sup>28</sup> The author found that different hagiographic models for female saints provided the ideal vehicle to support Margaret’s holiness. Thus, the text explicitly constructed Malcolm not just as a mere “reformed” barbarian king, but also more importantly, as *locus* of Margaret’s sainthood. The transformation of King Malcolm became Margaret’s miracle.

Margaret’s intervention for her husband by teaching him how to pray effectively is a key motif in medieval saint-queens’ lives, so the text aligned the narrative with literary hagiographic

---

<sup>23</sup> *Life*, 38-9.

<sup>24</sup> *Life*, 38-9.

<sup>25</sup> *Life*, 39.

<sup>26</sup> *Life*, 39; Turgot, *Vita*, 241: “Quae ipsa respuerat, eadem et ipse respuere; et quae amaverat, amore amoris illius amare.”

<sup>27</sup> Jo Ann McNamara, “*Imitatio Helenae*: Sainthood as an Attribute of Queenship,” in *Saints: Studies in Hagiography*, ed. Sandro Sticca, vol. 141, Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies (Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1996), 51–80, at 52; Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 41-2.

<sup>28</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 40-1.

conventions that would be familiar to the reader.<sup>29</sup> The passage, with its focus on how “she instructed him by her exhortation and example,”<sup>30</sup> used hagiography as a didactic tool that emphasized the intercessory model popularized after the Gregorian reforms in the mid-eleventh century.<sup>31</sup> The intercessory hagiographic model responded to contemporary interpretations of appropriate queenly behaviour; it was moulded by noblewomen to assert their power through religion.<sup>32</sup> In queen-saints’ hagiography, female submissiveness was portrayed as an effective resource that allowed a queen to mediate between God and her husband’s royal power. Queens would then negotiate their role around their relationship with the king and with his warrior-like qualities, asserting their sanctity through charity, piety and promoting peace or impeding war.<sup>33</sup> In a similar manner, the *Life* personified Margaret as the foreign queen whose intercessory role was to convert King Malcolm. For Margaret, sanctity and good queenship both relied on her ability to demonstrate piety through her deeds rather than her miracles. King Malcolm’s portrayal as a barbaric king of Scots in need of reform provided the perfect vehicle for Margaret to prove her sanctity through deeds while simultaneously serving to teach Queen Matilda appropriate queenly behaviour. Although Malcolm was portrayed as a king of Scots in need of reform, such a

---

<sup>29</sup> Huntington, “Conspicuous Consumption,” 149-50. Huntington is also aware that Turgot’s portrayal of Margaret, at least in terms of her “conspicuous consumption,” contradicted contemporary hagiographical displays of ascetism, yet she recognizes that this is probably due to Turgot’s need to address the complex relation between the display of social power and status and expectations of sainthood. Huntington suggests that the *vita* has a political agenda (151). James Campbell suggests that twelfth-century English historiography aimed to please Norman superiors. See James Campbell, “Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past,” in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 209–28.

<sup>30</sup> *Life*, 38-9; Turgot, *Vita*, 241: “Didicit ille ab ea etiam vigiliis noctis frequenter orando producere; didicit, ejus hortatu et exemplo [...]”

<sup>31</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, “Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos,” in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 126–46, at 131.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 131; McNamara, “Imitatio Helenae,” 51-80.

<sup>33</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 56; McNamara, “Imitatio Helenae,” 52.

view should not be taken as historically accurate: it merely conformed to a hagiographical trope, serving didactic purposes.

Yet ideas of Scottish barbarism in general, and assumptions about Malcolm's behaviour specifically, cannot be solely attributed to hagiographic conventions. Twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historians often portrayed Celts, in particular Scots, as barbarians.<sup>34</sup> Anglo-Norman portrayals of Malcolm III and the Scots criticize Scottish military behaviour and Malcolm's political dealings with the Anglo-Norman kings of England, William the Conqueror (r. 1066-1087) and his son, William Rufus (r. 1087-1100). Thus Anglo-Norman historians changed how Celtic peoples, particularly the Scots, were depicted in the twelfth century, constructing stereotypes of Scottish barbarity based on chivalric ideals that were still foreign to the Scots in the late eleventh century.

Chroniclers such as William of Malmesbury (ca. 1127), Orderic Vitalis (c. 1110-15), and the author of the *Historia regum Anglorum*, possibly compiled by Symeon of Durham (c. 1128), recorded the various conflicts between the Anglo-Norman kings and their Celtic neighbours, particularly the Scots,<sup>35</sup> the military behaviour of Scots as depicted in these chronicles did not

---

<sup>34</sup> Gillingham, "Disunited Kingdom." John Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), xv-xvi, 11, 45-7; Robert Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225*, The New Oxford History of England (Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press, 2000); Bartlett, *Making of Europe*.

<sup>35</sup> See J. O. Prestwich, "Orderic Vitalis," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2006 online edn 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20812?docPos=1>; Ordericus Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy*, trans. Thomas Forester, vol. III (London: H. G. Bohn, 1854); and Amanda Jane Hingst, *The Written World: Past and Place in the Work of Orderic Vitalis* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009). Though Symeon's authorship of the *Historia Regum* has been disputed, it is possible Symeon compiled the sources in the *Historia Regum* to use for another historical work. See Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, 125-7; Bernard Meehan, "Symeon of Durham (Fl. c. 1090-c.1128)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2006 online edn 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25556>; Symeon of Durham, *Simeon of Durham's History of the Kings of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson, Repr., Church Historians of England (Lampeter: Llanerch Publishers, 1987), cited hereafter as Durham, *HR*. William of Malmesbury began writing his historical works between 1100 and 1118, but his writing activity continued until at least the 1140s. See R. T.

conform to notions of appropriate chivalric conduct in the first two decades of the twelfth century. King Malcolm and eleventh-century Scots were depicted in twelfth-century chronicles as irredeemably barbaric. For William of Malmesbury, for example, Malcolm "... with his party [...] often brooded over the nest of tyranny; there [in York] they frequently killed his [William the Conqueror's] generals..."<sup>36</sup> Malcolm also "... burnt and plundered the adjacent provinces of England [...] merely to distress the mind of [King] William, who was incensed at his territories being subject to Scottish incursions."<sup>37</sup> The *Historia Regum* echoed Malmesbury's sentiment: it recounts that in 1079 Malcolm "devastated Northumberland, as far as the great river Tyne, slew many, took more prisoners, and returned with great spoil."<sup>38</sup> Details of Malcolm's raids of Northumbria and his difficult relationship with William the Conqueror are found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (ASC), especially manuscripts D and E. ASC D noted Malcolm's submission to William in 1072, though it did not provide the place of the submission.<sup>39</sup> ASC E included details of Malcolm's raid of Northumbria in 1079, where he took many slaves and spoils; it also

---

Thomson, "Malmesbury, William of (b c. 1090, d. in or after 1142)," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29461?docPos=1>; William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England: From the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen. With Notes and Illustrations* (H. G. Bohn, 1847); Emily A. Winkler and Emily Dolmans, "Discovering William of Malmesbury: The Man and His Works," in Rodney M. Thomson, Emily Dolmans, and Emily A. Winkler, eds., *Discovering William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2017), at 1-2.

<sup>36</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, 282.

<sup>37</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, 282.

<sup>38</sup> Durham, *HR*, 150. Symeon took this account from John of Worcester, who wrote his *Chronicon ex chronicis* between c. 1095 and 1140. See Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester: Volume II: The Annals from 450 to 1066: The Annals from 450-1066 Vol 2*, ed. R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, trans. Jennifer Bray (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1995), 31.

<sup>39</sup> ASC D, 1072 AD. In the Introduction, Dorothy Whitelock explained that MS D (BL Cotton Tiberius B. iv) contains material from Symeon of Durham and Bede, showing considerable interest in northern English events. The oldest scribal hand in MS D dates from the second half of the eleventh century. See Whitelock, "Introduction," ASC, xiv-xvii. See also Gransden, *Historical Writing*, 78-9.

documented Malcolm's submission to William Rufus in 1091.<sup>40</sup> Turgot's portrayal of King Malcolm did not contain any explicit reference to barbaric behaviour, but the omission of important information about Malcolm's military and political activities suggests a conscious effort to dissociate Malcolm from ideas of Scottish barbarity. This point is especially important, since the *Life* was written for Queen Matilda, Malcolm's daughter, and Turgot would have taken care to eliminate any condemnation for Malcolm's behaviour from the account.

An example of Turgot's omission of Malcolm's barbaric behaviour is found in Turgot's description of Malcolm's death. Turgot wrote that

On the fourth day preceding her [Margaret's] death, while the king was absent on an expedition, and at such a great distance that it was impossible for any messenger, however swift he might be, to bring her tidings of what was happening to him, she became sadder than usual.<sup>41</sup>

Then she said to me, for I was seated near her, "Perhaps on this very day such a heavy calamity may befall the realm of Scotland as has not been for many ages past." When I heard these words I paid no great attention to them, but a few days afterwards a messenger arrived who told us that the king was slain on the very day on which the queen had spoken the words narrated. As if foreseeing the future, she had been most urgent with him not to go with the army, but it came to pass—how I know not—that *he did not follow her advice*.<sup>42</sup>

The passage mentioned that the king was killed during a military expedition that Margaret had urged Malcolm not to undertake. This passage demonstrated Margaret's capacity for prophecy,

---

<sup>40</sup> ASC E, 1079 and 1091 AD. Note that this entry is almost identical to Symeon of Durham's description of this raid in the *Historia Regum* (see below). See pp. 169-70 for Malcolm's submission to William Rufus and his death in 1093.

<sup>41</sup> *Life*, 73; Turgot, *Vita*, 252: "Quarta ante suum obitum die, cum rex in expeditione esset, atque illa longo terrarum intervallo, quid erga ipsum ea die ageretur, nullius nuntii celeritate scire potuisset, tristior solito effecta [...]"

<sup>42</sup> *Life*, 73 (my emphasis); Turgot, *Vita*, 252: "[...] hoc nobis sibi assidentibus dixit: 'Forte hodie tantum mali regno Scottorum accidit, quantum multis retro temporibus non provenit.' Nos vero haec audientes, ejus dicta tunc quidem negligenter accepimus; sed, post aliquot dies veniente nuntio, eodem die quo haec regina dixerat, regem fuisse occisum intelleximus. Quem quidem ipsa, quasi futurorum praescia, multum prohibuerat ne quoquam cum exercitu iret; sed nescio qua de causa contigit, ne tunc illius monitis obediret."

further evidencing her sanctity. The urgency of Margaret's plea suggested that the king's decision to go away with the army was a rash one, yet Turgot did not address the reason behind the king's rashness, or who killed him. Malcolm's behaviour was problematic for Turgot's narrative because it implied a return to barbarity, rendering Margaret's influence ineffective.

William of Malmesbury and Orderic Vitalis provided incriminating accounts of Malcolm's military activities as examples of unrestrained behaviour and dishonourable political conduct. According to William of Malmesbury, Malcolm gave William Rufus, king of England, a "false oath" and "was slain soon after together with his son, by Robert of Mowbray, earl of Northumberland, while, regardless of his faith, he was devastating the province with more than usual insolence."<sup>43</sup> Orderic Vitalis, whose portrayal of Scots was more subdued, noted that Malcolm "was met on the road near the borders by Robert de Mowbray and his nephew Morel with some men-at-arms, who lay in ambush for him and murdered him."<sup>44</sup> He added that, when William Rufus learned of Malcolm's death, he was "deeply distressed, being ashamed that so foul and cruel a deed should be done by Normans."<sup>45</sup> William Rufus's reaction to Malcolm's death in 1093 relieved him from any involvement in the incident, while simultaneously showing how the king condemned his nobles' unrestrained military conduct while failing to contain it.<sup>46</sup> Vitalis's account of Malcolm's death served as a reminder that the king of England was responsible for public order in his country;<sup>47</sup> for Malmesbury, it was Malcolm who failed his

---

<sup>43</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, 283.

<sup>44</sup> Vitalis, *Hist. Ecc.*, 11.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 109 and 111. Kaeuper argued that in English monarchy, it was the king's duty to maintain "a working monopoly of the means of violence associated with war." He ascertains that the English kings increasingly sought to make any displays of violence by the elites illicit.

<sup>47</sup> Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 107.

kingly duty by warmongering and breaking oaths imprudently. Highlighting Malcolm's devastation of Northumbria, Malmesbury attributed Malcolm's death to his treachery and his bellicosity.<sup>48</sup> Orderic Vitalis, on the other hand, saw Malcolm's death as an isolated incident of Norman treachery that did not characterize Norman behaviour; he was more sympathetic towards Malcolm than Malmesbury was.<sup>49</sup> For William of Malmesbury, Malcolm's death was the result of his incessant violence against Northumbria, a violence the *Life of Saint Margaret* failed to mention. Vitalis, on the other hand, writing in the 1110s at a time when Anglo-Scottish (and particularly Scoto-Northumbrian) relations were more peaceful, had a more favourable view of Scots. Malcolm's death concluded a period of Scottish aggression against England during the last half of the eleventh century and it was Malcolm who led those aggressions, raiding Northumbria on five different occasions between 1068 and 1093.<sup>50</sup> While Orderic Vitalis used this passage to criticize William Rufus's failure to contain his nobility, William of Malmesbury emphasized Malcolm's bellicosity and his failure at emulating appropriate kingly conduct.

Malcolm's warmongering was problematic for Turgot's narrative, since he portrayed Malcolm as an obedient husband and pious king in the *Life*, yet his death revealed a pattern of violent, insubordinate behaviour. Malcolm's death exemplified not only the consequences of ignoring a saint's advice, and therefore challenging the will of God, but also how his behaviour exceeded the limitations of acceptable kingly conduct. Malcolm's death was one of the historical

---

<sup>48</sup> Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century*, 3-18. For Gillingham, the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* served to position Anglo-Norman culture as superior by barbarizing the English's Celtic neighbours.

<sup>49</sup> Orderic's portrayal of Scots in the eleventh century was rather unique: Scots were a peace-loving and God-fearing nation that had little interest in war. Yet Orderic's favourable view of Scots contrasted with his view of English kingship as taking over the whole island of Albion and its inhabitants, including the Scots and the Welsh. See Hingst, *Written World*, 61-6.

<sup>50</sup> Bartlett, *Norman and Angevin Kings*, 78. For David Carpenter, Malcolm's invasions of Northumbria were part of a desire to expand his powerbase south of his kingdom. He commented that Malcolm was remembered at Durham as "a man of the greatest ferocity and bestial character, who ravaged Northumbria miserably with frequent invasions." See Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery*, 120.



incidents that threatened and contradicted the *Life of Saint Margaret* and had the potential to subvert Margaret's sainthood.

Another source of tension between the *Life's* account of Malcolm and his actual behaviour involved Margaret's attempts to free the slaves in her kingdom. Slavery was common in the kingdom of Scots during Margaret's lifetime, as the *Life* described:

But who can tell the number of English of all ranks, carried captive from their own land by violence of war and reduced to slavery, whom she restored to liberty by paying their ransom? Spies were employed by her to go secretly through all the provinces of Scotland and ascertain what captives were oppressed with the most cruel bondage, and treated with the greatest inhumanity. When she had privately ascertained where these prisoners were detained, and by whom ill-treated, [...] she paid their ransom and set them at liberty forthwith.<sup>51</sup>

Although Saint Margaret was portrayed as effectively promoting peace by releasing Anglo-Saxon slaves, this passage simultaneously showed how ineffective Margaret was in preventing both war and slavery in her own kingdom.<sup>52</sup> Catherine Keene has observed that Margaret's initial role in the kingdom was that of a war-impeder; however her role as peace-weaver and war-impeder "was greatly diminished within a few years of her marriage."<sup>53</sup> Though the *Life* is silent as to who enslaved the English, the *Historia regum Anglorum*, attributed to Symeon of Durham, provides an answer.

The *Historia regum* described how Malcolm devastated the north of England in 1070, ordering his army to "no longer spare any of the English nation, but either to smite all to the

---

<sup>51</sup> *Life*, 57; Turgot, *Vita*, 247: "Quis autem enumerando explicare poterit quot et quantos dato pretio libertati restituerit, quos de gende Anglorum abducens captivos violentia hostilis redegerat in servos? Nam et occultos exploratores quaquaversum per provincias Scottorum miserat, ut, videlicet, qui captivorum duriori premerentur servitute, et inhumanis tractarentur, ubique perquirerent, eique subtiliter, ubi, et a quibus affligerentur, renuntiarent: talibus ipsa ex intimis visceribus compatiens, celeriter subvenire, et redemptos ad libertatem festinavit renovare."

<sup>52</sup> *Life*, 57.

<sup>53</sup> See Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 57.

earth, or to carry them off captives under the yoke of perpetual slavery.”<sup>54</sup> According to the chronicle

The Scots, more savage than wild beasts, delighted in this cruelty, as an amusing spectacle [...] Seeing these things, Malcolm was yet moved to pity by no tears, no groans of the unhappy wretches; but, on the contrary, gave orders that they should be still further pressed onward in the march. Scotland was, therefore, *filled with slaves and handmaids of the English race*; so that even to this day, I do not say no little village, but even no cottage, can be found without one of them.<sup>55</sup>

It was common for Scots to conduct war as slave-hunts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; however, by the twelfth century Normans did not use slavery since it was widely condemned by chroniclers and clerics.<sup>56</sup> This was because, as Matthew Strickland has argued, the arrival of Normans in England “was to mark the importation into England of a differing military ethos, which placed an increasing stress on ransom and the sparing of knightly captives, and which eschewed the enslavement of prisoners of war as a token of barbarism.”<sup>57</sup> Malcolm’s slave-hunt occurred in 1070, the year he married Margaret, corresponding to a period prior to the effects of Margaret’s influence on the king. Yet by no means was this an isolated incident. The *Historia Regum* mentioned that in 1079, after he had been married to Margaret for nearly a decade, Malcolm took slaves from northern England, an observation also made by the *ASC*.<sup>58</sup> For David Carpenter, “Margaret might have regretted the slaves,” but nonetheless she “needed the wealth

---

<sup>54</sup> Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1070 AD.

<sup>55</sup> Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1070 AD (my emphasis). See also Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century*, 45-6.

<sup>56</sup> John Gillingham, “Women, Children and the Profits of War,” in *Gender and Historiography. Studies in the Earlier Middle Ages in Honour of Pauline Stafford*, ed. Janet L. Nelson, Susan Reynolds, and Susan M. Johns (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012), 61–74; Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century*, 47; Matthew J. Strickland, “Killing or Clemency? Ransom, Chivalry and Changing Attitudes to Defeated Opponents in Britain and Northern France, 7-12th centuries,” in Hans-Henning Kortum (ed.) *Krieg im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2001), 93-122.

<sup>57</sup> Strickland, “Killing or Clemency,” 95.

<sup>58</sup> *ASC* E, 1079 AD; Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1079 AD, 150.

and the prestige which the expeditions brought.”<sup>59</sup> By omitting how Malcolm instigated the slavery and oppression of English captives in real life, the *Life of Saint Margaret* focused on how Margaret rescued the English from captivity and suggested to the reader that Malcolm was not associated with the enslavement of the English. However, the continuation of slavery in the kingdom of the Scots confirmed Malcolm’s barbarity, which threatened Turgot’s conception of Malcolm as *locus* of Margaret’s sainthood.

While this discussion of Malcolm III’s portrayal in the *Life of St Margaret* has, until now, focused on contemporary assumptions of Scottish barbarism, one of Malcolm’s most prominent roles in the *Life* was that of interpreter for Margaret’s ecclesiastical reforms:

In this discussion the king took part as an assessor and chief actor, being fully prepared to both say and do whatever she might direct in the matter at issue. And *as he knew the English language quite as well as his own*, he was in this council a *very careful interpreter for either side*.<sup>60</sup>

While some scholars have argued that the passage above shows Margaret’s inability to speak Gaelic, more recent scholarship has suggested that it was implausible that a queen would not learn the dominant language of her kingdom.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, Margaret could read Latin, and most likely speak it, since Turgot narrates how the queen had several books containing the Gospels.<sup>62</sup> Margaret’s communications with Lanfranc of Canterbury, of which only Lanfranc’s responses

---

<sup>59</sup> Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery*, 124.

<sup>60</sup> *Life*, 44-5 (my emphasis); Turgot, *Vita*, 243: “Sed in hoc conflictu rex ipse adiutor et praecipuus residebat; quodcumque in hac causa illa jussisset, dicere paratissimus et facere. Qui, quoniam perfecte Anglorum linguam aequae ac propriam noverat, vigilantissimus in hoc Concilio utriusque partis interpreter extiterat.”

<sup>61</sup> Jessica Alice Nelson, “From Saint Margaret to the Maid of Norway: Queens and Queenship in Scotland, c.1067-1286” (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 2006).

<sup>62</sup> *Life*, 37.

survive, were in Latin as well.<sup>63</sup> If Margaret desired to promote reforms to the Scottish Church, it followed that she would be able to converse with them in Latin. Moreover, this particular passage can be interpreted as evidence of Malcolm's English upbringing at the court of Edward the Confessor. Catherine Keene has argued that Turgot modelled this passage after the episode recounting the advent of Christianity in Northumbria, found in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*:<sup>64</sup>

Which place [Lindisfarne], as the tide ebbs and flows twice a day, is enclosed by the waves of the sea like an island; and again twice in the day when the shore is left dry, becomes contiguous to the land. The king [Oswald of Northumbria] also humbly and willingly in all cases giving ear to his admonitions, industriously applied himself to build and extend the church of Christ in his kingdom; wherein, when the bishop [Aidán], *who was not skillful in the English tongue [qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat]*, preached the Gospel, it was most delightful to see the king himself interpreting the word of God to his commanders and ministers, for he had perfectly learned the language of the Scots during his long banishment.<sup>65</sup>

In her discussion, Keene observed that Turgot's portrayal of Malcolm as an Anglophone king of Scots that serves as interpreter for a religious figure is based on Bede's account of King Oswald's role as interpreter for Aidán of Iona in the passage quoted above.<sup>66</sup> Bede's focus on the Christianization of Northumbria suited Turgot's hagiographical needs in the early twelfth century. Turgot uses Bede's phrase "*qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat*," meant to describe Bishop Aidán's inability to speak English, to describe Malcolm's *proficiency* in the

---

<sup>63</sup> Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson, eds., "A Letter from Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury (1070-1089)," in *Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), ep. 50, 160-3, in *Epistolae: Medieval Women's Latin Letters*, <https://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/23738.html>.

<sup>64</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 87.

<sup>65</sup> Bede, "Ecclesiastical History of the English People" in *The Complete Works of Venerable Bede: Ecclesiastical History*, ed. John Allen Giles, III: iii, 286 (Latin transcription) and 287 (English translation); hereafter, Bede, *HE*: "Qui videlicet locus, accedente ac recedente rheumate, bis quotidie instar insulse maris circuleitur undis, bis renundato littore contiguus terra redditur; atque jus admonitionibus humiliter ac libenter in omnibus auscultano ecclesial Christi in regno suo multum diligenter aedificare ac dilatare curavit. Ubi pulcherrimo saepe spectaculo contigit, ut, evangelizzante antistite, *qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat* ipse rex sui ducibus ac ministris interprete verbi exsisteret coelestis; quia nimirum tam longo esili sui tempore linguam Scotorum jam plene didicerat."

<sup>66</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 87.

language: “Qui quoniam perfecte Anglorum linguam aequè ut propriam noverat.”<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, as a newcomer to Northumbria, Aidán could not speak English: Turgot’s decision to use a phrase from this passage might also signal that Margaret was unable to speak Gaelic at the time and thus, although the *Life of Saint Margaret* does not provide a date for the majority of the events it describes, it is possible that Margaret’s councils in Scotland were held shortly after she arrived. So, Turgot might have chosen a parallel passage in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* to describe Margaret’s early influence on the Scottish Church, especially her attempts at reforming the observance of Lent and Easter in the kingdom.<sup>68</sup> Oswald’s role in the Christianization of Northumbria, especially as an interpreter for Bishop Aidán, was parallel to Malcolm’s role in facilitating Margaret’s reform of the Scottish Church.<sup>69</sup> Margaret’s role as reformer was similar to Bishop Aidan’s role as evangelizer, as Turgot subtly reinterpreted Margaret’s attempts to bring the Scottish church in line with Rome as a second evangelization of the Scots.<sup>70</sup> More importantly, this second evangelization came from England, through Margaret, to Scotland, whereas in Bede’s account, it was the Scots who came to Northumbria to evangelize the English. Turgot’s narrative of Margaret’s reforms closed a historical circle, where the English re-evangelized the Scots in the same way the Scots had previously and initially evangelized Northumbria.

Bede’s description of Aidán’s arrival in Northumbria is not the only source for the passage describing Malcolm’s involvements in Margaret’s reforms of the church. Turgot also

---

<sup>67</sup> *Life*, 32: “... he learned Latin so well, that he spoke it as well as he did his own native tongue...” See Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 87.

<sup>68</sup> *Life*, 45-6.

<sup>69</sup> Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 88.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

used Bede's description of the Synod of Whitby (664 AD), where Northumbrians and Scots debated the correct date for the observance of Easter, and where Northumbrians decided to follow the Roman observance date.<sup>71</sup> According to Bede, King Oswiu of Northumbria and his son, Alfrid, along with Bishop Colman, Bishop Agilbert of the West Saxons and Bishop Cedd met at Whitby to decide whether Northumbria should follow the Scottish or the Roman method for calculating the date of Easter. Bishop Cedd, who was trained by Scottish clerics, "[...] was in that council a most careful interpreter for both parties" (*qui et interpres in eo concilio vigilantissimus utriusque partis extitit*).<sup>72</sup> Turgot used this line from Bede to describe Malcolm's role as interpreter in Margaret's councils: "he was in this council a very careful interpreter for either side" (*vigilantissimus in hoc concilio utriusque partis interpres existerat*).<sup>73</sup> *The Life of Saint Margaret's* depiction of the role of King Malcolm in the ecclesiastical councils held in Scotland in the eleventh century was thus based on Bede's descriptions of similar events, the evangelization of Northumbria and the Synod of Whitby, in England during the sixth and seventh centuries.

Bede described King Oswald as knowing the Scottish language because he was exiled in Scotland for a long time. Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century accounts of Malcolm describe how he was banished from Scotland by Macbeth (r. 1040-58) after Duncan's murder, and presumably that was how Malcolm learned English as well as his own language.<sup>74</sup> Thus the description of Malcolm's participation as Margaret's interpreter should not be seen as evidence of Malcolm's supposed upbringing in England; on the contrary, this passage sought to create a historical and

---

<sup>71</sup> I owe this reference to Dr. James E. Fraser.

<sup>72</sup> Bede, *HE*, III: xxv.

<sup>73</sup> *Life*, 44-5; Turgot, *Vita*, VIII, 243.

<sup>74</sup> This will be discussed in Chapter 2, under "Dunfermline Compilation."

religious link between Northumbria and Scotland, using Bede's portrayal of Saint Oswald as basis for the portrayal of Malcolm III. Thus, Turgot's narrative ties the recent Scottish past to the Northumbrian distant past, creating a historical link between the Scots and the Northumbrians where both peoples influence and cooperate with each other. Bede represented not only a historical authority on the English pre-Christian past, but was also one of Durham's most revered historians.<sup>75</sup> By reclaiming Bede's account of a Northumbrian past, Turgot constructed Malcolm as an active participant and facilitator of Margaret's reforming zeal. Malcolm became a link between the Scots and the Northumbrians, fostering strong political ties between both people by a process of religious reformation.

The portrayal of King Malcolm as a collaborator in Margaret's religious reforms was also designed to strengthen political and religious links between the Canmore dynasty and the monks of Durham. Close ties between Durham and the Scots kings were first fostered, evidently, by Turgot's agency. Malcolm III was the only layman present at the foundation of Durham Cathedral, along with the prince bishop, William of St Calais, and Turgot himself.<sup>76</sup> According to Valerie Wall, Turgot devised the foundation ceremony as a way of securing his position as prior and archdeacon of Durham during the bishopric of Ranulf Flambard, but Turgot also ensured that Durham was involved in securing the succession of Malcolm and Margaret's children to the

---

<sup>75</sup> Although Bede did not leave Wearmouth-Jarrow Abbey during his lifetime and was initially interred at Jarrow after his death in 735, it is believed that his remains were translated to Durham Cathedral in the eleventh century. See James Campbell, "Bede [St Bede, Bæda, known as the Venerable Bede] (673/4–735), monk, historian, and theologian," Oxford National Dictionary of Biography, online edn 24 May 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1922>.

<sup>76</sup> Valerie Wall, "Malcolm III and the Foundation of Durham Cathedral," in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 325–37, at 325; Barrow, "Scotland and Durham," 313.

Scottish kingship.<sup>77</sup> Queen Matilda's patronage of Turgot's *Life* evidenced the strong relationship between Malcolm and Margaret's children and Turgot. The *Liber Vitae* of Durham documented the special covenant between the monastic community of St Cuthbert and the Scottish royal family that would have special prayers said for the safeguarding of their souls.<sup>78</sup> Likewise, Durham was involved in Duncan II's and Edgar's bids for the Scottish throne: as Geoffrey Barrow has noted, the monks of Durham produced the only extant charter from Duncan II's reign, where Duncan's legitimacy as king is attested.<sup>79</sup> It was at Durham that Duncan's seal was fashioned and it was through English intervention that both Duncan II and Edgar I became kings of Scots.<sup>80</sup> The monks of Durham received generous land grants from Scottish kings Alexander I and David I; it was Alexander I who made Turgot the first non-Scottish bishop of St Andrews and who attended the opening of St Cuthbert's tomb in 1104.<sup>81</sup> Turgot and his monastic community were deeply invested in cementing a reciprocal relationship with the Canmore dynasty.<sup>82</sup>

Turgot's desire to portray Malcolm as Margaret's miracle contradicted contemporary English notions of Scottish backwardness and seems to have been the first of several texts produced in Norman England to contain less negative portrayals of Scots. Turgot's *Life of Saint Margaret* was the first account that featured a positive portrayal of Malcolm III, possibly because

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, 329-30.

<sup>78</sup> Dalton, "Scottish Influence on Durham," 341.

<sup>79</sup> Barrow, "Scotland and Durham," 314. Professor A. A. M. Duncan asserted the authenticity of this charter in Archibald Duncan, "The Earliest Scottish Charters," *Scottish Historical Review* 37 (1958): 103; but this has been questioned in Joseph Donnelly, "The Earliest Scottish Charters?," *Scottish Historical Review* 68, no. 1 (1989): 1-22. Duncan responded to Donnelly's criticism, reasserting his initial dating of the charter to 1094, in A. Duncan, "Yes, The Earliest Scottish Charters," *Scottish Historical Review* 78, no. 205, Part 1 (April 1999): 1-38.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, 314-17.

<sup>81</sup> Barrow, "Scotland and Durham," 314-15; Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1104 AD, 105-6.

<sup>82</sup> Keene, "The Dunfermline Vita," 52.



he sought to strengthen political and religious ties between Durham and the Scottish kings. But most importantly, Turgot's *Life* was the beginning of a series of historiographical attempts to use Malcolm to cement the legitimacy of the Canmore dynasty against alternative claims to the kingship, from both inside and outside the kingdom. This trend was followed by Ælred of Rievaulx, whose ties to both the Scottish kings and Durham contributed to the creation of the second phase of Malcolm's literary image: Malcolm's confrontation with a treacherous nobleman.

### **Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia Regum Anglorum* (1153 x 4)**

Like Turgot of Durham, Ælred of Rievaulx (1110-1167), abbot of the Cistercian abbey of Rievaulx in Yorkshire, developed a close friendship with Malcolm's descendants, in particular with David I of Scotland; his son Prince Henry, earl of Northumberland and Huntingdon; and his stepson, Waltheof, later abbot of Melrose Abbey.<sup>83</sup> Ælred's familiarity with the Canmore dynasty began at the age of 14, when he was sent to the Scottish court, serving as King David's chamberlain or steward.<sup>84</sup> After entering religious life at the age of 24, Ælred's career as an abbot, peacemaker, and prolific writer saw him constantly bridging the boundaries between public and religious life.<sup>85</sup> More importantly, Ælred's appreciation for his friendship with King David inspired three of his most important works: the *Relatio de Standardo* (1153), the *Eulogium Davidis regis Scotorum* (1153), and the *Genealogia regum Anglorum* (1153-4).<sup>86</sup> These three

---

<sup>83</sup> Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*, 39.

<sup>84</sup> Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*, 39-40. Truax noticed that scholars debate what was the extent of Ælred's role in David's court. While Geoffrey Barrow argued that his duties and influence at court were limited, Marsha Dutton and Aelred Squire have both argued that he had the traditional duties of a steward. For Truax, Ælred's comments on his closeness with the King David and Prince Henry show that his duties in court were considerable and influential.

<sup>85</sup> Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*; Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 135.

<sup>86</sup> For these works, see the most recent edition and English translation, Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx*.

works contributed to popularizing King David's image as a pious and just ruler. Nevertheless, David was not the only Scottish monarch featured in Ælred's writings. Both the *Genealogia* and *Relatio de Standardo* reflect briefly on the kingship of David's father, Malcolm III, presenting an ambiguous image of Malcolm's interactions with his own nobility and with his English counterpart. While *Relatio de Standardo*'s portrayal of Malcolm III reverberated contemporary Anglo-Norman ideas of Scottish barbarism, the *Genealogia* pursued a rehabilitated image of Malcolm as a merciful and just king. Ælred's *Genealogia* was the first twelfth-century source to contain the story of Malcolm and the treacherous nobleman. This particular story has been preserved in Scottish historiography, finding its way into the *Gesta Annalia* I (discussed in Chapter 2), to John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (discussed in Chapter 3), Andrew of Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl* (discussed in Chapter 4) and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* (discussed in Chapter 5). While this story contributed to promoting Scottish kings as civilized and merciful, Ælred's narrative also served as an example of good kingship for David I to follow. The narrative also had repercussions for Malcolm's later historiographical portrayals.

Ælred composed the *Genealogia regum Anglorum* between November 1153 and October 1154, during the last year of David's reign and before the death of King Stephen of England in October 1154.<sup>87</sup> Elizabeth Freeman noted that the *Genealogia* was a continuation of the *Eulogium Davidis regis Scotorum*, linking David's ancestry to that of the Anglo-Saxon kings of England.<sup>88</sup> The *Genealogia* has been seen as a "mirror" for kings, as a "future-oriented history"

---

<sup>87</sup> Marsha L. Dutton, "Aelred of Rievaulx: Abbot, Teacher, and Author," in *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167)*, vol. 76, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017), 17–47, at 41.

<sup>88</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 115–16 ; Dutton, "Abbot, Teacher, and Author," 41; Ælred, *Genealogia*, 71. In the dedication, David is mentioned as a kinsman of Duke Henry of Anjou (Henry II of England). Dauvit Broun, following Marsha Dutton's introduction to the English translation of the *Genealogia*, states that the *Eulogium* and *Genealogia* are not separate works; rather, John Pinkerton

with the aim of serving as a guide to kingship for Henry of Anjou (the future Henry II of England).<sup>89</sup> From the outset, David was disassociated from his Scottish predecessors and refashioned instead as the descendant of the Anglo-Saxon kings, from Woden to Edward the Confessor.<sup>90</sup> Ælred presented David as the son of a new dynasty severed from its Scottish past and implanted into the Anglo-Saxon house of Wessex. Contrary to portrayals of barbaric Celts found in contemporary Anglo-Norman chronicles, Ælred's King David was a paragon of civility that lived as a "monk-king."<sup>91</sup>

Ælred commenced his account of Malcolm and the treacherous nobleman by asserting that he heard the story from King David himself: "as the noble King David tells it, will, I know, reveal to my readers the kind heart King Malcolm had."<sup>92</sup> According to Ælred, Malcolm was alerted by a member of his court that another leading nobleman met with the king's enemies in a plot to kill him. Instead of accusing the would-be traitor, Malcolm asked the informant to be silent and when the traitor returned to court, the king ordered his men to present themselves in the morning for a hunt. After a day of hunting, Malcolm arrived at a hillock:

Each day it offered welcome rest to soldiers wearied with the hunt. The king stood on it, higher than the rest; in accord with the law of hunting that in the people's tongue is called a *tryst*, he assigned each of the thanes and his dog a separate place, so that where the wild

---

was the first modern editor to reproduce the *Eulogium* separate from the *Genealogia* in 1789. Broun further suggests that the version of the *Genealogia* printed by Migne in 1855 is an abbreviation of the full *Genealogia*. Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum* and Bower's *Scotichronicon* represent the fuller version of Ælred's text. See Dauvit Broun, "Attitudes of Gall to Gaedhel in Scotland before John of Fordun," in *Miorun Mòr Nan Gall, "The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander"?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern*, ed. D. Broun and M. D. MacGregor (Glasgow, UK: Centre for Scottish and Celtic Studies, University of Glasgow, 2009), 49–82, at 69, fn. 60, <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/8835/>; and Marsha Dutton, "Introduction," in Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, 35–6.

<sup>89</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 128.

<sup>90</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia*, 73.

<sup>91</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 128 (for King David's monk-like behaviour) and 133 (for view of Celts as barbarians).

<sup>92</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia*, 116.

animal, blocked on all sides, might choose and exit, it would meet extinction. He himself, however, kept that traitor with him apart from the others, alone with himself.<sup>93</sup>

In the *Genealogia*, Ælred portrays Malcolm in an improved light, compared to the accounts of Malcolm found in contemporary chronicles; Malcolm and his court are here following, anachronistically, Norman customs and conventions for entertainment. In fact, it was David who established the first hunting reserves in Scotland, since forest laws in England were first introduced by William the Conqueror.<sup>94</sup> David's interest in hunting is attested in several royal charters issued during his reign, including a twelfth-century amendment about hunting added to a charter dated to the reign of Macbeth.<sup>95</sup> Since David would have been between eight and ten years old at the time of his father's death, and afterwards lived in England,<sup>96</sup> it can be assumed with confidence that Ælred's account of Malcolm is fictionalized, but whether the invention is attributable to Ælred or to King David is debatable. His intention in citing King David as the source of this story was to impress his impartiality as a historian upon the reader. Ælred's depiction of Malcolm in the *Genealogia* exemplifies his rejection of the stereotype of the barbaric Celt that was so predominant in the historiography of the mid-twelfth century in England.<sup>97</sup> It also shows a new historiographical trend: historians writing from David's reign onwards depict him and his descendants as civilized kings, Anglo-Norman in language and customs, as opposed to the barbaric people they ruled. David's interest in hunting, a popular twelfth-century Norman pastime, might explain Ælred's depiction of Malcolm III as an enthusiastic participant in the tryst. By depicting Malcolm's court as civilized according to

---

<sup>93</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, *Genealogia*, 117.

<sup>94</sup> Gilbert, "Hunting Reserves," 17-20; Judith A. Green, "Forest Laws in England and Normandy in the Twelfth Century," *Historical Research* 86, no. 233 (2013): 416-31, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12003>.

<sup>95</sup> Gilbert, "Hunting Reserves," 3-4.

<sup>96</sup> Oram, *David I*, 49.

<sup>97</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 138.

Norman conventions, Ælred portrayed Malcolm as an active and civilized participant in Norman culture, linking an imagined Scottish past to the reality of David's kingship.

In this particular account, Malcolm's troubles with traitors from within his ranks seem inspired by David's own struggles as king of Scots rather than by a historically-accurate assessment of eleventh-century Scottish kingship. In particular, King David's experience with treachery from within his own ranks could have inspired Ælred's narrative about Malcolm and the traitor. In 1130, David had to confront the dynastic opposition of Angus of Moray and Malcolm MacHeth, both of whom intended to take over the Scottish kingship while David was away at the English court.<sup>98</sup> In *Relatio de Standardo*, Ælred narrated that Malcolm MacHeth's rebellion against King David was an attempt to usurp the Scottish crown.<sup>99</sup> Ælred portrayed William FitzDuncan, earl of Moray and David's nephew, as a traitor; Ælred was aware that treachery in Scotland came from the earldom of Moray.<sup>100</sup> Opposition against the Scottish king was prevalent during David's reign,<sup>101</sup> and it is likely that it was David's own political troubles that inspired his account of Malcolm and the treacherous noble.

Contemporary politics might have conditioned Ælred's portrayal of Malcolm III in the *Genealogia*, yet Ælred was also influenced by representations of treachery, chivalry and masculinity in twelfth-century chronicles. When Malcolm had a moment alone with the traitor, he then confronted him. The king encouraged the traitor to do what he intended, since they were both alone and none of the court would come to their aid. Malcolm's taunts were aimed at diminishing the traitor's masculinity:

---

<sup>98</sup> Oram, *David I*, 85-6, and 90-1.

<sup>99</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, De Standardo*, 263.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid, 265.

<sup>101</sup> McDonald, *Outlaws*, 75-85; R. Andrew McDonald, "'Treachery in the Remotest Territories of Scotland': Northern Resistance to the Canmore Dynasty, 1130-1230," *Canadian Journal of History* 34 (1999).

If you are able, if you dare, if you have the heart, carry out what you have intended... If you plan to kill me, what time is better, safer, freer of dangers, even more manly? Have you prepared poison? But who does not know that that is womanish? Or are you going to set a trap in my bed? Even adulteresses can do that. Or have you hidden a sword, to strike me in hiding? No one doubts that that is what bandits do, not soldiers. Do rather what better becomes a soldier; act like a man; fight me while alone with me alone, so that your betrayal, which cannot be free of perfidy, will at least be free of disgrace.<sup>102</sup>

Malcolm's message was clear: treachery is unmanly. The traitor's options for killing the king were unbecoming of a true knight. Ælred recounted that "up to this point, the man had scarcely restrained himself;"<sup>103</sup> restrained masculinity and true knighthood are closely linked in this passage. Confronted with the possibility of committing an act contrary to notions of masculinity, the traitor was reduced to begging for the king's forgiveness. Malcolm's response to the traitor's repentance was royal mercy: instead of showing lack of restraint by punishing the traitor with death, Malcolm abstained from enacting capital punishment, protecting the traitor's reputation in the process.<sup>104</sup> Ælred's representation of Malcolm as a merciful monarch contrasts sharply with contemporary portrayals found in English chronicles and discussed earlier in this chapter. Portraying Malcolm as a merciful king diminished arguments of Scottish barbarity promoted by Anglo-Norman chroniclers, disassociating stereotypes of Scottish barbarism from representations of Scottish kingship. In the *Genealogia*, Malcolm became an example of good kingship:<sup>105</sup> Malcolm's restrained response to treachery was an appropriate example for David to follow.

Despite the *Genealogia*'s insistence on Malcolm's merciful kingship, Ælred's other portrayals of Malcolm were not as laudatory as the one included in the *Genealogia*. In *Relatio de Standardo*, he provided an account of the Battle of the Standard that focused on the actions of

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid, 117-8.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, 118.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, 118-9.

<sup>105</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 125, for the observation that the *Genealogia* showed Ælred's desire to educate kings by providing examples of good kingship.

David and his son, Henry, earl of Northumbria and Huntingdon. Walter Espec, founder of Rievaulx Abbey, gave a speech on the battlefield that included a short reference to the relationship between Malcolm and William the Conqueror:

These [the Scots], these are the men who once thought they would not resist us but yield, when William, the conqueror of England, penetrated Lothian, Calatria, and Scotland as far as Abernethy and when *that warlike Malcolm* became ours by surrender--and now they are challenging their own conquerors, their masters in war!<sup>106</sup>

Walter Espec's speech portrayed Scots as a conquered people, ungrateful and treacherous to their masters, the English. The speech repeated ideas of Malcolm as "warlike" and as surrendering to William at Abernethy in 1072. Scholars have shown that Ælred based his account of the *Relatio* on Henry of Huntingdon's account of the battle; Huntingdon's account reinforced images of barbaric Scottish soldiers devastating the north of England.<sup>107</sup> It seems that this particular portrayal of Malcolm III is explained by Ælred's use of Huntingdon as a source. It is also rather telling that Ælred did not attempt to tie Malcolm to King David in this instance: "that warlike Malcolm" was not described as the father of the current king of Scots, possibly as an attempt to disassociate David from Scottish barbarity. Ælred's narration of Walter Espec's speech shows the prevalence of stereotypes of Scots as barbarians, and especially of Malcolm as a bellicose king. These ideas were still prevalent in chronicles written in the middle of the twelfth century and they show the ambiguity of the portrayals of kings of Scots in English chronicles.

Ælred's portrayal of Malcolm in this passage contrasts with his portrayal of David and his son in *Relatio de Standardo*. Both men were represented as civilized royalty that took poor decisions due to the ill-conceived advice of some of their nobles.<sup>108</sup> For example, Robert de

---

<sup>106</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, De Standardo*, 253 (my emphasis).

<sup>107</sup> Freeman, "Aelred as a Historian among Historians," 138-9; see also Oram, *David I*, 129-31.

<sup>108</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, De Standardo*, 257-259. "He [Prince Henry] was a young man fair of face and handsome in appearance, of such humility that he seemed lower than everyone, of such authority

Bruce, the Anglo-Norman ancestor of the eponymous king of Scots, warned David against invading England: “Spare yourself, therefore, O King, spare yourself, spare your kingdom, spare above all your son, the most splendid of young men! Today you are exposing them, naked of counsel and deprived of all help, to the treachery of the Scots and presenting him to their fury.”<sup>109</sup> Bruce further warned the king to “Beware especially of implicating yourself in the sins of wicked men.”<sup>110</sup> King David disregarded Bruce’s advice, listening instead to his nephew William FitzDuncan, earl of Moray, described as “the principal instigator of the war.”<sup>111</sup> Ælred’s opinion on the Battle of the Standard was later repeated by William of Newburgh in *Historia rerum Anglicarum* (1189 x 1196), which portrayed David as “disgraced” since the Scots “rushed boldly into battle.”<sup>112</sup> William of Newburgh and Ælred of Rievaulx represent English chroniclers who, like Turgot of Durham, were somehow close to Northumbria or to the Scottish kings, and were more eager to portray Scottish kings in a favourable light.

Ælred of Rievaulx’s accounts of King Malcolm thus represented a subtle shift into more ambiguous views of Scottish kings in Anglo-Norman historical writings. The *Genealogia* reimagined Malcolm as a pious king whose restrained response to a murder attempt served to foster links between good kingship and good knighthood. It served also to break with stereotypes of Scottish kings as barbarians. Despite including the story of Malcolm and his would-be assailant in the *Genealogia*, Ælred’s short comment on Malcolm’s submission to William the Conqueror perpetuated stereotypes of Scots as treacherous and rebellious. Ælred’s ambiguous

---

that he was revered by everyone, and so gentle, so pleasant, and so agreeable that he was loved by everyone.”

<sup>109</sup> Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx, De Standardo*, 263.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 263.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 265.

<sup>112</sup> William of Newburgh, *The History of William of Newburgh*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London, 1856), 410.



portrayals of Malcolm were part of a wider trend in Anglo-Norman historiography while simultaneously they paved the way for the unabashedly favourable portrayals of Malcolm found in Scottish historical writings of the thirteenth century. This account of King Malcolm constituted the basis on which thirteenth-century Scottish portrayals of Malcolm as a dynastic founder would rest.

### **Chronicle of Melrose Abbey, first phase (1173 x 4)**

The original content of the *Chronicle of Melrose* was written between 1173 x 4 by a team of scribes, with considerable additions and re-writings that dated mostly from the mid-thirteenth century.<sup>113</sup> The *Chronicle* contains additions and information written by a total of forty-four scribes, writing between the late twelfth and late thirteenth centuries.<sup>114</sup> It was commissioned by Abbot Jocelyn, later bishop of Glasgow, one of the greatest Scottish literary patrons of his day.<sup>115</sup> Although what is considered the *Chronicle of Melrose* is found in British Library MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fos. 1-75, recent scholarship by Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison has identified British Library Cotton Julius B. XIII, fos. 1-47 as containing the first part of the *Chronicle*. Palaeographic and codicological analysis has concluded that both parts of the *Chronicle of*

---

<sup>113</sup> Broun, "Recovering," 53-5 (for MS dating); Broun "III: Editing the Chronicle of Melrose," 30; and Broun "VII: Charting the Chronicle's Physical Development," in Broun and Harrison, *Chronicle of Melrose Abbey*, 125-73.

<sup>114</sup> Broun, "Editing," 31.

<sup>115</sup> A. A. M. Duncan, "Sources and Uses of the Chronicle of Melrose, 1165-1297," in *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland, 500-1297: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the Occasion of the Ninetieth Birthday*, ed. Simon Taylor (Dublin: Four Court Press, 2000), 149-50. Jocelin of Melrose also commissioned the *Life of St Kentigern* from Jocelin of Furness. See Dauvit Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 125-46; Norman F. Shead, "Jocelin, Abbot of Melrose (1170-1174), and Bishop of Glasgow (1175-1199)," *The Innes Review* 54, no. 1 (June 1, 2003): 1-22, <https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2003.54.1.1>; Helen Birkett, "From the Testimony of Trustworthy Men," in *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2010), 115-38; and *Jocelin of Furness: proceedings of the 2011 Conference*, ed. Clare Downham. (Donington, Shaun Dyas, 2013), 5.

*Melrose* were written by individual scribes who were responsible for specific sections, and that it is possible that the scribes decided the sources, content and form of the section they wrote.<sup>116</sup> For Broun, this methodological inconsistency accounted for the *Chronicle*'s "variety... in subject-matter."<sup>117</sup> However, the content of the *Chronicle* is not necessarily inconsistent or unfocused, a fact Broun recognized in the statigraphic study cited in this chapter.<sup>118</sup> Taking into consideration the study of *Chronicle* by Broun and Harrison, this section will examine the entries about Malcolm III found in MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fos. 12r-16r. Because of the complex layered structure of the *Chronicle*'s entries, this section of the chapter will analyze the first phase of the *Chronicle*'s composition, which occurred between 1173 x 4. First, it will identify the scribe responsible for the entries on Malcolm III, discussing the sources, uses, and focus of his entries. Then, the section will discuss in detail how the Englishness, particularly the Northumbrian identity, of the monastic community of Melrose conditioned the choice of historical sources, and thus the Anglo-centric view of Scottish history put forward in the *Chronicle*. Although the *Chronicle*'s portrayal of Malcolm III is partly explained by the Northumbrian origin of the historical sources consulted by scribes, it is greatly responsive to the nature of Anglo-Scottish political struggle between 1173 and 1174. The scribe responsible for entering information on Malcolm III was focused on transmitting English history from a Northumbrian point of view, manipulating information about Malcolm to reflect on contemporary political events.

The identification of the scribal hand that wrote the entries about Malcolm III in the *Chronicle of Melrose* helps clarify the scribe's activities and intention. Broun suggests that the

---

<sup>116</sup> Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 149.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> Broun, "Recovering," 53. Broun argued here that "the whole project was left in the hands of a team of scribes working with only some general guidance on how to achieve their goal of creating a codex which would embrace a Christian and particularly English conception of the past."

scribe responsible for the majority of the text in MS Cotton Julian B. XIII and for the entries about Malcolm III in MS Cotton Faustina IX, fos. 12r-13v and 15r-21r was Scribe 3.<sup>119</sup> These entries show antipathy towards Malcolm's military activities in northern England, as they focused on documenting Malcolm's attacks in Northumbria in general.<sup>120</sup> According to the *Chronicle*, in 1062 Malcolm "ferociously devastated Northumbria, violating the peace of St Cuthbert in Holy Island."<sup>121</sup> In 1070, Malcolm entered England and "devastated Cleveland all the way;" in the same entry, the scribe inserted information on Edgar Ætheling's arrival in Scotland with his sisters, Margaret and Christina, and the resulting marriage between Malcolm and Margaret.<sup>122</sup> The *Chronicle of Melrose* recorded further attacks initiated by Malcolm after his marriage to Margaret. The scribe also described the relationship between King Malcolm and King William. The entry for 1072 explains that King William entered Scotland and met Malcolm at Abernethy, yet the information following this entry was erased.<sup>123</sup> The original entry read "and became his man," an act of submission that would prove Scotland's subjugation to English rule.<sup>124</sup> Later, in 1079, Malcolm entered England and "devastated up to the Tyne."<sup>125</sup> The following year, King William sent his son, Robert Curthose, to meet Malcolm in Scotland at "Eaglesuret" but the visit was fruitless except for the foundation of Newcastle on the river

---

<sup>119</sup> Broun, "Charting the Chronicle's Physical Development," 127. According to Broun, Scribe 3 was responsible for writing the main text in Julius B. XIII, fos. 2r-40r and Faustina B. IX fos. 12r-13v and 15r-21r. The Faustina B. IX folios written by Scribe 3 contain the entries about Malcolm III.

<sup>120</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fos. 12v-16v.

<sup>121</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 15r: "Northimbriam, ferociter depopulator; violata pace sancti Cuthberti in Halielande."

<sup>122</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 15r. "usque cliueland uastauit."

<sup>123</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 15v; For discussion on the erasure of this information, see Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 143.

<sup>124</sup> Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 143. Broun suggests that the information on Malcolm's submission was erased in 1291, when Edward I of England was near Melrose, looking for chronicle information that would provide evidence for his lordship of Scotland.

<sup>125</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 15v: "ad tynam uastavit."

Tyne.<sup>126</sup> In 1091, William Rufus and his army met Malcolm at Lothian after Malcolm had devastated northern England; Robert helped pacify relations between William and Malcolm, resulting in Malcolm's submission and obedience.<sup>127</sup> The last entry on Malcolm's reign is found under 1093, the year he died, where the scribe recorded that Malcolm was involved in the foundation ceremony for Durham Cathedral. Immediately thereafter, Scribe 3 noted that "King Malcolm, with his first-born son Edward, was slain at Northumbria."<sup>128</sup>

The scribe copied the majority of the information on Malcolm's kingship from the *Historia regum Anglorum* (see Appendix A).<sup>129</sup> The *Historia regum*'s scathing portrayal of Malcolm represents Northumbrian impressions of Scots from the 1120s, when Scoto-Northumbrian relations, particularly between David I and the monastic community at Durham, declined significantly. Scribe 3's reliance on the *Historia Regum*'s portrayal of Malcolm signalled the scribe's opinion of Scottish activity in northern England. Melrose, like Dryburgh, is located in what Adam of Dryburgh considered "the land of England but the kingdom of Scots:" the choice of the *Historia regum* as the primary source for these entries provides evidence to further support Broun's assertion that the monks of Melrose during this period might have self-identified as English rather than Scots.<sup>130</sup> However, considering Melrose's proximity to Northumbria, it is possible that the choice of the *Historia regum* as one of the sources for the *Chronicle*'s text was also based on accessibility to sources produced at Durham. The reliance on an early twelfth-

---

<sup>126</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 15v.

<sup>127</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 16r.

<sup>128</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 16r. "Rex Malcolmus cum filio suo primogenito edwardo a norhimbris occisus est." See also Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 146, for Scribe 3's sources, which includes the *Historia Anglorum*.

<sup>129</sup> Durham, *HR*, 124; 135; 138-9.

<sup>130</sup> Broun, "Becoming Scottish in the Thirteenth Century," 19-31; Broun, "Becoming a Nation," 95.

century Northumbrian historical source reveals how the community at Melrose felt about living “in the land of England, but the kingdom of the Scots.”

Before examining Scribe 3’s use of Northumbrian sources to describe Malcolm’s kingship in the *Chronicle*, it is important to examine further evidence of the English identity of Melrose’s monastic community. Jocelin of Furness was commissioned to write a hagiography of Saint Waltheof, abbot of Melrose (1148-65), that was nearly contemporary to the *Chronicle of Melrose*. In the account, Abbot Waltheof was described as an English saint: “let England rejoice that by divine gift she has now received her seventh saint of incorrupt body, to shine out over the whole kingdom like a seven-branched candelabrum.”<sup>131</sup> Waltheof was, indeed, of English noble stock: his mother was Matilda of Huntingdon, wife of David I of Scotland, and a descendant of Earls Waltheof (d. 1076) and Siward of Northumbria (d. 1055). Earl Waltheof, considered a martyr, was the only Anglo-Saxon nobleman beheaded by William the Conqueror after 1066, accused of inciting a revolt against William’s rule.<sup>132</sup> There was considerable interest in Earl Waltheof’s martyrdom in the *Life of St Waltheof*: Jocelin of Furness’s account of Earl Waltheof’s martyrdom, which insisted on the earl’s innocence, is markedly different from other written accounts of his death and it is strongly pro-Waltheof in content.<sup>133</sup> It is possible that Jocelin obtained his account of Earl Waltheof from a Melrose version of events.<sup>134</sup> Emphasis on Earl Waltheof’s innocence could have been influenced by the strong anti-Norman, pro-English sentiment found in late twelfth-century historical writings, a sentiment shared by the *Chronicle of Melrose*. The promulgation of a Northumbrian perspective and pro-English version of

---

<sup>131</sup> See *Vita Waldevi*, AASS 135, p. 277E, cited in Helen Birkett, *The Saints’ Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (York: York Medieval Press, 2010), 136.

<sup>132</sup> Birkett, “Vita S. Waldevi,” 130.

<sup>133</sup> Birkett, “Vita S. Waldevi,” 121.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid*, 122.

historical events and saintly deeds in both the *Chronicle of Melrose* and the *Life of Saint Waltheof* is likely due to the monastic community's sense of English, and particularly, Northumbrian identity at a time when Melrose was within the political domain of the king of Scots.

Jocelin's depiction of Abbot Waltheof's sanctity showed a preoccupation for interpreting the recent past through a Northumbrian historical lens, specifically through the writings of Bede.<sup>135</sup> In 1171, the monks of Melrose opened Waltheof's tomb to find that his body was uncorrupted, an episode that Jocelin noted from oral testimony but that he compared to the opening of the tomb of St Cuthbert.<sup>136</sup> Similarly, Jocelin's description of the vision of Walter, a monk of Melrose, is paralleled by two accounts from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*: Drythelm's vision of heaven and hell and Caedmon's story. While the parallelisms are imbedded in the narrative but not apparent in the use of language, Helen Birkett has argued that Walter possibly read Bede's accounts on Drythelm and Caedmon and recounted his personal experience through the lens of Bede's writings. The account of Walter's visions appears to have been moulded by the reading interest of the monastic community at Melrose, since Walter seems familiar with Bede's accounts of Drythelm and Caedmon.<sup>137</sup> In that case, it is probable that Walter, and his monastic community, saw themselves as part of this Northumbrian cultural and historical legacy. Similar to Turgot's treatment of Malcolm's role as Margaret's translator, Jocelin used Bede's account of the Northumbrian past to model his *Life of St Waltheof*. More importantly, the insistence on a Northumbrian sense of identity and history to describe the life and miracles of Saint Waltheof of Melrose during the 1170s, around the time the *Chronicle of Melrose* was written, supports the

---

<sup>135</sup> Birkett, "Vita S. Waldevi," 129-31.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid, 129.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid, 131.

argument that the monastic community at Melrose identified as English, and specifically as Northumbrians at this time.

An example of Northumbrian emphasis in the *Chronicle of Melrose* is found in the entry for year 1054. Scribe 3 wrote, “Siward, duke of the Northumbrians, by the command of King Edward, entered Scotland with a large army engaging in battle with the king of Scots, Macbeth, putting him to flight. And Malcolm, as the king commanded, was established king.”<sup>138</sup> While Scribe 3 obtained his information from the *Historia Regum*, this particular entry also appeared in other twelfth-century Anglo-Norman sources. The first chronicle version of this entry is found in John of Worcester’s *Chronicon ex chronicis*, written in the early twelfth century:

Siward, the stout earl of Northumbria, by order of the king entered Scotland, with a large body of cavalry and a powerful fleet, and fought a battle with Macbeth, king of the Scots, in which the king was defeated with the loss of many thousands both of the Scots and of the Normans before mentioned; he then, as the king had commanded, raised to the throne Malcolm, son of the king of the Cumbrians.<sup>139</sup>

William of Malmesbury included the same account in his *Gesta regum Anglorum*, written roughly at the same time as the *Chronicon*:

Siward, earl of the Northumbrians, who at his command, engaging with Macbeth, the Scottish king, deprived him of both life and his kingdom, and placed on the throne Malcolm who was *the son of the king of Cumbria*.<sup>140</sup>

Malmesbury’s account added information on Macbeth, who was presumed killed by Siward in battle. Both Worcester and Malmesbury were following an entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* D, written in the north of England, and containing additional information on events in Scotland:

In this year Earl Siward went with a large force into Scotland and inflicted heavy losses on the Scots and routed them, and the king escaped.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v.

<sup>139</sup> Worcester, *Chronicon*, 1054 AD; Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1054 AD, 124.

<sup>140</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, 214.

<sup>141</sup> *ASC* D, 1054 AD, 128-9.

The *ASC* neither includes information on Macbeth's death nor the circumstances under which Siward entered Scotland with an army. Most importantly, there is no indication whatsoever that Siward's military intervention had anything to do with the Scottish succession, as Malcolm is not even mentioned in this entry. The most logical explanation for these incongruences is that different historians confused information on a certain Malcolm, son of the king of the Cumbrians,<sup>142</sup> and added this information under the entry for Siward's battle in Scotland in 1054.

A.A.M. Duncan has argued that it was William of Malmesbury who adapted John of Worcester's entry to portray Malcolm III as Malcolm, son of the king of the Cumbrians.<sup>143</sup> Yet both entries could be interpreted in a similar manner: that Siward of Northumbria placed Malcolm, son of the king of the Cumbrians, as king of Scots after Siward defeated Macbeth in battle.<sup>144</sup> Though the status of Cumbria, or Strathclyde, as an independent kingdom in the mid-eleventh century has been the subject of considerable debate,<sup>145</sup> by Worcester and Malmesbury's time, it was held by the king of Scots. Alexander I had assigned to his brother, David, the regions of Cumbria and Lothian as a lordship; in fact, David styled himself as *princeps* of Cumbria in contemporary charters, even when he did not hold all of Cumbria under his control.<sup>146</sup> David's position in Cumbria could have been the result of the partition of the kingdom: Edgar I gave

---

<sup>142</sup> A. A. M. Duncan first made this argument in *Kingship of the Scots*, 40; see further discussion of Duncan's conclusions see Oram, *David I*, 19-21 and Dauvit Broun, "The Welsh Identity of the Kingdom of Strathclyde 900–1200," *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 111–180, at 133-4 and 138, <https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2004.55.2.111>.

<sup>143</sup> A. A. M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 40.

<sup>144</sup> Tim Clarkson, "Son of the king of the Cumbrians," in *Strathclyde and the Anglo-Saxons in the Viking Age* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2014), 149-52.

<sup>145</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 40; Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba, 789-1070*, 156 and 261-2; Clarkson, "Son of the king of the Cumbrians," 149-52.

<sup>146</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 60.



David control over the region of Glasgow.<sup>147</sup> It is plausible that William of Malmesbury and John of Worcester assumed that the Cumbrian Malcolm was Malcolm III because his son David held Cumbria in the early twelfth century during the reigns of his brothers Edgar I and Alexander I.<sup>148</sup>

Evidence from the *Gesta regum Anglorum* suggests that William of Malmesbury considered the Cumbrian Malcolm and Malcolm III as two different men. Malmesbury's *Gesta* differentiated between the king of Scots and the king of the Cumbrians (or Cambrians) in the entry for the year 959, where King Edgar of England accepted the submission of "Kinad (Kenneth), king of the Scots, *Malcolm, king of the Cambrians*, the prince of pirates, Maccus, all of the Welsh kings [...]"<sup>149</sup> Moreover, while historians have customarily considered that the kingdom of Strathclyde was subject to the kingdom of the Scots, and that Cumbrian kings were Gaelic through the male line, Dauvit Broun has recently rejected this idea, arguing that tenth-century Cumbrian kings were Britonic in culture and lineage.<sup>150</sup> Thus while it is not impossible that the chroniclers in question could have confused a Cumbrian prince with Malcolm III, Malmesbury's commentary on the 959 submission to King Edgar suggests that the chronicler could have known that the two titles were not interchangeable at least by that date, and that Malcolm king of the Cumbrians and Malcolm king of Scots were different individuals.

There is also evidence that the monks of Melrose considered Cumbria as a distinct politico-cultural entity in the late twelfth century. In the *Life of Kentigern*, written by Jocelin of Furness

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, 61.

<sup>148</sup> Woolf, who attributes the idea of Malcolm III as Cumbrian prince to John of Fordun, has argued this point. See Woolf, *Pictland to Alba*, 157.

<sup>149</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, 147.

<sup>150</sup> Broun, "Welsh Identity," 126-7. Furthermore, Broun argued that "The demonstration of an on-going Brythonic kingdom of Strathclyde under its own line of kings well into the eleventh century means that we should seek to understand this kingdom's demise as a phenomenon of the mid-eleventh century, not earlier."

and commissioned by Abbot Jocelin of Melrose, later bishop of Glasgow, the diocese of Glasgow was situated “according to the limits of the Cambrian kingdom.”<sup>151</sup> Cambria stood between Scotland and England, and in the Office of St Kentigern found in the Sprouson Breviary, it is a term used interchangeably with Britannia and Wallia.<sup>152</sup> This suggests a strong cultural association between Cambria and Wales as linguistically similar. However, Jocelin of Furness is specific about the terminology used to describe the country of Kentigern: it is Cambria, not Wallia, differentiating between the kingdoms.<sup>153</sup> So the idea of Cambria as a distinct geopolitical entity was clear by the time Jocelin of Melrose commissioned the *Life of St Kentigern*. If both Abbot Jocelin and Jocelin of Furness could differentiate between Cambria/Cumbria and Scotland in the late twelfth century, as William of Malmesbury had been able to do in the *Gesta regum*, it can be inferred that Scribe 3 was well aware of this distinction. Most importantly, Scribe 3 knew that “Malcolm, son of the king of the Cumbrians” was not Malcolm III because his source, the *Historia regum*, specified that Malcolm III held Cumbria “not by right, but by force.”<sup>154</sup> This information led Scribe 3 to delete the clause “son of the king of the Cumbrians” from his entry for the year 1054. It is Scribe 3 in the *Chronicle of Melrose* who first *explicitly* identified Malcolm, the Cumbrian prince, with Malcolm III. Scribe 3 converted an innocuous entry on the son of the king of the Cumbrians into a charged political statement: that Malcolm III held his kingdom as a client king *because* of English royal intervention.

---

<sup>151</sup> Alexander Penrose Forbes (ed.) *Lives of S. Ninian and S. Kentigern compiled in the Twelfth Century* (Edinburgh, 1874), 55, 182-3, cited in Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 125. For a discussion of the the *Life of St Kentigern* as a vehicle for propagating ideas of a Cumbric identity for Glasgow, see Broun, “Welsh identity,” 111-180.

<sup>152</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 126.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid, 126.

<sup>154</sup> Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1070 AD, 139.

Scribe 3's entry was an innovative interpretation of the battle of 1054 between the Scots and the English. This particular entry exemplifies the Anglo-centric view of Scottish kingship as derived from the intervention of the English king and nobility. The intervention of Earl Siward in placing Malcolm as king also showed the monks of Melrose's interest in a Northumbrian articulation of the English (and Scottish) past. Such a view has conditioned our understanding of Malcolm III as an Anglicized Scottish prince, which is the basis for the last phase on the evolution of Malcolm's portrayal in Scottish historiography, to be explored in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of this study. Why would the monks of Melrose portray Malcolm as placed on the Scottish throne by orders of Edward the Confessor, denying his royal sovereignty? The decision to omit the identifier of this particular Malcolm from the entry can be ascribed to contemporary political circumstances. The monks of Melrose might have not seen themselves as Scots by this point, and the Scottish-led violence that erupted in northern England during the years 1173 and 1174 could provide an answer for the *Chronicle*'s depiction of Malcolm Canmore.

The *Chronicle of Melrose*'s emphasis on the year 1174 provides the clue for understanding why Scribe 3 was interested in portraying Malcolm III as a client king of England. Scribe 3, who copied the original entries on Malcolm in MS Faustina B. IX, was also responsible for copying Hugh of Saint-Victor's *Chronicle* found in MS Julius B. XIII.<sup>155</sup> The scribe extended Saint-Victor's *Chronicle* to the year 1174, though for Broun "the significance of 1174 is not immediately apparent."<sup>156</sup> Yet, in December 1174 William the Lion, king of Scots, was forced to sign the Treaty of Falaise while in captivity. Broun's dating of the *Chronicle of Melrose* coincides with the king of Scots' involvement in the rebellion against Henry II in favour of his

---

<sup>155</sup> Broun, "Recovering," 53.

<sup>156</sup> Broun, "Recovering," 53.

son, Henry the Young King, between 1173 and 1174, and the Battle of Alnwick in 1174, where William was captured by Ranulf de Glanville.<sup>157</sup> The *Chronicle of Melrose* was composed during a period of intense Anglo-Scottish antagonism that saw increased Scottish hostility against the north of England, and that culminated in the establishment of Scotland as a fiefdom of the king of England, for which William had to pay an annual tribute.<sup>158</sup> The Treaty of Falaise established English lordship over Scotland. Scribe 3's decision to identify the Malcolm in the 1054 AD entry as Malcolm III was possibly motivated by the loss of sovereignty experienced by the Scottish king due to the signing of the Treaty of Falaise in 1174. Furthermore, the king of Scots' new subservient status established peace in the Scottish Borders, as it minimized armed incursions into the north of England. The transformation of Malcolm into a client king in the *Chronicle of Melrose* reflected Scribe 3's approval of the subordination of William the Lion to the king of England, since the new relationship promised peace from armed conflict in the region.

The antecedent for the Treaty of Falaise was King William's involvement in the rebellion against Henry II of England begun by Henry, the Young King. According to David Carpenter, the Young King's rebellion was an ideal opportunity for Henry II's enemies to unite against him. Several nobles, such as Hugh earl of Chester, Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk, Robert earl of Leicester and even King William himself had been deprived of lands previously belonging to them by inheritance or obtained during the reign of King Stephen.<sup>159</sup> When faced with the prospect of recovering Northumbria, which he saw as his by hereditary right, William initially

---

<sup>157</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 226. See also Fantosme, *Chronicle*; and Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 98-102. For Broun's dating of the *Chronicle of Melrose*, see Broun, "Recovering the Chronicle of Melrose," 53-55. A. A. M. Duncan had also dated the *Chronicle of Melrose* to the 1170s. See Duncan, "Sources and Uses," 157.

<sup>158</sup> Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, 99; Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 225-6.

<sup>159</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 224.

chose the diplomatic route: he “checked first with King Henry, who offered nothing, and then threw his lot with the Young King, who promised Carlisle and the northern counties.”<sup>160</sup> William and his brother, David earl of Huntingdon, ravaged Northumbria “and reduced it to famine,” a military move certain to prove unpopular with the local population. In 1174, William invaded Cumbria, taking Carlisle.<sup>161</sup> Yet William’s military and political luck was not to last. On 13 July 1174, he was surprised by English forces at Alnwick, tied to his horse, and taken to Henry II.<sup>162</sup> William’s capture ended the rebellion; he was subsequently criticized by Jordan Fantosme, a contemporary Anglo-Norman historian, for behaving rashly. The Scottish army was also criticized for its brutality.<sup>163</sup> The *Chronicle of Melrose*’s account of the rebellion echoed the indignation at William’s treatment of Northumbria:

However, from there the king departed [that place], and the Scots cruelly burned the great part of Northumbria with fire and savagely pierced through its people with the sword. From there, they marched to Carlisle and attacked all the men of the city.<sup>164</sup>

The entry is not contemporary to events: it was recorded by Scribe 13, who wrote the main entries for the annals of 1171-97 sometime between 1199 and 1214.<sup>165</sup> But Scribe 13’s

---

<sup>160</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 224. Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 99. For the Scottish kings’ relationship with Northumbria, and William’s relationship with Durham in particular, see Barrow, “Scotland and Durham,” 311–23, at 320. Jordan Fantosme, writing at the time of the rebellion, expressed that it was Henry II’s intransigence and poor treatment of William which pushed the king of Scots to rebel against him: “Noble king of England with the right bold countenance, do you not remember that when your son was crowned you made the king of Scotland do him homage, with his hand placed in your son’s, without being false to his fealty to you?” “After this crowning and after this transfer of power you took away from your son some of his authority, you thwarted his wishes so that he could not exercise power. ‘Therein lay the seeds of a pitiless war. God’s curse be on it!’” Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 1.

<sup>161</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 225.

<sup>162</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 225; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 190-93; 202. Jordan Fantosme claimed that William was captured immediately after Henry II did penance for Thomas Beckett’s murder (202).

<sup>163</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 225; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 167-71.

<sup>164</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 21v, 1173 AD: “Profectus autem inde rex magnam partem northumbrie scotti *crudeliter* igne combusserunt et plebem eius ferociter gladio transuerberauerunt. Inde ad carlegium iter recurant et ciuitatem totis uiribus oppugnant.” (Many thanks to Chelsea Hartlen and Richard Griffin for their help with this translation.)

<sup>165</sup> Broun, “Charting the Chronicle’s Physical Development,” 129.

intervention marks the first time that the *Chronicle of Melrose* included historical material that was “collected and drafted at Melrose.”<sup>166</sup> Thus while the material was written into the *Chronicle* after the fact, the information reflected the sentiment of the scribes who recorded the events. William’s actions in Northumbria, namely his burning of the greater part of the earldom and the Scots’ murder of the native population by the sword, were considered as “cruel” by the scribes of Melrose. The *Chronicle of Melrose* and Jordan Fantosme’s *Chronicle* agreed that William’s involvement in the Young King’s rebellion concluded with the Scots’ cruel behaviour against the local Northumbrian population.<sup>167</sup> When William was captured at Alnwick in July 1174, the Northumbrians must have breathed a sigh of relief.

William’s capture at Alnwick and imprisonment at Falaise meant that he was at the mercy of the king of England: it was only after agreeing to the Treaty that William was released in 1175.<sup>168</sup> William had to accept Scotland as a fief of England and swear loyalty to Henry for his kingdom; the Scottish nobles and prelates were also obliged to accept Henry as their overlord.<sup>169</sup> Interestingly enough, A.A.M. Duncan observed that the treaty did not explicitly refer to Scotland as a “fief,” and the Scottish kings did not have to provide customary scutage or money to England as feudal agreements usually stipulated. Nonetheless, the Scottish king and his descendants had to submit to the king of England and saw the status of the Canmore dynasty diminished.<sup>170</sup> While previous attempts by both the English crown and clergy had sought to reduce Scotland to a subordinate status, this was only achieved when William the Lion signed the

---

<sup>166</sup> Broun, “Charting the Chronicle’s Physical Development,” 129.

<sup>167</sup> Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 167-93.

<sup>168</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 99; Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 226.

<sup>169</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 99.

<sup>170</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 101.

Treaty of Falaise.<sup>171</sup> However, William's new status as a client king was the result of the Scots' political and military failure in Northumbria during the Young King's Rebellion.

The consequences of the Treaty of Falaise for Scottish royal sovereignty are the most plausible explanation for the *Chronicle of Melrose*'s interpretation and manipulation of the portrayal of Malcolm III. By linking Malcolm III with Siward of Northumbria's incursion into Scotland in 1054, Scribe 3 re-wrote the Scottish past to provide a precedent for William the Lion's new status as a client king of England. The choice of this entry to make a precedent for Scotland's loss of regnal sovereignty was not arbitrary: it recognized how the kings of Scots in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries derived their identity and sovereignty from Malcolm III himself. Because of this, Scribe 3's manipulation of this entry in the *Chronicle of Melrose* became crucial evidence of Scotland's status as a subordinate kingdom.

Nowhere is the connection between Malcolm III and William the Lion more apparent than in the *Chronicle of Melrose*'s treatment of Malcolm's submission at Abernethy in 1072, found in folio 15v. As previously mentioned, the *Chronicle* followed the *Historia Regum*'s account of this event, including the phrase "became his man." The *Chronicle* did not detail the reason why William entered Scotland, but the *Historia Regum* did note that Malcolm "had grievously offended him [King William I], because, as before has been said, he had in the preceding year furiously ravaged the territories of his kingdom."<sup>172</sup> The territories in question were in Northumbria. Malcolm's raiding of Northumbria in the second half of the eleventh century bore resemblance to William the Lion's military campaigns in Northumbria in 1174: both ravaged the

---

<sup>171</sup> Geoffrey Barrow argued that the Pope's letter to William the Lion in 1180 concerning the Treaty of Falaise acknowledged the idea of independence; this is also seen in how the cancellation of the Treaty of Falaise was phrased. G. W. S Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," in *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London; Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992), 3-4.

<sup>172</sup> Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1072 AD, 142.

county, both inflicted damage on the local population by barbaric and cruel means, and both culminated in the submission of the Scottish king by force. As a direct descendant of Malcolm III, William the Lion's devastation of Northumbria was merely a repetition of the distant past, a past where the kings of Scots savagely destroyed Northumbria as the result of conflicts with the English kings. As Broun has shown, the *Chronicle of Melrose* employed "different scribes as 'authors'," which permitted each scribe to provide "their own view of the past."<sup>173</sup> The use of Northumbrian sources for the information on Malcolm III's kingship both reflected and conditioned Scribe 3's ideas of the Scottish past through a northern English lens. Scribe 3's inclusion of Malcolm's submission at Abernethy not only showed that William the Lion's forced submission at Falaise had a historical precedent in the reign of the founder of his dynasty, but also showed how the Scottish past could be manipulated to further English interest. Thus Malcolm III's status in the *Chronicle* shows how the monks of Melrose understood the political status of the king of Scots, and of the Scottish Borders, in the late twelfth century.

## Conclusion

Malcolm III's portrayal in twelfth-century historical writings was conditioned by several political and historiographical factors. Turgot of Durham's *Life of Saint Margaret* and Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia* show initial attempts by English monks with ties to the kings of Scots to remodel the image of Malcolm III into that of a more palatable monarch. Turgot's portrayal of Malcolm was drastically different from the vitriolic portrayals found in other twelfth-century English sources. Malcolm became the basis of Margaret's sanctity: his "miraculous" transformation from barbaric king of Scots into a pious and just monarch showed the benefits of Margaret's influence in Scotland. This reliance on Malcolm's reformed behaviour to sustain

---

<sup>173</sup> Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 146.



Margaret's holiness was not without issues, and because of this, Turgot omitted from the *Life of Margaret* any mention of Malcolm's political and military activities. Likewise, Turgot reimagined the recent Scottish past through a Northumbrian lens by using Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* as the foundation for the passage on Margaret's reformation of the Scottish Church. By interpreting the Scottish past from a Northumbrian historical perspective, Turgot likened Malcolm to Oswald of Northumbria, further enhancing the political and religious ties between the Canmore dynasty and the monks of Durham.

Ælred's depiction of Malcolm as a pious king was also inspired by close ties between historian and monarch. Since Ælred was raised at the court of King David I of Scotland, he was well-acquainted with the king's efforts at Normanizing the Scottish kingdom. The *Genealogia* presented Malcolm III as a Norman-like king, following Anglo-Norman pastimes and with a modernized royal court. According to Ælred, King David himself was the source of this account: the story is less concerned with any memory of Malcolm's kingship and more reflective of the need to portray Malcolm as a model of good kingship that David should emulate. Ælred's other portrayal of Malcolm, based on accounts of his supposed submission to William the Conqueror in 1072, expressed contemporary ideas of Scots as barbarians. While it might seem that depicting Malcolm's submission to the English is a step backwards from the portrayal of Malcolm in the *Genealogia*, it does follow contemporary English images of Malcolm.

Although Turgot and Ælred portrayed Malcolm in an improved light, the monk of Melrose known as Scribe 3 followed Anglo-Norman depictions of Scottish barbarity. In the *Chronicle of Melrose*, Malcolm became king of Scots because he was placed on the throne by English intervention: Malcolm was, explicitly, a client king of the king of England. Although Scribe 3's use of Northumbrian sources and his interest in English events is explained by the Englishness of

the monastic community at Melrose, the English identity of the monks of Melrose does not explain why Malcolm was portrayed so negatively. The decision to cast Malcolm in such a negative light is situation-specific: it is explained by the outburst of Scottish violence and warfare against Northumbrians during the Young King's rebellion of 1173-4. William the Lion's incessant raiding in the north of England conformed to stereotypes of Scottish military abuses in the earlier part of the twelfth century. Scottish attacks on Northumbria only stopped when William was captured at Alnwick in 1174, and was later forced to agree to the Treaty of Falaise in December of that year. The Treaty of Falaise made the king of Scots a client king of England. The subservient conditions imposed on William the Lion and on Scotland from 1174 to 1189, when Richard I annulled the Treaty, not only inspired the *Chronicle of Melrose's* re-imagining of Malcolm's ascent to the Scottish throne, but also created a precedent for English intervention in Scotland. It was precisely the subservient condition of the Scottish kings in the late twelfth century that increased Anglo-Scottish strife over the political status of the Scottish crown. Faced with the prospect of losing their sovereignty, thirteenth-century Scottish monarchs, particularly Alexander III (r. 1249-86), sought to prove their regnal independence. Manipulating the portrayal of Malcolm III as a dynastic founder would suit their particular political and historiographical needs.

## CHAPTER 2: MALCOLM III IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY: *CHRONICLE OF MELROSE*, DUNFERMLINE COMPILATION AND THE *GESTA ANNALIA* I

### Introduction

As seen in Chapter 1, the portrayal of Malcolm III in twelfth-century chronicles reflected the entangled political situation between Malcolm's descendants, known as the Canmore dynasty, the monastic community at Durham, and the English kings. A similar motivation is found behind the portrayal of Malcolm III in thirteenth-century sources. These sources tied Malcolm to the Anglo-Saxon line of Wessex kings, because portraying "Máel Coluim and Margaret as dynastic founders allowed kings of Scots to be portrayed as successors to a prestigious line of English kings."<sup>1</sup> According to Dauvit Broun, thirteenth-century accounts of Malcolm and Margaret provided a "tighter dynastic structure" to the Canmore kings by declaring rival claimants to the throne, such as Duncan II and his descendants, the MacWilliams, and the descendants of King Lulach (r. 1058), the MacHeths, as illegitimate.<sup>2</sup> Recently, Alice Taylor echoed Broun's conclusions about the importance of linking Malcolm's kingship to an Anglo-Saxon past as a way of legitimizing his descendants' right to the Scottish throne.<sup>3</sup> And for Steve Boardman, the elevation of Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders was a "by-product" of Margaret's

---

<sup>1</sup> Dauvit Broun, *Irish Identity*, 196; Geoffrey Barrow had already argued that "the intention of Scottish rulers at least from the time of David I was to establish a linear dynasty in which the crown would, whenever practicable, pass from father to son." For Barrow, Malcolm's kingship was still "Celtic" in essence. See G. W. S. Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," in *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London; Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992); and Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," 40.

<sup>2</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 196.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland." See also Keith J. Stringer, "The Emergence of a Nation-State, 1100-1300," in *Scotland: A History*, ed. Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 38-68, at 43; and Broun, "Birth of Scottish History," 12. This trend had begun in the twelfth century with Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia*, where he provided a common lineage for David I and Henry I. See Freeland, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, 71-122.

canonization.<sup>4</sup> While there was a desire to portray Malcolm as a dynastic founder and tie his legitimacy to the Anglo-Saxon house of Wessex, Malcolm's ties to England could prove potentially problematic for thirteenth-century Scottish kings Alexander II (r. 1214-49) and Alexander III (r. 1249-86), who had to actively repel all threats to their sovereignty from both inside and outside the kingdom.<sup>5</sup> Part of the reason why Malcolm was suddenly the focus of Scottish identity and kingship is explained by internal dynastic troubles, but this is not the full story. The conclusions about Malcolm put forward by Broun, Taylor and Boardman acknowledge the increasing anxiety to elevate Malcolm's kingship, but they do not fully explain how this goal was achieved.

Scottish chroniclers did respond to increased and intensified pressures against the Canmore kings from the peripheral areas of the kingdom. In the early thirteenth century, Alexander II inherited the troubles of his father, William the Lion, culminating in threats from the rulers of the Isles along with rebellions led by a coalition between the MacWilliams and MacHeths.<sup>6</sup> Alexander's handling of both threats asserted his grip over his territory and over the Scottish throne.<sup>7</sup> The often-forgotten war of 1215-17 saw Alexander and the Scottish nobility pitted

---

<sup>4</sup> Stephen I. Boardman, "Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum," in *Royal Dunfermline*, ed. Richard Fawcett (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2005), 139-53, at 143.

<sup>5</sup> For a comprehensive study of Alexander II's reign, see Richard Oram, *Alexander II, King of Scots: 1214-1249* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012), particularly K. J. (Keith John) Stringer, "Kingship, Conflict and State-Making in the Reign of Alexander II: The War of 1215-17 and its Context," 99-156; and Dauvit Broun, "Contemporary Perspectives on Alexander II's Succession: The Evidence of King-Lists," 79-98. For Alexander III's kingship, see Norman H. Reid, ed., *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III, 1249-1286* (John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1990). See also Dauvit Broun, "The Inauguration of Alexander III," in *Scottish Independence* 163-181. For threats to Scottish sovereignty from inside the kingdom, see Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292*; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*; McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*; McDonald, "Treachery in the Remotest Territories of Scotland," 161-92; R. Andrew McDonald, *The Kingdom of the Isles*, 1997; Russell Andrew McDonald, "Old and New in the Far North: Ferchar Maccintsacairt and the Early Earls of Ross, c.1200-74," in *The Exercise of Power in Medieval Scotland, c.1200-1500*, ed. Stephen I. Boardman and Alasdair Ross (Dublin: Four Courts, 2003). 23-45.

<sup>6</sup> McDonald, *Outlaws*, 44-55.

<sup>7</sup> Oram, "Introduction: An Overview of the Reign of Alexander II," in *Alexander II*, 14-26; 35.

against governmental encroachment by King John of England (r. 1199-1215), whose oppressive regime personally affected Alexander and his barons.<sup>8</sup> His son, Alexander III, also had to deal with his share of troubles, particularly with the MacWilliams, the Kingship of the Isles, the King of Norway and, more importantly, the English kings.<sup>9</sup> Alexander III had to defend the sovereignty of his crown against homage claims requested by Henry III in 1251, and his son Edward I in 1278.<sup>10</sup> Increasing pressures to consolidate the outskirts of the Scottish kingdom under the rule of the Scottish king, combined with outside threats to the kingdom's independence seem to have inspired a new chapter in the evolution of Malcolm III's image as founder of the Canmore dynasty: as an ideal Scottish king.

Yet Malcolm's thirteenth-century portrayal was not only influenced by threats to the Scottish kingship. Facing challenges to their sovereignty from both inside and outside the kingdom, Alexander II embarked on a series of legal reforms that mirrored contemporary state-making trends. While Scotland had first seen the introduction of Anglo-Norman legal and feudal developments during the reign of David I, Alexander II incorporated the ideas of English common law and adapted them to the political needs of his kingdom and his people: laws produced during the reign of Alexander in the 1230s were framed through the jurisdiction of royal officials.<sup>11</sup> Increased royal authority was achieved by adapting and implementing a

---

<sup>8</sup> Stringer, "Kingship, conflict and state-making," 107-11.

<sup>9</sup> Reid, ed., *Alexander III*; McDonald, *Outlaws*, 56-60; 119-23.

<sup>10</sup> David M. Walker, *A Legal History of Scotland I: The Beginnings to A.D. 1286*, vol. 1, 9 vols. (Edinburgh: W. Green and Son, 1998), 71-2; Cosmo Innes, ed., *Registrum de Dunfermlyn: Liber Cartatum Abbatie Benedictine S. S. Trinitatis et B. Margarete Regine de Dunfermlyn*, The Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh: Thomas Constable, 1842), #321 at 217.

<sup>11</sup> Taylor, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124-1290*, 164; see also Hector L. MacQueen, *Common Law and Feudal Society in Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), 4-5 and 47-50; Alison A. B. McQueen, "Parliament, the Guardians and John Balliol, 1284-1296," in *The History of the Scottish Parliament, Volume 1: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1235-1560*, vol. 1, 3

comprehensive system of lords' courts through which royal justice could be achieved in remote localities. A cohesive legal system permitted a strong grip on the kingdom.<sup>12</sup> The implementation of lordly courts and sheriff courts permitted the regular administration of royal justice, creating a cohesive sense of Scottishness that was tied to loyalty to the king rather than to ethnicity.<sup>13</sup> The development of Scotland into a thirteenth-century state, with a more developed legal machinery and ample opportunity for magnates to be politically involved, meant that, contrary to the case of England, Scottish nobles were involved in the state-making and identity-crafting process.

But how did thirteenth-century historical narratives from Scotland achieve Malcolm's portrayal as a dynast? Taking into consideration the complex character of the political, legal and social developments in Scotland during the thirteenth century, this chapter will examine Phase 2 of the development of Malcolm's portrayal to provide an answer. A detailed examination of thirteenth-century portrayals of Malcolm III found in the additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose* (ca. 1259 x 65), the *Dunfermline Compilation* (1249 x 1285), and the *Gesta Annalia I* (c. 1285) will illuminate the careful balancing of Malcolm's legitimacy as Scottish king by right and his involvement with the House of Wessex. It is here that we see how Malcolm's image was elevated to become on par with Saint Margaret's, and why it was suddenly so important to portray Malcolm as king of Scots by hereditary right and as a law-giver, marking a dynastic departure from previous Scottish (Celtic) kings. Scottish chronicles paid increasing attention to the manner in which Malcolm obtained his throne, an emphasis that had important repercussions in the development of Malcolm's portrayal from the fourteenth century onwards. It was also, during the thirteenth century, that Malcolm was first explicitly described as being raised in

---

vols. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 29–49; Walker, *Legal History*, 89-97; Barrow, *David I of Scotland*.

<sup>12</sup> MacQueen, *Common Law*, 33.

<sup>13</sup> MacQueen, *Common Law*, 49; Broun, "Becoming a Nation," 95-100.

England. Reinventing Malcolm as a king of Scots raised in England explained not only his decision to marry Margaret and merge both dynastic houses into one, but also his penchant for legal developments that were on par with Anglo-Norman laws and customs. During a period of intense socio-political and legal change, Malcolm's portrayal as a merciful, law-giving Anglicized king was more important than ever to cement the legitimacy of the Canmore dynasty.

***Chronicle of Melrose Abbey, part 2 (ca. 1249 x 1285)***

As argued in the previous chapter, Scribe 3 (1173 x 4), who based his account of Malcolm III on the *Historia Regum Anglorum*, portrayed Malcolm as a client king placed on the Scottish throne in 1054 on the orders of Edward the Confessor. Constructing Malcolm III as a client king subservient to the English invented a historical precedent to the subservient status that Malcolm's great-grandson, William the Lion, held in the third quarter of the twelfth century. The *Chronicle's* account of Malcolm's submission at Abernethy in 1072 further raised questions about the independence of the Scottish crown. While the portrayal of Malcolm III as a king of Scots by English imposition was based on late twelfth-century Anglo-Scottish royal politics, this portrayal was detrimental to sustaining Scotland's independence and sovereignty in the second half of the thirteenth century. The first years of the reign of Alexander III saw an increasing preoccupation with demonstrating the king's right to govern Scotland free of English control.

By the mid-thirteenth century, Melrose scribes saw the need to correct the *Chronicle's* portrayal of Malcolm III. Between 1246 and 1259, a particular scribe of Melrose, identified by Broun and Harrison as Scribe 27, made several additions to the *Chronicle's* entry for 1054. Another anonymous scribe made changes to the entry for the year 1072.<sup>14</sup> This section will

---

<sup>14</sup> Dauvit Broun, "Creating and Maintaining a Year-by-Year Chronicle: The Evidence of the Chronicle of Melrose," in *The Medieval Chronicle VI*, ed. E. Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 141–52, at 143.

examine Scribe 27's additions to MS Faustina B. IX, fos. 12r-13v, comparing the strategic placement of the additions to the political milieu in which the additions were made (see Appendix B). Special consideration of the contemporary circumstances of Alexander III's kingship will be made, particularly in relation to his dealings with Henry III (r. 1216-72) and Edward I (r. 1272-1307) of England. Dauvit Broun has noted the uniqueness of Scribe 27's activities and has argued that

The concern to emphasise legitimate inheritance according to the rules of primogeniture (which is readily apparent in the text of this stratum) could account for the failure to reach further back than the succession of Donnchad to his grandfather Máel Coluim mac Cinaeda in 1034, for to do so would have required most kings to be branded usurpers.<sup>15</sup>

This section will argue that Scribe 27 added information about eleventh-century Scottish succession in order to manipulate the meaning of Scribe 3's original entry for the year 1054, affecting how Malcolm's ascent to the Scottish throne was interpreted. By clarifying the circumstances previous to Siward's placement of Malcolm as king of Scots, Scribe 27 sought to correct earlier notions of Malcolm's lack of regnal sovereignty. Scribe 27's additions could have had crucial repercussions for sustaining Alexander III's claims of sovereignty while cementing Malcolm III's status as founder of the Canmore dynasty.

Scribe 27 was responsible for adding information about Malcolm II (r. 1005-34/5), Duncan I (r. 1034/5-40), Macbeth (r. 1040-58), and Malcolm III to the *Chronicle*'s original text.<sup>16</sup> It is possible that Scribe 27 was working in or shortly after 1249; his only contributions to the *Chronicle* consisted of adding information on these kings and some additions to fo. 45r about

---

<sup>15</sup> Dauvit Broun, "Charting the Chronicle's Physical Development," in *The Chronicle of Melrose: A Stratigraphic Edition. Introduction and Facsimile Edition. Vol. 1*, ed. Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison, vol. 1, 2 vols. (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007), 148-9.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.



English bishops.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, Scribe 27's additions marked the first set of additions made to the *Chronicle* since the early thirteenth century. Broun argued that the material included by Scribe 27 in fos. 12v-13r constitute an attempt to establish the legitimacy of Malcolm's descendants to the Scottish throne.<sup>18</sup> However, establishing regnal legitimacy based on primogeniture was not the ultimate goal of Scribe 27's additions: rather, it was his method to establish Malcolm as rightful heir to Scotland's crown in the manuscript. His goal was to erase any notion of Malcolm III as a king subject to England.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the original entry for Malcolm's ascension to the Scottish throne is found in MS Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v, under the year 1054: "Siward, earl of Northumbria, by the command of king Edward, entered Scotland with a great army to battle with the king of Scots, Macbeth; he put him to flight. And Malcolm, by the king's command, was set up as king."<sup>19</sup> In the mid-thirteenth century, Scribe 27 needed to change the meaning of the incriminating entry, but he did not do it by changing the original entry above. Instead, he made two particular additions to fo. 12v: "Malcolm king of the Scots died. And Duncan, his grandson, succeeded him."<sup>20</sup> In the same folio, under the year 1039, he added the following information: "Duncan king of the Scots died, whose kingdom Macbeth usurped for himself."<sup>21</sup> He also made two additions about regnal succession on fo. 13v. Under the year 1055, he added: "Lulach reigned

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 148-9. Scribe 27 noted the death of the bishop of Bath (1242), succession of William Raleigh as bishop of Norwich (1239) and Hugh Pattishall as bishop of Chester (1240), and the deaths of the bishops of Salisbury (1246), Canterbury (1240), and Chester (1238).

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>19</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B IX., fo. 13v: "Dux northimbrorum Siwardus iussu rege Edwardi Scotiam cum multo exercitu [sic] intrans prelium cum rege scottorum macbe[o]th committens illum fugauit [sic]. Et malcolmum ut rex iusserat regem constituit."

<sup>20</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B IX., fo. 12v, s.a. 1034: "Obiit Malcolm rex scottorum. & Dunecanus nepos eius ei successit."

<sup>21</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 12v: "Obiit Dunecanus rex scottorum cui regnum Macbet sibi usurpauit."

four and a half months.”<sup>22</sup> For the year 1056, Scribe 27 added the following information:

“Malcolm, son of Duncan, received the kingdom of Scotland by hereditary right.”<sup>23</sup> When these additions are taken into consideration, they read in the following order and manner:

1034: Malcolm king of the Scots died. And Duncan, his grandson, succeeded him.

1039: Duncan king of the Scots died, whose kingdom Macbeth *usurped* for himself.

1054: **Siward, earl of Northumbria, by command of king Edward, entered Scotland with a great army to battle with the king of Scots, Macbeth; he put him to flight. And Malcolm, by the king’s command, was set up as king.**

1055: Lulach reigned four and a half months.

1056: Malcolm, son of Duncan, received the kingdom of Scotland *by hereditary right*.

By incorporating information on Malcolm’s father and on Macbeth’s ascent to the Scottish throne, the entry for the year 1054 now implied that Malcolm should have been king of Scots by hereditary right, but Macbeth’s usurpation stood as an impediment for Malcolm to reign after Duncan’s death. Scribe 27’s addition about Macbeth’s kingship constitutes the earliest explicit and extant articulation of Macbeth as a usurper, but the portrayal of Macbeth’s kingship as the result of usurpation was, in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, an attempt to rectify the notion that Malcolm was a client king.<sup>24</sup> The vilification of Macbeth in the *Chronicle of Melrose* was, then, a by-product of Scribe 27’s attempts to legitimize Malcolm’s kingship.

Scribe 27’s assertion that Macbeth was a usurper was not only innovative, but contradictory to eleventh- and twelfth-century notions of this king of Scots. The eleventh-century

<sup>22</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B IX., fo. 13v: “Lulach quatuor menses et dimidium regnauit.”

<sup>23</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B IX., fo. 13v: “Malcolmus filius dunecani suscepit regnum scocie iure hereditario.”

<sup>24</sup> Ted Cowan has argued that “Shakespeare succeeded admirably in destroying the historical MacBeth,” but evidence from the *Chronicle of Melrose*, as shown above, stipulates that Macbeth’s reputation was destroyed by Scottish chroniclers for several political purposes. The story Shakespeare used for his play was already in place by the early fifteenth century, mostly through Andrew of Wyntoun’s portrayal of Macbeth. See Edward J. Cowan, “The Historical MacBeth,” in *Moray: Province and People*, ed. W. David H. Sellar (Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1993), 117–41, at 117.

*Prophecy of Berchán* portrayed Macbeth as a great king of Scots: furious, tall and blonde.<sup>25</sup>

Benjamin Hudson has argued that the latter part of the *Prophecy* was composed during Malcolm's reign and that Macbeth's portrayal escaped historiographical manipulation by Malcolm's supporters.<sup>26</sup> Another eleventh-century portrayal of Macbeth was written by Marianus Scotus, an Irish Benedictine monk based at Mainz who wrote a universal chronicle between 1069 and 1082.<sup>27</sup> For Marianus Scotus, Macbeth was a generous king who went on pilgrimage to Rome and spread silver "like seed;"<sup>28</sup> this portrayal of Macbeth was the only one included in the *Chronicle of Melrose's* original text composed by Scribe 3. Sometime in the second half of the thirteenth century, another Melrose scribe, identified as Scribe 28, inserted additional information about early medieval Scottish kings to the *Chronicle of Melrose's* text. Scribe 28 included portions of what is known as the "Verse Chronicle" in the years that marked the succession and death of Scottish kings. The "Verse Chronicle" is highly laudatory about Macbeth's kingship, stating that "Macbeth became king of Scotland for seventeen years; and in his reign there were productive seasons. But Duncan's son, named Malcolm, cut him off *by a cruel death*, in Lufnaut."<sup>29</sup> Therefore, eleventh-century notions of Macbeth's kingship were largely positive, and the fact that they were echoed throughout the twelfth and thirteenth

---

<sup>25</sup> Hudson, *Prophecy of Berchán*, 91: "The red, tall, golden-haired one, he will be pleasant to me among them; Scotland will be brimful west and east during the reign of the furious red one." Also see Anderson, *Early Sources*, 601.

<sup>26</sup> Benjamin T. Hudson, "The Scottish Gaze," in *History, Literature and Music in Scotland, 700-1560*, ed. R. Andrew McDonald (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 29–59, at 49. See also Edward J. Cowan, "Historical MacBeth," 135–6.

<sup>27</sup> Kingsford, "Marianus Scotus [Moelbrigte] (1028–1082)."

<sup>28</sup> Scotus, *Chronica*, 427: "1050. Rex Scocie Machetad, Romae argentum seminando pauperibus distribuit."

<sup>29</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B IX., fo. 12v, s.a. 1039: Rex Macabeda decim Scocie septemque fit annis/ In cuius regno fertile tempus erat. / Hunc in Lufanaut truncavit morte crudeli/ Duncani natus, nomine Malcolmus. Translation from Anderson, *Early Sources*, 601.

centuries, when Malcolm's dynasty was well established, shows that Macbeth's positive image was not detrimental to the legitimacy of the Canmore dynasty. On the contrary, the contradictory accounts of Macbeth's character in the *Chronicle of Melrose* suggest that the portrayal of Macbeth as a usurper in the mid-thirteenth century was only meant to eliminate doubts over Malcolm III's royal sovereignty in this particular chronicle.<sup>30</sup>

Portraying Macbeth's kingship as illegitimate, as the product of usurpation, would have hindered rival claims to the Scottish crown, whether it was the men based in Moray and Ross or the king of England in Westminster. Confrontations between the MacWilliams and the MacHeths and the kings of Scots had occurred since Malcolm's reign. As R. Andrew McDonald has argued, "the early Canmore kings inaugurated, and their successors consolidated, a thoroughgoing transformation of Scottish society, characterized by a process of "Europeanisation" or modernization of the kingdom."<sup>31</sup> By the thirteenth century, the initial "modernization" of the Scottish kingdom along Anglo-Norman lines was cemented, but the collateral damage of this process was the increased hostility against Malcolm's descendants from Moray and Ross.<sup>32</sup> A sixteen-year-old Alexander II inherited the dynastic struggles between his family and the MacWilliams and MacHeths. In 1215, the MacWilliams and the MacHeths united and took over Moray, in a strategic coordination of efforts that took advantage of the former

---

<sup>30</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. XI, fo. 13r, 1050 AD. None of the scribes seem to have tried to change or eliminate the entry for the year 1050, which included Marianus Scotus's assertion that Macbeth went to Rome and was charitable.

<sup>31</sup> McDonald, *Outlaws*, 3. See also Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 38-4; G. W. S Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1980); Barrow, *David I of Scotland*, 10; A. D. M. Barrell, *Medieval Scotland*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 15-6; Matthew Hammond, ed., *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286*, vol. 32, Studies in Celtic History (Boydell Press, 2013), particularly the introduction, "The Paradox of Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286," 1-52; and Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, 198.

<sup>32</sup> McDonald, *Outlaws*, 61-85.

king's death and the youth of his successor.<sup>33</sup> The rebellion was quashed by Ferchar Maccintsacairt in the north with a local army; he was later knighted for his efforts.<sup>34</sup> While Maccintsacairt was a northern noble, from whom the earls of Ross were descended, his military victory against the united forces of the MacWilliams and the MacHeths represented the increased acceptance of the Canmore kings, in problematic and remote areas of the kingdom, as the only heirs to the Scottish throne.<sup>35</sup>

There is another way in which the *Chronicle of Melrose* sought to eliminate the ambiguity of the status of Malcolm's kingship. The entry for 1072, where Malcolm submitted to William the Conqueror, was also manipulated. In this instance, an anonymous scribe erased the phrase "and became his man," incriminating evidence that Malcolm made a feudal submission to William. This erasure could have been made in 1291 when Edward I looked for evidence of England's claim to the Scottish throne near the Scottish Borders.<sup>36</sup> However, considering the aims of Scribe 27's changes to the main body of the *Chronicle of Melrose*, it is worth pondering whether this particular erasure was done by Scribe 27 or at the same time he was writing. Yet lacking further evidence, this conjecture should remain as a suggestion. When we consider Scribe 27's additions and the partial erasure of the entry for 1072, the Melrose scribes' agenda is clear: they ensured that Scotland's sovereignty was indisputable by portraying Malcolm III as

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, 43. The rebellion was led by Donald Bàn MacWilliam and Kenneth MacHeth. See McDonald, "Ferchar Maccintsacairt," 25-28. The 1215 rebellion is documented in the *Chronicle of Melrose*; see A. A. M. Duncan, "Sources and uses of the *Chronicle of Melrose*, 1165-1297," in *Kings, clerics and chronicles in Scotland, 500-1297: Essays in honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the occasion of the ninetieth birthday*, ed. Simon Taylor

Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2000), 146-70, at 167.

<sup>34</sup> McDonald, "Ferchar Maccintsacairt."

<sup>35</sup> McDonald. 24-5.

<sup>36</sup> Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 153.

indisputably sovereign.<sup>37</sup>

Written at a time when Alexander III's sovereignty was questioned by the English monarchs, Scribe 27's additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose* enhanced Malcolm III's image as a sovereign king of Scots. Scribe 27 refrained from making any additions about Scottish kingship before 1034 as it would portray any other Scottish king who was not of the royal line as a usurper.<sup>38</sup> Additionally, Scribe 27 recognized that it was only the questionability of Malcolm's sovereignty which had immediate repercussions for the validity of Alexander III's independent kingship, since Malcolm was the dynastic founder from which Alexander was directly descended, and to whom he traced his ancestral rights. This is explicitly stated on folio 14, which is an added king-list of the Canmore dynasty, beginning with Malcolm and Margaret and culminating in Alexander III. The folio was conceived independently of the *Chronicle*, and was composed between 1198 and 1214, with additions made after three key dates: December 1214, 1242 x 1243, and between March and June 1264.<sup>39</sup> The king-list was bound to the *Chronicle* possibly on May 1291, the date when Edward I requested the Guardians of Scotland to recognize him as their king.<sup>40</sup> While the king-list was appended to the *Chronicle of Melrose* after Scribe 27 made his additions, the inclusion of Alexander III as a direct descendant of Malcolm III in the king list is contemporary to the date range for Scribe 27's activities. This suggests that both the scribes that composed the king list in folio 14 and Scribe 27 were well aware of Malcolm's position as dynastic founder from whom thirteenth-century Scottish kings traced their ancestry. The additions made to the *Chronicle of Melrose* in the second half of the thirteenth century attest

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, 143. Broun notes that the scribes also erased the word "Scots" from the entry for the year 924, where it mentions that King Edward the Elder as the "most invincible king of the English, Danes, Cumbrians, Scots and Britons."

<sup>38</sup> Broun, "Charting the Chronicle's Physical Development," 149.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, 171.

<sup>40</sup> Broun, "Creating and Maintaining," 143.

to how important it was for Alexander III to establish his sovereignty against English claims of overlordship. By manipulating the portrayal of Malcolm III, Alexander III's ancestor, Scribe 27 effectively reinterpreted Malcolm's ascension to the throne not as an act of English political intrusion, but of English recognition and support of Scottish sovereignty. Malcolm's ascension to the Scottish throne could be used as evidence of Scottish regnal independence and of England's historical recognition of this fact. Good

### **The Dunfermline Compilation (c. 1249-1286)**

The only surviving copy of the Dunfermline Compilation is found in a fifteenth-century manuscript dated to the reign of James III (r. 1460-88), and held at the Biblioteca del Palacio Real in Madrid. While the extant manuscript was written in the fifteenth century, the contents themselves were compiled sometime between 1249 and 1285, during the reign of Alexander III.<sup>41</sup> The Dunfermline Compilation includes, among other texts, an interpolated copy of Turgot's *Life of Saint Margaret*, a copy of the *miracula* of Saint Margaret, and a copy of a shorter chronicle and a king list known as the Dunfermline Chronicle.<sup>42</sup> These three items will be the object of analysis for this portion of the chapter, as they contain unique accounts of Malcolm III's kingship. The version of Turgot's *Life* found in the Compilation, referred to from now onwards as the Dunfermline *Vita*, contains four narrative interpolations to the main twelfth-century account. These additions concern different aspects of Malcolm's reign. Similarly, the

---

<sup>41</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland."

<sup>42</sup> Madrid, Biblioteca del Palacio Real MS II 2097, fos. 1-17v (Dunfermline *Vita*); fos. 23r-25r (Dunfermline Chronicle); and 26r-41v (*Miracula* of Margaret). This manuscript is available in microfiche form at the University of St Andrews Library, which has been consulted for this study. Translations of the passages from the Dunfermline *Vita* are taken from the "Appendix: Translation of the Dunfermline *Vita*" in Catherine Keene, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective*, The New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 135-222. The Appendix will be cited as *DV* from now onwards.

Dunfermline Chronicle linked Malcolm to Anglo-Saxon rulers, while item 7 of the *miracula* recounts a remarkable dream-vision about Malcolm and Margaret that was included and expanded by Walter Bower in his *Scotichronicon*.<sup>43</sup>

While the contents of the Dunfermline Compilation have increasingly caught the attention of Scottish medievalists, and there are already several studies on different aspects of the manuscript's contents and form, the Compilation's emphasis on Malcolm III and his kingship has received little scrutiny.<sup>44</sup> Taking into consideration the available research about the Dunfermline Compilation, this section will explore and analyze its portrayal of Malcolm III. In doing so, this section will show how central Malcolm III was to the Compilation's imagining of Scottish kingship and identity, constructing Malcolm as a dynastic founder and paragon of good kingship that his descendants could emulate. Malcolm was, as Claire Harrill has noted, "an active agent of reform as opposed" to a passive recipient of saintly intervention.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, Malcolm's status as a dynastic founder served to counter notions of English overlordship at a time when Malcolm's thirteenth-century descendants were increasingly pressured to submit to the king of England. Finally, Malcolm's kingship was entangled with the history of Dunfermline Abbey, where the king and his queen and most of his descendants were buried. Dunfermline "was crucial to royal authority" in the eleventh century, as SangDong Lee has argued, a fact that

---

<sup>43</sup> Robert Bartlett, *The Miracles of St Æbbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 80-1; Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 177-235; Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon* / by Walter Bower, ed. D. E. R. Watt, New ed., 9 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987).

<sup>44</sup> Recent scholarship on the Dunfermline *Vita* includes Taylor, "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland."; Keene, "The Dunfermline 'Vita'"; and Bartlett, *The Miracles of St Æbbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland*. The most recent assessment of the contents of the Dunfermline Compilation is found in Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 177-235. Harrill's thesis is the only attempt, so far, at examining the manuscript and its contents as a whole and placing them in its particular political and religious contexts; this chapter will refer to Harrill's thesis extensively.

<sup>45</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 193.



the clergy at Dunfermline seem to have emphasized in the thirteenth century.<sup>46</sup> It was founded by Margaret ca. 1070, marking the beginning of a south-centric Scottish kingship, since Dunfermline was favoured by the Canmore dynasty as the royal mausoleum.<sup>47</sup> Thus Dunfermline Abbey would have had a special interest in reinforcing links with Canmore kings,<sup>48</sup> which Dunfermline achieved by producing a manuscript that placed Malcolm III at the centre and as the source of royal authority and power. Malcolm III's portrayal in the Dunfermline Compilation linked ideas of dynasty formation to thirteenth-century Scottish notions of kingship, identity and state-making that served to reinforce the sovereignty and primacy of the Canmore kings.

Before examining how the Dunfermline Compilation portrayed Malcolm III, it is imperative to understand the historical research conducted on the Dunfermline Compilation to date. Robert Bartlett published the first edition of the Dunfermline Compilation's miracles of Margaret. Bartlett's introduction to the *Miracula* stressed a previously-unknown translation of Margaret's relics in 1180, as well as providing information about the extent of Margaret's cult at Dunfermline.<sup>49</sup> In 2009, Alice Taylor published a palaeographical and textual analysis of the contents of the Dunfermline Compilation, in which she concluded that the Compilation underwent several editorial stages, suggesting that the Dunfermline *Vita* "would briefly have had an existence independent of the Dunfermline compilation."<sup>50</sup> The increased agency of Edgar Ætheling in the Compilation shows an interest in attributing the sovereignty of the Scottish kings to Edgar's political intervention.<sup>51</sup> By tracing the ancestry of the Scottish kings not only to

---

<sup>46</sup> SangDong Lee, "Recreating the Devotional Space of Dunfermline Abbey Between Ca. 1124-1180," *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 46 (2015): 31–56, at 31.

<sup>47</sup> Boardman, "Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum," 139-53; Lee, "Dunfermline Abbey," 31; Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 28.

<sup>48</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 28; 181-3.

<sup>49</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, xli-xlvi.

<sup>50</sup> Taylor, "Historical writing," 243.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 243-45.

Margaret, but to the house of Cedric and emphasizing the kingship of Alfred the Great (871-99), the Dunfermline Compilation portrayed the Canmore kings as descendants of the House of Wessex and, as such, deserving of an anointed coronation. Thus Taylor argues that the Dunfermline Compilation was brought together as an attempt to substantiate Alexander III's request for an anointed coronation in 1249, which was declined by the pope due to the uncertain status of the Scottish kingship in relation to England.<sup>52</sup> However, as Claire Harrill has observed in her recent examination of the Dunfermline Compilation, the contents of the whole manuscript allude to a desire to promote the Canmore dynasty rather than merely supporting Alexander III's bid for an anointed coronation.<sup>53</sup>

Catherine Keene examined the Dunfermline *Vita*'s portrayal of Malcolm, arguing that Malcolm's death was reminiscent of the martyrdom of several Anglo-Saxon kings from whom Margaret was descended, such as Edward the Martyr and Edmund Ironside. According to Keene, Malcolm was tied to "that glorious dynasty by depicting him as the successor to the long line of Anglo-Saxon kings in terms of his judicious rule and martyr's death."<sup>54</sup> Thus the Dunfermline *Vita* was composed to substantiate Scottish claims to a Scoto-Northumbrian kingdom.<sup>55</sup> Her argument depends on dating the contents of the Dunfermline *Vita* to before 1154, as D.E.R. Watt theorized, and attributing the authorship of these particular passages to Turgot himself, something that Taylor's research has dispelled.<sup>56</sup> In truth, some aspects of Malcolm's portrayal

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 247-8.

<sup>53</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 179-80.

<sup>54</sup> Keene, "The Dunfermline Vita," 44.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 44.

<sup>56</sup> Keene, "Dunfermline Vita," 44; and Watt, *Scotichronicon* 3, 195. See Taylor, "Historical writing" 232; and Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 179. Contrary to Taylor, Keene argues that the Dunfermline *Vita* represents the first version of the story of Malcolm and the nobleman, and that Ælred summarized the story in his *Genealogia*. This argument follows Donald Watt's initial assessment of this account. Such argument has been countered by Alice Taylor, who has argued that Ælred's story is the original account,

created a dialogue with Anglo-Saxon martyr stories; yet as will be argued here, the inspiration for portraying Malcolm in a judicial and merciful light comes less from Anglo-Saxon martyrs and more from thirteenth-century royal and legal developments, particularly those occurring during the reign of Alexander II.

While current research on the contents of the Dunfermline Compilation show how the Canmore kings derived a sense of kingship and identity from their descent from Saint Margaret and the House of Wessex,<sup>57</sup> portraying the Canmores as descended from English royalty could prove politically problematic during the mid-thirteenth century. Arguing that the Scottish kings derived their right to rule from Saint Margaret and her ancestors simultaneously portrayed the Canmore kings as heirs to a Scottish and Anglo-Saxon royal inheritance while raising questions about the sovereignty and independence of the Scottish throne. An example of this is Taylor's argument that Edgar Ætheling ensured the rise of Margaret's sons to the Scottish throne, which could be interpreted as evidence of the subordinate status of the Scottish kings to the English crown. How could the contents of the Dunfermline Compilation reconcile the need to prove descent from Anglo-Saxon rulers with the expression of Scottish kingship and identity as sovereign and politically distinct? Analyzing the Dunfermline Compilation's unique portrayal of Malcolm III as a dynastic founder could provide an answer to this query. My analysis of Malcolm's portrayal complements Harrill's arguments by examining how the influence of the Anglo-Saxon kings in the construction of a Scottish royal identity presented Malcolm as royal heir to the Wessex dynasty without denying or infringing on notions of Scottish royal sovereignty.

---

and the Dunfermline *Vita* represents an interpolation. But since Ælred named King David as his source, the Dunfermline *Vita*'s account cannot be more than an interpolation of Ælred.

<sup>57</sup> Taylor, "Historical writing," 237; Keene, "The Dunfermline Vita," 44.

The Dunfermline *Vita* contains four interpolations that pertain to Malcolm III's kingship. These four additions highlight Malcolm's political agency and the quality of his reign, particularly ascribing to him innovations on royal mercy and pardon, law-giving, and noble counsel. Territorial expansion and consolidation during the reign of Alexander III brought new theoretical interpretations of ideals of kingship that were modeled on European and Anglo-Norman standards.<sup>58</sup> The implementation of increasingly sophisticated mechanisms for the administration of justice, particularly the *colloquia* and the extension of royal mercy and pardon, during the reigns of Alexander II and III consolidated royal power through the dispensation of justice, but also reaffirmed the Canmore dynasty's sovereignty during the long thirteenth century.<sup>59</sup> Like his frustrated attempts to be recognised with an anointed coronation, Alexander III's constant troubles with the English kings over the assertion of his royal sovereignty were a key feature of his reign,<sup>60</sup> and these troubles were exacerbated after the king's sudden death in 1286. The stories about Malcolm in the Dunfermline *Vita* mark a striking departure from Turgot's original account and they reflect a desire to enhance the status and standing of the Canmore dynasty's founder.

---

<sup>58</sup> Cynthia J. Neville, "The Beginnings of Royal Pardon in Scotland," *Journal of Medieval History* 42, no. 5 (2016): 559–87, at 581.

<sup>59</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 569–82; Stringer, "The Emergence of a Nation-State, 1100–1300." Keith J. Stringer, "The Scottish 'Political Community' in the Reign of Alexander II (1214–49)," in *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093–1286*, ed. Matthew H. Hammond (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013); Stringer, "Kingship, Conflict and State-Making," Hector L. MacQueen, "Canon Law, Custom and Legislation: Law in the Reign of Alexander II," in *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214–49*, ed. Richard D. Oram (Leiden: Brill, 2005), at 223–25; Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," 33–4; Walker, *Legal History of Scotland*, David Carpenter, "Scottish Royal Government in the Thirteenth Century from an English Perspective," in *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093–1286*, ed. Matthew Hammond, vol. Studies in Celtic history (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), 117–60; Taylor, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124–1290*.

<sup>60</sup> Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," 33.

The most obvious difference between Turgot's account of the *Life of Margaret* and the Dunfermline *Vita* interpolations about Malcolm is the stress on the relationship between king and nobility. Malcolm's nobles had actively participated in the events leading to Malcolm's initial meeting and subsequent marriage to Margaret of Wessex:

[...] the king ordered thither many of his highest nobles, who were wiser than the previous ones. 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 unity and diligence of the entire family, not without admiration, engaged in pleasant conversation among themselves.<sup>61</sup>

The noblemen's attentions towards Margaret's family and other Anglo-Saxon refugees departed from twelfth-century ideas of Scottish barbarity. As representatives of the king's majesty, Malcolm's noblemen provided the first point of contact between Margaret and Malcolm. The nobles had another crucial function: they gathered impressions on the new arrivals, as the passages stressed that Malcolm's nobles noted "carefully the nobility of the men, and the beauty of the women." Their behaviour towards the newcomers reflected the quality and the magnanimity of Malcolm's kingship. Rather than being presented as either a barbarian or a reformed barbarian, Malcolm had "royal majesty" before his marriage to Margaret. Royal majesty in this case was possible because of a strong relationship between king and nobility; it was during the reign of Alexander II that the Scottish king first designated himself as *dominus rex*, or "universal lord."<sup>62</sup> Geographically, mainland Scotland was unified during Alexander's reign and politically, charters from the first half of the thirteenth century suggest a strong idea of political community that, though not yet articulated as such, did represent the strong, "intimate"

---

<sup>61</sup> *DV*, 170: "Quibus auditis, rex plures et prudenciores prioribus de summis suis proceribus illac direxit. Ac illi ut nuncii regie maiestatis suscepti, virorum proceritatem mulierum venustatem ac totius familie unitatem et industriam, non sine admiracione diligentius considerantes, gratum apud semetipsos inde colloquium conferunt."

<sup>62</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 75; Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," 32.

links between the king and his men.<sup>63</sup> This articulation of political reciprocity and obedience, where people of different social strata could be included in the king's court and be beneficiaries of the king's majesty, is possibly what led to a change in the definition of Scottishness from an ethnic-based designation to an articulation of political support for the Scottish king.<sup>64</sup> Though Broun sees this articulation fully expressed by the 1260s, Stringer's research on Alexander II's political community marks this change before Broun's proposed date.<sup>65</sup> Thus Malcolm's political community, like that of Alexander II and later Alexander III, not only represented the king's majesty, but was fully engaged in the processes that led to the union of the Scottish kingship with Anglo-Saxon royal blood, creating what is now known as the Canmore dynasty.

Changes to the relationship between nobility and kingship, which were the result of state-making in Scotland in the thirteenth century, required an infusion of new magnate blood into the kingdom. As Keith Stringer suggests, "[...] the composition of Alexander II's court was significantly affected by the rise of a new generation of earls who were more politically aware and active."<sup>66</sup> New knightly families of either Anglo-Norman or continental origin arrived in Scotland, including the Balliols, the Menzies, the Mowats, the Mowbrays and the Bissets.<sup>67</sup> Yet the integration of new continental and Anglo-Norman families into Scotland's political milieu was not begun by Alexander II: it was palpable in the reign of his father, William the Lion, and even during the reign of David I.<sup>68</sup> With a new, continental and Anglo-Norman nobility, the

---

<sup>63</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 75. See also Carpenter, "Scottish Royal Government," 140-55, for how the development of a light handed Scottish royal policy contributed to the rise of Scottish identity closely linked to the relationship between king and nobility.

<sup>64</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 70-1; Broun, "Becoming a Nation," 97-8.

<sup>65</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 53-84; Broun, "Becoming a Nation," 98.

<sup>66</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 62.

<sup>67</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 64.

<sup>68</sup> Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History*; Barrow "The Reign of William the Lion," in *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London ; Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992), 67-90,

Canmore kings had sought to increase their power and authority in their territory, leading to the implementation of Norman governmental structures in the twelfth century, and the creation of the *colloquium* and new laws in the thirteenth.<sup>69</sup> The new nobility reflected the Canmore kings' increased sovereignty, power and authority; this was the nobility that helped the king maintain the unity of his kingdom, and in turn, the king kept tight reins over the affairs of his magnates.<sup>70</sup> Taking into consideration the re-alignment of the political order during Alexander II's reign,<sup>71</sup> it is not surprising that the Dunfermline *Vita* highlighted the quality of Malcolm's nobles, "who were wiser than the previous ones." The idea that Malcolm introduced a better nobility into Scotland represented a clean break with a pre-feudal Scottish regnal past, and a self-identification with European currents of political thought, where the nobility had an increasing role in the governance of kingdoms.<sup>72</sup> Attributing royal and legal initiatives that developed in the thirteenth century to Malcolm III made it seem like the thirteenth-century Scottish kings were not beginning, but continuing a state-building project that was begun by Malcolm himself. By presenting Malcolm as a modernizing king, the Dunfermline *Vita* attributed the socio-political changes in Scotland's elite to Malcolm, cementing his place as a dynastic founder whose innovations departed from pre-feudal Scottish royal practices. Thus Malcolm became the

---

at 72; Jordan Fantosme, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R.C. Johnston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 69. According to Jordan Fantosme, "The king of Scotland [William] was skilled in warfare and in inflicting damage on the enemies he fought; but *he was too much in the habit of seeking new advice*. He cherished, loved, and held dear people from abroad. He never had much affection for those of his own country, whose right it was to counsel him and his realm. In a very short time it became evident-- you will hear me tell of it-- how his war developed because of bad advice."

<sup>69</sup> See Alice Taylor, "Leges Scocie and the Lawcodes of David I, William the Lion and Alexander II," *Scottish Historical Review* 88, no. 2 (2009), doi:10.3366/E0036924109000869; McQueen, "Parliament," 30-1; Stringer, "Political Community," 74.

<sup>70</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 70.

<sup>71</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 68. The reign of Alexander II saw the rise of the Comyn family and it led to a rivalry with Alan Duward, justiciar of Scotia.

<sup>72</sup> Walker, *Legal History of Scotland*, 232.; Barrow, "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland," 32.

paradigm of good Scottish kingship and of state-making royal enterprise for his thirteenth-century descendants.

As Keith Stringer has argued, the thirteenth-century Scottish nobility was actively involved in political affairs; Malcolm's nobles in the Dunfermline *Vita* shared similar levels of political involvement. In the passage where Malcolm's nobles met Margaret and her family, a particular noble made a prophecy about "the mistress" of the family, Margaret. The Dunfermline *Vita* narrated that

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: "It is no wonder that they would have believed her to be the mistress since she was the mistress not only of this family, but divine providence had preordained that she would even be queen of the entire realm, or rather a partner in his rule." 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.<sup>73</sup>

The nobleman was the voice of "divine providence," carefully advising the king that it was God's will that Margaret would become queen of the kingdom. Malcolm's regard for his nobles' advice was symptomatic of the development of more participatory models of governance, where the kingdom's magnates had an important advisory role to the king. Such regard for counsel was observed in Alexander III's refusal to give homage to Henry III for his kingdom, claiming that he would have to consult this matter with his nobles before he could provide a final answer.<sup>74</sup> The format of the conversation between the king and his nobles is reminiscent of the development of

---

<sup>73</sup> *DV*, 171: "Reverse autem nuncio cum seniorum reverenciam iuvenum vero prudenciam, matronarum maturitatem et iuvenularum venustatem sue regi nunciassent, quidam subintulit dicens. Nec mirum si illam dominam crediderint quam dominam non solummodo illius familie, sed etiam totius regni reginam, immo et regni sui participatem divina praeordinaverit providencia. Rex autem malcolmus audiens anglos illos esse et ibi adesse, in propria persona illos visitat et alloquitur et unde venerunt aut quo vadant plenius explorat."

<sup>74</sup> Walker, *Legal History*, 72.



parliamentary features during the reign of Alexander III, to which the Dunfermline Compilation is dated.<sup>75</sup> During his reign, however, these assemblies lacked a coherent structure or schedule, and they seemed to meet on an ad hoc basis.<sup>76</sup> The development of the *colloquia* during the late thirteenth century reinterpreted Scottish kingship to exalt cooperation between the nobility and the monarch as a characteristic of royal rule: it has been argued that these *colloquia* were used by the barons “to rule collectively.”<sup>77</sup> Alison McQueen noted that the *colloquia* merely presented to the king the judicial decisions that the barons had already taken elsewhere, “with the decision given before the king, not by him.”<sup>78</sup> Their role was not to wait for the king’s advice, but to report to the king the consensus of the baronial class in matters concerning the administration of the kingdom. This passage shows how the magnates had already agreed that Margaret would be the king’s “partner in rule” before presenting their consensus to their king. Thus Malcolm’s nobles had already agreed on the suitability of Margaret as queen of Scots, even before Malcolm had met her. The essence of crown-magnate relations during the period of state formation in Scotland served as inspiration behind the depiction of Malcolm’s nobility as wise, contributing to a greater disassociation from a pre-feudal Scottish past. The advisory role of the nobility in this passage was specifically moulded to emphasize the advisory role and collective wisdom of the kingdom’s barons during the reign of Alexander III.

Baronial influence was not only seen in the provision of wise counsel to the king. The Dunfermline *Vita* included a passage where Malcolm conceded five specific legal developments

---

<sup>75</sup> Taylor, “Historical Writing,” 229. For the development of the Scottish colloquium during the reign of Alexander III, see McQueen, “Parliament,” 30.

<sup>76</sup> McQueen “Parliament,” 30; Stringer and Tanner (eds.) “Intro,” in *The History of the Scottish Parliament Vol. I*, 3.

<sup>77</sup> McQueen, “Parliament,” 30.

<sup>78</sup> McQueen, “Parliament,” 31.

on royal justice. These provisions were made at Saint Margaret's instigation, and they meant to correct legal abuses that were presumably characteristic of Malcolm's royal predecessors:

Whence the king thoroughly eliminated certain unjust practices contrary to *royal piety*, which had been done inappropriately by his ancestors against all pious justice. He did so for the love of God and at the queen's entreaty. Moreover, *the petitions that she had urged on him for a long time* he conceded to her in the hearing of all.<sup>79</sup>

Instead of portraying Malcolm as the target of Margaret's civilizing endeavors, the Dunfermline *Vita* presents Malcolm as Margaret's legal and royal counterpart. By listening to expert (and saintly) advice, Malcolm improved the quality of Scottish kingship, providing royal piety and justice. The Scottish baronage, prelates, and churchmen agreed to Malcolm's legal changes, emphasizing the importance of magnate consent in the implementation of royal policy and law.<sup>80</sup> The Dunfermline *Vita* continued to present Malcolm as the king who brought justice and piety to Scotland, separating him from his royal (and Celtic) ancestors and marking a dynastic departure from the early medieval past that symbolized a new era in Scottish kingship. Malcolm's image as a law-giver in the Dunfermline *Vita* can be traced to the political and legal developments of thirteenth-century Scotland, when the new barons of the kingdom heavily influenced the provision of justice, and in turn, their relationship with the monarchy.

The provision of royal justice in Scotland in the thirteenth century permitted wider participation by the baronage.<sup>81</sup> The introduction of English legal features into Scotland, such as

---

<sup>79</sup> *DV*, 189: "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 obsecrationes penitus delevit, insuper et petitiones quas ipsa multo tempore postulaverat, ei in aure omni benigne concessit."

<sup>80</sup> Carpenter, "Scottish Royal Government," 154-5; Alice Taylor, "Homo Ligius and Unfreedom in Medieval Scotland," in *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286*, ed. Matthew H. Hammond, *Studies in Celtic History* 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), 85-116, at 116.

<sup>81</sup> See David Carpenter, "Scottish royal government," 117-159; MacQueen, *Common Law*, 20; Cynthia J. Neville, *Land, Law and People in Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 13-40; Taylor, "Leges Scocie," 207-88. According to Taylor, the *LS* is not the product of a particular legislation or assembly, but it is an "unofficial law code" (208). Part of the capitula in the *LS* were

the brieve of *novel disasine* and the royal letters of *mortancestry*, and swearing to uphold the king's law, showed a desire to accommodate English legal developments to a Scottish political context.<sup>82</sup> The Scottish crown and nobility adapted English legal features in a way which did not guarantee a wider availability to legal recourses, like common law did in England. Scottish legal provision in the thirteenth century greatly benefitted earls and other barons, who kept the judgement for several crimes, particularly homicide, within their courts, and reaped the revenues of judging such cases without having to defer to royal intervention.<sup>83</sup> Scottish nobles, most of whom also held lands in England, were well-acquainted with how the extension of English common law affected the English baronage, and were keen to avoid the restrictions of over-arching royal justice provisions in Scotland.<sup>84</sup> Limiting the extension of royal legal impositions meant that the Scottish nobility was less restricted than the English nobility, allowing for the development of a strong sense of Scottish identity that grew “‘with’ rather than ‘against’ the king.”<sup>85</sup> Thirteenth-century Scottish kingship was therefore marked by the development of a

---

“decrees and laws issued under the name of the king, often with the consent of ecclesiastical and secular *potentes* of the kingdom, sometimes formed by the *iudices* of the kingdom.” (209).

<sup>82</sup> MacQueen, *Common Law*, 18-20; Carpenter, “Scottish Royal Government,” 140; Taylor, “Leges Scocie,” 212-3; Neville, *Land, Law and People*, 22. The assize of novel disassine was established by Alexander II in 1230, while mortancestry first appeared in Scottish legal records in 1253, during the early reign of Alexander III. See Neville, *Land Law and People*, 22 for the idea of gradual accommodation of European customs into Scottish courts in the mid-thirteenth century. According to Taylor, chapter 15 of the *LS* can be dated to 1197, and it includes the swearing of an oath by the Scottish baronage to uphold royal justice in their respective lands by helping “the king with all their might by interrogating wrongdoers and taking compensation from them.” The oath was of English origin and it is included in Hubert Walter’s *Edictum Regime* (1195). The main difference between the Scottish and English versions of this oath is that the English version is applied to all freemen in the kingdom, whereas the Scottish version only applies to the king’s barons. Neville asserts that the Scottish government “accommodated,” rather than assimilated English legal developments.

<sup>83</sup> Carpenter, “Scottish Royal Government,” 151; Taylor, “Leges Scocie,” 212-3 for a provision from 1197 where the baronage of Scotland had to swear that they upheld the law.

<sup>84</sup> Carpenter, “Scottish Royal Government,” 155.

<sup>85</sup> Carpenter, “Scottish Royal Government,” 117. For the importance of baronial courts in Scotland during this period, see Neville, *Law, Land and People*.

concept of *communitas regni* where the magnates and prelates of the kingdom were involved in the dispensation of justice and the law-making processes of the kingdom.<sup>86</sup>

Yet while the idea of a *communitas regni* was present in Malcolm's portrayal as a law-giver, the content of Malcolm's laws did not seem to reflect the Scottish crown's cooperative attitude towards its magnates. Malcolm's legal reforms centred around regulation of the king's behaviour, rather than the regulation of the behaviour of the Scots. For example, Malcolm's second legal provision ensured that the king could not accept bribes from robbers who had extorted money from other neighbours, nor could the king accept any accusations from subjects previously exiled and then pardoned without suitable eyewitnesses. The provision explained that before Malcolm, kings had destroyed the homes of subjects based on a "verbal account of this type of reconciled person without any witnesses."<sup>87</sup> Malcolm's fourth provision specified that the king could not have himself accepted as the adopted son of a rich man, so as to claim that man's inheritance after his death.<sup>88</sup> Malcolm "with an oath swore that he himself would not do it."<sup>89</sup> The last provision stated that the king could not contend with any person at court directly and that person had to be judged by someone of their own social rank. The Dunfermline *Vita* observed that "[f]or thus quite often the rights of lesser men had been subverted by rank as well

---

<sup>86</sup> Barrow, "Community of the Realm," 122-38, at 125; Stringer, "Scottish Political 'Community'," 80; Carpenter, "Scottish Royal Government," 140-55: The justiciars of Scotia and Lothian were particularly taxed with the dispensation of justice in the localities, reducing the need for royal intervention in crimes such as homicide. This gave considerable legal powers to the justiciar in Scotland, contrary to their counterpart in England, and allowed for the development of a sense of Scottish community and identity centre around the relationship between nobles and king.

<sup>87</sup> *DV*, 190.

<sup>88</sup> *DV*, 190; Taylor, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland*, 378, for Taylor's assessment of the laws given by Malcolm here as spurious.

<sup>89</sup> *DV*, 191.

as by affection.”<sup>90</sup> None of these provisions reflected the character of the application of royal justice and of crown-magnate relationships during the reigns of Alexander II and III.

Rather, portraying Malcolm as the king who regulated royal conduct appears to have been symptomatic of the agitated relationship between king and barons *in England*. On June 15, 1215, King John (r. 1199-1216) accepted the Magna Carta at Runnymede, setting a legal precedent for regulating kingly conduct in England, ensuring that the king would honour the rights of England’s freemen and barons as established by Henry II and Richard I.<sup>91</sup> Among the provisions included in the Magna Carta, Article 21 stated that the earls and barons would be judged only by their equals; Article 37 established that the king should not have guardianship of an heir of a man holding land from the crown; and Article 38 prohibited royal officials from placing freemen on trial without credible witnesses.<sup>92</sup> Alexander II had also been affected by John’s transgressions: Article 59 stated that the English barons would treat Alexander “in the same way as our other barons of England, unless it appears from the charters that we hold from his father William, formerly king of Scotland, that he should be treated otherwise.”<sup>93</sup> Scottish barons, such as Alan of Galloway and Saer de Quincy, served as intermediaries between John and his English barons, and Keith Stringer has observed that such eroded relations between John and his barons might have prompted those English barons with Scottish lands to feel stronger political affinity with the

---

<sup>90</sup> *DV*, 191.

<sup>91</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle for Mastery*, 87 and 289-96.

<sup>92</sup> “English Translation of the Magna Carta,” British Library, accessed January 26, 2017, <https://www.bl.uk/magna-carta/articles/magna-carta-english-translation>.

<sup>93</sup> “English Translation of the Magna Carta,” #59. For the relationship between Alexander and John, see Keith J. Stringer, “Kingship, Conflict and State-Making,” 99-156, at 101-2; and Oram, *Alexander II*, 30. Oram noted that Alexander received the news that John sealed the Magna Carta the same day he received news that his enemies, the MacWilliams, had been beheaded by Ferchar Macinstsaccart.

king of Scots.<sup>94</sup> Crown-magnate relations in Scotland ensured that Alexander would not suffer the same fate as his counterpart John,<sup>95</sup> and the Dunfermline *Vita* recognized the importance that regulating the king's conduct had in the maintenance of these relations. This account re-imagined Malcolm's legal provisions as the source of regulated royal conduct, which led to an intimate and trusting relationship between Scottish kings and barons.<sup>96</sup> By implementing self-regulatory royal measures, Malcolm prevented his descendants from suffering King John's fate. If this interpolation was inspired by the events of 1215, it is plausible that it was added to the text sometime before Alexander II's death in 1249, though this is an informed speculation.<sup>97</sup>

An important aspect of the dispensation of royal justice in Scotland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was the provision of royal mercy. Notions of royal mercy as a way of dealing with baronial dissent are found already implemented in the twelfth century, yet the thirteenth century saw an increase in the use of royal pardon and mercy for dealing with treachery among the king's subjects.<sup>98</sup> Malcolm's encounter with a treacherous nobleman in the Dunfermline *Vita* was exemplary of this trend. Titled "How generous and kind was Malcolm king of Scotia,"<sup>99</sup> the passage was incorporated and expanded from Ælred of Rievaulx's

---

<sup>94</sup> Stringer, "The War of 1215-17," 112-13. Alan of Galloway was one of John's key negotiators and he is included in the Preamble to the Magna Carta. He was also Constable of Scotland at the time. Saer de Quincy, earl of Winchester, was the lead negotiator with John at Runnymede and had considerable lands in Scotland. As Stringer has argued, Alexander could hope for a good deal with Galloway and de Quincy negotiating with Scottish interests in mind.

<sup>95</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 74-80.

<sup>96</sup> Stringer, "Political Community," 75.

<sup>97</sup> See Taylor, "Historical Writing," 243, for the dating of editorial phases of the Dunfermline *Vita*. The first editorial phase occurred sometime between December 1154 (the date of composition of Ælred's *Genealogia* and April 1285; the second phase occurred when the Continuator added material from Ælred's *Life of Saint Edward*, sometime between 1249 and 1285.

<sup>98</sup> For examples of twelfth-century royal piety, see Ælred's *Lament for David*, 47-8; for thirteenth-century royal mercy and piety see Neville, "Royal Pardon."

<sup>99</sup> *DV*, 173: "Quam magnanimous atque benignus fuit malcolmus rex scocie."

*Genealogia*.<sup>100</sup> The Dunfermline *Vita* included this passage right after Malcolm and Margaret's marriage because "we should deem that something should be presented regarding her husband as head--he whose heart was worth no less than his mind--so that one of his deeds unearthed here may be stated for those reading."<sup>101</sup> This section developed in the same manner as in Ælred's narrative, except when the king and the traitor were alone, where the Dunfermline *Vita* specified that Malcolm "made a firm stand; turning his face [towards the traitor], he broke into the fight..."<sup>102</sup> The Dunfermline *Vita* accentuated the traitor's cowardice and unmanliness but incorporated these words into Ælred's original account:

Do what becomes a soldier *and not a traitor*, do what is manly *and not womanly*, and come together alone with me alone, so that at least your treason *might be free* from depravity, since it cannot be free from your infidelity.<sup>103</sup>

Malcolm's insults reveal the close relationship between chivalry and masculinity in the medieval period.<sup>104</sup> Treachery was equated with poor knighthood and unmanliness; this association prompted the traitor to repent. Malcolm only forgave the traitor after he had performed his repentance and sworn allegiance to the king. This scene, showing Ælred's notions of royal mercy that characterized David I's provision of justice, encapsulates thirteenth-century

---

<sup>100</sup> See also Taylor, "Historical writing," 242-3. For Taylor, it was the Dunfermline Compiler who added the passage into the *Vita* before compiling the rest of the Dunfermline Manuscript. That means the Dunfermline *Vita* went through two stages of editing.

<sup>101</sup> *DV*, 173: "...ideo de viro suo tamquam de capite duximus aliquid praetermittendum, ut cuius fuerit cordis quanti ne animi, unum opus eius hic exaratum legentibus declaret." Compare this with Ælred's assertion that he included the passage because he heard it from King David himself, in Ælred, *Genealogia*, 73.

<sup>102</sup> *DV*, 174: "...et vultu volvente pugnam in hec verba prorupit."

<sup>103</sup> *DV*, 175: "Age potius quod militis est et non proditoris, age quod est viri et non mulieris, atque solus cum solo congregare, ut saltem proditio tua turpitudine videatur carere, que infidelitate carere non potuit." The *Genealogia* text reads: "Age potius quod militia, age quod viri et solus cum solo congrede, ut saltem proditio tua turpitudine careat quae infidelitate carere non poterat."

<sup>104</sup> Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003).

developments on the use of the royal pardon to deal with traitors. Thirteenth-century royal pardons included elaborate ceremonies that incorporated the rest of the baronial community of Scotland, and that required rebels to perform the role of supplicants begging for the king's mercy with the purpose of being re-introduced into the political community.<sup>105</sup> An example of a such performance is the submission of Robert V Bruce, lord of Annandale, to Alexander III in 1270 after Bruce was accused of retaining crown revenue for himself.<sup>106</sup> Bruce submitted himself to Alexander's will at Scone, and begged for the king's forgiveness in public.<sup>107</sup> The similarities between the ritual of submission followed by Robert Bruce and the traitor's submission to Malcolm in the Dunfermline *Vita* show how contemporary notions of royal pardon and mercy were used to re-interpret the Scottish past, especially Malcolm's reign, as the source of the king's power and authority. Alexander III understood the importance of portraying himself as a merciful ruler,<sup>108</sup> and the Dunfermline *Vita* incorporated this image into its portrayal of Malcolm III.

But there were other important considerations in the use of royal mercy as a way of maintaining political unity in the kingdom. The kings' treatment of political opponents was transformed from mutilation and beheading (as in the case of Guthred MacWilliam in 1212) to the forgiveness of transgressions, attempting to pacify opposition by incorporating the dissenters into the king's good graces.<sup>109</sup> The Dunfermline *Vita*'s insistence on Malcolm's clemency

---

<sup>105</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 578. Neville stressed the importance of baronial courts as both social and legal spaces, where performance and speech were central to giving a "living meaning" to curia assemblies. See J.C. Schmitt, "The rationale of gestures in the west," in *A Cultural History of Gesture*, quoted by Neville, *Land, Law and People*, 27.

<sup>106</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 579.

<sup>107</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 579.

<sup>108</sup> Neville "Royal Pardon," 571.

<sup>109</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 565 and 571.



became the golden standard of royal rule that Scottish kings ought to emulate.<sup>110</sup> Royal mercy and piety became tools by which the Scottish king could contain violence and dissent in his own ranks, providing traitors with an opportunity to repent and incorporate themselves into the rest of the political community. Royal piety and noble consensus became the two main forms by which the Dunfermline *Vita* re-imagined Malcolm's kingship in line with thirteenth-century political and legal developments.

Malcolm's death in the Dunfermline *Vita* served as a cautionary tale of how failing to provide justice resulted in the fall of monarchs from power. However, the Dunfermline *Vita* expanded this passage to include details of the treachery that led to the king's demise. Keene concluded that this passage presented Malcolm in the light of Anglo-Saxon martyrs, such as Edward the Exile and Edmund Ironside,<sup>111</sup> but a closer look into the content of the passage itself reveals that Malcolm's policy in Northumbria was the cause of his death. In the Dunfermline *Vita*, Edgar I explained to his ailing mother how Malcolm besieged Alnwick Castle, causing much devastation to the local population.<sup>112</sup> Resentment over Malcolm's behaviour led the men of Alnwick to devise a way to kill the Scottish king:

One who was more expert than the others in trickery, strong in vigor and daring in deeds, offered himself for the trial of death, so that he might either surrender himself to death or free his fellows from death. 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 would surrender the village to the king, and as evidence of good faith, he offered the keys of the castle, which he carried on his spear, before everyone. When he heard this, the king, weakened by the trickery, unarmed and consequently less of a threat to the traitor, ran from his tent.

---

<sup>110</sup> Neville, "Royal Pardon," 571-2.

<sup>111</sup> Keene, "The Dunfermline Vita," 50-2.

<sup>112</sup> The information on Malcolm's attack of Northumbria is found in John of Worcester's *Chronicon*, while it was Geoffrey Gaimar who added the information about the king's assailants and about Malcolm's attempt to take Alnwick Castle. These events are also found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* E. ASC E, 1093 AD, 170, fn. 8.

Having sought the opportunity, the armed man pierced the unarmed king, and quickly hid in the neighbouring wood.<sup>113</sup>

Catherine Keene has suggested a comparative approach to this passage and the passage involving the treacherous nobleman, arguing that they function in tandem by portraying Malcolm's behaviour and death in the manner of Anglo-Saxon martyr-kings.<sup>114</sup> For Keene, the Dunfermline *Vita* compared Malcolm to Edmund of East Anglia in order to press the Canmore dynasty's rights over Northumbria.<sup>115</sup> It is apparent that the Continuator of the Dunfermline *Vita* wrote the passages to converse with each other; however, it is also apparent that, while Malcolm's behaviour was vastly improved in the Dunfermline *Vita*, he was not portrayed as an Anglo-Saxon martyr-king. Instead, it is argued here that the passage functioned as a commentary on good and lawful kingship, not as a comparison with Anglo-Saxon martyrdom.

In the passage with the would-be traitor, Malcolm exemplified the virtues and benefits of royal mercy, not only in dissuading political dissent in the kingdom but strengthening the ties between monarch and magnate. By denying mercy to the men of Alnwick, the king himself exacerbated political dissent and treachery, bringing about his own death. Malcolm's treatment of the Scottish noble contrasted significantly with his treatment of Northumbrians, a marked difference between Malcolm's domestic and foreign policies. Malcolm's aggressiveness towards the Northumbrians is a key feature of the *Historia Regum*'s account of Malcolm's kingship, for

---

<sup>113</sup> *DV*, 219. The *ASC E* mentions Malcolm's incursion and death at Northumbria, though it gives no further detail about the location of his death or particular circumstances, except from specifying that Morel of Bamburgh killed him. The names Archil Morel and Morel of Bamburgh are used interchangeably to refer to Malcolm's killer, but recent studies on the sources for this event show that chroniclers recording the event confused the name of two separate persons. See *ASC E*, 1093 AD; and David X. Carpenter, "Morel of Bamburgh, Archil Morel, and the Death of King Malcolm III: A Case of Mistaken Identity," *Northern History* 52, no. 2 (September 1, 2015): 314–23, <https://doi.org/10.1179/0078172X15Z.00000000094>.

<sup>114</sup> Keene, "Dunfermline Vita," 49.

<sup>115</sup> Keene, "Dunfermline Vita," 49–51.

the chronicler remarked that “in his death the justice of an avenging God was plainly manifested; for this man perished in that province [Northumbria] which he had often been wont to ravage, instigated by avarice [...]”<sup>116</sup> The king’s death by Northumbrian treachery mirrored the king’s own betrayal of the men of that province, souring Scoto-Northumbrian relations. Malcolm’s behaviour was not that of an Anglo-Saxon martyr king: it was the behaviour of his son, David I, and his great-grandson, William the Lion, towards the Northumbrians.<sup>117</sup> Malcolm’s death also prompted dynastic strife, as his brother, Donald Bàn, fought for power with his nephews Duncan II and Edgar.<sup>118</sup> The inclusion of the circumstances behind Malcolm’s death focuses less on the king’s inherent barbarity and more on the perils of failing to provide royal mercy for those afflicted by the crown’s actions, risking dynastic chaos and territorial fragmentation.

While the Dunfermline *Vita* elevated Malcolm’s image to that of a dynastic founder, it also showed a closer relationship between the king and his wife, Saint Margaret, and her Anglo-Saxon roots. Malcolm was not only associated with the Wessex royal house through marriage; in the Dunfermline *Vita*, he was already Anglicized prior to Margaret’s arrival to Scotland because 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.<sup>119</sup>

Information on Malcolm’s proficiency in the English language was included in Turgot’s *Vita* to denote Malcolm’s role in Margaret’s religious reforms. In the Dunfermline *Vita* this section reads:

---

<sup>116</sup> Durham, *HR* (trans.), 1093 AD, 159.

<sup>117</sup> Barrow, “The Kings of Scots and Durham,” 318-20.

<sup>118</sup> *ASC* E, 1093 AD.

<sup>119</sup> *DV*, 172. “Anglicam enim linguam simul et romanam eque ut propriam perfecte *didicerat*, cum pro patre sue obses esset in anglia.” (my emphasis)

Since he knew the language of the English perfectly, he came forth as a most vigilant interpreter of each party in this council.<sup>120</sup>

As explained in Chapter 1, Turgot modelled the passage about Margaret's ecclesiastic reforms on Bede's recounting of the advent of Christianity in Northumbria, instigated by King Oswald. The *Historia Ecclesiastica* explained that Oswald interpreted "the word of God to his commanders and ministers, for he had perfectly learned the language of the Scots during his long banishment."<sup>121</sup> The original Latin reads "interprete verbi existeret coelestis; quia nimirum tam longo esili sui tempore linguam Scotorum jam plene *didicerat*." The Dunfermline *Vita* also used the verb *didicerat* to describe how Malcolm learned English. This verb is not used in Turgot's original entry nor is it repeated in the Dunfermline *Vita* in the same passage. The likely explanation for this change is that the continuator recognized Turgot's original passage from Bede, and then decided to refer to that passage to explain how Malcolm learned English. Therefore, the notion that Malcolm was raised in England as a hostage may have originated in Bede's account of King Oswald's exile in Scotland, where it specified how the Northumbrian king learned Gaelic. Moreover, there was a precedent in the eleventh century for a king of Scots raised in England as a hostage for his father: Duncan II, Malcolm's son from his first marriage, was given as a hostage to William the Conqueror in 1072.<sup>122</sup> It would not have been far-fetched for the Dunfermline *Vita*'s continuator to assume that Malcolm was a hostage in England for his

---

<sup>120</sup> *DV*, 189: "Qui quoniam perfecte anglorum linguam noverat, vigilantissimus in hoc consilio utriusque partis interpres exciterat."

<sup>121</sup> Bede, *HE*, III: iii, 268 (Latin) and 269 (English translation): "Qui videlicet locus, accedente ac recedente rheumate, bis quotidie instar insulse maris circuluatur undis, bis renundato littore contiguus terra redditur; atque jus admonitionibus humiliter ac libenter in omnibus auscultano ecclesiam Christi in regno suo multum diligenter aedificare ac dilatare curavit. Ubi pulcherrimo saepe spectaculo contigit, ut, evangelizante antistite, *qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non noverat*, ipse rex sui ducibus ac ministris interpres verbi existeret coelestis; quia nimirum tam longo esili sui tempore linguam Scotorum jam plene *didicerat*."

<sup>122</sup> *ASC* D and E, 1072 AD. For Duncan as a hostage, see Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 30; and Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 45.

father like Duncan II had been a hostage in England for Malcolm. Portraying Malcolm as Anglicized also changed the dynamic between Malcolm and Margaret in the Dunfermline *Vita*. The invention of an English past for Malcolm III emphasized how the king was not the locus of Margaret's miracle, but her equal. It is thus in the Dunfermline *Vita* that we find the earliest extant mention of Malcolm III as an English-raised king of Scots, which provided an efficient explanation for Malcolm's civilized and law-providing good rule.

The Dunfermline *Vita* presented Malcolm and Margaret as equal partners, even when Turgot's original text did not reflect such equality. As explored in Chapter 1, Turgot's portrayal of Malcolm hinted at the king's barbarity, something that the Dunfermline *Vita* aimed to correct. At least one change to the twelfth-century text of the *Life of Saint Margaret* deserves closer inspection. Turgot noted that Margaret's piety compelled her to steal from the king's own property, so she could continue giving money to the poor. According to Turgot,

Although the King was fully aware of the theft, he generally pretended to know nothing of it, and felt much amused by it. *Now and then he caught the Queen in the very act, with the money in her hand, and laughingly threatened that he would have her arrested, tried and found guilty.*<sup>123</sup>

However, the Dunfermline *Vita* omits Malcolm's joking threat of Margaret from the account:

Indeed, although the king himself often knew this, pretending that he did not know what was happening, he joked that she was guilty.<sup>124</sup>

The change made to this passage in the Dunfermline *Vita* exemplifies how the hagiographic text was manipulated to present an image of marital bliss between Malcolm and Margaret that emphasized Malcolm's respectful behaviour. Therefore, the Dunfermline *Vita* consistently

---

<sup>123</sup> *Life*, 56: "Et saepe quidem cum rex ipse sciret nescire tamen se simulans, hujusmodi furto plurimum delectabatur; nonnumquam vero adductam, meo iudicio, ream esse iocabatur."

<sup>124</sup> *DV*, 200: "Et saepe quidem cum ipse rex hoc sciret, simulans tum se nescire in huiusmodi ream esse iocabatur."

showed Malcolm III in a positive light, diminishing traces of barbarism in favour of evidence of exemplary royal rule. Moreover, Malcolm and Margaret were presented as partners in rule, as dynastic founders, whose rule was based on Anglo-Saxon kingship.<sup>125</sup>

The portrayal of Malcolm and Margaret as founders of a dynasty continued in the Dunfermline Chronicle's king-list (fos. 23r-26r; see Appendix C) that began with Malcolm and ended with James III and was based on king-list E.<sup>126</sup> The original list must have stopped at Alexander III's death, with information about the death of Margaret Maid of Norway, the "Great Cause," John Balliol and Robert Bruce, and the Stewart dynasty added afterwards.<sup>127</sup> Malcolm was introduced as "Malcolm the eldest, king of Scotland: husband of Saint Margaret," despite Malcolm being the third king of Scots of that name.<sup>128</sup> The creator of the king list disassociated Malcolm from any previous Scottish kings, excluding his father, Duncan I.<sup>129</sup> According to the king list, Malcolm reigned from 1056 to 1093, for a total of thirty-six "happy" years. The king list also stated that Malcolm became king after his father Duncan *iure hereditario* ("by hereditary right"). Both the phrase *iure hereditario* and the marking of Malcolm's first reign year as 1056 are also found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*.<sup>130</sup> However, this is not explicit evidence that the Dunfermline Compilation used Melrose as a source. Coupar Angus Abbey kept a chronicle that

---

<sup>125</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 190.

<sup>126</sup> Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid MS. II 2097, fos. 23r-25r. I thank Dr Alice Taylor for pointing out the connection between king-list E and the Dunfermline Compilation's king-list.

<sup>127</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing," 231-2.

<sup>128</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23r: "malcolmo seniore rege scocie: sponso sancte margarite."

<sup>129</sup> There is a recorded instance of Alexander II paying for a mass-chaplaincy for Duncan I's soul at Elgin Cathedral in 1235. A.O. Anderson suggested that Alexander II's payment implies that Duncan was killed in Moray. It could be that, by Alexander II's reign, Scottish kings understood Duncan to be important to their dynastic history and ancestry. See Anderson, *Early Sources*, 581, fn. 7. I owe this suggestion to Dr James E. Fraser.

<sup>130</sup> Dr Taylor also suggested this connection.

seems to have used the *Chronicle of Melrose* as source;<sup>131</sup> it is not impossible, then, that the Dunfermline Compiler used either the chronicle of Coupar Angus or another Fife-based chronicle related to the *Chronicle of Melrose*. That the idea of Malcolm as king by hereditary right and as founder of a dynasty is found in both the *Chronicle of Melrose* and the Dunfermline Compilation speaks to the coherent articulation of kingship shared by Scottish historical works of the second half of the thirteenth century.

There are more specific ways in which the Dunfermline Compilation asserted the legitimacy of the Canmore dynasty. The king list repeated the story of Margaret's arrival in Scotland with her family, dated to 1067 in the entry. Margaret, a virgin according to the king list, married Malcolm at Dunfermline in the "first betrothal that was made in accordance to religious rite in the land of Scotland."<sup>132</sup> Portraying Malcolm and Margaret's betrothal as the first Scottish marriage made in accordance with the Church had two aims: first, it made it explicit that this union was sanctioned by the Church, which in turn made Duncan II illegitimate.<sup>133</sup> Furthermore, if Malcolm and Margaret's marriage was the first legitimate marriage in Scotland, their sons were the indisputable heirs to the Scottish crown. In the entry for Donald Bàn, Malcolm's sons are described as "legitimate heirs."<sup>134</sup> While the entry for Donald Bàn does not brand him a usurper, he is called unfaithful; Malcolm and Margaret's sons lingered in England after the death of their parents, which gave Donald ample opportunity to take the crown.<sup>135</sup> The king list in the

---

<sup>131</sup> A. A. M. Duncan, "Sources and Uses of the Chronicle of Melrose, 1165-1297," in *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland, 500-1297: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the Occasion of the Ninetieth Birthday*, ed. Simon Taylor (Dublin: Four Court Press, 2000), 146-85, at 169-70.

<sup>132</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23rb: "Hec fuit prima desponsacio. Que rite facta fuit in terra scocie."

<sup>133</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23vb: "Duncanus notho filio regis Malcolmis." For discussion of Duncan II and the identity of his mother, Ingibjorg, see Duncan, *Kingship*, 42.

<sup>134</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23va: "legitimus heredibus scilicet edgaro. alexandro. et illustrissimo dauid."

<sup>135</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23vr: "In Anglia cum parentibus *martyris* sue commorantibus. Non enim audebant in scocia post mortem parentum quorum moram facere propter metem donaldo patrum sui. quia multum eum

Dunfermline Compilation constructed a Scottish dynasty that began with the legitimate marriage of Malcolm and Margaret, ensuring that any potential rival claims to the throne, such as that of Duncan II and his uncle Donald Bàn, were baseless.

Yet the portrayal of Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders had repercussions beyond the political sphere. Margaret was the founder of the Benedictine priory of Dunfermline, where the Dunfermline manuscript was copied.<sup>136</sup> It was during the reign of Alexander III, in 1248, that Margaret was formally canonized by the Pope, becoming Scotland's only canonized royal saint and one of the first European royal saints canonized.<sup>137</sup> Her relics were transferred on 19 July 1250 from her initial resting place to a new altar inside Dunfermline Abbey, in a ceremony led by Alexander III himself.<sup>138</sup> Margaret's canonization and the transfer of her relics in the mid-thirteenth century were a much-needed triumph for Alexander III's assertion of Scottish sovereignty, but it also placed Dunfermline in the spotlight. As Stephen Boardman has argued, "the fortunes of the church were clearly bound up with those of the offspring of Malcolm and Margaret."<sup>139</sup> The Dunfermline Compilation was filled with additions that highlighted Dunfermline's role in Malcolm and Margaret's reign, particularly as the site where Malcolm and Margaret met and married: Dunfermline was the place where the Canmore dynasty was born.<sup>140</sup>

---

[tundum] stieban enim eum infidelem." The *ASC*, under the year 1094, specifies that Donald was chosen as king of Scots by the people, which casts doubts over contemporary acknowledgement of ideas of primogeniture and kingship. Curiously, in this entry both Malcolm and Margaret are called martyrs, yet in the entry for Malcolm's kingship this word is never used. See *ASC* E, 1094 AD; further explanation by Duncan, *Kingship*, 53-4.

<sup>136</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, xxxiii; Duncan, *Kingship*, 82; Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 182-4. Harrill notes that Dunfermline was a major book production centre in Scotland in the fifteenth century, when the manuscript was copied.

<sup>137</sup> Duncan, *Kingship*, 82; Robert Bartlett, *Miracles*, xxx.

<sup>138</sup> Duncan, *Kingship*, 151.

<sup>139</sup> Steve Boardman, "Royal Mausoleum," 140.

<sup>140</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 198-9. According to Harrill, "Dunfermline Abbey was synonymous with royal power (if not 'supreme state power'), and as such religious pilgrimage to Margaret's tomb would also take pilgrims along a route that emphasised the political power of the Scottish royal family."



The Dunfermline Chronicle repeated information about Malcolm's marriage to Margaret, specifying how the first church-sanctioned marriage in Scotland occurred in Dunfermline (see Appendix C).<sup>141</sup> Under the entry for Malcolm and Margaret's deaths, the king list notes that Margaret was buried in Dunfermline in the altar of the Holy Cross, and so was Malcolm; subsequent entries on Edgar I, Alexander I, David I, and Malcolm IV all note that they were buried in Dunfermline. Royal patronage of Dunfermline was very strong during the reigns of David I and Malcolm IV; under David I's kingship, Dunfermline was consecrated in 1150.<sup>142</sup> The association between the Canmore kings and Dunfermline Abbey as royal mausoleum, cult centre, and dynastic site had been forged during the twelfth century, but it was during the reign of Alexander III that it was used for both political and religious purposes.<sup>143</sup> Collecting and distributing information on Malcolm and Margaret's association with Dunfermline, including Margaret's *miracula*, consolidated the idea of a sovereign Scottish kingship rooted in a holy and sophisticated ancestry. Nowhere is this more apparent than in one of the miracles of Saint Margaret of Scotland included in the Dunfermline Compilation, where Malcolm and Margaret helped save their kingdom.

Miracle 7 was set at the Battle of Largs of 1263, when Haakon IV of Norway sent a large fleet to attack Scotland over the control of the Western Isles, and it was included by Walter Bower in his *Scotichronicon*.<sup>144</sup> The Battle of Largs was recorded in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, which stated that Haakon lost because God sank the Norse ships.<sup>145</sup> In this miracle, Malcolm and Margaret, along with their sons, were protectors of the kingdom. They appeared to Sir John

---

<sup>141</sup> MS. II 2097, fo. 23rb; see above.

<sup>142</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, xliii. Lee, "Dunfermline Abbey," 34.

<sup>143</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 178-9; and Boardman, "Royal Mausoleum."

<sup>144</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon*, Book 10, ch. 15, p. 336-9. Vol. 5 ed. Watt.

<sup>145</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 63r.

Wemyss, a knight, in a dream: Malcolm was dressed as a knight in “shining armour,” (*fulgentibus armis*) and so were his sons.<sup>146</sup> According to Margaret’s message to Wemyss, they knew the threat posed by the Norwegian fleet and hurried to Largs to save Scotland, “to bring victory over that tyrant who is attempting to subject my [Margaret’s] kingdom to his power. For *I have accepted this kingdom from God*, and it is entrusted to me and my heirs for ever.”<sup>147</sup> The knight, who was battling a fever at the time, woke up and rode the next morning to Dunfermline to tell his dream to the abbot. It was the abbot who confirmed that it was not a dream that he had had, “but a sign from heaven.”<sup>148</sup> Wemyss was cured of his fever and Scotland was saved from the ferocity of the Norwegians. Margaret’s intercession produced a double miracle.

Part of a king’s duty was the military protection of his kingdom and Malcolm here went to defend his kingdom against Norwegian “tyranny.” There is a strong parallelism between Malcolm holding Margaret’s right arm and the idea of medieval knights as the “right arm” of the Church: as a saint, Margaret would represent the church itself.<sup>149</sup> While Harrill describes Margaret as performing “both the typical king-role of military protector and the role of patron saint,” the miracle itself suggests that Margaret ceded her duties as military protector to Malcolm, since holy men and clergy were forbidden by the Church to engage in military combat.<sup>150</sup> The miracle clearly portrayed Margaret and Malcolm as dynastic equals, with Malcolm as representative of military action and Margaret representing the Church. Moreover,

---

<sup>146</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, 88: “Que in manu dextera militem ducebat, *fulgentibus armis* indutum, gladio accintum, assidem habens impositam.”

<sup>147</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, 88-9: “Cum istis ad Largys regnum defensum proper, victoriam acture de tyranno qui regnum meum suo mititur subiugare dominio. Nam *mihi hoc regnum a Deo accepi* commendatum et heredibus meis inperpetuum.”

<sup>148</sup> Bartlett, *Miracles*, 87.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid, 4. See also Katherine Allen Smith, “Saints in Shining Armor: Martial Asceticism and Masculine Models of Sanctity, Ca. 1050-1250,” *Speculum* 83 (2008): 572–602, at 579.

<sup>150</sup> Harrill, “Politics and sainthood,” 212 (for quote); see also Smith, “Saints in Shining Armour,” 582.

the appearance of Margaret along with Malcolm and their sons in this miracle reiterates the theme of the Dunfermline Compilation: the promotion of the Canmore dynasty's status in Scottish history. By including Malcolm, Edgar, Alexander, and David in Margaret's miracle, the author of this passage emphasized the importance of the Canmore dynasty as a family unit of saintly attributions that were led by, but not constricted to, Saint Margaret herself. Thus, although Miracle 7 evidenced the queen's sanctity, it is apparent that the miracle also portrays the earliest Canmore kings as saintly. Margaret's sanctity was important and relevant to Scottish ideas of kingship and sovereignty in the thirteenth century, but the Canmore kings were also recognized as participants of saintly endeavours.

Margaret's assertion that she had "accepted this kingdom from God" echoed the words spoken by Alexander III in October 1278 in the presence of Edward I of England, as he refused to give homage to Edward for Scotland: "Nobody but God himself has the right to the homage for my realm of Scotland, and *I hold it of nobody but God himself*."<sup>151</sup> The Scottish version of Alexander's homage, which survives in the *Registrum de Dunfermlyn*, also had Alexander claim that he held his kingdom from God alone.<sup>152</sup> Margaret was, therefore, the holder of the rights to her kingdom, which had direct political implications for the legitimacy of Alexander III's sovereignty as king of Scots. Wemyss's participation in this miracle as messenger was also rather telling. Wemyss became an earthly link between Malcolm and Margaret and the church of Dunfermline, and eventually, the kingdom of the Scots. Dunfermline became the site where the political and religious defence of Scotland converged; Dunfermline was locus of the power,

---

<sup>151</sup> Walker, *Legal History*, 72; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 160-2.

<sup>152</sup> Innes, *Reg. Dunferm.*, 217, at #321: "Cui Rex statim respondit et aparte dicens *ad homagium regni mei scocie. Nullus ius habet nisi solus Deus nunc illud teneo. Nisi de solo deo.*" This information was added to the *Registrum* between 1320-30. See Walker, *Legal History*, 72, fn. 83.

sovereignty and liberty of Scotland and the Canmore dynasty.<sup>153</sup> In Miracle 7, as well as in the Dunfermline Compilation, Malcolm III was key to asserting the royal and dynastic sovereignty of Scotland. Its importance was even more apparent in the annalistic chronicle known as the *Gesta Annalia* I, which includes information found in the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Chronicle of Melrose*.

### **Gesta Annalia I (c. 1285)**

The last extant portrayal of Malcolm III in the thirteenth century is found in the *Gesta Annalia* I, which Dauvit Broun has dated to 1285.<sup>154</sup> The *Gesta Annalia* had been ascribed to John of Fordun before Broun argued that the *Gesta* represented an earlier work based on a chronicle written at Dunfermline ca. 1250.<sup>155</sup> The attribution of the *Gesta Annalia* to John of Fordun was made by Felix Skene, the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*'s most recent editor, who divided the content of what was the full *Gesta Annalia* into two separate sections: what is now known as *Gesta Annalia* I is found in an appendix to Fordun's *Chronica*, since its material is included in the *Chronica*'s Book V.<sup>156</sup> The textual history of the *Gesta Annalia* I is rather complex and is summarized as follows.

In *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain* (2007), Dauvit Broun explained the developmental stages of the *Gesta Annalia* I and II and their inclusion into John of Fordun's

---

<sup>153</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 217.

<sup>154</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 175; John of Fordun, "III. Johannis de Fordun Capitula Ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa," in *Johannis de Fordun, Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, ed. William F. Skene, vol. 1, *The Historians of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872), 406–37. Cited from here onwards as *GAI*. Dauvit Broun has subdivided the *Gesta Annalia* appended to John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* in two parts: *Gesta Annalia* I is dated to ca. February 1285, while *Gesta Annalia* II dates from October 1285 to 1363.

<sup>155</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 216–7; Broun, "A New Look," 20.

<sup>156</sup> Broun, "A New Look," 10–11.

*Chronica gentis Scotorum*.<sup>157</sup> The *Gesta Annalia* I originated in an earlier history of Scotland written by Richard Vairement sometime in the 1260s. This history was the earliest full historical narrative of Scotland from the earliest origin-myths to the accession of Malcolm III.<sup>158</sup> Vairement's history was expanded into a text dubbed by Broun as "proto-Fordun," which included alternative accounts of the Scottish past without substantial changes and extended Scottish history until the time of its composition.<sup>159</sup> The *Gesta Annalia* I that survives is merely a fragment of the longer "proto-Fordun" that contained a history of Saint Margaret's Anglo-Saxon ancestors.<sup>160</sup> Most recently, Alice Taylor has identified the Dunfermline Compilation as one of the three major sources used by the compiler of the *Gesta Annalia* I (that is, of "proto-Fordun"); the portrayal of Malcolm III in the extant *Gesta Annalia* I seems to originate from the Dunfermline Compilation.<sup>161</sup> This account is continued and supplemented by information found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*.<sup>162</sup> This section of Chapter 2 will explore the portrayal of Malcolm III in the *Gesta Annalia* I; by way of comparison with the *Gesta Annalia*'s likely or known sources, the discussion will assess how the changes made by this chronicle further enhanced the image of Malcolm's sovereignty.

The first of these changes pertains to the moment when one of Malcolm's noblemen made a prophecy about Margaret's destiny as queen of Scots. The *Gesta Annalia* stated that

---

<sup>157</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 252-60.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 258-9.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., 260-1.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>161</sup> Taylor, "Historical Writing," 234, esp. fn. 39. Fordun did use the *Gesta Annalia* I for his material on Book V, chapter 9 onwards, where he manipulated the text minimally with the exception of including Ælred of Rievaulx's eulogy of David I. The implications of Fordun's use and organization of the content of the *Gesta Annalia* I on Malcolm's portrayal in the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* will be analyzed in depth in Chapter 3.

<sup>162</sup> Duncan, "Sources and Uses," 163-5. According to Duncan, the *Gesta Annalia* stopped using the *Chronicle of Melrose* as a source in the year 1196.

Margaret was “the mistress *and heiress* not only of the family, but also of the *whole kingdom of England* indeed, and divine providence predestined her to be participant in his [Malcolm’s] rule.”<sup>163</sup> The Dunfermline *Vita*’s passage did not include information about Margaret as heiress to the whole kingdom of England.<sup>164</sup> *Gesta Annalia* highlighted the importance of Margaret’s inheritance and status as English princess to her marriage to Malcolm, implying that Malcolm married Margaret primarily for this reason. Similarly, after Malcolm’s nobles had identified the incoming family, he then decided to pay them a visit. The Dunfermline *Vita* stated that “Yet where he [Malcolm] had seen Margaret [...]”<sup>165</sup> while the *Gesta Annalia* has different wording for the same phrase: “Therefore, wheresoever the king had seen Margaret...”, turning the word “king” (*rex*) into the sentence’s subject.<sup>166</sup> Another example of editorial manipulation of the Dunfermline *Vita*’s material is found in the passage containing Malcolm’s encounter with a treacherous nobleman. Here, the word *rex* was added to the original passage, further stressing Malcolm’s agency: “Quibus nominatis et adductis, *rex inquit*, in regis verbo tibi dico, *rex* ante promissa stabit.”<sup>167</sup> In this way, the *Gesta Annalia* emphasized that it was the king who initiated the dialogue. These editorial changes reinforced Malcolm’s royal agency, which was expected of a chronicle that contained a section dedicated to Malcolm’s reign.

Some changes and additions to the content taken from the Dunfermline *Vita* were not merely minor or editorial. The most compelling example of the *Gesta Annalia*’s manipulation of

---

<sup>163</sup> *GAI*, xiii, 416: “Nec mirum si illam dominam crediderint, quam dominam non solum illius familiae, sed etiam totius regni Angliae et heredem, ymmo et regni sui participem futuramque reginam divina praedestinavit providencia.”

<sup>164</sup> *DV*, 171: “Nec mirum si illam dominam crediderint quam dominam non solummodo illius familie, sed etiam totius regni reginam, immo et regni sui participatem divina praedestinaverit providencia.”

<sup>165</sup> *DV*, 171: “At ubi margaritam viderat [...]”

<sup>166</sup> *GAI*, xiv, 417: “Rex ergo ubicumque Margaritam viderat...”

<sup>167</sup> *GAI*, xv, 418.

the Dunfermline *Vita*'s original content is found in its description of how Malcolm and Margaret's washed the feet of paupers as part of their charity work:

Having finished the Office of the Matins, however, and returning to her bedchamber, she was accustomed to wash the feet of six paupers herself, along with the king...<sup>168</sup>

The *Gesta Annalia* added more information to the original passage:

In the time of Lent and the fortieth day before Christmas, unless a major worldly obligation impeded it, and after having finished the matins and celebrated the solemn masses at dawn, *the king* returning to his chamber would wash, with the queen, the feet of six beggars...<sup>169</sup>

By turning Malcolm into the perpetuator of the action the *Gesta Annalia* showed Margaret as following the king's lead in the performance of charity work, a sharp contrast to the Dunfermline *Vita*'s portrayal of Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic equals, and even more to Turgot's original portrayal of Malcolm as Margaret's subordinate. Malcolm's piety was further exalted by including information about the king's praying habits, which complemented his charity work. The author of the *Gesta Annalia* diminished Margaret's royal agency to enhance Malcolm's. The *Gesta Annalia* established Malcolm as sovereign king stressing that Malcolm was the leader, and Margaret the follower.

It was important for the author of the *Gesta Annalia* to emphasize how Malcolm balanced his charity work and kingly duties. In a passage that was taken from the Dunfermline *Vita*, the *Gesta Annalia* informed the reader that after washing the feet of the beggars, the king "agitated, would occupy himself with his kingship and about temporal matters" while Margaret entered the church to pray with many tears. The original passage, as found in the Dunfermline *Vita*,

---

<sup>168</sup> DV, 204: "Peracto autem matutinorum officio, rediens in cameram pedes sex pauperum *cum rege ipsa* lavare..."

<sup>169</sup> GAI, xviii, 421: "In Quadragesimali tempore, et quadraginta diebus ante Dominicum natale, nisi major secularis occupation impendiret, peracto matutinali officio, et aurorae missarum solenniis celebratis, rediens in cameram *rex pedes sex pauperum cum regina* lavare..."

mentioned nothing about Malcolm's activities, only that Margaret would enter the church to pray and sob. For the *Gesta Annalia* to present a thorough portrayal of Malcolm's piety and charity, the author adapted the content of the Dunfermline *Vita* to focus on the king's piety, even if that meant attributing to him actions that were originally undertaken by the queen.

A comparison of the Dunfermline *Vita* and the *Gesta Annalia* I shows that the author of the *Gesta Annalia* I used the *Chronicle of Melrose* as a source for information on Scottish events before 1165. According to the Dunfermline *Vita*, Malcolm "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."<sup>170</sup> However, the *Gesta Annalia* painted a rather different picture. It stated that Malcolm "had learned the English language at the same time as the Roman as equally and as perfectly as his own, because after the death of his father he had remained 17 years in England."<sup>171</sup> Malcolm became king of Scots in 1055, according to the *Gesta Annalia*, since it was in 1067, twelve years after he came to the throne, that Margaret married him.<sup>172</sup> The entry in the Dunfermline *Vita* does not contain such information, so from where did the *Gesta Annalia* derive the information for Malcolm's regnal dates? Possibly from the *Chronicle of Melrose*. The length of Malcolm's stay in England coincided with the dates for Macbeth's reign as found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*: from 1039 until 1054.<sup>173</sup> The *Verse Chronicle* included in the margins of the *Chronicle of Melrose* in the second half of the thirteenth century states that "Macbeth became

---

<sup>170</sup> *DV*, 171: "Anglicam enim linguam simul et romanam eque ut propriam perfecte *didicerat*, cum pro patre sue obses esset in Anglia."

<sup>171</sup> *GAI*, xiii, 416: "Anglicam enim linguam simul et Romanam aequae ut propriam plene *didicerat*, cum post patre sui morte XVII annis mansisset in Anglia."

<sup>172</sup> *GAI*, xvi, 419: "Huic magnanimo viro regi Scotiae Malcolm ab incarnationis Dominicae anno MLXVII et suae regnationis XII, Margareta, ut praemissum est, matrimonio copulatur."

<sup>173</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo.12v.



king of Scotland for seventeen years”<sup>174</sup> and seems the likely source of the date range of Malcolm's stay in England found in the *Gesta Annalia*. The start of Malcolm's reign is situated between 1054 and 1056 in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, because the entry for 1054 mentions Macbeth's murder and the entry for 1056 mentioned how Malcolm ascended the Scottish throne “by hereditary right.” The interpolations made to the *Chronicle of Melrose* by Scribes 27 and 28 had fulfilled their function of clarifying the status of Malcolm's kingship by reiterating that the English had aided him retrieve his throne, not that they had placed him as a puppet king at the command of Edward the Confessor. It turned a narrative of English regnal imposition into one of Anglo-Scottish political cooperation. The *Gesta Annalia* I's interest in the dates for Malcolm's and Macbeth's kingship were symptomatic of the political need to legitimate Malcolm as rightful, sovereign ruler of Scotland.

## Conclusion

Malcolm III's portrayal in the thirteenth century was as the locus of competing ideas of Scottish kingship and identity. In the *Chronicle of Melrose*, the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Gesta Annalia* I, Malcolm was an increasingly Anglicized king whose reign marked a departure from previous modes of Scottish kingship, and whose affinity for English-style government provided his descendants with a model of ideal kingship to emulate. Yet Malcolm was also an increasingly sovereign ruler whose right to the crown was independent of English intervention. Scribe 27's additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose* clearly indicated an anxiety to secure the independence of Malcolm's kingship, and they reflected the core ideal of Scottish kingship as understood by Scottish chroniclers of the period: the Canmore kings were sovereign rulers who looked to

---

<sup>174</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 12v (lower inner margin): “Ergo Rex Macabeda x Scocie vii. que fit annis.”

England for regnal sophistication, not for the legitimation of their own kingship. Malcolm's portrayal as a sovereign ruler who was already Anglicized before joining Margaret in marriage reconstructed the Scottish past to combat constraining English political intervention and asserting the control and power of the Canmore kings over a newly unified and expanded Scottish kingdom. As Malcolm was redefined as a sovereign, Anglicized ruler, his thirteenth-century descendants, Alexander II and III could sustain the independence and validity of their right to rule Scotland as a sovereign kingdom. Historiography supported the idea of a south-looking, Anglicized, and modern Scottish dynasty whose sovereignty was unquestionable.

But the portrayal of Malcolm as a sovereign king also served to quell internal challenges to the Canmore dynasty. By portraying Malcolm and Margaret as participants in Scotland's first legal marriage and, therefore, dynastic founders, rival claims to the Scottish kingship from the descendants of Duncan II and Lulach were invalidated. The portrayal of Macbeth as a usurper in the *Chronicle of Melrose* had the specific function of constructing eleventh-century Scottish kingship as hereditary and based on primogeniture while asserting Malcolm as ruler by hereditary right; the Dunfermline Compilation's assertion of Duncan II as *nothus* was meant to delegitimize the MacWilliams' claims to the Scottish crown. That Malcolm was the patriarch of the Canmore dynasty is apparent in the Dunfermline Compilation's depiction of Malcolm as the first of his name, tying Malcolm to Margaret's Anglo-Saxon ancestors and erasing traces of previous Scottish kings. A new definition of Scottish kingship, one that disassociated itself from twelfth-century notions of Scottish barbarity, was supported through the reconstruction of Malcolm III as a pious, law-giving monarch whose sophistication was independent of Margaret's influence.

Thirteenth-century Scottish kingship had the same qualities ascribed to Malcolm in these three historical sources. It was increasingly Europeanized with a strong governmental apparatus and with a sophisticated law-provision system. It derived its identity from the Wessex royal house while maintaining regnal sovereignty: it was influenced by, but not subordinated to, English kings. Its nobility participated in the political sphere not just of Scotland, but of England as well. Scottish chroniclers understood the pressing challenges to the Canmore dynasty's legitimacy and independence, and their re-imagining of Malcolm III was a response to those challenges. Malcolm was carefully crafted as an independent ruler by hereditary right, who, though marriage and upbringing, assimilated the modernizing qualities of English kingship without compromising the sovereignty of his kingdom. Such a portrayal would protect the Canmore dynasty's independence, at least until 1286.

### CHAPTER 3: MALCOLM CANMORE IN JOHN OF FORDUN'S *CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM* (CA. 1370s)

#### Introduction

Chapter 2 identified and examined the second phase of the historiographical evolution of Malcolm's portrayal. It argued that changes in the concept of Scottish kingship and internal and external challenges to the Canmore dynasty accounted for historiographical interest in portraying Malcolm as king by hereditary right. Themes of dynastic legitimization and preservation, which became prevalent in Scotland after the First War of Independence (1296-1328) and the inauguration of Robert Bruce as king of Scots in 1306, conditioned the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in fourteenth-century sources.<sup>1</sup> The extinction of the Canmore dynasty soon after the death of Margaret, Maid of Norway in 1290, the factionalism arising in Scotland due to the regnal claims of Robert Bruce and John Balliol, and the seizure of Scottish sovereignty by Edward I of England in the 1290s changed the circumstances and requirements of an heir

---

<sup>1</sup> For Robert Bruce and the Wars of Independence, see G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988); Michael Penman, *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2014); Michael Brown, *Disunited Kingdoms: Peoples and Politics in the British Isles 1280-1460*, Medieval World (Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education, 2013); Michael Brown, "Aristocratic Politics and the Crisis of Scottish Kingship, 1286-96," *The Scottish Historical Review* 90, no. 1 (April 1, 2011): 1-26, <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2011.0002>; McQueen, "Parliament, the Guardians and John Balliol, 1284-1296," 29-49; Alexander Grant and K. J. Stringer, eds., *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S Barrow* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993). For late medieval Scottish kingship and nobility, see *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in Honour of Norman Macdougall*, ed. Michael Brown and Roland Tanner (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008); Amanda G. Beam, *The Balliol Dynasty, 1210-1364* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008); Roger A. Mason, "Beyond the Declaration of Arbroath: Kingship, Counsel and Consent in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scotland," in *Kings, Lords and Men in Scotland and Britain, 1300-1625: Essays in Honour of Jenny Wormald*, ed. Stephen Boardman and Julian Goodare (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), 265-82. For Brucean ideology and late medieval chronicle production, see Stephen Boardman, "Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the 'Anonymous Chronicle,'" *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 23-43, at 23-4; Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 38; Katie Stevenson, *Power and Propaganda: Scotland 1306-1488*, The New History of Scotland 3 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

presumptive to the Scottish throne. Recognized Scottish kingship evolved from the king's legitimization by hereditary right to legitimization by hereditary right *and* noble consent.<sup>2</sup> In the fourteenth century, Scottish kings had to assert their sovereignty as independent from English control as well as unify the kingdom under their leadership, minimizing internal dynastic factionalism. The portrayal of Malcolm Canmore's kingship, especially the circumstances under which he inherited the Scottish throne, evolved to reflect the struggle for ensuring the legitimacy and continuity of the Bruce dynasty during the reigns of Robert I (r. 1306-1328) and his son, David II (r. 1331-1371).<sup>3</sup>

The earliest fourteenth-century portrayal of Malcolm Canmore is found in Books IV and V of John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, which is commonly dated to the 1360s but has been ascribed a *terminus post quem* of 1371 x 8.<sup>4</sup> Dauvit Broun has recently argued for a later dating, between 1384 x 87.<sup>5</sup> Before Dauvit Broun's reassessment of the *Chronica*'s Scottish origin myth and the *Gesta Annalia* I and II, scholars considered the *Chronica* represented the

---

<sup>2</sup> Stevenson, *Power and Propaganda*, 26 and 28; for the earliest expression of the need for noble consent to crown a king of Scots, see "The Appeal of the Seven Earls," in Edward Lionel Gregory Stones, ed., *Anglo-Scottish Relations 1174-1328; Some Selected Documents, Edited and Translated by E.L.C. Stones* (London: Thomas Nelson & Son, 1965), 44-50; and in Sir Francis Palgrave, ed., *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland, and the Transactions between the Crowns of Scotland and England*, vol. I (The Commissioners on the Public Records of the Kingdom, 1837), 14-21; A.A.M. Duncan, "Before Coronation: Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century," in *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon*, ed. David J. Breeze, Thomas Owen Clancy, and Richard Welander, Monograph Series (Society of Antiquaries of Scotland) No. 22 (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), 139-68, at 140; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 46 and 306-8 for the Declaration of Arbroath and the articulation of contractual theory of kingship. For the Declaration of Arbroath, see Records of the Parliament of Scotland, accessed January 14, 2018, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/>, 1320/4/1. Cited hereafter as *RPS*.

<sup>3</sup> Barrow, *Robert Bruce*; Michael A. Penman, *David II, 1329-71* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell, 2004).

<sup>4</sup> For dating of Fordun's *Chronica*, see Broun, "A New Look," 20; and Broun, *Irish Identity*, 11; and Boardman, "Chronicle Propaganda," 24. Boardman argues that internal evidence in the *Chronica* suggests it was not yet completed by the accession of Robert II to the throne in February 1371.

<sup>5</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 223.

earliest attempt to write a full history of Scotland.<sup>6</sup> Instead, as discussed in Chapter 2, the *Gesta Annalia* I is a fragment of an earlier, thirteenth-century text that Broun dubbed “proto-Fordun” and which he attributes to Richard Vairement (i.e. Hector Boece’s “Veremundus”), who was active between 1239 and 1267.<sup>7</sup> Veremundus’s chronicle covered the period from the origins of Scottish history until an account of the reign of Malcolm III. Therefore, Broun has concluded that, if Vairement was the author of “proto-Fordun,” from which the *Gesta Annalia* I is extracted, “then it would clearly have a claim to be regarded as the earliest sustained narrative of a distinct Scottish past.”<sup>8</sup> However, as James Goldstein has suggested, “[...] the fourteenth-century historian, in transmitting legends about the origin of his nation, made an important contribution of his own to the Scottish tradition of historiography.”<sup>9</sup> How is it possible to ascertain Fordun’s historiographical contribution to changing ideas about Malcolm’s youth and kingship when the *Chronica*’s material was transmitted from earlier sources?

This chapter offers an examination of the manner in which Fordun incorporated the *Gesta Annalia* I’s information on Malcolm Canmore’s kingship into the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 11-12; Broun, “Birth of Scottish History,” 21; Broun, “A new look,” 20-1; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 215-68. For earlier assessments of the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, see Bruce Webster, “John of Fordun and the Independent Identity of the Scots,” in *Medieval Europeans* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), 85–102, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26610-4\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26610-4_5); Alice McKim, “Gret Price off Chewalry: Barbour’s Debt to Fordun,” ed. G. Ross Roy, *SSL* 24 (1986): 7–29; Marjorie Jean Drexler, “Attitudes to Nationality in Scottish Historical Writing from Barbour to Boece” (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1979). More recent assessments of the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* include Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*; Boardman, “Chronicle Propaganda,” 23-43; Murray Andrew Lucas Tod, “The Narrative of the Scottish Nation and Its Late-Medieval Readers: Non-Textual Reader Scribal Activity in the MSS of Fordun, Bower, and Their Derivates” (University of Glasgow, 2005); Katherine H. Terrell, “Subversive Histories: Strategies of Identity in Scottish Historiography,” in *Cultural Diversity in the British Middle Ages : Archipelago, Island, England*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 153–72.

<sup>7</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 235-6. For the identification of Veremundus with Richard Vairement, see Nicola Royan, “Hector Boece and the Question of Veremund,” *Innes Review* 52, no. 1 (2001): 42–62, <https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2001.52.1.42>.

<sup>8</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 236.

<sup>9</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 106.

Although it is apparent that the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* is a “patchwork” of English and Scottish sources, Fordun’s approach to composing (or compiling) the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* is typical of late medieval chroniclers who, appealing to the veracity of their accounts, left incongruences and contradictions between their sources embedded in their narratives.<sup>10</sup> But Broun has also noted that “Fordun’s chronicle cannot simply be regarded as a carbon copy of an earlier work.”<sup>11</sup> In fact, even when transmitting his information from the *Gesta Annalia* I, Broun acknowledges that some of the word choices in the *Chronica* can be attributed to Fordun himself. Furthermore, in *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain*, Broun explains that, despite Fordun’s copying of the material found in the *Gesta Annalia* I, “this [argument] is not to deny that significant parts of the work known to scholarship as Fordun’s chronicle could not have been Fordun’s own contribution.”<sup>12</sup> This chapter is partly dedicated to understanding how Fordun transmitted material about Malcolm III that originated in the *Gesta Annalia* I, and therefore, from proto-Fordun. It shows Fordun’s methodology for copying from both the *Gesta Annalia* I and William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta regum Anglorum*. Understanding how Fordun incorporated historical material from other sources can shed light on how he incorporated the account of Macbeth’s kingship into the pre-existing narrative on Malcolm’s reign.

Disentangling the twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources from the fourteenth-century narrative is a rather arduous task, but it is necessary to understand the processes by which Fordun interpolated and manipulated his sources to achieve an image of Malcolm Canmore that fitted with Fordun’s vision of Scottish history.<sup>13</sup> An in-depth textual analysis of Fordun’s adaptation of

---

<sup>10</sup> Terrell, “Subversive Histories,” 164-5; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, 2-16; John and Winifred MacQueen, “Introduction to Books III and IV,” in Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, xvi, for Fordun’s deliberate design of Scottish royal chronology.

<sup>11</sup> Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 227.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Webster, “John of Fordun,” 94.

the *Gesta Annalia* I's information on Malcolm's reign can reveal the subtle yet relevant manipulation of the source to conform to a pre-established narrative of Scottish kingship that reflects on the challenges faced by the Bruce kings, Robert I and David II, during their particular reigns. The *Chronica gentis Scotorum* is not only important as an extant witness to now-lost sources on earlier Scottish history, but it might offer a glimpse into the fourteenth-century political milieu that shaped Fordun's understanding of Scottish kingship in general and Malcolm's reign in particular.

Malcolm Canmore's portrayal in Book V, chapters 9 to 22 of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* appears to be reflective of David II's reign, in particular the Second War of Independence (1332-1357), the coronation of Edward Balliol as king of Scots in 1332, and David's antagonistic relationship with Robert the Stewart, his half-nephew and heir to the Scottish throne. Woven into the passages taken from earlier sources is a less antagonistic view of Anglo-Scottish relations as witnessed by Fordun's treatment of the relationship between Malcolm Canmore and Edgar Ætheling, and even in his portrayal of Malcolm's dependence on Siward of Northumbria and Edward the Confessor to effectively gain his throne. As Michael Brown has shown, "the policies and proposals of the 1360s suggest a conscious desire by both English and Scottish crowns to reverse the changes of the preceding seventy years."<sup>14</sup> Anglo-Scottish royal relations at the time were more cooperative than antagonistic, as seen by David II's desire to leave his kingdom to either John of Gaunt or Lionel of Clarence, sons of Edward III of England.<sup>15</sup> As such proposals were rejected by the Scottish Parliament in 1364, David's attempts to curtail the rights of Robert Stewart as his heir demonstrate how dynastic tensions increased in the Scottish political sphere of the time. It will be argued in this chapter that the

---

<sup>14</sup> Brown, *Disunited Kingdoms*, 213.

<sup>15</sup> Brown, *Disunited Kingdoms*, 213.



Bruce-Stewart conflict over the inheritance of the Scottish crown and the eventual succession of the Stewart dynasty in 1371 affected Fordun's portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. Overall antipathy towards the crowning of Robert Stewart as Robert II in 1371 partially conditioned Fordun's narrative about Malcolm Canmore.<sup>16</sup>

Nonetheless, the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* was not only conditioned by the reign of David II. The *Chronica* contains the earliest extant version of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff story, which, as found in the *Chronica*, was concerned with the circumstances surrounding Malcolm Canmore's ascent to the throne. This chapter argues that the Macbeth and Macduff story is the product of Brucean ideology, inspired by Bruce's vilification of Balliol's kingship in order to sustain his own candidacy,<sup>17</sup> and eventual enthronement, as king of Scots.

### Fordun's Sources

John of Fordun's main sources for the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* have been discussed in detail, first by Marjorie Anderson and, most recently, by Dauvit Broun, and John and Winifred MacQueen.<sup>18</sup> What follows is a summary of the current state of scholarship about the source material contained in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* in general, followed by an explanation of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Drexler, "Attitudes to Nationality," 20; for the unpopularity of Robert II's rise to the Scottish throne with the nobles and knights loyal to David II, see Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 1-38, at 3.

<sup>17</sup> One of the tactics the Scottish community produced to legitimize Bruce's kingship was the "Letter of the Clergy" of March 1309-10, which established John Balliol as a puppet king imposed by Edward I, despite the fact that Balliol's kingship had, at all times, received the support of his political community. See Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 81 and Norman H. Reid, "Crown and Community under Robert I," in *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S Barrow*, ed. Alexander Grant and K. J. Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), 203-22, at 203-5.

<sup>18</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 63-7 and 212-15; Broun, *Irish Identity*, 11-31, 63-81, 133-164 (discussion on Anderson's X-group); Broun, "A New Look," 9-30; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 227-268 (on the *Gesta Annalia* and Veremundus); MacQueen and MacQueen (eds.), "Introduction to Books I and II," in *Scotichronicon* 1, xiii-xxxii; and *Scotichronicon* 3, xiii-xxiii.

particular main sources that form the bulk of the material of the *Chronica*'s Book V, chapters 9-20.

According to Anderson, Fordun's main source for Pictish and Scottish kingship was the X group king-lists, which included lists D, K, the list used by Fordun and another one used by Andrew of Wyntoun.<sup>19</sup> This includes the use of the *Verse Chronicle* as it appears in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, copied by Scribe 28.<sup>20</sup> He also used the *Chronicle of Huntingdon*, which was composed in 1290-1 as a response to Edward I's enquiry about England's right over the kingship of Scotland but was not used as part of the final inquest.<sup>21</sup> The *Chronicle of Huntingdon* also took material from the *Chronicle of Melrose*.<sup>22</sup> Anderson argued that Fordun could have used the Poppleton Manuscript, containing an account of Malcolm III's children, for the *Chronica*.<sup>23</sup> Scholarly opinion on Fordun's use (or lack thereof) of the *Historia* included in the now-lost St Andrews *registrum* has varied: while Anderson argued that Fordun might have visited St Andrews to collect material for his *Chronica* without using the now-lost *Historia* contained in the St Andrews *registrum*, the most recent editors of Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* argue that he possibly did.<sup>24</sup> Most recently, Dauvit Broun has convincingly argued that the chronicle known as the *Gesta Annalia* I, of which the first part has been subject

---

<sup>19</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 212-15, at 212; also see 63-7.

<sup>20</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fos. 12v-13v; Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 213; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 210.

<sup>21</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 213-4; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 209-13; Stones and Simpson (eds.) "Appendix VII," in Edward Lionel Gregory Stones, *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland, 1290-1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause*, Glasgow University Publications (Oxford: Published for the University of Glasgow by the Oxford University Press, 1978), I, 222-4, and II, 297-99; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 34 for the *Chronicle of Huntingdon*'s portrayal of Macbeth.

<sup>22</sup> MacQueen and MacQueen (eds.), "Introduction to Books II and IV," *Scotichronicon* 2, xvii.

<sup>23</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 214. However, as the MacQueens argue, he was unaware of the Poppleton MS's material on Pictish and Scottish material. See MacQueen and MacQueen (eds.), *Scotichronicon*, 2, xviii.

<sup>24</sup> For Anderson's argument, see *Kings and Kingship*, 215; MacQueen and MacQueen (eds.) *Scotichronicon* 1, xxix; and 2, xvii.

to analysis in Chapter 2 of this thesis, was not Fordun's first draft for Book V of the *Chronica*, but that it represents an independent work, already in existence by c. 1285.<sup>25</sup> Fordun used, among other English sources, William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum*, which he interpolated with other sources in his chapters on Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne.<sup>26</sup>

Broun's scholarship on the *Gesta Annalia* I has identified one of the main sources for Fordun's account of Malcolm Canmore's kingship. Yet the source for the account of Macbeth, Macduff and Malcolm Canmore's exile, as found in the *Chronica*'s Book IV, chapters 44 to 47, and Book V, chapters 1-8, remains unidentified.<sup>27</sup> In Book IV, chapters 45 to 47, Macbeth betrays Duncan, expelling Malcolm Canmore and his brother, Donald Bane (Donald Bàn), from the kingdom. Malcolm eventually arrives in Northumbria to gather advice from his kinsman, Siward of Northumbria; though the earliest attribution of an English upbringing to Malcolm is found in the Dunfermline *Vita* and repeated in the *Gesta Annalia* I, Fordun's account represents the earliest attribution of English blood to Malcolm.<sup>28</sup> Chapter 46 marks the first introduction of the character of Macduff, thane of Fife, into Scottish history.<sup>29</sup> Chapters 1 to 8 of Book V contain the earliest extant account of Malcolm Canmore's test of loyalty for Macduff. Without an earlier extant source for the narrative, the analysis put forward in this chapter depends on determining Fordun's methodology for composing the *Chronica*'s account of Malcolm's kingship. Textual analysis of Fordun's use of the *Gesta Annalia* I and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta* for his account of Malcolm's kingship will reveal Fordun's approach to composing his *Chronica*.

### **Fordun's methodology**

---

<sup>25</sup> Broun, "A New Look," 17.

<sup>26</sup> MacQueen and MacQueen (eds.), *Scotichronicon* 2, xviii.

<sup>27</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlv-xlvii, and V: i-viii.

<sup>28</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlv-xlv.

<sup>29</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlvi.

Our only knowledge on Fordun's methodology for composing the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* comes from Walter Bower's prologue to the *Scotichronicon*. According to Bower, John of Fordun was a chaplain at Aberdeen who composed the *Chronica* after researching different chronicles and sources scattered throughout the British Isles.<sup>30</sup> Though Fordun's research trip through the British Isles has been called into question,<sup>31</sup> it is clear that Fordun's approach to composing the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* has added another layer of complexity to an already convoluted textual composition. As William Scott argued, "[...] his chronicle shows different standards of scholarship, accuracy and regard for the truth, depending on the period he is dealing with, the quality of his sources, and whether or not Anglo-Scottish relations are involved."<sup>32</sup> Indeed, Fordun's handling of the *Gesta Annalia* I and the *Gesta regum Anglorum* seems conditioned not only by his ideas on Malcolm's kingship, but also by his ideas on Anglo-Scottish and Franco-Scottish relations. Analyzing Fordun's use of the *Gesta Annalia* I and the *Gesta regum Anglorum* shows how the chronicler manipulated, changed and interpolated the material he found in both of these sources to sustain his narrative of ideal Scottish kingship. This comparison can be seen in Appendix D.

The account of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne and his reign is found in Book V, chapters 9-21 of the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*. The composition and arrangement of these chapters show that Fordun relied primarily on the *Gesta Annalia* I to shape his narrative, a source that he manipulated to a certain extent, mostly by altering the succession of its chapters (see Appendix D). For example, Chapter 15 of the *Gesta Annalia* I narrates Ælred of Rievalux's story

---

<sup>30</sup> Matthew McDiarmid, "The Northern Initiative: John of Fordun, John Barbour and the Author of the 'Saints' Legend," in *Literature of the North*, ed. David Hewitt and Michael Spiller (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1982), 1–13, at 1.

<sup>31</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 12–13.

<sup>32</sup> William W. Scott, "John of Fordun's Description of the Western Isles," *Scottish Studies* 23 (1979): 1–13, 7.

about Malcolm and the would-be assassin; Fordun divided Chapter 15 into chapters 9 and 10 of the *Chronica*. Fordun used the information found in Chapter 15 of the *Gesta Annalia* for composing the second half of Chapter 9 of the *Chronica*; the information found in the first half of Chapter 9, such as the precise date of Malcolm's accession to the throne, the length of his reign, and a brief description of his character and of his relationship with Saint Margaret of Scotland seem to come from either another source, now lost, or is a summary of several sources, including the *Gesta regum Anglorum*.<sup>33</sup> Chapter 10 focused only on the second half of the story, from the moment Malcolm taunted the traitor until Malcolm forgave him.<sup>34</sup> Chapter 11 took its information from the *Gesta regum Anglorum*, and contained an account of the aftermath of King Edward's death and the English succession.<sup>35</sup> Chapter 12 details William the Bastard's invasion of England; the majority of this chapter is found in the *Gesta Annalia*'s Chapter 11, but the *Chronica* interpolated information from the *Gesta regum Anglorum*.<sup>36</sup> Chapter 13 spoke of the misery of the English after the Norman Invasion, while Chapter 14, which detailed the arrival of Edgar Ætheling in Scotland, is a merging of Chapters 12 and 13 of the *Gesta Annalia* I. Fordun also copied Chapter 14 of the *Gesta Annalia* for his Chapter 15 of the *Chronica*, which narrated Malcolm's marriage to Saint Margaret. Thus, Fordun's chapter arrangement indicates that he did not structure these particular chapters of the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* to mimic the structure of the chapters of the *Gesta Annalia* I.

For Chapters 16 to 18 of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, Fordun followed the structure of Chapters 16 to 18 of the *Gesta Annalia*. Fordun used Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* for the bulk of Chapter 19 (on William's death) before returning to using the *Gesta Annalia*'s

---

<sup>33</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206-7; *GAI*, XV, 417-8.

<sup>34</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: x, 207-8; *GAI*, XV, 417-8.

<sup>35</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix and x, 206-08; *GAI*, XV, 417-8.

<sup>36</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xii, 209-10; *GAI*, XIX, 415; Malmesbury, *GRA*, ii, 228.

Chapters 19 and 20 as the basis for Chapters 20 and 21 of the *Chronica*. Thus there are several conclusions to derive from Fordun's chapter organization, structure and the use of his two main sources. First, Fordun used the chapters from the *Gesta Annalia*, but he altered their order, except for Chapters 16 to 18, which correlate with Chapters 16 to 18 of the *Gesta Annalia*. Second, while the *Gesta Annalia* I was the main source for Fordun's chapters on Malcolm's reign, he frequently interpolated information from the *Gesta regum Anglorum*, and from at least one other source on Malcolm that remains unidentified, or is otherwise lost. Furthermore, the additions labelled "Willelmus" in the *Chronica* are Fordun's own interpolations.

Yet Fordun's use of the *Gesta Annalia* I and the *Gesta regum Anglorum* show a more important methodological trend. While Fordun was more faithful to the content of the *Gesta Annalia* I, copying it without much manipulation, his use of the *Gesta regum Anglorum* was rather liberal. Fordun amended, paraphrased, and merged passages from different chapters of Malmesbury's text to produce an alternative version of historical events in Scotland in the late eleventh century. Chris Given-Wilson has shown that late-medieval chroniclers such as Henry Knighton and Adam Usk used similar composition methods for their histories.<sup>37</sup> Henry Knighton, for example, favoured official chancery records over news reports as higher quality sources, seldom altering the former and considerably amending the latter.<sup>38</sup> This methodology shows that piecing or weaving texts from different sources to form another historical tract was a standard methodology for medieval historians, but it also shows that the use of the sources was hierarchical in nature. By copying more faithfully from his Scottish sources while considerably altering his English ones, Fordun created a hierarchy of source material that prioritized Scottish versions of history over English ones. Fordun wove the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* from

---

<sup>37</sup> Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, 14-20.

<sup>38</sup> Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, 16.

information found in other chronicle works, adapting and shaping this information to suit his particular narrative, especially his views on Scottish kingship and Malcolm Canmore.<sup>39</sup> Fordun's considerable manipulations of his original sources shed light on the primary themes that underpin his representation of Malcolm Canmore's reign.

### **Malcolm's virtue and charity: Fordun's use of the *Gesta Annalia* I**

How did these changes alter the way Malcolm was portrayed in the narrative? How did it affect Fordun's portrayal of kingship, charity, and dynastic partnership? The reorganization of the chapter structure of the *Gesta Annalia* I in the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* undid the thirteenth-century idea of Malcolm's kingship as the foundation of a new Scottish dynasty that derived legitimacy from its intermarriage with the House of Wessex (see Appendix E). As discussed in Chapter 2, thirteenth-century sources portrayed Malcolm and Margaret as a dynastic couple, both halves of equal importance. Instead, Fordun's *Chronica* highlighted Malcolm's hereditary right to the Scottish throne by stressing his descent from Kenneth MacAlpin and from an unbroken line of Scottish kings dating back millenia, even when the original information comes from thirteenth-century sources.<sup>40</sup> Fordun's use of the *Gesta Annalia* I revealed a desire to portray Malcolm and Margaret's marriage not as a dynastic equal partnership, but rather as a relationship where Malcolm was elevated above Margaret. Deviating from the narrative found in the *Gesta Annalia*, the *Chronica* re-introduced Malcolm's Scottish ancestry as the source of his sovereignty and the independence of his rule. This deviation from his source had considerable effects on the portrayal of Malcolm's relationship with his wife, Saint Margaret. To illustrate the

---

<sup>39</sup> Drexler, "Attitudes to Nationality," 11.

<sup>40</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 63-75; *Scottish Independence*, 236-58; "Birth of Scottish History," 4; Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 49-67, for her discussion of Fordun's use of X-group regnal lists.

changes that Fordun made to the contents of the *Gesta Annalia* I, the following discussion will quote the narrative of both sources in their original Latin.

In the *Gesta Annalia*, the chronicler placed Margaret's arrival in Scotland in Chapters 12 to 14, followed by Malcolm's encounter with the traitor in Chapter 15.<sup>41</sup> Fordun changed this: Malcolm dealt with the traitor in Chapters 9-10 of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, while Margaret arrived in Scotland considerably later in the narrative, in Chapter 14. Chapter 9 of the *Chronica* introduces information on Malcolm's kingship, coronation in Scone, regnal dates and a summary of his qualities, information not found in the *Gesta Annalia*.<sup>42</sup> According to Fordun, Malcolm "Erat enim rex satis humile corde, fortis et animo, corporis viribus praepotens, et audax, non temerarius, ac multis aliis dotatus virtutibus, ut in sequentibus apparebit."<sup>43</sup> The chapter then provides a brief summary of the order of events that will be introduced in later chapters of Book V: that Malcolm had a peaceful relationship with England while King Edward reigned, but peaceful Anglo-Scottish relations ended with the arrival of William the Bastard.<sup>44</sup> From this

---

<sup>41</sup> See *GAI*, xii-xv, 415-18.

<sup>42</sup> *GAI*, xiii, 416. The *Gesta Annalia* mentions that Malcolm spent 17 years at the English court, but does not provide his reign years. See Fordun, *Chronica*, V: viii, 206, where Fordun first stated that Malcolm killed Lulach on 3 April 1057 in Strathbolgy. Fordun took his information on Lulach's death in Strathbolgy from the extracts of the *Verse Chronicle* found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*. The *Chronicle of Melrose* states that Lulach "reigned four and a half months" under the year 1055, and was killed in Esseg, Strathbolgy by Malcolm. On the same folio, Melrose states that Malcolm began his reign in 1056, and reigned 35 years and eight months. That would place Malcolm's death in 1091 instead of 1093; Fordun stated that Malcolm reigned from April 1057 until November 1093, for a total of 36 years and six months, a reign length correctly provided in the beginning of the *Chronica*'s Book V, chapter 9. Melrose does state that Malcolm reigned for 37 years and eight months, a reign date that would place Malcolm's death in 1094. It seems that Fordun, following the information contained in Melrose for the death of King Lulach, corrected Malcolm's reign dates from 1056-1094 to 1057-1093, matching perhaps the dates found in the source pertaining to the kingship of Macbeth. See Anderson, *Early Sources*, 603; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 180; MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v, 1055 and 1056 AD.

<sup>43</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206; *Chronicle* (trans.), 194: "How [he] was a king very humble in heart, bold in spirit, exceeding strong in bodily strength, daring, though not rash, and endowed with many other good qualities, as will appear in the sequel."

<sup>44</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206: "Primis regni sui novem annis, Edwardo rege vivente, firmam pacem Anglis et communionem, et usque adventum Willelmi Bastard, observabat."



point onwards in Chapter 9, Fordun interpolated material from the *Gesta Annalia* I, Chapter 12, citing Turgot as his source and reiterating Malcolm's good qualities as king: "De rege Scotorum Malcolmo Canmor magnanimo, dignum aliquid dicendum duximus, ut cujus fuerit cordis, quanti vel animi, unum ejus opus hic exaratum legentibus declarabit."<sup>45</sup> The repetition of Malcolm's good qualities and good kingship reiterates the *Chronica*'s portrayal of Malcolm as a king in his own right. As Marjorie Drexler observed, for Fordun, the fate of the kingdom was entwined with the fate and quality of its king;<sup>46</sup> it is precisely for this reason that Fordun focused on Malcolm's personal capabilities as a political leader. These qualities did not stem from Margaret's influence, but were already manifest before her arrival in Scotland. Malcolm derived his good kingship from his own kingly conduct, independent of Margaret's intercession in the affairs of the Scottish kingdom. Establishing Malcolm as an exceptional king prior to Margaret's arrival in Scotland provided a dynastic example that future kings of Scots could emulate and it reiterated how good kingship was inherited through an unbroken dynastic line. But most crucially, it showed how Malcolm's kingship was independent in its own right.

While in the *Gesta Annalia* I, the account of Malcolm and the traitor is preceded by eight chapters that detailed Saint Margaret's Wessex ancestry, in the *Chronica*, this same account is preceded by the chapters concerning Malcolm's battle against Macbeth for the Scottish throne. The information about Malcolm and the traitor might have been replicated mostly without change by Fordun in the *Chronica*, but the manner in which Fordun arranged the information to appear before Margaret's arrival in Scotland and after Malcolm's troubles with Macbeth signal a departure from thirteenth-century ideas of Malcolm's kingship as entwined with Margaret's

---

<sup>45</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206; *Chronicle* (trans.), 194: "Of Malcolm, the high-souled king of the Scots, says Turgot, we instance this as worthy of mention, to the end that this one of his doings, here set down, may show forth to those who read of it how kind was his heart, and how great his soul."

<sup>46</sup> Drexler, "Attitudes to Nationality," 17; see also Brown, "Introduction," 1-4.

deeds and influence in Scotland. No longer is Malcolm secondary to Margaret's queenship: he is the chief influence in his kingdom, with the qualities to affect the destiny of both Scotland and England.

Malcolm's prominence in the *Chronica* is apparent in his involvement in providing charity in the kingdom. Chapter 18 of the *Chronica* is based on Chapter 18 of the *Gesta Annalia* I, and it tests Malcolm's religious fervor and pious works. Fordun, following the *Gesta Annalia*'s information, states that Malcolm, along with Margaret, washed the feet of six paupers in their chamber.<sup>47</sup> Later, the same chapter explains that, at times, the king and queen fed the poor at Malcolm's court.<sup>48</sup> In the *Chronica*, "fuerunt autem rex et regina caritatis operibus *ambo pares*, *ambo cultu pietatis insignes*."<sup>49</sup> This particular line was added by Fordun to the material he copied from the *Gesta Annalia*, and it aims at elevating Malcolm's piety to the level of Margaret's. However, Malcolm performed charitable works on his own initiative as well. Chapter 20, which is a much-amended version of Chapter 19 of the *Gesta Annalia*, stressed that Malcolm founded Durham Cathedral and Dunfermline Abbey as part of his charity work.<sup>50</sup>

Haec opera et pietatis hiis similia idem rex <Malcolmus> exercens, novam Dunelmensem ecclesiam *fundare coepit et aedificare* <ponentibus> eodem rege Malcolmo, Willelmo ejusdem ecclesiae episcopo, et Turgoto priore, *primos lapides in fundamento*. <Fundavit itaque ecclesiam Sanctae Trinitatis de Dunfermlyn ante diu, quam multis ditavit donariis et redditibus.><sup>51</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xviii, 216: "...rediens in cameram rex pedes sex pauperum cum regina lavare..."

<sup>48</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xviii, 216-7.

<sup>49</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xviii, 217; *Chronicle* (trans.), 206: "Indeed the king and queen were both equal in works of charity— both remarkable for their godly behavior."

<sup>50</sup> I have placed Fordun's possible additions in brackets, any changes in word order from the original source in italics and the interpolations from other sources are underlined.

<sup>51</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xx, 218; *Chronicle* (trans.), 208: "This king Malcolm, practicing these and the like works of piety, as we read in Turgot, began to found and to build the new church of Durham— this same King Malcolm, William, bishop of that church, and Turgot, the prior, laying the first stones in the foundation. He had likewise, long before, founded the church of the Holy Trinity at Dunfermline, and endowed it with many offerings and revenues."

The foundation of Durham Cathedral here is attributed to Malcolm as chief actor; according to Symeon of Durham, who is the main source for information on the foundation ceremony of Durham Cathedral, Malcolm was indeed in attendance at the ceremony, but there is little evidence that he was involved in building and founding the cathedral itself.<sup>52</sup> Portraying Malcolm as the founder of Durham Cathedral was a manipulation of Symeon of Durham's account of the foundation ceremony to enhance Malcolm's image as a religious patron and as a pious king in his own right. Fordun improved Malcolm's image as a religious patron further by stating that he had founded Dunfermline Abbey, which is usually attributed to Saint Margaret herself.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, Margaret brought several monks from Canterbury to lead the church at Dunfermline, introducing Benedictine monks into Scotland. The sentence attributing the foundation of Dunfermline to Malcolm is not part of the information contained in the *Gesta Annalia* I,<sup>54</sup> so it is apparent that the *Chronica* is the first source of this information. By attributing the foundation of Dunfermline Church to Malcolm Canmore, Fordun reduced Margaret's relevance as patron of religious houses, reinforcing Malcolm's royal agency. Malcolm's independence as a benefactor of churches was but one of the ways in which Malcolm's reign became disassociated from Margaret's influence in the late medieval Scottish historiography.

Fordun increased Malcolm's political agency by reinterpreting the relationship between Malcolm and Margaret, diminishing Margaret's religious accomplishments and influence in

---

<sup>52</sup> Wall, "Malcolm III," 325-37.

<sup>53</sup> *DV*, 174: "For she built there a noble church in honor of the Holy Trinity with the intention of three salutary wishes; namely for the redemption of the king's soul, and her own, and in order to obtain prosperity for her offspring in this life and in the one to come." See also Richard Fawcett, "Dunfermline Abbey Church," in *Royal Dunfermline*, ed. Richard Fawcett (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2005), 27-63, at 27.

<sup>54</sup> See *GAI*, xiv, 417.

Scotland as a result. Chapter 14 detailed Margaret's arrival in Scotland, an account taken almost verbatim from the *Gesta Annalia* I. Fordun made a small, but crucial change to the chapter's narrative. In the *Chronica*, one of Malcolm's messengers reported to the king that the newcomers in Dunfermline were of royal English stock, and that Margaret was the lady of that family. But Fordun added that Margaret was "post fratrem Angliae totius heredem, ymmo regni sui participem futuramque reginam divina praedestinaverit providentia"<sup>55</sup> Margaret's status as heiress of England prompted Malcolm to marry her; Chapter 15 stated that "Nam sicut olim Hester Assuero regi pro suorum salute concivium divina providentia, ita et haec illustrissimo regi Malcolmo copulata fuit in conjugium."<sup>56</sup> This phrase was taken from the *Gesta Annalia* I and provided a biblical precedent for Margaret's marriage to Malcolm, where it was the queen's holy duty to soften the grip of her husband's grasp on her people to ameliorate their suffering.<sup>57</sup> The sentence also contextualized Margaret's religious reforms and positive influence in Scotland, of which the primary beneficiary was Malcolm himself. Yet this sentence had no such effect or purpose in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. By emphasizing Malcolm's quality of character prior to Margaret's arrival in Dunfermline, Fordun portrayed Malcolm as a civilized and peaceful king of Scots whose successful kingship required no reformation or intervention from his English wife. The main function of this sentence in the passage above was to emphasize how Margaret's marriage to Malcolm was meant to ameliorate her people's situation in England, thus stressing the subordinate political status of the queen and her brother in the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*.

---

<sup>55</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xiii, p. 212; *Chronicle* (trans.), 201: "...but also the heiress of the whole of England, after her brother; and God's providence had predestined her to be Malcolm's future queen, and the sharer of the throne."

<sup>56</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xv, 213; *Chronicle* (trans.), 202. "For as Hester of old was, through God's providence, for the salvation of her fellow-countrymen, joined in wedlock to King Ahasuerus, even so was this princess joined to the most illustrious King Malcolm."

<sup>57</sup> MacQueen, "Books V and VI," *Scotichronicon* 3, xviii.

Fordun's narrative inverted the relationship between Malcolm and Margaret, making Margaret and the Anglo-Saxons dependent on Malcolm's kingship. Moreover, Malcolm and Margaret's marriage became politically convenient for Edgar Ætheling and his desire to regain the English throne.

The reign of David II saw an increased desire to strengthen the ties between Scotland and England, either by marital alliances or by English inheritance of the Scottish throne. David and Edward III sought to overcome the Anglo-Scottish antagonism that characterized much of the last decade of the thirteenth century and the first four decades of the fourteenth. But the effort to repair Anglo-Scottish relations began with Robert I and Edward II: through the Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton (1328), David Bruce was betrothed to Joan of England to strengthen political and dynastic lines between England and Scotland.<sup>58</sup> Andy King and Michael Penman have argued that Scottish kings were willing to antagonize their own nobility to ensure peace with England; this was certainly the case with David II's relationship with his parliament over his attempts to declare an English heir to the Scottish throne.<sup>59</sup> Between 1346 and 1352, David II tried to avoid paying a ransom for his release after the Battle of Neville's Cross of 1346 by offering to Edward III the right to name one of his younger sons as heir presumptive of the Scottish throne if David failed to beget any male heirs.<sup>60</sup> The Scottish Parliament rejected David's proposal in February 1352; David's attempt to legalize an English succession to the Scottish throne was both a political maneuver to hinder the claim of Robert the Stewart and an

---

<sup>58</sup> Stevenson, *Power and Propaganda*, 28.

<sup>59</sup> Andy King and Michael A. Penman, *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge ; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2007), 10.

<sup>60</sup> See A. Duncan, "'Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense': David II and Edward III, 1346-52," *Scottish Historical Review* 67, no. 2 (1988): 113-141.

attempt to promote peace and dynastic unity with England.<sup>61</sup> As Michael Brown has suggested, patriotism in fourteenth-century Scotland was flexible and negotiable, moulded by practicality rather than by anti-English sentiment.<sup>62</sup> David II's betrothal to an English princess resembles Margaret's betrothal to Malcolm; it is in this political context that Fordun's portrayal of the relationship between Malcolm and Margaret, and that between Malcolm and Edgar Ætheling, should be understood.

Furthermore, portraying Malcolm Canmore as a great religious patron mirrored David II's own religious patronage. The Bruce dynasty's devotion to St Thomas of Canterbury was due to personal religious conviction and political factors. David's father, Robert I, was devoted to St Thomas and his personal interest in pilgrimage to St Thomas Becket's shrine was a continuation of the support given to the shrine by the Canmore kings, particularly William the Lion, Alexander II and Alexander III.<sup>63</sup> David II's devotion to St Thomas of Canterbury, sought to impress the Scots with the importance of maintaining healthy and peaceful Anglo-Scottish relations.<sup>64</sup> David also ordered the reconstruction of the kirk of St Monans after he was healed from a facial injury sustained at Neville's Cross.<sup>65</sup> Like David II, Robert I's devotional practices were both politically advantageous and personally motivated, and they reflect his need to justify

---

<sup>61</sup> Michael Penman and Roland Tanner, "An Unpublished Act David II, 1359," *The Scottish Historical Review* 83, no. 215 (2004): 59–69; A.A.M. Duncan, "Honi soit qui mal y pense," 113.

<sup>62</sup> Michael Brown, "Introduction," in eds. King and Penman, *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century*, 8.

<sup>63</sup> Michael Penman, "The Bruce Dynasty, Becket and Scottish Pilgrimage to Canterbury, c. 1178- c. 1404," *Journal of Medieval History* 32, no. 4 (2006): 346–370, doi:10.1016/j.jmedhist.2006.09.003, 347. Michael A. Penman, "Christian Days and Knights: The Religious Devotions and Court of David II of Scotland, 1329–71," *Historical Research* 75, no. 189 (2002): 249–272, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.00150>.

<sup>64</sup> Penman, "The Bruce dynasty, Becket and Scottish pilgrimage to Canterbury," 346-370, at 347; see also A. Duncan, "'Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense': David II and Edward III, 1346-52," *Scottish Historical Review* 67, no. 2 (1988): 117-8.

<sup>65</sup> Duncan, "Honi soit qui mal y pense," 115; Michael Penman, "Christian Days and Knights," 251-2.

his usurpation of the Scottish throne, and thus legitimize his kingship.<sup>66</sup> Devotions to the cults of Saint Andrew, Saint Columba and Saint Margaret of Scotland featured among Robert I's religious observances.<sup>67</sup> According to Michael Penman, Bruce's observance of specific saints' cults was inspired by Edward I's own devotional practices, which were often politically motivated and which Bruce must have witnessed first-hand while he lived at Edward's court.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, Bruce was motivated to restore the sovereignty of the Scottish crown by attempting to recover the relics stolen from Edinburgh by Edward I and which were mostly associated with Saint Margaret and the Canmore dynasty.<sup>69</sup> Thus, Fordun's emphasis on Malcolm Canmore's charitable work would resonate with the political and personal inclinations of the Bruce dynasty's devotional practices, which sought to re-establish Scotland's royal sovereignty in Robert I's reign through observance of local saints' cults and, during David II's kingship, to establish peaceful Anglo-Scottish relations through the patronage of St Thomas of Canterbury.

The *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, therefore, used the *Gesta Annalia* I, which depicted Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders, to portray Malcolm as a sovereign Scottish king whose piety and charity was only matched by his political and military prowess. Moreover, while thirteenth-century sources insisted that Margaret's marriage to Malcolm was beneficial to Scots, Fordun portrayed their marriage as politically beneficial to Edgar Ætheling. It makes sense that the thirteenth-century historiographical model that stressed the Canmore dynasty's descent from Alfred of Wessex through Saint Margaret was no longer useful in the fourteenth century after Edward I deployed that lineage to undermine Scotland's regnal sovereignty. Thus, Fordun's

---

<sup>66</sup> Michael Penman, "'Sacred Food for the Soul': In Search of the Devotions to Saints of Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, 1306–1329," *Speculum* 88, no. 4 (2013): 1035–1062, at 1039–41 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0038713413002182>.

<sup>67</sup> Penman, "'Sacred Food for the Soul,'" 1039.

<sup>68</sup> Penman, "'Sacred Food for the Soul,'" 1039.

<sup>69</sup> Penman, "'Sacred Food for the Soul,'" 1043.

*Chronica* asserts the independence of the Canmore dynasty by transmitting the historical material that re-associated Malcolm Canmore with early medieval Scottish rulers descended from Kenneth MacAlpin, limiting the influence of Saint Margaret of Scotland on Malcolm's reign.

### **Malcolm, Edgar Ætheling and the Normans: Fordun's use of the *Gesta Regum Anglorum***

The following chapters of the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, specifically Chapter 11, contextualized the political upheaval in England and how it ultimately affected Fordun's characterization of Margaret as dependent on Malcolm. They also affected Edgar Ætheling's portrayal as rightful heir of England. Chapter 11, on the death of King Edward, extracts most of its material from William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, with considerable interpolations from the *Gesta Annalia* I. On King Edward's death, Fordun recounts that,

Rex Edwardus, pronus in senium <eo> quod ipse non suscepit liberos, et Godwini videret invalescere filios, misit ad regem Hunorum, <sed Turgotus dicit ad imperatorem,><sup>70</sup> ut filium <sui> fratris Edmundi <Irnsyde> Edwardum cum omni familia sua mitteret, futurum ut aut ille aut filii sui succedant *hereditario* <jure><sup>71</sup> *regno* Angliae; orbitatem suam cognatorum suffragio *debere sustentari*.<sup>72</sup> <Igitur> continuo <postquam advenerat,> apud Sanctum Paulum Londoniae fato defunctus est, <Edgaro filio superstiti cum sororibus praenominatis, quem> pro genere regno proximum rex proceribus commendavit.<sup>73</sup> Rex demum, postquam exactis in regno non plene XXIII annis,<sup>74</sup> obit vigilia Epiphaniae...<sup>75</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Information taken from *GAI*, x, 414.

<sup>71</sup> *GAI*, x, 414: "Edwardi junioris, filii Edmundi Irnsyde, cui regnum *hereditario jure* debebatur, regem constituere moluntur."

<sup>72</sup> Fordun copied this passage from Malmesbury, *GRA*, ii: #228, p. 382; interpolations from information found in *GAI*, x, 414.

<sup>73</sup> Beginning with "pro...commendavit," this passage was copied from Malmesbury, *GRA*, iii: #338, p. 408.

<sup>74</sup> Phrase copied from *GAI*, x, 414.

<sup>75</sup> "vigilia Epiphaniae" was copied from *GAI*, x, 414. The full passage is found in Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xi, 208. *Chronicle* (trans.), 196: "King Edward, says William, bowed with age, and having no children himself, while he saw Godwin's sons growing in power, sent to the king of the Huns (but Turgot says, to the emperor) to send him over Edward, the son of his brother Edmund Ironside, and all his family; —for that either he was to succeed to the kingdom of England by hereditary right, or his sons should do so; because his own childlessness out to be made good by the help of his kindred. Edward accordingly



As seen in the extract above, Fordun had preference for some of the material presented by the *Gesta Annalia* I on King Edward's death. While Fordun decided to favour Malmesbury's interpretation of the whereabouts of Edward the Exile, he did acknowledge that Turgot (that is, the *Gesta Annalia* I), contained an alternative explanation. Fordun favoured information about Edward the Exile that reiterated his hereditary right to the kingdom, deciding to incorporate the word *jure* in the phrase "hereditario jure regno Angliae" because a similar phrase appears in the *Gesta Annalia*'s chapter 10: "Edwardi junioris, filii Edmundi Irnside, cui regnum *hereditario jure* debebatur, regem constituere moliuntur."<sup>76</sup> Likewise, the phrase "pro genere regno proximum rex proceribus commendavit"<sup>77</sup> was taken from the *Gesta regum Anglorum* to emphasize Edgar's status as *atheling*, or heir presumptive. Moreover, the rest of Fordun's account of King Edward's death showed how Harold Godwineson "a majoribus extorta fide, secundum alios consentientibus, arripuit diadema regni..." ("obtained fealty from the magnates by force, or with their consent *according to others*, and seized the diadem of the kingdom...)<sup>78</sup> The idea that Harold "extorted" support from English nobles and that he stole the English kingship was explicitly stated in the *Gesta Annalia* I, since Harold "sinistro omine extortaque fide a majoribus regnum sibi indebitum obtinuit. Et die, scilicet, Epiphanie, qua sepultus est rex Edwardus, dyadema regali capiti proprio imposuit."<sup>79</sup> The same idea was also found in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta*.<sup>80</sup> Therefore, Fordun carefully selected information from the *Gesta Annalia*

---

arrived, but leaving his son Edgar. With his afore-named sisters, surviving him. This Edgar, the king recommended to the nobles, as being by blood the next for the kingship. The king, at length, when he had not fully completed his twenty-fourth year on the throne, died on the Eve of Epiphany..."

<sup>76</sup> *GAI*, x, 414.

<sup>77</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, iii: #338, p. 408 ("the king commended Edgar to the nobles as nearest by birth to the kingship.")

<sup>78</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xi, 208; *Chronicle* (trans.), 196-7.

<sup>79</sup> *GAI*, x, 414.

<sup>80</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, ii, 385.

I's and the *Gesta regum Anglorum*'s account of King Edward's death, highlighting Edgar Ætheling's status as heir presumptive to the English crown and diminishing the legitimacy of Harold Godwineson's kingship. Edgar's status as king was dependent on confirmation from the English nobility, who had pledged to support Harold.

Fordun's portrayal of Harold Godwineson as a nobleman that forced the English nobility to obtain the English throne reads as a cautionary tale against Robert Stewart's claims to the Scottish crown. Like Harold Godwineson in eleventh-century England, Robert Stewart was the most powerful nobleman in fourteenth-century Scotland and was made heir presumptive to the throne by his grandfather, Robert I.<sup>81</sup> But by 1371, the year of David II's death, the rise of nobles and knights loyal to David II meant that Robert's political importance was undermined.<sup>82</sup> The last years of David II's reign saw an spectacular increase of royal authority and power that managed to threaten considerably Robert Stewart's royal ambitions.<sup>83</sup> By emphasizing Edgar Ætheling's right to the English crown against Harold Godwinson's forceful intimidation of the English nobles, Fordun's *Chronica* promoted a pro-Brucean version of Scottish history that sided with the current monarch's attempts to curb the political ambitions of his main political rival and nephew. Fordun's manipulation of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* and the *Gesta Annalia* I promoted a dynastic union between England and Scotland that would guarantee the Scottish kingdom's independence by healing the wounds created by the Wars of Independence.<sup>84</sup> At the same time, the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* cautioned its late fourteenth-

---

<sup>81</sup> Boardman, *Early Stewart Kings*, 3-4.

<sup>82</sup> Boardman, *Early Stewart Kings*, 11-25.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, 1-3.

<sup>84</sup> A. A. M. Duncan, "A Question about the Succession, 1364," in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vol. 12 (Edinburgh: Pillans & Wilson, Ltd. for the Scottish History Society, 1994), 1-57, at 29-35, esp. nos. 9, 10, 19, 21, 22, and 23.

century audience against dynastic rivalry and inheritance troubles within the kingdom itself as sources of fragmentation and political dissent.

Immediately following the information taken from the *Gesta Annalia*, Fordun interpolated information on Edgar Ætheling's arrival in Scotland in chapter 15. Following William of Malmesbury, Fordun recounted that,

*Omnes Anglorum profugos*<sup>85</sup> *Malcolmus libenter recipiebat*, tutamentum singulis quantum poterat impendens: Edgarum<sup>86</sup> <cum Stigando Cantuariensi et Baldredo Eboracensi archiepiscopis, sed<sup>87</sup>> Edgarum praecipue, cujus sororem pro antiqua memoria nobilitatis jugalem sibi fecerat. Ejus causa conterminas Angliae provincias rapinis et incendiis infestabat.<sup>88</sup>

Fordun took the information from the *Gesta regum Anglorum*'s book 3. Yet Malmesbury's original passage had a significantly different intention than that expressed by Fordun. While the passage above quoted is taken from Chapter 249, the phrase "cum Stigando Cantuariensi et Baldredo Eboracensi archiepiscopis" is found in Chapter 251, where it states that,

*Edgarus, cum Stigando et Aldredo archiepiscopis regis dedititus, sequenti anno, facto ad Scottum transfugio, jusjurandum maculavit; sed cum ibi aliquot annis degens, nihil ad*

<sup>85</sup> Changed from *perfugos*.

<sup>86</sup> Information comes from *GRA*, iii., #249, p. 422.

<sup>87</sup> Addition not found in *GRA* passage cited.

<sup>88</sup> *GRA* iii, #249, p. 423; missing rest of sentence: "...non quod aliquid ad regnum illi profuturum arbitraretur, sed ut Willelmi animum contristaret, qui Scotticis praedis terras suas obnoxias indignaretur." (not that he supposed, by so doing, he could be of any service to him, with respect to the kingdom; but merely to distress the mind of William, who was incensed at his territories being subject to Scottish incursions.) (English trans., p. 262). Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xv, 213; *Chronicle* (trans.), 202: "Malcolm, says William, gladly welcomed all the English fugitives, affording to each such protection as was in his power—to Edgar, to Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, and to Aldred of York—but especially to Edgar, whose sister he made his consort, out of regard for her old and noble descent. On his behalf, Malcolm harried the border provinces of England with fire and rapine." The rest of this sentence was omitted by Fordun, and it is found in *GRA* iii, #249, p. 423, which reads: "...non quod aliquid ad regnum illi profuturum arbitraretur, sed ut Willelmi animum contristaret, qui Scotticis praedis terras suas obnoxias indignaretur." ("not that he supposed, by so doing, he could be of any service to him, with respect to the kingdom; but merely to distress the mind of William, who was incensed at his territories being subject to Scottish incursions." (English trans., p. 262). Footnote seems to be disarranged

praesens commodi, nihil ad futurum spei, praeter quotidianam stipem nactus esset, Normanni liberalitatem experiri pergens, ad eum, tunc ultra mare detente, navigavit.”<sup>89</sup>

Fordun made no mention of Edgar’s violation of an oath to William the Bastard (implied by Malmesbury’s use of the word *perfugos*, or “deserters”), nor of his decision to later seek King William because his stay in Scotland had not been advantageous to his cause. Moreover, Malmesbury never mentioned that Stigand and Aldred went to Scotland with Edgar Ætheling; Fordun clearly took this information out of its original context to show how Edgar had the support of the higher clergy of England and how all three men became refugees (*profugos*, or “fugitives”) in Scotland due to William’s usurpation of the throne. Malmesbury’s original passage on Edgar’s disobedience and defection to Scotland was reworked into a statement of Malcolm’s power by portraying the king as protecting the true heir to the English throne.

Inventing ecclesiastical support for Edgar Ætheling’s claim to the English throne, Fordun manipulated the reason why Edgar was exiled to Scotland to mirror Bruce’s claim to the Scottish throne in 1306. Robert Bruce’s parliament of February 1309 produced written support in the name of the Scottish clergy for Bruce’s reign.<sup>90</sup> The document, signed by the bishops of Scotland, stipulated that Robert Bruce was the rightful heir to the throne of Scotland and the choice of the people and the clergy of Scotland to be king.<sup>91</sup> While the Scottish political and ecclesiastical community had expressed widespread support for John Balliol, with the exception

---

<sup>89</sup> Malmesbury, *GRA*, III: 251, 424; Malmesbury, *Chronicle* (trans.), 284: “Edgar, having submitted to the king with Stigand and Aldred the archbishops, violated his oath the following year, by going over to the Scot [Malcolm Canmore], but after living there some years, and acquiring no present advantage, no future prospects, but merely his daily sustenance, being willing to try the liberality of the Norman [King William], who was at that time beyond the sea, he sailed over to him.”

<sup>90</sup> Cosmo Innes, ed., *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, Searchable Text Edition, vol. 1 (Burlington, ON; St Andrews: TannerRitchie Publishing and University of St Andrews, 1844), 460-1. Cited hereafter as *APS*. See also Penman, “Diffinizione Successionis,” 8.

<sup>91</sup> *APS*, i, 460-1; Penman, “Diffinizione Successionis,” 8.

of Bishop Robert Wishart of Glasgow, the insecurity of Bruce's claim by proximity of degree rather than by seniority triggered an aggressive campaign of propaganda aimed at constructing a recent historical past where the community of the realm and the Scottish clergy had always supported Bruce's claim to the throne.<sup>92</sup> In this passage, the *Chronica* portrayed Edgar's exile in Scotland as his only way to gather political support for his cause. Thus these passages of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* seem to reflect on the political milieu under which the Bruce dynasty assumed and retained control of the Scottish crown.

### **Macbeth the tyrant and Macduff the kingmaker: legitimizing Malcolm's bid to the throne**

Yet Edgar Ætheling was not the only prince in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* that was exiled in another country due to regnal usurpation. Malcolm's path to the Scottish throne began when Macbeth killed King Duncan and usurped the throne of Scotland, forcing Duncan's heirs, Malcolm and Donald Bane, into exile. From the contents of the narrative, it is apparent that the story was meant to focus on Malcolm's trials and tribulations after his exile in England and his recovery of the throne as contingent on noble support. The earliest expression of the contractual theory of monarchy in Scotland is found in the Declaration of Arbroath of 1320, but it has its roots in a propagandistic document known as the "Appeal of the Seven Earls." Extant documents from the Great Cause, like the Great Roll of Caen, the *Processus* and the *Instructiones*, did not mention Scottish kingship being dependent on noble choice; instead, they focused on the independence of Scottish kingship by hereditary right.<sup>93</sup> The notion that John Balliol was a "puppet king" imposed by Edward I and that Bruce was always the nobility's choice to be king

---

<sup>92</sup> RPS 13120/4/1; Penman, "Diffinizione Successionis," 2; Stevenson, *Power and Propaganda*, 26-8; Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 85, for how early fourteenth-century Scottish documents portrayed Bruce as always having noble consent for his kingship.

<sup>93</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 57-78 (Great Roll of Caen); 86-7.

of Scots did not appear until the first decade of the fourteenth century, after Bruce had usurped the crown in 1306.<sup>94</sup> The story of Macbeth's usurpation and Malcolm's exile depicted dynastic struggles but not much Anglo-Scottish antagonism, and it will be argued that such focus was the result of the impact of Brucean ideology and propaganda on historiographical production of the early fourteenth century.

While historians such as Nora Chadwick, Edward J. Cowan, and John Bannerman have attributed the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff story to oral tradition or folklore, an analysis of the contents of the story shows the political applicability of such an elaborate narrative.<sup>95</sup> Most recently, A.A.M. Duncan argued for the existence of a "Macbeth romance" in the late thirteenth century, observing that "[...] what this narrative is very definitively not is an orally transmitted history of Macbeth and his contemporaries on which we can build a view of the eleventh century."<sup>96</sup> The arguments put forward by Chadwick, Bannerman, Cowan, and Duncan depend on interpreting this narrative as the narrative of Macbeth's tyranny: such a view is reflective of the lingering influence of William Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. As already discussed in Chapter 2, the earliest appearance of the idea that Macbeth was a usurper is first found in the second half of the thirteenth century in the *Chronicle of Melrose* and it was a by-product of scribal attempts to clarify the legality of Malcolm's kingship. Thus, Macbeth's kingship did not have the historiographical importance and centrality in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that it has today. The narrative about the fight for the Scottish throne in the mid-eleventh century was the

---

<sup>94</sup> Reid, "Crown and Community," 204-5.

<sup>95</sup> Nora K. Chadwick, "The Story of Macbeth," *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 4, no. 2 (1949): 189-216. Edward J. Cowan, "Historical MacBeth," 117-41; Alexander Grant, K. J. Stringer, and John Bannerman, eds., "Macduff of Fife," in *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), 20-38, at 27. However, Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 37, disputed the idea of oral origins for this story.

<sup>96</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 37; see Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 38, for an example from Fordun's use of the Scottish origin myth as Brucean propaganda.

narrative of Malcolm's recovery of the Scottish throne, not of Macbeth's tyranny and usurpation. Contrary to Duncan's assertion, this chapter will argue that the story on which Fordun based his account of Malcolm, Macbeth and Macduff does not appear to have been earlier than 1306, the date of Robert Bruce's ascension to (or usurpation of) the Scottish throne.

Because Fordun's *Chronica* contains the earliest extant witness to the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative, and therefore there is no other earlier source with which the account can be compared in order to identify Fordun's interpolations in the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*, the analysis of the narrative here is based on a comparison of the content of Book IV, chapters 44-47 with the political events of the reign of Robert Bruce, and some events that seem more correlative to the reign of David II. It is impossible to distinguish with certainty between the original content and Fordun's own voice without an earlier version of the narrative that serves as point of comparison; however, the specificity of several elements of the account, particularly Macduff's interactions with both Macbeth and Malcolm Canmore, reveal ideas about Scottish kingship that were mainstream by the early fourteenth century.

The story of Malcolm, Macbeth and Macduff can be summarized briefly as follows. Chapter 44 introduced Malcolm as the son of King Duncan and a cousin of Earl Siward of Northumbria, with a brother called Donald Bane. Malcolm received Cumbria upon his father's accession to the throne in 1034.<sup>97</sup> Duncan, a benevolent king, was "murdered through the wickedness of a family, the murderers of both his grandfather and great-grandfather, the head of which was Machabeus [i.e. Macbeth], son of Finele [...]"<sup>98</sup> Chapter 45 recounted Macbeth's accession to the Scottish throne. After killing Duncan, "[...] this Machabeus hedged round with bands of the disaffected and at the head of a powerful force, seized the kingly dignity in A.D.

---

<sup>97</sup> This date is found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*. See MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 12v.

<sup>98</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 180.

1040, and reigned seventeen years,” pursuing Malcolm and Donald without success. Both princes remained in the kingdom for two years until Malcolm went to Cumbria and Donald went to the Isles. Once in Cumbria, Malcolm visited his relative Earl Siward, who recommended that he ask for King Edward the Confessor’s advice. Some Scottish nobles were loyal to Malcolm and conspired to return him to Scotland, but upon hearing their plans, Macbeth either punished them, or killed them. Chapter 46 introduced Macduff of Fife and his conflict with Macbeth. Macduff was one of the most loyal men to Malcolm but was quiet about his resolution to return Malcolm to Scotland. However, other men denounced him to Macbeth, who grew suspicious of Macduff’s loyalties. Macbeth’s threats prompted Macduff to escape to England on a vessel, arriving in Northumbria where Malcolm was. Malcolm finally arrived at the court of the king of England in chapter 47. Book V, chapters 1-5 contained the advice to princes section where Malcolm tested Macduff’s loyalty by feigning to be lecherous, a thief, and a false man.<sup>99</sup> Malcolm later sent Macduff back to England with a message to his supporters and rallying the help of both King Edward and Earl Siward, killed Macbeth in 1057, contradicting William of Malmesbury’s notion that it was Siward who killed Macbeth.<sup>100</sup>

The organization of Book IV also merits closer scrutiny. Book IV traced Scottish kings from Kenneth MacAlpin until Macbeth obtained the throne, cutting the Macbeth narrative off right when Macduff makes his first appearance in the *Chronica*.<sup>101</sup> Twelfth- and thirteenth-century Latin historical narratives on the Canmore succession explored in the previous two chapters disassociated Malcolm III from his early medieval ancestors by virtue of his marriage to

---

<sup>99</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 184-90.

<sup>100</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 192.

<sup>101</sup> Fordun, IV: xlvi, 189-90.



Saint Margaret.<sup>102</sup> Proto-Fordun created a narrative that tied the Scottish origin myth with Kenneth MacAlpin, and then directly tied MacAlpin to Malcolm Canmore, which is the narrative transmitted directly to the *Chronica*. The only disruption to this dynastic continuity was encountered when Macbeth treacherously killed King Duncan and usurped the Scottish throne, an idea first encountered in the *Chronicle of Melrose*.

Macduff of Fife was one of the key characters in the account of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne. It was Macduff who helped Malcolm recover his throne, yet in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, Macduff's relationship to Malcolm was founded on ancestry. Chapter 26 narrated the events of Duff's reign in the late tenth century. King Duff was the son of King Malcolm I and came from the same branch of the Alpinid dynasty as Malcolm Canmore. In Chapter 28, Kenneth III was described as "the son of Malcolm, and brother of King Duff," and it also narrated that "as soon as Kenneth was crowned, Edgar received Malcolm, the son of Duff, as prince of Cumbria [...]"<sup>103</sup> The two candidates for the crown that combatted Kenneth III's changes to the royal succession were Constantine, son of Culén, and Gryme (Giric), "son of Kenneth, son of Duff," who is styled as "Girgh Mac-Kinat-Mac-Duff" in king-list F and "Girus mac Kinalt macduf" in its variant manuscript, Harleian 4628.<sup>104</sup> The author of the original passage seems to have used this regnal list for its information on Kenneth III and Giric, but what is telling is the emphasis on the descent from King Duff and his descendants' possession of Cumbria. Here, the source is foreshadowing Macduff of Fife, since the patronymic "macduf"

---

<sup>102</sup> Several chronicle examples were explored in previous chapters, such as Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia*, the *Chronicle of Melrose*, the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Gesta Annalia* I. None of these historical works tie Malcolm to the Scottish kings descended from Kenneth MacAlpin, except for his father, Duncan I. For the portrayal of Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders, see also Broun, *Irish Identity*, 195-197.

<sup>103</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 163.

<sup>104</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 165-66; Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 275.

was used to describe King Giric in king-list F, its variant, and in the *Chronica gentis Scottorum*.<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, Malcolm IV gave a relative of his in marriage to Earl Duncan II of Fife, thus it seems that the Canmore dynasty and the Macduff earls of Fife were also related by marriage as well as by blood.<sup>106</sup> The author of Fordun's source for Book IV seems to have been aware of Malcolm and Macduff's supposed kinship, an affinity exploited in the portrayal of the relationship between Malcolm Canmore and Macduff.

Chapter 44's narration of the events that led to the death of Duncan appear to be based on twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scottish challenges to the Canmore dynasty. It has been previously noted that the descendants of Kings Lulach and Duncan II, the MacHeths and the MacWilliams respectively, represented internal resistance to the kings descended from Malcolm and Margaret's line.<sup>107</sup> Repeated attempts at rebellion by members of both these families, with at least the MacHeths indirectly related to the historical Macbeth, permeated Scottish memory and made its way into thirteenth-century narratives of Scottish kingship, and eventually into Fordun's *Chronica* through his sources. However, while the internal conflict between the Canmore kings and these two families was relevant during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, by the fourteenth century, David II would fight both Stewart and Edward Balliol and his supporters, a group of English magnates known as the Disinherited.<sup>108</sup> The *Chronica*'s assertion that Macbeth "with bands of the disaffected" seized the Scottish throne would resonate with fourteenth-century readers who had, fresh in their minds, the Bruce-Balliol contest for the Scottish crown. Yet there

---

<sup>105</sup> For an assessment of Macduff of Fife, see Bannerman, "Macduff of Fife," 20-38.

<sup>106</sup> G. W. S Barrow, "The Earls of Fife in the 12th Century," *PSAS* lxxxvii (March 1952): 51-62, at 54 and also fn. 6. Barrow noticed the shared names between the Canmore dynasty and the earls of Fife, suggesting that there was a blood relation between both families.

<sup>107</sup> McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*.

<sup>108</sup> MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War of Independence*, 11-59 and 151-5; Penman, *David II*, 47-53.

is another, more poignant example of a reinterpretation of the eleventh-century past to comment on fourteenth-century Scottish politics.

In Book V, chapter 8, the *Chronica* states that

Subito namque post mortem Machabei, convenerunt quidam ex ejus parentela sceleris hujusmodi fautores, suum consobrinum nomine Lulath, cognomine fatuum, ad Sconam ducentes, et impositum sede regali regum constituent: sperabant enim sibi quasi regi populum obedire libenter, nullus tamen illi parere volebat, aut aliquibus factis vel fiendis communicare. Audiens autem hoc Malcolmus, suos comites ipsum huc illucque persequendum emisit; sed in irritum quatuor mensibus deducunt conatus, donec in superioribus partibus scrutantes, inventum loco qui dicitur Essy, provinciae Strathbolgy, cum suis sequacibus occidit; vel, ut quidam tradunt, ibidem casu Malcolmus obvium habens interfecit, anno Domini MLVII [...]<sup>109</sup>

The imposition of King Lulach upon the Scottish throne by a band of Macbeth's followers bore similarities with the crowning of Edward Balliol by some of his followers at Scone in 1332.

While Lulach's reign lasted four months, Balliol's lasted only three. Like the aftermath of the Battle of Annan, where David II's nobles, led by Archibald Douglas, deposed Balliol, Lulach was killed by Malcolm's earls.<sup>110</sup> When Edward Balliol landed in Scotland with the Disinherited, he managed to gather support from south-east Scotland to the extent that his coronation at Scone on 24 September 1332 was attended by several nobles and bishops, including the earl of Fife, who performed his customary duties.<sup>111</sup> Yet the narrative on Lulach's coronation does not involve the participation of Macduff of Fife or another representative of the earldom. Such omission can be

---

<sup>109</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: viii, 205-6; *Chronicle* (trans.), 193-4: "For, on the death of Machabeus, some of his kinsfolk, who were just the men for such a piece of iniquity, came together, and bringing his cousin Lulath, surnamed the Simple, to Scone, *set him on the royal seat and appointed him king*— for they hoped that the people would willingly obey as king; but no one would yield him obedience, or become a party to anything that had been or was to be done. Upon hearing this, *Malcolm sent forth his earls* hither and thither after him. But their efforts were fruitlessly spun out through *four months*; until, searching in the higher districts, *they found him at a place called Essy, in the district of Strathbolgy, and slew him with his followers*; or, as some relate, Malcolm came across him there, by chance, and put him to death in the year 1057..."

<sup>110</sup> For the Battle of Annan of December 1332, where Archibald Douglas defeated Edward Balliol and his forces, see Penman, *David II*, 50.

<sup>111</sup> Penman, *David II*, 48-9. Penman remarks that Edward Balliol's coronation might have been better attended than Robert I's.

explained by Macduff's loyalty to Malcolm and his role in returning the rightful king to Scotland, but it might also signal that the account itself was composed in Fife. The earl of Fife's participation in Balliol's coronation ceremony in 1332 would be interpreted as treacherous, and if the account of Lulach's coronation at Scone was composed in Fife, it would be logical for the Fife-based author to eliminate any reference that associated Macduff and his descendants with treachery to the rightful Scottish king.

Furthermore, Penman has argued that it is possible that some of the support for Balliol's coronation "was given under duress as Balliol began to make ayres to collect homage and fealty."<sup>112</sup> The fact that Fordun alluded to "as some relate" in the narrative is evidence that he had an alternative source, a king-list related to Anderson's X-group,<sup>113</sup> for this event but chose to favour the version where Malcolm's nobles killed Lulach. As Emily Wingfield has observed of Fordun's depiction of the Trojan Legend, "[...] while asserting the historical independence of Scotland from the rest of Britain, Fordun simultaneously highlights the role of opinion in the formation of supposedly historical fact and exposes the extent to which historical record is open to willful political manipulation."<sup>114</sup> Fordun here alluded to an idea of historical veracity by scrutinizing the sources used for constructing his narration of Malcolm's ascension to the throne and favouring those sources that presented a version of Scottish kingship based on the Bruce-Balliol conflict of the fourteenth century. He also possibly manipulated the content of his sources on Macbeth and Malcolm Canmore, just as he manipulated the *Gesta Annalia* I and *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. In doing so, Fordun reconstructed the eleventh-century Scottish past to support the Bruce dynasty and, in particular, the rule of David II.

---

<sup>112</sup> Penman, *David II*, 49.

<sup>113</sup> Anderson, *Kings and Kingship*, 63-7; 212-13; 276.

<sup>114</sup> Emily Wingfield, *The Trojan Legend in Medieval Scottish Literature* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014), 35; Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 109.

Book V of the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* opened with the long dialogue between Malcolm and Macduff where the prince advised the nobleman on choosing the right individual as king of Scots.<sup>115</sup> Fordun's decision to open Book V with this dialogue shows how Malcolm and Macduff would mark a new chapter in the conception of Scottish kingship, one where the crown was held not only by hereditary right but by noble consent.<sup>116</sup> The Macduff earls of Fife held a privileged position among Scottish earls as they were responsible for leading the king to his throne during the enthronement ceremony, although the crowning of the king was generally done by the bishop of St Andrews.<sup>117</sup> Royal succession by both hereditary right and by noble consent did not pre-date the appearance of a document known as the "Appeal of the Seven Earls."<sup>118</sup> This document, dated from the 1290s and addressed to Bishop Fraser and John Comyn of Badenoch, both Guardians of Scotland, argued that the Guardians were infringing proper royal protocol by backing Balliol as king of Scots: according to the document, the choice of king should be done

---

<sup>115</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: i-vi, 197-203.

<sup>116</sup> Stevenson, *Power and Propaganda*, 26 and 28.

<sup>117</sup> Bannerman, "Macduff of Fife," 26. There has been much emphasis on the role of the earls of Fife as officiants of the enthronement ceremony of the Canmore kings based on the description of such ceremony for Alexander III. However, it is worth noting that the earl of Fife might have led the procession along Scone Abbey and led the king to the throne, but he had no responsibility in choosing, consenting or crowning the king of Scots, as apparent in the account of Alexander III's coronation. The first explicit instance where a representative of the earls of Fife crowned the king of Scots occurred in 1306, when Isabella Comyn, countess of Buchan, crowned Robert Bruce as king of Scots. For a recent study of Robert I's coronation as an act of state propaganda, see Lucinda H. S. Dean, "Projecting Dynastic Majesty: State Ceremony in the Reign of Robert the Bruce," *International Review of Scottish Studies* 40 (2015): 34-60, at 36-8; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 152; Duncan, "Before Coronation: Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century," at 140; and for the account of the coronation of Alexander III, see Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 289: "...the lord Malcolm, Earl of Fife and the lord malice?, Earl of Strathearne- and a great many other nobles, and led Alexander, soon to be their king, up to the cross which stands in the graveyard, at the east end of the church. There *they set him on the royal throne*, which was decked with silken cloths inwoven with gold; *and the bishop of Saint Andrews*, assisted by the rest, *consecrated him king*, as was meet." See also John Bannerman, "The King's Poet and the Inauguration of Alexander III," *The Scottish Historical Review* 68, no. 186 (October 1, 1989): 120-49, at 124; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, 174-83.

<sup>118</sup> Palgrave, *Docs. Hist. Scot.* 14-21; also in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 44-50; Duncan, "Making a king at Scone," 140; and Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 46.

by the consent of the Seven Nobles of Scotland with the earl of Fife having the premier position among them.<sup>119</sup> While the “Appeal of the Seven Earls” dates from 1290-1, and has been recognized as a forged document that portrays Scottish succession as a matter of both heredity and noble election, Scottish kingship was not decided in such a manner until the coronation of John Balliol in 1292, which was accepted by the Guardians and the rest of the political community of Scotland.<sup>120</sup> In fact, the political community supported the return of Balliol as king and the right of his son Edward Balliol as heir to the throne in 1300.<sup>121</sup> The vilification of John Balliol, his portrayal as an English-imposed king representing foreign interests, did not begin until after the inauguration of Robert Bruce in 1306;<sup>122</sup> it is, therefore, unlikely that a chronicle that portrayed Malcolm Canmore as the rightful king of Scots by heredity and by noble consent would do so before the first appearance of portrayals vilifying Balliol circa 1306.

According to the *Chronica*, Macduff kept his loyalty to Malcolm quiet to avoid inciting Macbeth’s ire, but those nobles supporting Macbeth told the king of Macduff’s disloyalty. Suspicious of the nobleman’s motives, Macbeth proceeded to threaten Macduff, which in turn prompted the noble to escape from court and go to England to look for Malcolm Canmore.<sup>123</sup> Macbeth then appropriated Macduff’s lands and castles in retaliation for Macduff’s treachery. There was a similar altercation between John Balliol and a certain Macduff, son of Earl Colbán of Fife, who made an appeal to Edward I in 1293 because he was dispossessed from his

---

<sup>119</sup> *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 44-50; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 46.

<sup>120</sup> Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 30 and 41; 110-3. Even in the late 1290s, William Wallace fought in the name of King John Balliol as “a representation of the legitimacy of a free Scottish realm,” even when Wallace himself stemmed from the same south-western territories from which Bruce, Bishop Wishart and the Stewart also came.

<sup>121</sup> Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 112-14.

<sup>122</sup> Reid, “Crown and Community,” 205.

<sup>123</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: I, 197.

inheritance by the bishop of St Andrews and Balliol's parliament.<sup>124</sup> Macduff sought the legal help of Edward I, claiming that King John had taken away his lands and castles without valid reason, and that the king refused to return him his rightful inheritance.<sup>125</sup> Macduff's case was postponed because of Edward's other commitments, but was heard in an English parliament in 1295, where John Balliol failed to appear.<sup>126</sup> Because of Balliol's disobedience, Edward I invaded Scotland in 1296, effectively beginning the First War of Independence. Balliol's intransigence and the unfair appropriation of Macduff's property by the bishop of St Andrews bore striking resemblance to Fordun's account of the dispute between Macbeth and Macduff, where the latter resorted to escaping to England to ask for the return of Malcolm Canmore to Scotland. Balliol's treatment of the thirteenth-century Macduff seems a likely inspiration behind Fordun's passage of the dispute between tyrant and noble, and such a dispute could support the Brucean notion that Balliol was unfit to rule. Thus the passage on the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff dispute was likely transmitted by Fordun from his original source without much manipulation on his part.

In Fordun's account, however, there is no mention of the role the bishop of St Andrews, William Fraser, and his brother Andrew, played in exacerbating the conflict between the historical Macduff of Fife and John Balliol. Macduff only sought the help of Edward I when his lands and castle were sacked by Andrew Fraser under the instructions of the bishop of St Andrews. It is possible, therefore, to theorize that the original account was not only designed to place the full blame of the conflict on Macbeth's actions, but that the passage's silence on the

---

<sup>124</sup> For a full assessment of Macduff's litigation against King John, see Brown, "Aristocratic Politics," 17-23; see also Bannerman, "Macduff of Fife," 33.

<sup>125</sup> Brown, "Aristocratic Politics," 19; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 58-9.

<sup>126</sup> Brown, "Aristocratic Politics," 20.

bishop of St Andrews' role in the conflict means that the original account was authored at St Andrews. Since, as Broun and Boardman have observed, Fordun used several chronicle accounts that were composed at or were associated with St Andrews,<sup>127</sup> it is plausible that the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative was part of one of these sources or was an entirely different source composed and found at St Andrews in the early fourteenth century.<sup>128</sup> By the late thirteenth century, St Andrews Priory Library held at least ninety-five texts, making it one of the largest libraries in Scotland at the time.<sup>129</sup> Thus, it is likely that Fordun consulted the library at St Andrews Priory for many of his sources on Scottish history, where he found the *Anonymous Chronicle* and *St Andrews Chronicle*, and almost certainly, the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative as well.

Once Macduff arrived in England, he begged Malcolm to return to Scotland “[...] warningly exhorting him to betake himself to the government of the kingdom, a consummation too long delayed through his own sloth, and no one else’s.”<sup>130</sup> Macduff proceeded to convince Malcolm of his faithfulness, stating that most Scottish nobles had taken an oath to support Malcolm and serve him. But Malcolm was unsure of Macduff’s words because other men,

---

<sup>127</sup> These sources are the *Anonymous Chronicle* and the *St Andrews Chronicle*. However, as Boardman has also noted, both chronicles contained information on David II’s and Robert I’s reigns; it is not known if these sources were longer histories that incorporated information on eleventh-century Scottish kingship. See Broun, “A New Look,” 21; and Boardman, “Chronicle Propaganda,” 25-8.

<sup>128</sup> Dauvit Broun has noted how several king-lists in association with the Scottish origin-myth found in Wyntoun and Bower suggest that they were composed at St Andrews. He further argued that “it is possible, also, to see a tradition of writing Scottish history centred on St Andrews [...]”. See Broun, “A New Look,” 21.

<sup>129</sup> Norman H. Reid, “The Prehistory of the University of St Andrews,” in *Medieval St Andrews: Church, Cult, City*, ed. Michael Brown and Katie Stevenson (Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2017), 237–67, at 250. See also John Higgitt, *Scottish Libraries*, vol. 12, *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* (London: British Library in association with the British Academy, 2006), 230-6. With thanks to Dr Kate Ash-Irisarri for suggesting Higgitt’s book.

<sup>130</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: i, 197; *Chronicle* (trans.), 184: “[...] reditum illi suasit, et quod ad regni se transferat regimen diu nimis sua tantum nec alterius desidia tardatum, ardentem adhortatur.”



Macbeth's supporters, had also deceitfully urged him to return to Scotland. Such experience prompted Malcolm to test Macduff's loyalty by ensuring the nobleman that he could not be king because he was lustful, a possible reference to David II's reputation.<sup>131</sup> Macduff's eloquent response made reference to Roman history to refute Malcolm's claim that a lustful king could not have a successful kingship, claiming that "[...] if thou meetly extend the borders of thy kingdom, rule it in peace, and adorn it with new lands and new buildings, thou shalt not, for such misdeeds, lose the name of a good king, or the favour of the nation."<sup>132</sup> Likewise, the sin of thievery, which Malcolm claimed to have, would be pardonable according to Macduff's response.<sup>133</sup> But it was falsehood which was unforgivable; it could be that Robert Bruce's defection to the English side, along with his submission to Edward I, was the "falsehood" which inspired Malcolm's challenge to Macduff in this passage. Bruce submitted to Edward I in 1302 out of fear that a Balliol restoration would jeopardize his claim to the Scottish throne and his standing as earl of Carrick.<sup>134</sup> Moreover, Bruce's assassination of John "the Red" Comyn in Greyfriars church in Dumfries won him both outlawry and excommunication, crimes that a man fit for kingship should not commit. It was because of Comyn's murder that Bruce had to argue against the legitimacy of Balliol's kingship.<sup>135</sup> Despite his troubles, Bruce was able to gather support from the Stewarts and the Douglasses to seize the Scottish throne, defending Scotland's regnal sovereignty until his death in 1329. While the sovereignty of the Scottish crown remained uncontested, fourteenth-century kingship was exercised in tandem with the political community and the exercise of royal authority was conditioned by the support and involvement of the king's

---

<sup>131</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: i, 197. This suggestion was made by Professor Boardman.

<sup>132</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), 187.

<sup>133</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: iv, 200-1.

<sup>134</sup> Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 122.

<sup>135</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 96.

magnates: the crown governed as long as the lords retained considerable power in the running of the kingdom.<sup>136</sup> The idea of contractual monarchy, first articulated in the Declaration of Arbroath, was not present in the *Processus* composed by Baldred Bisset in 1301: the idea of a conditional and/or contractual monarchy was only produced by Scottish clerks to legitimize the kingship of Robert Bruce.<sup>137</sup> Malcolm's challenge to Macduff's loyalty seems to be inspired by and to reflect on how Bruce's sins did not impede him from being a "good" king that was able to effectively defend Scotland against England. The representatives of the political community of Scotland would support the candidacy of a king that could maintain Scottish sovereignty, regardless of his sins and crimes, as long as they would be involved in the governance of the kingdom.

The passage's most surprising feature is its intention: Malcolm's elaborate ruse was meant to test Macduff's personal and political loyalty. If magnate support was imperative to a successful bid to the kingship, then unquestionable loyalty to the rightful king should come with the territory. David II did not always experience such undivided loyalty from his senior magnates: Robert the Stewart abandoned the field at the Battle of Neville's Cross, which led to David's disastrous loss, and several senior Scottish nobles sided with Edward Balliol when he invaded Scotland in 1332.<sup>138</sup> Robert the Stewart was Scotland's leading noble during the reign of David II; he was also his half-nephew and the heir presumptive to the Scottish throne. His withdrawal from the battlefield in 1346 along with his constant preoccupation with minimizing David's political control resulted in David's aggressive and antagonistic approach to subduing

---

<sup>136</sup> Brown, "Introduction," 9-11.

<sup>137</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 86; Mason, "Kingship, Counsel and Consent," 265-282, at 265-6.

<sup>138</sup> Penman, *David II*, 47-8; MacInnes, *Second War*, 151-5 and 104 (for Stewart's withdrawal from Neville's Cross).

Stewart's power. The coronation of Edward Balliol in 1332 at Scone was attended by Earl Duncan IV of Fife, among other Scottish nobles; Earl Duncan and his vassals sided with Balliol during his invasion and subsequent conflict for the crown in the 1330s.<sup>139</sup> It seems that this passage was shaped by the political milieu of the early fourteenth century and the Bruce-Stewart bid for power in Scotland and it is unlikely that such a passage was originally composed before the early fourteenth century.

Even in exile in England, Malcolm's agency as prince is evident. He was able to gather the support of most of his political community, represented by Macduff, using Macduff as a messenger to his political community. As the *Chronica* commented, "had Malcolm not been there, this people [i.e. Macbeth's men] would not have fled from the battle, even if King Edward, and his men to boot, had been present with Siward."<sup>140</sup> Malcolm, as rightful heir and choice of the political community of Scotland to the throne, was able to muster loyalties as soon as he returned to Scotland: Macbeth's troops deserted him on the battlefield and Malcolm was able to vanquish Macbeth easily. Chapter 8 sought to address the desertion of Macbeth's troops by stating that men are able to desert an unlawful king on the battlefield because "they took this opportunity of giving the rightful heir, by their flight, an opening for surely recovering the kingdom."<sup>141</sup> The Declaration of Arbroath made a specific provision for nobles to depose a king who could not defend them from tyranny, no doubt inspired by the reign of John Balliol.<sup>142</sup> The message behind Fordun's account of Malcolm's recovery of his kingdom is clear: if a man is a lawful heir to the crown, the kingdom will support him. Malcolm Canmore's legitimacy as heir to the Scottish throne, despite Macbeth's usurpation and tyranny, was uncontested.

---

<sup>139</sup> MacInnes, *Second War*, 152.

<sup>140</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: vii, 192.

<sup>141</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: viii, 193.

<sup>142</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 95.

## Conclusion

The *Chronica gentis Scotorum*'s portrayal of Malcolm Canmore was greatly influenced by Fordun's sources and by the political milieu of the early fourteenth century. Fordun favoured chronicle material of Scottish origin over English sources, which is apparent in his use of both the *Gesta Annalia* I and the *Gesta regum Anglorum*. The *Chronica* changed the information found in both of these sources to reinforce the image of Malcolm Canmore as a sovereign Scottish king descended from a long line of Scottish kings whose reign marked the beginning of a new era in Scottish history. Malcolm Canmore's kingship was defined by his defence of Edgar Ætheling's right to the English throne, first by marrying Edgar's sister Saint Margaret, and later by engaging in conflict with the Normans. Fordun's Malcolm was not an equal to Saint Margaret: he was her superior as shown by his charitable work and virtuous kingship. Malcolm Canmore was here more independent from English influence than in the thirteenth-century Scottish sources Fordun used to compile the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. The portrayal of Malcolm Canmore was also conditioned by fourteenth-century ideas of kingship and Anglo-Scottish relations. The reign of David II and his striving for peaceful Anglo-Scottish relations, along with his conflict-ridden relationship with Robert Stewart, seem to have influenced Malcolm's portrayal in the *Chronica*. In its treatment of Malcolm's conflict with William the Bastard and his relationship with Edgar Ætheling, the *Chronica* revealed its pro-Brucean stance.

The portrayal of Malcolm Canmore's reign was also symptomatic of a shift in ideas about kingship, succession, and royal-magnate relations that were a result of the Wars of Independence. While thirteenth-century ideas of kingship saw the Canmore kings as heirs by hereditary right and descendants of the House of Wessex reigning in cooperation with their nobles, fourteenth-century Scottish kings were considered to be also chosen by the consent of their political

community. The introduction of Macduff of Fife as representative of this community and as the link between Malcolm Canmore and the oppressed Scottish kingdom stemmed from the idea that the Scottish king depended on magnate support to attain (and retain) the crown. Macduff's conflict with Macbeth, similar to the conflict between John Balliol and a certain Macduff in the 1290s echoed the Great Cause, and later, the Second War of Independence. Macduff's litigation against King John and the bishop of St Andrews was the cause behind Edward I's invasion of Scotland in 1296; similarly, Macduff's escape to England, the loss of his lands at the hands of Macbeth and while in exile, and Siward of Northumbria's invasion of Scotland in 1057 seem inspired by the events of 1296. Malcolm's test of loyalty for Macduff was meant to show how an heir needed his nobility's support to attain the crown and simultaneously how the nobles owed loyalty to their king. The emphasis on Macbeth's usurpation, Malcolm's exile and the role of Macduff as representative of the political community of Scotland show that the original source for this account could not have been composed before the fourteenth century, possibly after 1306. As the importance of the political community of the realm for the approval of a king grew, the role of Macduff became more prominent in Scottish chronicles, particularly in the fifteenth century.

## CHAPTER 4. MALCOLM CANMORE IN ANDREW OF WYNTOUN'S *ORYGYNALE CRONIKYL* (CA. 1408 x 1424)

### Introduction

The first appearance of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative inaugurated a new phase in the evolution of Malcolm Canmore's portrayal, one whose goals was to dispel doubts about the legitimacy and sovereignty of Malcolm's kingship. Scottish chroniclers of the fifteenth century transmitted the story of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne found in Fordun's *Chronica*, demonstrating the increased interest in Malcolm Canmore prior to his marriage to Saint Margaret. The second chronicler to elaborate on the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative was Andrew of Wyntoun, prior of St Serf's in Loch Leven. Inspired by John Barbour's narrative historical epic *The Brus* (c. 1375) and the now-lost *Stewartis Orygynale*, and supported by the patronage of a Fife laird, Sir John Wemyss of Leuchars and Kincaldrum (ca. 1372-1428),<sup>1</sup> Wyntoun composed the *Orygynale Cronikyl*, a 30,000-line history of Scotland written in the vernacular and in octosyllabic meter.<sup>2</sup> Wyntoun's original goal was to divide the *Cronikyl* into

---

<sup>1</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, I: 54. Sir William Fraser suggested that the Wemyss family had rights over the bailiary of River Leven and that Wyntoun's family could have been associated with Kildrummy Castle, in the earldom of Mar, to which the Erskine family was claimant. Sir Alan Erskine, Sir John Wemyss's father-in-law, was the keeper of Loch Leven Castle and also possibly coroner of Fife: it is possible that Wemyss and Wyntoun were acquainted through Erskine. For Sir Alan Erskine, see Penman, *David II*, 260. According to Penman, David II seems to have made Sir Alan Erskine coroner of Fife in the second half of the year 1361.

<sup>2</sup> See Amours, "Introduction," xxx-xxxiv, for Wyntoun's biography; for the *Orygynale Cronikyl*, see R. J. Lyall, "Lost Literature of Medieval Scotland," in *Bryght Lanternis: Essays on the Language and Literature of Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. J. Derrick McClure and Michael R. G. Spiller (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989), 33-47. R. James Goldstein, "'I Wil My Proces Hald': Making Sense of Scottish Lives and the Desire for History in Barbour, Wyntoun and Blind Hary," in *A Companion to Medieval Scottish Poetry*, ed. Priscilla Bawcutt and Janet Hadley Williams (Cambridge: Boydell, 2006), 35-48; Wingfield, *Trojan Legend*; R. Lyall, "'A New Maid Channoun'? Redefining the Canonical in Medieval and Renaissance Scottish Literature," *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26, no. 1 (January 1, 1991), 1-18. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol26/iss1/3>; Broun, *Irish Identity*; 95-104; Rhiannon Purdie, "Malcolm, Margaret, Macbeth and the Miller: Rhetoric and the Re-Shaping of History in Wyntoun's Original Chronicle," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, New Series, 41 (December 2015): 45-63. Emily Wingfield, "'Qwhen Alexander Our Kynge Was Dede': Kingship and Good Governance in

seven books, after the seven ages of the world, and to have Book VII culminate with the reign of Alexander III, whose death led to the First War of Independence.<sup>3</sup> Wyntoun's placement of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff story at the end of Book VI and his personal kingship at the beginning of Book VII showed Malcolm's centrality in the construction of a sovereign identity for Scottish kingship.<sup>4</sup>

Yet Wyntoun introduced important changes to the way Malcolm Canmore was imagined in the *Orygynale Cronikyl*. First, Wyntoun portrayed Malcolm as the illegitimately-born son of King Duncan and the miller of Forteviot's daughter, a decision that could be problematic for establishing the legitimacy of the Canmore dynasty as heirs to the Scottish throne. Second, Wyntoun reduced Malcolm's political agency considerably. Wyntoun deliberately changed the account of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative found in Fordun's *Chronica*, transferring many of the actions of Malcolm to Macduff of Fife. Such changes imply that Macduff has an increased political agency in the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*.

Although Broun's analysis of the *Chronica* and of thirteenth-century Scottish historical material centres on their use in response to English historiography produced before and shortly after the Wars of Independence, Stephen Boardman has questioned the applicability of this thesis

---

Andrew of Wyntoun's Original Chronicle," in *Premodern Scotland: Literature and Governance 1420-1587*, ed. Joanna Martin and Emily Wingfield, First edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 19–30; Eleanor Commander, "Andrew Wyntoun, Historiographical Propagandist: The Four Kingdoms in His 'Original Chronicle,'" in *Rhetoric, Royalty, and Reality: Essays on the Literary Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, vol. 7, Mediaevalia Groningana New Series (Paris, Leuven, Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005), 1–16; Steve Boardman, "A People Divided? Language, History and Anglo-Scottish Conflict in the Work of Andrew of Wyntoun," in *Ireland and the English World in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Brendan Smith (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009), 112–29.

<sup>3</sup> Amours, "Introduction," xlviii; Goldstein, "I Will My Proces Hald," 39.

<sup>4</sup> Wingfield, "Kingship and Good Governance," 27; Harrill, "Politics and Sanctity," 266.

to fifteenth-century Scottish chronicles.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, R. James Goldstein's research on Wyntoun's work has revealed the chronicler's attempt to construct Scottish history within a wider continental and biblical context as part of a desire to "make sense of the more *local destiny* of his kingdom within this larger providential framework."<sup>6</sup> Goldstein has further suggested that late medieval notions of the earlier Scottish past were not only conditioned by Anglo-Scottish animosity, but also served to commemorate the past in order to "[...] celebrate some moment in the present."<sup>7</sup> This chapter will precisely place Wyntoun's account of Malcolm Canmore within this "local" historical context, examining Malcolm's portrayal in the *Orygynale Cronikyl* within the perspective of early fifteenth-century Scottish politics, particularly events associated with Fife, rather than examining Malcolm's portrayal as a Scottish response to English claims of regnal superiority or to English historiography in general.

The key to exploring Wyntoun's unusual portrayal of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative is to understand the political career of the *Cronikyl*'s commissioner, Sir John Wemyss, an adherent of Robert Stewart, Duke of Albany and Earl of Fife and Menteith.<sup>8</sup> A detailed examination of the political relationship between Sir John Wemyss and the Duke of Albany during the first decades of the fifteenth century can shed light onto the changes Wyntoun made to

---

<sup>5</sup> Boardman, "A People Divided," 114; see also Steve Boardman, "Late Medieval Scotland and the Matter of Britain," in *Scottish History: The Power of the Past*, ed. Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 47–72. Boardman's evaluation of the treatment of the "Matter of Britain" by Scottish chroniclers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries concludes that while Anglophobia was institutionalized in Scotland in this period, Scottish writers did not seek to challenge completely the myth of Brutus, a sense of a British past, or to discard Arthurian romances. For example, John Barbour and Andrew of Wyntoun had a positive view of the British and Arthurian tradition materials (59).

<sup>6</sup> Goldstein, "I Will My Proces Hald," 40; Amours, "Introduction," xxxviii.

<sup>7</sup> Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, 6.

<sup>8</sup> For Robert Stewart, Earl of Fife and Menteith and later Duke of Albany, see Hunt, "The Governorship of the First Duke of Albany," and Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*.



the *Cronikyl*'s account of Malcolm Canmore. Both Karen Hunt and James Fraser have identified a correlation between the content of Wyntoun's *Cronikyl* and the governorship of the Duke of Albany,<sup>9</sup> but this is the first attempt at tying the relationship between Wemyss and Albany to the unusual portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Cronikyl*. Wemyss's involvement in the conflict between Albany and his nephew, David Stewart, Duke of Rothesay, had negative repercussions for the relationship between Albany and Wemyss. Sir John was wrongfully accused by Albany, and later acquitted by Albany's own council, of illegally appropriating revenue from the mails of Wemyss.<sup>10</sup> After the apparent reconciliation between Albany and Wemyss, the latter was involved in the attempts to negotiate the return of James I of Scotland from English captivity. Wyntoun used the conflict between Malcolm Canmore, Macbeth and Macduff to reflect on the conflict between Sir John Wemyss and the Duke of Albany and, more importantly, on the delicate balance of power between kings and nobles.

Furthermore, the increased political agency of Macduff of Fife in the *Orygynal Cronikyl* is also explained by Wyntoun's use of a now-lost source that contained additional information on Macduff. At least parts of this source also survived in Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* (1440s); a comparison between Wyntoun and Bower's accounts of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative will identify which specific additions to both the *Orygynale Cronikyl* and the *Scotichronicon* are attributable to this source. The depiction of Macduff's increased political agency in Scotland, and his ability to choose and depose kings of Scots as necessary, was also inspired by the Duke of Albany's tenure as effective ruler of Scotland during the reigns of Robert

---

<sup>9</sup> Hunt, "Duke of Albany," 3-4; James E. Fraser, "'A Swan from a Raven': William Wallace, Brucean Propaganda, and 'Gesta Annalia' II," *The Scottish Historical Review* 81, no. 211 (April 1, 2002): 1-22, based on James E. Fraser, "Like a Swan from a Raven': The Historiographical Image of William Wallace, 1297-1582" (MA thesis, University of Guelph, 1999), 45.

<sup>10</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #34.

II, Robert III and James I. Therefore, this chapter will analyze how fifteenth-century Scottish politics and governance affected the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Orygynale Cronikyl*.

### Wyntoun's sources

Research into Wyntoun's source materials has been sparse. Yet like John of Fordun, Andrew of Wyntoun used several sources, both identified and anonymous, to complete his *Orygynale Cronikyl*. F.J. Amours' introduction to his edition of the *Cronikyl* remains the authoritative study about Wyntoun's use of extant source material.<sup>11</sup> Wyntoun acknowledged some of his sources and it is well known that one of his main sources was John Barbour's *The Brus*, which he acknowledged accordingly.<sup>12</sup> Wyntoun used a variety of other sources, such as Martinus Polonius's *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, Honorius of Autun's *Imago mundi*, Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum historiale*, the *Legenda aurea* by Jacobus de Voragine, Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Brittanorum*, and the now-lost St Andrews *Registrum*.<sup>13</sup> The sources for the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff account in Book VII are the following: Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia* through the Dunfermline *Vita*, the *Verse Chronicle*, and either a copy of the *Chronicle of Melrose* or a derivate of this work.<sup>14</sup> Wyntoun, as a canon of St Andrews, had access to the library of St Andrews Priory where he would have found most of these histories, but without information about the contents of the library at Lochleven, it is impossible to tell

---

<sup>11</sup> See Amours, "Introduction," Section 9.

<sup>12</sup> Amours, "Introduction," ci; see also Wyntoun, I: i, 54; and W. A. Craigie, "The St. Andrew MS. of Wyntoun's Chronicle," *Anglia* 20 (1898): 363–80. On occasions, Wyntoun referenced Barbour for further reading on particular topics, instead of copying material directly from Barbour.

<sup>13</sup> Amours, "Introduction," Section 7.

<sup>14</sup> Amours, "Introduction," Section 7. Amours argues that Wyntoun did not use the *Chronicle of Melrose*, but it is possible that he did have, in fact, access to either a copy of this work or a derivate. The Dunfermline Compilation, on the other hand, was unknown in Amours' time; for a discussion of Wyntoun's use of the Dunfermline *Vita*, see Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 264–70.

from which library he obtained which chronicle.<sup>15</sup> Much of the information Wyntoun used for these chapters is of unknown extraction, for example, Chapter 16 describing the story of King Duncan and the miller of Forteviot's daughter, and Chapter 18, on Macbeth's rise to the throne (Cotton MS) or Malcolm Canmore's recovery of the throne (Wemyss MS).<sup>16</sup>

Wyntoun used the *Chronicle of Melrose* for certain aspects of the story of Duncan and Macbeth found in Chapters 16 and 18 of the *Cronikyl*, especially the regnal dates. Wyntoun used Melrose for some information on Macbeth: Chapter 18 commented that

All his tyme was gret plente  
 Habundande bathe on lande and se.  
 He was in [iustice] richt lauchful,  
 And til his legis al awfulle.  
 Qwhen pape was Leo þe [nynt] in Rome,  
 As pilgrayme to þe cowrt he coyme,  
 And in his almus he sew siluir  
 Til al pure folk þat had mystare [...] <sup>17</sup>

This information is a translation of Marianus Scotus: "Rex Scottiae Macbethad Romae argentum pauperibus seminando distribuit."<sup>18</sup> Later in Chapter XVIII, Wyntoun noted that Macbeth was conceived by the devil and, after banishing Duncan's sons from the kingdom, he took the crown and "made gret sterynge" in Scotland.<sup>19</sup> Chapter XVI, line 1648 stated that Macbeth "his [Duncan's] kynrik he vsurpit syne," information found in the *Chronicle of Melrose* under the year 1039.<sup>20</sup> Thus Wyntoun followed the order of information about Macbeth found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, where Scribe 27 had turned Macbeth into a usurper without erasing the information about Macbeth's piety found in Marianus Scotus. Wyntoun also used the *Chronicle*

<sup>15</sup> Amours, "Introduction," lxxviii.

<sup>16</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xvi and xvii (Cotton); cxvi and cxvii (Wemyss). See below pp. 167-72 for discussion of these different manuscripts.

<sup>17</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xviii, ll. 1889-1896.

<sup>18</sup> Scotus, *Chronica*, 1050 AD; see also Amours, "Notes," 64-5, no. 1893-96.

<sup>19</sup> Wyntoun, V: xviii, ll. 1947-54.

<sup>20</sup> MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 12v, 1039 AD.

of *Melrose* in a more creative manner. A. A. M. Duncan noticed that the episode concerning Macbeth's beheading in Chapter 17 was based on the *Chronicle of Melrose's* description of the beheading of Guthred MacWilliam in 1212. *Melrose* stated that MacWilliam was beheaded and his head was taken to Kincardine to Prince Alexander, the future Alexander II. In the *Cronikyl*, Macbeth was beheaded and his head was also taken to the king at Kincardine.<sup>21</sup> Wyntoun increasingly relied on the *Chronicle of Melrose* for Malcolm's kingship in Book VII, using it for the date of his coronation (1056 AD), for information on Christina, Saint Margaret's sister, and on Malcolm's raids of Northumbria as well as Malcolm's submission to King William.<sup>22</sup> Wyntoun used material from the Dunfermline Compilation for Book VI, Chapter 19 and Book VII, Chapter 30.<sup>23</sup> The accounts of Malcolm's death at the hands of a Northumbrian traitor and of Margaret's death in Edinburgh Castle and her internment at Dunfermline are all found in the Dunfermline *Vita*.<sup>24</sup>

Yet, the use of another source has been unequivocally rejected by scholars, except by Amours: John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. Macpherson's introduction to David Laing's edition of the *Orygynale Cronikyl* commented that Wyntoun did not use Fordun, since he does not mention Fordun's name in the text.<sup>25</sup> This hypothesis has prevailed in scholarship, as it was most recently supported by the editors of Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* and by Dauvit

<sup>21</sup> Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 37; and also see Wyntoun VI: xviii, ll. 2241-46.

<sup>22</sup> See Amours, "Notes," 67-8, nos. 1; 21-112; 223-40; 245-66; 291-294; 295-302.

<sup>23</sup> See Wyntoun, VI: xix, ll. 2307-2380; and xx.

<sup>24</sup> See Wyntoun, VI: cxxiv, ll. 320-55 (Wemyss). The Wemyss MS has the complete information on Malcolm's death in Alnwick, lacking in the Cotton MS.

<sup>25</sup> Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland. by Andrew of Wyntoun. Edited by David Laing*, ed. David Laing, *The Historians of Scotland*, V.2, 3, 9 (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872), I: xxxvi; see also Amours, "Introduction," I: xxxix.

Broun.<sup>26</sup> Amours, however, argued that Wyntoun did use Fordun as a source, occasionally citing the *Chronica* directly.<sup>27</sup> An example of Wyntoun's quotation of Fordun is found in Book V, Chapter 117 (Wemyss), where Macbeth tells Macduff that "it were nocht ill/ To put þin awne nek in zone zok [...]"<sup>28</sup> Although Wyntoun's Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative deviated considerably from Fordun's, particularly in the story of Malcolm's "get" and Macbeth's conception, Wyntoun did follow the basic order of Fordun's narrative in Chapter 18, where Macbeth first threatened Macduff, and then Macduff left Scotland for England to look for Malcolm Canmore.<sup>29</sup> He also incorporated Fordun's dialogue between Malcolm and Macduff, where Malcolm pretends to have three vices: his version, however, was much abbreviated.<sup>30</sup> It

---

<sup>26</sup> D. E. R. Watt, "The Sources," in *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, ed. D. E. R. Watt, New ed., 9 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987), 234–58; and also Broun, *Irish Identity*, 97.

<sup>27</sup> Amours, "Introduction," xxxix; Section 9; and also his Notes to the *Cronikyl*, found on Vol. I from p. 3 onwards.

<sup>28</sup> Wyntoun, V: cxviii, ll. 2020-1. Cotton MS reads: "And to the thayne said angrily, / Lyk al wrethyn in his skin, / His awyn nek he suld put þar in/ þe zok, and ger hym drawchtis dra [...]" (ll. 1974-78).

<sup>29</sup> Although Fordun stated that Macduff went to England to Ravynsore in Northumbria to ask Malcolm to return to Scotland, Wyntoun has Macduff going directly to the court of Saint Edward the Confessor. See Fordun, *Chronica*, V: 1.

<sup>30</sup> Wyntoun, V: xviii, ll. 2116-2184. In the "Notes" section of Vol. I of the *Cronikyl*, Amours argued that Wyntoun did not use Fordun for this account because it was shorter than Fordun's version; thus, he argued that Fordun was not the author of the Macduff account. While the analysis of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative put forward in Chapter 3 concurs with Amours' conclusion, Wyntoun did use Fordun as his source for this passage. Fordun's version reads: "the king, one day, took occasion, *I know not on what pretext*, first to upbraid him, more cruelly than usual, perhaps on account of his disloyalty, with his shortcomings towards him; and then added plainly that he should stoop his neck under the yoke, as that of the ox in a wain." Wyntoun provided a background story explaining Macbeth's threat to Macduff: Macduff's oxen failed to draw the wain during the construction of Macbeth's castle in Dunsinane. It is unlikely, therefore, that if the source contained the reason for Macbeth's threat to Macduff, that Fordun's account claimed to be ignorant of that reason. Furthermore, Macduff was laboring against Macbeth from the beginning in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, while in the *Cronikyl*, he only betrayed Macbeth after this passage. Thus it follows that, although the original source of this account was not Fordun himself, Wyntoun is copying and expanding Fordun's version to create a precedent for the disagreement between Macbeth and Macduff. See Amours, "Notes," in "Introduction," I, 65, no. 1970.

can be concluded, so far, that Wyntoun consulted at least the original source from which Fordun took his account of Malcolm's return to Scotland.<sup>31</sup>

For Book VII, Chapters 1-3, Wyntoun relied on the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Chronicle of Melrose* for his structure and information. For the date of Malcolm's coronation, Wyntoun followed the *Chronicle of Melrose* and Dunfermline Compilation instead.<sup>32</sup> There is one exception, and that is the beginning of Chapter I, which began with information on Malcolm's coronation at Scone, information only found in Fordun's Book V, Chapter 9.<sup>33</sup> Both Fordun and Wyntoun included the information on Malcolm's coronation at Scone before continuing to the story of Malcolm and the traitor; however, Fordun included a short summary of the state of affairs in England between Malcolm's coronation and the account of the traitor, a summary that was missing in Wyntoun. It seems that Wyntoun partially followed Fordun for the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative and the information on Malcolm's coronation at Scone, and then decided to follow more closely the dates and information on Anglo-Scottish events found in the Dunfermline Compilation, which was also contained in the *Gesta Annalia* I and, in a slightly different order, in Fordun's *Chronica*. Additionally, Wyntoun omitted any mention of Malcolm's charitable work or his involvement in the Durham Cathedral's foundation ceremony, favouring instead the *Chronicle of Melrose*'s information on Malcolm's raids and his relationship with William I of England. Wyntoun was, therefore, concerned with Malcolm's kingship and

---

<sup>31</sup> For this argument, see Amours, "Notes," in "Introduction," I, 65, no. 1970.

<sup>32</sup> Both Melrose and the Dunfermline Compilation place Malcolm's accession in 1056 AD. See Wyntoun, VII: i, l. 1 for coronation date taken from MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v and Madrid MS II/2097, fo. 23rb; for the use of 1057 AD as accession date, see Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix-x.

<sup>33</sup> See Wyntoun, VII: i, ll. 1-20 (Cotton); and Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206. This information is not found in the *Chronicle of Melrose* or the Dunfermline Compilation, which follows Melrose for its information on Malcolm's accession. See MS Cotton Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v and Madrid MS II. 2097, fo. 23rb.

governance and less concerned with charitable work or Saint Margaret's role in the kingdom, apart from her ancestry.

But if Wyntoun used Fordun directly, why did he choose to omit any reference to the *Chronica*? Amours argued that Wyntoun's account of Duncan, Macbeth and Malcolm differed so much from Fordun that he decided to omit any reference to this chronicler.<sup>34</sup> However, because knowledge of the author of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* is found only in the Prologue to Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*, composed during the 1440s, and the extant manuscripts of the *Chronica* lack any authorial attribution or title, it may be that the reason Wyntoun did not mention Fordun as a source was because he simply did not know his name.<sup>35</sup> For Wyntoun, what we know today as Fordun's *Chronica* was an anonymous chronicle, which explains why Wyntoun did not name it in the *Orygynale Cronikyl*.

### Manuscripts, Dating and Chapter Headings: The *Cronikyl* in Context

The *Orygynale Cronikyl* has remained an understudied source because of its very complex textual history. Its composition is dated between 1408, the year of the death of the countess of Mar, and 1424, the first year of James I's personal rule; Amours had dated the *Cronikyl* between 1406, the date of Robert III's death, and 1424.<sup>36</sup> Yet none of the extant manuscripts date to the first two decades of the fifteenth century. These manuscripts are: Wemyss MS (ca. 1500 x 1550; in possession of the Wemyss family), BL Royal MS 17 D XX (c. 1475 x 1499), BL Cotton MS Nero D XI (1450 x 1499), BL Lansdowne MS (c. 1500s), University of St Andrews MS 8 (St

---

<sup>34</sup> Amours, "Introduction," xxxix.

<sup>35</sup> For the Prologue of the *Scotichronicon*, see Bower, *Scotichronicon* 9, 2-5.

<sup>36</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 96, fn. 40 for a discussion of the dating of Wyntoun's second (Royal MS) and third (Cotton MS) recessions; see also Amours, "Introduction," xxxviii, for a suggestion of 1406 as earliest composition date.

Andrews MS, ca. 1500 x 1550), NLS Advocates' Library 19.2.3 (First Edinburgh MS, ca. 1480), NLS Advocates' Library 19.2.4 (Second Edinburgh MS, 1550 x 1599), BL Harleian MS (ca. 1600s), and Auchinleck MS (end of fifteenth century).<sup>37</sup> William Craigie argued that the Wemyss MS, although of a later date, represents the earliest recension of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*, an opinion that Amours repeated in the introduction to his edition of the *Cronikyl* and that Broun concurs with.<sup>38</sup> The Royal and Cotton MSS represent the second and third recensions, respectively.<sup>39</sup> Amours suggested that Wyntoun "[...] was probably revising it [the *Cronikyl*] for more than one edition probably during the regency of the Duke of Albany [...]"<sup>40</sup> That is, that although the manuscripts in question appear to be three different recensions, they might have been created more or less simultaneously, representing both Wyntoun's improvements to his own narrative and changes made to the narrative based on the particular audiences to which each recension was aimed. Furthermore, Chapter 26 of the Royal MS contains a positive assessment of the Duke of Albany, which implies that this chapter was produced sometime after Albany's death in 1420.<sup>41</sup>

Out of the three recensions, the Wemyss MS is the most idiosyncratic. Wyntoun intended to divide the *Cronikyl* into seven books, ending with the death of Alexander III in 1286, but later

---

<sup>37</sup> A thorough description of each manuscript is found in Amours, "Introduction," xlvii-lxvii. Amours also cited information from David Laing "Appendix II: Notices of the Various Known Manuscripts of the *Cronikyl*," in Laing, ed., *Orygynale Cronykil*, III, xvii-xxxv. Laing had erroneously dated the Wemyss MS to the early fifteenth century (p. xxv), but Amours, who had access to the manuscript, dated it to 1500 at the earliest based on "spelling and writing" (p. xlviii). For an analysis of the St Andrews MS, consult W. A. Craigie, "The St. Andrew MS. of Wyntoun's Chronicle," *Anglia* 20 (1898): 363-80.

<sup>38</sup> See Craigie, "Wyntoun's 'Original Chronicle'," 52-3; Amours, "Introduction," lxxxvii-xc; and Broun, *Irish Identity*, 96-7.

<sup>39</sup> Amours, "Introduction," xlvii; and Broun, *Irish Identity*, 96-7.

<sup>40</sup> Amours, "Introduction," xxxiii.

<sup>41</sup> Craigie, "Wyntoun's 'Original Chronicle'," 53; See Wyntoun, IX: xxiii-xxiv (ed. Laing) for the account of Rothesay's death, IX: xxvi for the description of Albany (l. 2786: "Resembyll he couth a mychty King"); and Craigie, "Wyntoun's 'Original Chronicle'," 51 on the date of composition of Chapter 26.



decided, in the same manuscript, to extend the narrative to cover Scottish history up to the death of Robert II.<sup>42</sup> The second recension, represented by the Royal MS, was extended to cover Scottish events up to 1408, the date of the death of the countess of Mar.<sup>43</sup> Some manuscripts include a eulogy to the Duke of Albany, showing that the last revisions to the *Cronikyl* must have occurred sometime after 3 September 1420 and before 1424, the year of James I's return to Scotland.<sup>44</sup> The decision to extend the second and third recensions to include more contemporary Scottish events indicate that Wyntoun revised the contents of the *Cronikyl* to match either a broader or a different audience than the audience for whom it was originally intended, Sir John Wemyss. The second and third recensions include more laudatory material on the Duke of Albany, which suggests that Albany was recently deceased (or still alive) when Wyntoun wrote the second recension, yet it might also suggest that the first recension was intended only for private use by Wemyss and the revisions, additions, and changes made to the second and third recensions were geared towards a more general audience interested in contemporary political events. The *Cronikyl*'s complicated textual history, transmission, and extant manuscripts prevents a more specific dating of the second and third recensions, so the argument proposed previously must remain as an informed suggestion.

A comparison of Wyntoun's version of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative in both the Wemyss and Cotton MSS will indicate where Wyntoun made changes to the account and suggest why he made those changes. The decision to exclude the second recension from this analysis was based on the state of Laing's edition of the Royal MS, which contains numerous

---

<sup>42</sup> Amours, "Introduction," li.

<sup>43</sup> Wyntoun, IX: xxiv (ed. Laing).

<sup>44</sup> See Amours, "Introduction," xxx.

errors and changes that were not explained or acknowledged by Laing.<sup>45</sup> There are some differences between the content of the Wemyss MS and the Royal and Cotton MSS, but little difference between the content of the second and third recension's narrative on Macbeth. An example of Wyntoun's manipulation of the content of the three recensions of the *Cronikyl* is found in the chapter headings, or rubrics, of the Wemyss, Royal and Cotton MSS.

Three manuscripts, Wemyss, Second Edinburgh and St Andrews, share the same chapter rubrics and represent the earliest chapter headings as found in the first recension of the *Cronikyl*.<sup>46</sup> This set of rubrics emphasized Malcolm Canmore and his kingship as topics of each chapter. For example, the rubrics read "How malcolme canmore duncanis sone/Was gottin ze may hew but hone" (Chapter 117), "How Edmund Irnsid tholit dede/ Throu a traytour in a close steid." (Chapter 118), and "How malcolme canmore come to ye crown/Off Scotland and tuke possessioun" (Chapter 119). In the manuscripts of the second and third recensions, the headings for these chapters focus on King Duncan and Macbeth: "Quhen King Duncane in Scotland/Malcolmis fadyr was regnand" (Chapter 17), "Þis chaptere sal tell þe tide/Quhen slane wes Edmond Irnsyde" (Chapter 18), and "Quhen Þat Makbeth Fynlaw rase/And regnand in to Scotland was" (Chapter 19). This change aimed at reducing the focus on Malcolm's exile and later accession to the throne in order to place the focus on Macbeth's tyranny. For the first time in a Scottish chronicle, Macbeth was the focus of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative. Wyntoun's original rubrics show that the Wemyss MS represented the earliest recension of the

---

<sup>45</sup> See Broun, *Irish Identity*, 97, fn. 51 where Broun argues that Laing's edition of the Royal MS is not fully reliable, but Amours's edition of the Wemyss and Cotton MSS is.

<sup>46</sup> Craigie, "Wyntoun's Original Chronicle," 50 for a distribution of rubrics and text by recension and representative manuscripts. Craigie argued that Wyntoun changed the rubrics of the second and third recensions because he gave the original manuscript of the *Cronikyl* to Sir John Wemyss without making another copy of the text, and thus he forgot the original chapter headings, prompting him to invent other ones for the second recension onwards.

*Cronikyl*: the focus of the chapters that contained the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative remained on Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne, similar to how they appeared in Fordun's account of the narrative. The second set of rubrics, however, signalled a desire to depart from the original focus of this narrative, instead creating interest in Macbeth's usurpation and tyranny and in Duncan's kingship, thus suggesting that Wyntoun made these changes to please a different type of reader.

The rubrics corresponding to Book VII, Chapters I-III of the second and third recensions also underwent considerable changes.<sup>47</sup> In the Wemyss MS, the first set of rubrics were interested in Malcolm's fight with a knight (Chapter 122: "How King Malcome assayet a knyght/That to betraiss him before hade hecht"), William the Bastard's arrival in England (Chapter 123: "How William Bastard wan Inghland/ And of his broþer efter him beand"), and Malcolm and Margaret's deaths (Chapter 124: "How king Malcome slane was/And of queen Margaretis disces")<sup>48</sup> Again, these rubrics bear some resemblance to the chapter headings of Fordun's Book V, Chapters 10 ("Accession of King Malcolm to the kingdom—He fights with a Traitor"), 11 ("The fight—The Traitor is worsted"), 12 ("How William Bastard's coming to England was brought about [...]") and 21 ("Death of Saint Margaret [...]").<sup>49</sup> In the Cotton MS, however, the rubrics focused on Malcolm's accession to the throne (Chapter 1), William Bastard first reigned in England (Chapter 2) and Malcolm and Margaret's wedding (Chapter 3). Wyntoun's changes to rubrics found in the second and third recensions differed somewhat from

---

<sup>47</sup> Since Wyntoun initially intended his *Cronikyl* to have only seven books and he later decided to expand it to nine, these chapters correspond to Chapters 122-124 of the Wemyss MS. Part of Chapter 123 is missing. See Wyntoun, VII: iii (Cotton) and VI: cxxiii, 342 (Wemyss; in blank).

<sup>48</sup> Wyntoun VI: cxxii-cxxiv (Wemyss). The heading for Chapter cxxiv, absent in Amours' edition, was reconstructed using the content of the St Andrews MS (St Andrews University Library MS DA775.A6W9, fo. 239v), which follows the rubrics of the Wemyss MS.

<sup>49</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle*, V: X-XII, XXI.

Fordun's own chapter headings, yet the goal was also to reimagine Malcolm's kingship as a new era of Scottish kingship.<sup>50</sup> Wyntoun's decision to begin his seventh book with the account of Malcolm's coronation and fight with a traitor further attests to his desire to portray Malcolm's reign as a departure from the previous line of Scottish kings, by virtue of his marriage to Saint Margaret, which culminated with Robert II, the first king of the Stewart dynasty. This tied the Stewarts into the Canmore dynasty but not into Scotland's more ancient regnal past, a decision that was probably inspired by Wyntoun's use of John Barbour's *Stewartis Orygynale*, which traced the ancestry of the Stewarts to Fleance of Warenne instead.<sup>51</sup> The reader of the first recension, Sir John Wemyss, would have seen Scottish kingship as a continuous line, from ancient origins until Alexander III and later continuing directly to Robert II, the father of his lord, the Duke of Albany. The readers of the second and third recensions, however, would see Malcolm's kingship, and his marriage to Saint Margaret, as the beginning of a new era of Scottish kingship, a new dynasty combining Scottish and English blood from which the Stewarts claimed descent.

### **Additional source(s) about Macduff of Fife**

As alluded to earlier, the *Orygynale Cronikyl* based its account of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne partly on Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. Wyntoun made substantial changes to Fordun's narrative that will be discussed in detail in a later section. Yet Wyntoun also used other sources that are still unidentified; one of those sources had additional information about Macduff of Fife that is not found in earlier sources, but that can be found included in the

---

<sup>50</sup> Wingfield, "Kingship and Good Governance," 27; Purdie, "Rherotic and the Re-Shaping of History," 45–63.

<sup>51</sup> Lyall, "Lost Literature," 39; and "Barbour, John," in Dominic Head, ed., *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 69.

*Scotichronicon*'s Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative. Dauvit Broun has demonstrated that Wyntoun and Bower shared a historical source containing information about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that was composed at St Andrews and which each chronicler used independently.<sup>52</sup> Broun also highlighted, "no study has yet been undertaken, however, which specifically examines the material shared by Bower and Wyntoun relating to this period [i.e. 1264 to 1284]."<sup>53</sup> Moreover, this assessment does not include information on eleventh-century events; the previous chapter established that the Malcolm-Macduff-Macbeth narrative was composed sometime after 1306.

The first reference shared by both Wyntoun and Bower concerned the location of Macduff's castle. In the *Cronikyl*'s Book VI, Macduff escaped Macbeth's court in Dunsinane and arrived at Kennoway, where his wife and castle were located. Then, he instructed his wife to deal with Macbeth if the king came looking for him at the castle. Macduff took supplies and left Kennoway for England, intending to return to Scotland with the rightful king. Wyntoun mentioned once the location of Macduff's castle, Kennoway, in Book VI, Chapter 118 of the Wemyss MS: "To Kynnaghty Makbeth come sone/ And wald gret fellony thare haif done."<sup>54</sup> In the *Scotichronicon*, Macduff also escaped Macbeth's court in secret, arriving "At his castle of Kennoway, took up provisions and hurriedly made for the sea."<sup>55</sup> The rest of the *Scotichronicon*'s narrative followed Fordun's account of Macduff's first encounter with

---

<sup>52</sup> Broun, "A First Look," 14-5. Broun explained that Wyntoun and the *Gesta Annalia* share a similar chronology for the events between 1286 and 1292; moreover, there was a St Andrews source identified by D.E.R. Watt that was possibly written in the thirteenth century but contained information of at least the twelfth century.

<sup>53</sup> Broun, "A First Look," 14.

<sup>54</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, 286, ll. 2085-6 (Wemyss MS).

<sup>55</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 54, 436 (Latin) and 437 (English): "ad castrum suum de Kennachqwhi, expensas assumens, mare confestim peciit."

Malcolm in England.<sup>56</sup> Bower did not mention information about Macduff's wife's encounter with Macbeth or the location of Macbeth's court at Dunsinane. The source shared by Bower and Wyntoun contained only the information on Kennoway as the location of Macduff's castle and Wyntoun either obtained his information on Macduff's wife and Dunsinane from another source, either written or oral, or invented it himself. What is apparent, at least with this passage, is that Wyntoun and Bower shared the same source about Macduff.

Wyntoun and Bower also included detailed information about Macduff's encounter with Malcolm Canmore. In the *Cronikyl*, Macduff arrived at the court of Edward the Confessor, where he found Duncan's three sons. King Edward received Macduff well and agreed to help Macduff and Duncan's sons in recovering Scotland. Then, Macduff proceeded to plea with Duncan's sons for them to return to Scotland:

With his oste vengeans to tak  
off Makbeth for thar faderis saik  
and to conquere thar heretage  
that to thaim fell be rycht lynnage.<sup>57</sup>

When Malcolm's older, legitimate brothers declined to return to Scotland, Macduff then asked Malcolm "to follow thar rycht, and he undertuke/ that he suld mak him of Scotland king."<sup>58</sup> Malcolm then laid his three challenges to Macduff to test his loyalty.<sup>59</sup> In the *Scotichronicon*, Bower included a short, unattributed Latin poem at the end of Malcolm's three challenges to Macduff in Book V, Chapter 6. The poem stated that

In triumphant progress you will approach your father's kingdom.  
You will gain the crown of the kingdom by right, I promise.  
All rights are due to you, not to him.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 54, 436-39.

<sup>57</sup> Wyntoun, VI, cxviii, 290, ll. 2145-8 (Wemyss MS).

<sup>58</sup> Wyntoun, VI, cxviii, 290, ll. 2162-3 (Wemyss MS).

<sup>59</sup> Wyntoun VI: cxviii, 292-6.

<sup>60</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 6, 14-17: "prospere procedens regna patris subies. Regni, promitto, pocieris jure corona; omnia jura tibi, nulla debentur ei."

The idea that Macduff promised to make Malcolm king of Scots is apparent in both Wyntoun's and Bower's works, but the placement of the passage is different in each chronicle. Both passages cited Malcolm's "right" ("jure corona"/ "rycht") to the throne as the reason why Malcolm should return to Scotland to defeat Macbeth. Wyntoun's narrative incorporated the information into the main text while Bower included it at the end and in its original Latin verse form; the Latin poem itself never mentions Macduff or Malcolm by name. The placement of the Latin poem in the *Scotichronicon* suggests that the original poem was about Malcolm and Macduff, and that it must have come from a now-lost account of Malcolm's bid for the Scottish throne found at St Andrews that Wyntoun translated into Scots. Thus Bower included the poem as it appeared in the original source, while Wyntoun amended part of the content to support his portrayal of Malcolm Canmore as the illegitimate son of King Duncan and to heighten Macduff's political role in the narrative. The passages about Macduff of Fife indicate a putative source that was Fife-centric in its contents, and more importantly, that highlighted the role of Macduff as kingmaker and his overall increased political agency.

Nowhere is the emphasis on Fife more apparent than in the *Cronikyl*'s and the *Scotichronicon*'s inclusion of material about Macduff's privileges.<sup>61</sup> The *Cronikyl* dedicated the earlier part of Book VI, Chapter 119 to outlining the privileges Malcolm gave to Macduff and his family after defeating Macbeth, while the same information was found in a more condensed form as part of Book V, Chapter 9 of the *Scotichronicon*. In both chronicles, the content of Macduff's privileges was identical: Macduff and his descendants had the right to enthrone the king of Scots

---

<sup>61</sup> MacQueen and MacQueen, "Books V and VI," xviii. While the MacQueens note that Bower added information about Macduff's privileges, they do not mention that the information is also found in Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*. Moreover, the Introduction does not acknowledge the rest of the *Scotichronicon*'s additions on Macduff.

at their coronation ceremony, they would command the king's vanguard in all military campaigns, and they would enjoy the privilege of Macduff's Law in case of the death of any kinsmen.<sup>62</sup> In both instances the privileges were given to Macduff for his service to Malcolm and they were given specifically after Macbeth's defeat. Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*, however, mentioned that the law was enacted by the "black priest" of Weddale, the earl of Fife, and the lord of Abernethy, information not included in the *Scotichronicon*.<sup>63</sup> Wyntoun and Bower used the same source for this information, but Wyntoun's inclusion of information about the enactment of Macduff's Law shows that he either incorporated more information from his source, used other sources Bower did not, or obtained his information from oral accounts or common knowledge.

According to both Wyntoun and Bower, the Macduff Law established that members of the Macduff clan were given remission for unpremeditated killing by paying a "kinbot" of twenty-four marks, in case of a nobleman, and twelve marks, in case of a yeoman.<sup>64</sup> A.D.M. Forte has analyzed the contents of the Macduff Law as outlined in the Acts of the Scottish Parliament, edited by Cosmo Innes, and attributed by Sir John Skene to the reign of William the Lion.<sup>65</sup> Forte based his analysis partly on John Bannerman's study of Macduff of Fife, where he argued that the appearance of the provisions to the Macduff earls of Fife that appear in both Wyntoun and Bower show that such provisions were historically factual.<sup>66</sup> But as Alice Taylor has recently argued, later medieval sources should not be always analyzed as reliable transmissions of factual information from the earlier medieval period. Her comparative analysis of the charters of

---

<sup>62</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xix; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 9, 22-3. See also A. D. M. Forte, "A Strange Archaic Provision of Mercy: The Procedural Rules for the Duellum under the Law of Clann Duib," *Edinburgh Law Review* 14 (2010): 418-50.

<sup>63</sup> See Wyntoun, VI: xix, ll. 2286-88.

<sup>64</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xix, ll. 2277-2280; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 9, 22-3.

<sup>65</sup> Forte, "A Strange Archaic Provision of Mercy," 419-20.

<sup>66</sup> Bannerman, "Macduff of Fife," 26-7.



Donnchad I and II of Fife, dated to the reigns of David I and William the Lion respectively, show that cartulary evidence could portray new legal provisions as having a historical origin.<sup>67</sup> As shown in Chapter 3, interest in Macduff of Fife and his involvement in restoring Malcolm Canmore to the Scottish throne does not seem to pre-date the Wars of Independence; it has also been argued that Fordun's account of Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne possibly originated in the first years of the fourteenth century. Although Bannerman and Forte saw Wyntoun's account as representing the historical reality of the eleventh century, arguing that it was possible that the Law of Clan Macduff was first implemented by Malcolm III, Forte provided no example of the use or mention of the Law of Clan Macduff that pre-dated the year 1358.<sup>68</sup> In short, the appearance of later medieval accounts about Malcolm's grant of privileges to Macduff should not be taken as evidence of historical events of the eleventh century, particularly when the earliest evidence for this law dates to the second half of the fourteenth century. The inclusion of the account about Malcolm's provision of Macduff's Law is a reflection of the chronicler's understanding of the eleventh-century Scottish past and of the origin mythology that portrayed Malcolm Canmore's accession to the Scottish throne as the beginning of a new, golden era of Scottish kingship. This interest in Macduff of Fife shows that the anonymous source, found at St Andrews by the first half of the fifteenth century, portrayed a version of Malcolm Canmore's kingship that depended on the political agency of Macduff of Fife, thus creating a Fife-centric origin story for the Canmore dynasty.

---

<sup>67</sup> Taylor, *The Shape of the State*, particularly Chapter 1, "The Early Scottish State?" 25-81, at 47-53 for Donnchad II's charters.

<sup>68</sup> Forte, "A Strange Archaic Provision of Mercy," 423; Bannerman, "Macduff of Fife," 26-7. The earliest evidence about the existence of the law of Clan Macduff that Forte cites is the 1358 charter of David II to Walter Ramsay of Colluthie which made the latter Earl of Fife. Robert Stewart, earl of Fife, is explicitly called "head of the law of Clan MacDuff" in Robert II's parliament legislation of November 1384 at Holyrood. See *RPS* 1384/11/12.

There is another aspect about this putative source or sources that needs further consideration and that is the issue of dating. The fact that these additions about Macduff were found in chronicles dated to the first half of the fifteenth century but not in Fordun's *Chronica* might suggest a composition date between the 1370s, when the *Chronica* was finished, and before 1408, the approximate start date for the composition of the *Cronikyl*. The increased political agency of Macduff of Fife in the narrative can also be explained by this tentative date. Robert Stewart, younger son of Robert II and brother to Robert III, succeeded to the earldom of Fife in March 1372, making him the most prominent man in Scotland after his father and his brother.<sup>69</sup> Robert Stewart's spectacular rise in Scottish politics was aided by several turns as regent of Scotland for three kings, Robert II, Robert III and James I, and by his cunning political manoeuvres and connections with nobility, particularly the Douglasses. He was also made the head of the Law of Clan Macduff as the result of his tenure as earl of Fife.<sup>70</sup> The importance of Albany's rule in Scotland and his leadership as Earl of Fife would have been relevant to Wyntoun's audience. Thus, a Fife-centric source focused on the increased political agency of Macduff of Fife was possibly composed at a time where the earl of Fife, later the Duke of Albany, had an increased political agency and was, effectively, running Scotland as governor.

---

<sup>69</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 50-1; 56.

<sup>70</sup> *RPS*, 1384/11/12: "Preterea, in emendationem juris, dominus comes de Fyfe voluntarie et pro utilitate patrie cui preest tamquam capitalis legis de Clenm<sup>c</sup>duffe, concessit et promisit quod presens statutum et ordinationem servabit et servari faciet per omnia infra limites suas per tempus ordinatum, protestando pro libertate juris sui, videlicet, cum hoc gratis faciat et propter bonum commune ut predicatur, non cedat sibi nec dicte legi in prejudicium in futurum." ("In addition, in correction of the law, the lord earl of Fife, voluntarily and for the advantage of the country which he controls as head of the law of Clan MacDuff, granted and promised that he will protect the present statute and ordinance and cause it to be protected in all its respects within his limits through the term ordained, protesting for the freedom of his right, namely, since this was done freely and on account of the common good, as was said before, it should not turn out to his prejudice nor prejudice the said law in future.") See also Forte, "A Strange Archaic Provision of Mercy," 423; Alexander Grant, "Murder Will Out: Kingship, Kinship and Killing in Medieval Scotland," in *Kings, Lords and Men in Scotland and Britain, 1300-1625: Essays in Honour of Jenny Wormald*, ed. Stephen Boardman and Julian Goodare (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), 193-226, at 225-6.

### Sir John Wemyss and the creation of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*

Wyntoun's focus on Macduff of Fife as main political agent in the kingdom is attributable to the now-lost source examined in this chapter, yet Wyntoun's relationship with Sir John Wemyss, an adherent of the Duke of Albany, further suggests that the *Orygynale Cronikyl*'s portrayal of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative was inspired by Wemyss's political career. Wyntoun's prologue to the *Cronykil* provided the only acknowledgement of the relationship between chronicler and patron, a link that is worth examining in greater detail:

Suppose this treatise simpilly  
 I maid at the instance of a larde  
 That has my seruice in his warde  
 Schir Iohne of Wemys be rycht name  
 A worthy knyght and of gud fame  
 Albeid his lordschip be nocht like  
 To gretare lordis in the kinrik  
*He mon of neid be personer*  
 Off quhat kin[d] blame sa euer I beire  
 Syne throuch his bidding and counsaill  
 Off det I spent my travale.<sup>71</sup>

An examination of the language employed by Wyntoun to describe his patron might imply a closer relationship than anticipated. An example of the closeness between patron and chronicler can be found in Wyntoun's choice of vocabulary to describe Wemyss. The line "He mon of neid be personer": the Old Scots word "personer" usually translates as "portioner." However, the *Dictionary for the Scots Language* also suggests that this word can be translated as "participant," and it gives precisely this line from Wyntoun as example of this usage of "portioner."<sup>72</sup> The line is translated, thus, to "He must necessarily be participant," and the next line as "Of whatever kind of blame should I ever bear," refers to the responsibility for the contents of the *Cronikyl*

---

<sup>71</sup> Wyntoun, I: i, l. 54.

<sup>72</sup> "'Parsenere' (N.)," *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, accessed January 14, 2014, <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/parsenere> (item 2).

itself. The word “personer” played with the idea that Wemyss was a portioner “to gretare lordis in the kinrik” as well as a participant in the chronicle-making enterprise. The dual meaning of “personer” in this description of Sir John Wemyss recognized the laird’s involvement as patron and commissioner of the *Cronikyl* especially since it was through his “bidding and counsall” that Wyntoun wrote the work. There is reason to think that Wyntoun’s description of his patron was more than a literary trope. Wyntoun’s insistence that Wemyss was a knight of “gud fame,” although not of the rank of the greater lords of the kingdom might indicate that Wemyss’s good reputation stemmed from both his personal acts and his family’s reputation, both of which will be discussed in this chapter. By masking this description of Wemyss in the *Cronikyl* as a literary trope, Wyntoun gave due credit to his patron as the source of at least part of the information found in the text. Part of the information Wyntoun narrated about Malcolm Canmore appears to have been conditioned by Wemyss’s relationship to the Duke of Albany and the former’s involvement in several political events of the early fifteenth century.

### **The Albany-Rothesay conflict as a model for the Macbeth-Duncan conflict**

Sir John Wemyss’s involvement in the Albany-Rothesay conflict provides a more specific political context for understanding the *Cronikyl*’s depiction of the Macbeth-Duncan conflict. The struggle for power between uncles and nephews struck a chord with contemporary Scottish politics. The death of David Stewart, Duke of Rothesay, heir to the Scottish throne and Albany’s nephew, had considerable effects on the political landscape of Scotland in the first years of the fifteenth century.<sup>73</sup> Rothesay’s political power had increased significantly, marking the end of

---

<sup>73</sup> For the historiographical implications of Rothesay’s death, particularly the emergence of a cult around his tomb at Lindores Abbey, see Steve Boardman, “A Saintly Sinner? The ‘martyrdom’ of David, Duke of Rothesay,” in *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland*, Studies in Celtic History (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), 87–104.

Albany's guardianship of Scotland in 1398.<sup>74</sup> He besieged Sir John Wemyss's castle in Reres, possibly because the knight resisted Rothesay's attempts to occupy St Andrews Castle as Rothesay sought to ensure a new bishop of St Andrews was confirmed in late 1401.<sup>75</sup> The siege of Reres Castle coincided with the siege of St Andrews Castle and by late 1401, Wemyss had his lands taken from him.<sup>76</sup> Boardman noted that the siege of Reres Castle must have been approved by Albany,<sup>77</sup> but it is worth adding that the siege occurred in the same year Wemyss was combating Albany's refusal to acknowledge the sasine of his wife's lands. The siege of Reres could have been the result of Rothesay's attempts to ensure the confirmation of the bishop of St Andrews as well as an opportunity for Albany to use his nephew to chastise Wemyss for openly challenging his determination on Isabella Erskine's sasine. Sir William Fraser opined that Sir John must have committed some act of treason in reaction to Albany's behaviour, since there is a protection addressed to Alexander, earl of Buchan stating that Sir John submitted to the king and ordering the earl not to disturb the knight's possessions; Sir John had presumably lost his lands sometime before May 1402.<sup>78</sup> In either October or November 1401, Albany captured Rothesay and detained him at St Andrews Castle, where Wemyss was constable, and later transferred him to his castle at Falkland, where the young duke died in March 1402 under suspicious circumstances.<sup>79</sup> If Wemyss was still the constable of St Andrews Castle by the time Rothesay was imprisoned there by his uncle, then Rothesay would have been under the custody of Wemyss

---

<sup>74</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 206-7 (creation of ducal title of Rothesay), and 232 (for breakdown of Albany-Rothesay relations).

<sup>75</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 233.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, 233.

<sup>77</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 233.

<sup>78</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #44 (dated 24 May 1402), and for further discussion, see Fraser, *Wemyss*, I, 53.

<sup>79</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 194-7; 236. Boardman noted that if Rothesay was imprisoned at St Andrews Castle, he was possibly under the care of Sir John Wemyss (236). See also Boardman, "A saintly sinner," 87-104.

himself. This would make Wemyss a credible eyewitness to the illegal imprisonment, and any mistreatment, of the heir to Scotland's throne.

Boardman has further argued that Rothesay's capture was a response to the young duke's aggressive appropriation of revenue from the royal burghs, especially in Fife, of which his uncle Albany was earl.<sup>80</sup> In an unprecedented move, the Scottish Parliament ruled that Rothesay's death was the result of illness, not any wrongdoing by Albany, and between the 16th and 20th of May 1402, Albany and his associate, Archibald, earl of Douglas, were given a royal indemnity.<sup>81</sup> The Parliament's ruling does not imply that the nobility saw Rothesay's death as a mere accident; on the contrary, as Boardman has discussed, the terms of the indemnity suggest that the men were accused by their peers of killing the heir to the Scottish throne.<sup>82</sup>

The case is an example of how Albany pushed the limits of his power, affecting several men in the process.<sup>83</sup> One of the victims of his abuse of power was Sir John Wemyss himself. The relationship between the two men had deteriorated in the year 1400, when Wemyss's wife, Isabella Erskine, was declared as one of the heiresses to her parents' lands.<sup>84</sup> The Erskine sisters were retoured to their inherited lands on 26 May 1400.<sup>85</sup> Afterwards, both Sir John Glen, husband to Margaret Erskine, and Sir John Wemyss requested Albany to give the sasine of the lands to their respective wives, something that Albany refused on 6 June 1400 and later on the

---

<sup>80</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 232-6, at 234.

<sup>81</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 244.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Hunt, "Duke of Albany," 3-4; 46. Hunt mentioned that Albany attempted to exceed his power with his treatment of Wemyss and another knight, Sir John Ross of Hawkhead.

<sup>84</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: 37-45 and *Wemyss*, I, 51. Sir Alan Erskine died sometime in May 1400, and his wife sometime the year before. The Erskine sisters were immediately proclaimed as retoured heirs to their parents' estates.

<sup>85</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #27.

17th of that month and year.<sup>86</sup> Albany's response moved Wemyss and Glen to appeal the decision, and Sir John Erskine, chancellor of Glasgow and relative of the Erskine sisters, filed a protest against Albany's refusal.<sup>87</sup> Later, Wemyss and Glen were cited to Albany's court, and were given the reason for the refusal of the sasine: Albany claimed that Sir Robert Livingstone was in possession of a third of Wemyss. When both men refuted the claim, Albany requested that they supply the letters proving that Livingstone was not in possession of a third of Wemyss, a petition that both men refused since they claimed the court was held illegally.<sup>88</sup> Two reliefs of the lands of Wemyss were given to Sir Alan Erskine by Isabella, Countess of Fife on 28 December 1362, and on 14 January 1366-7, he received from Countess Isabella the ward and relief of the heirs of John Livingstone; it is from these gifts that the conflict over the sasine of the Erskine sisters originated.<sup>89</sup> The situation was exacerbated when Albany, at his council in Perth, accused Wemyss of illegally appropriating 1000 merks of revenue from the mails of Wemyss, an accusation that the knight refuted.<sup>90</sup> Ultimately, Albany's own council sided with Wemyss.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: # 29 and #30; *Wemyss*, I, 51-2.

<sup>87</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #31.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid. "...pro parte dicti domini ducis et comitis proponebat et dicebat, si prefati domini Johannes et Johannes de Wemys et de Glen aliqua munimenta, literas, uel instrumenta haberent monstranda, quare dominus Robertus de Levynston non erat tunc in possessione tercię partis terrarium de Wemys: Pro parte uero dominorum Johannis et Johannis de Wemys et de Glen dictorum, discretus vir, dominus Johannes de Erskyne, cancellarius Glasguensis, proponebat et isto modo respondebat quod, ad legitimum diem et locum, aliqua habebant ostendenda quod prefatus dominus Robertus non esset in possessione tercię partis terrarium de Wemys, set quia prefati domini Johannes et Johannes non erant legitime citati nec premuniti, nec eciam ibidem tunc non erat curia legitima, nullas euidentias penes hoc ostendebant, allegando quod, ad legitimum diem et curiam legitimam, habent aliqua ostendenda. Hiis dictis, prefatus dominus Johannes de Glen extra curiam recessit, dicens se nichil ibidem habuisse agendum."

<sup>89</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #9 and #10.

<sup>90</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss*, II: #34. Walter Stewart, Earl of Athol and Caithness, testified in a document in 1419 that Albany had convened a council illegally to accuse Wemyss of appropriating 1000 merks of revenue from the mails of Wemyss.

<sup>91</sup> Fraser, *Wemyss* II: #34.

Examining Wemyss's involvement in the Albany-Rothesay conflict helps contextualize Wyntoun's portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Cronikyl*, particularly his decreased political agency. As a result, Wyntoun placed a special emphasis on the relationship between nephews and uncles in the *Cronikyl*. While in the *Chronica*, Macbeth came from a family treacherous to the Canmore dynasty,<sup>92</sup> in Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*, Macbeth was King Duncan's own nephew:

bot þis Duncane to dede wes done  
Throu Fynlaw Makbeth *his sister sone*  
That *slew his eme* [uncle] in till Elgyne  
And falsly held his kinrik [kingdom] syne<sup>93</sup>

Duncan's murder by his own nephew took on a different dimension in Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*: it not only signaled usurpation and treachery, but also internal dynastic strife. The antagonistic dynamic between uncles and nephews was not restricted to Duncan's murder, as Wyntoun later portrayed Donald Bàn as killing his nephew Duncan II and banishing his three nephews, Edgar, Alexander and David.<sup>94</sup> Twelfth-century sources do acknowledge that the conflict between Donald Bàn and Duncan II occurred, that it destabilized the kingdom, and that both men were related in such fashion. Duncan II's portrayal as illegitimate and Donald Bàn's portrayal as usurper first began in the thirteenth century as a way to provide a "tighter dynastic structure" to Malcolm and Margaret's line.<sup>95</sup> By discussing the conflict between Duncan II and his uncle

---

<sup>92</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlv, 180. For a discussion of the MacHeth and the MacWilliam families, which claimed descent from King Lulach and from Duncan II respectively, see McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 61-123, at 62-4 (for MacWilliams) and 75-9 (for MacHeths). The identity of Malcolm MacHeth has been debated in modern historiography: he has been identified with an illegitimate son of Alexander I and a descendant of King Lulach, Macbeth's stepson, heir to the Cenél Loairn dynasty of Moray. McDonald, following Alexander Grant's argument, identifies Malcolm MacHeth as one person and that Aed, from whom he presumably is descended, was a member of Malcolm III's kindred. Malcolm MacHeth is usually associated with the earldom of Ross in the twelfth century.

<sup>93</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii. 1687-90 (my emphasis).

<sup>94</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxxiv, ll. 383-404.

<sup>95</sup> Broun, *Irish Identity*, 196.



Donald Bàn, Wyntoun provided his account of King Duncan's murder by Macbeth with a sense of historical accuracy and legitimacy, a distinctive aspect of late medieval Scottish chronicles.<sup>96</sup> Wyntoun's inclusion of treacherous and murderous uncles and nephews in the *Cronikyl* is reminiscent of Albany's involvement in the death of his nephew Rothesay in 1402. Wyntoun's decision to portray Duncan's murder as an act of treachery by his own nephew could reflect his view, and his patron's, of the Albany-Rothesay conflict. Wyntoun's account of how Macbeth killed Duncan and usurped the kingdom effectively masked Wyntoun's criticism of Albany's actions against Rothesay, representing the voice of the political community that accused Albany of murdering his nephew.

Parallelisms between Sir John Wemyss's political career and Wyntoun's account of Malcolm's rise to the throne can also be found in the *Cronikyl*'s account of the conflict between Macduff and Macbeth. In Fordun's account, Macduff was already labouring to help Malcolm recover the throne and it was Macduff's machinations that resulted in him being denounced as a traitor before Macbeth. Macbeth, already suspicious of Macduff's loyalty, riled up the thane, "[...] and then added plainly that he should stoop his neck under the yoke, as that of an ox in a wain; and he swore it should be so before long."<sup>97</sup> Macduff, terrified for his life, escaped Macbeth's court and arrived in England on a small vessel, where Malcolm received him "on account of the support he had given him."<sup>98</sup> Once Macduff arrived in England, he requested an audience with Malcolm where he "urged him to return, warmly exhorting him to betake himself to the government of the kingdom, a consummation too long delayed through his [Macduff's] own sloth, and no one else's."<sup>99</sup> Macduff said to Malcolm that he had been delayed in searching

---

<sup>96</sup> Wingfield, *Trojan Legend*.

<sup>97</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlvi, 182.

<sup>98</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, IV: xlvi, 182.

<sup>99</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: i, 184.

for him in England because he was collecting pledges of loyalty from other nobles. Then Malcolm sent Macduff back to Scotland with a message to his nobles, while he presented himself to Saint Edward the Confessor's court to request aid from the king in recovering his kingdom.<sup>100</sup> Macduff never engaged directly with Saint Edward.

But Wyntoun told a different story. After Macbeth gathered materials and oxen from Fife and Angus to build a "haus of fenss" in Dunsinane, he scolded Macduff because his oxen failed to perform in the field:

Than spak Makbeth dispitously  
 And said to þe thayne angrely  
 As he were wrythin in his will  
*Me think, he said, it were nocht ill*  
*To put þin awne nek in zone zoke*  
 For þi stottis to draw zone stok  
 To þov and all þin were wraith  
 A blasé I set nocht by zow baith<sup>101</sup>

Like in Fordun, Wyntoun's Macbeth uses the ox metaphor to insult Macduff, but as a result of the failure of Macduff's oxen to work in the field, not because of his machinations against Macbeth. Here, Macduff's conflict with Macbeth over the failing of the oxen is reminiscent of Wemyss's conflict with Albany in the first decades of the fifteenth century. In the *Cronikyl*, Macduff also left Macbeth's court for England on a small vessel, arriving directly at Saint Edward's court in England before meeting Malcolm. Saint Edward received him "And quhen he had salust þe king/ He tald þe causs of his cummyng/And þe king herd him soberly/ And ansuered him full gudly."<sup>102</sup> Macduff's reputation in the *Cronikyl*, in both England and Scotland, contrasted with Macduff's reputation in Fordun's account. Macduff negotiated Malcolm's release from England with Saint Edward directly, but in the *Chronica* it was Malcolm who negotiated

<sup>100</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: vii, 191-2.

<sup>101</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 2017-24. (my emphasis)

<sup>102</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 2133-6.

with Saint Edward. The changes that Wyntoun made to Macduff's role in the *Cronykil* are better explained when we compare this passage with Wemyss's role in helping return James I to Scotland.

In May 1412 and April 1413 Wemyss and other companions were given safe passage into England to conduct negotiations for James I's ransom.<sup>103</sup> Later, on December 13, 1423, Wemyss was one of the men given safe conducts to meet with James at Durham.<sup>104</sup> James I spent a total of eighteen years in captivity and had to see his cousin Murdoch, Albany's son, liberated before the Scots achieved an agreement with the English over his ransom. Like Henry IV did with James I, Saint Edward "*tretit the barnis* [Malcolm and his two brothers] *honorably*"<sup>105</sup> while they were living in the English court. The parallels between Malcolm Canmore and James I do not stop there. Like Wyntoun's Malcolm, James I's royal authority was greatly diminished as he was closely monitored by Henry IV and V from 1406. When war between England and France was imminent in the early fifteenth century, Henry V had James issue letters to the Scottish nobles asking them to join him against France. But the Scottish nobles refused to serve James while he was in English captivity.<sup>106</sup> The Scots' reply to James's request was an example of James's

---

<sup>103</sup> "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: May 1412 | British History Online," accessed January 14, 2018, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol8/pp733-745>, at "Pro quibusdam de Scotia," (May 15 1412); and "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: April 1413 | British History Online," accessed January 14, 2018, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol9/pp2-6>, at "De Tractando super Liberatione Regis Scotiae." In 1412, the Scotsmen given passage to England were: Walter, bishop of Brechin; William lord Graham; Alexander Ogilvy, earl of Angus; Master Robert de Lany; and Sir John Wemyss. In 1413, the bishop of Brechin, William lord Graham, Alexander Ogilvy and Sir John Wemyss returned to England for the liberation of James I, but the following men were also given safe conducts: David Benigne, abbot of Melrose, William Douglas of Drumlangrig, John Sinclair, Robert Erskine, Patrick Dunbar, Alexander Haliburton; James Douglas, brother of the Earl of Douglas; John lord of Montgomery and William Wallace.

<sup>104</sup> "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: July-December 1423 | British History Online," BHO, accessed January 14, 2018, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol10/pp294-316>. at "Pro Scotis."

<sup>105</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, l. 2129.

<sup>106</sup> Hunt, "First Duke of Albany," 31-2; Brown, *James I*, 18.

political impotence, an impotence that was shared by Malcolm Canmore in the *Cronikyl*. By making Macduff responsible for negotiating Malcolm's return to Scotland, Wyntoun replicated Wemyss's role in negotiating the release and return of James I to Scotland at a time where the Scottish regent was suspected of murdering the heir to the throne and the rightful king was politically constrained by his captivity. After Macduff first spoke with Edward, the king of England instructed the thane of Fife to avenge Macbeth's tyranny and usurpation by recovering Malcolm's rightful inheritance.<sup>107</sup> Macduff, not Malcolm, was placed in charge of avenging Duncan's death, which is a striking departure from Fordun's *Chronica*. The reason why Macduff chose Malcolm as heir over Duncan's other two legitimate sons was because "Bot schortly be lauchfull breþer twa [two brothers]/Forsuke to pass for gret perile."<sup>108</sup> Malcolm's brothers' response left Macduff with no other choice but to resort to Malcolm, an illegitimate son, as candidate for the Scottish kingship:

Than Makduf counsalit rycht thraly  
 Malcome the thrid broþer [brother] þaim by  
 Set he wes nocht of lauchfull bed  
 As ze before þis has hed red  
 To pass with him sen þai forsuke  
 To follow þar rycht and vndertuke  
 That *he suld mak him of Scotland king*<sup>109</sup>

Here, Wyntoun used the illegitimate birth of a Scottish prince to portray Macduff of Fife as a kingmaker, turning the historical role of the earls of Fife as heads of the king's enthronement ceremony into one of choosing the Scottish monarch themselves. The line, taken from the anonymous source that Bower later included in his *Scotichronicon*, stressed the importance of the earl of Fife in choosing and crowning kings of Scots; such ideas would have appealed to an

<sup>107</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 2141-50.

<sup>108</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 275-6.

<sup>109</sup> Wyntoun VI: cxviii, ll. 2157-2163.

audience familiar with the role of the Duke of Albany not only as Earl of Fife but as Lieutenant and later Governor of the kingdom. Moreover, it signaled Wyntoun's familiarity with contemporary political theory that stressed the nobles' duty in regulating royal (and regent) power.<sup>110</sup> This line explains better why Malcolm was portrayed as illegitimate: it enhanced Macduff's role as representative of the political community of Scotland and as kingmaker.

Yet the line concerning portraying Macduff as a kingmaker is only found in the Wemyss MS. The Cotton MS reads:

Malcolm, þe thrīde, to say schortly,  
 Makduff counsalit richt thrāly,  
 Set he was noucht of lauchful bede,  
 As in þis buk zhe [ye] haf herde rede;  
 Makduff hym tretit neurþeles  
*To be of stark hart and stoutnes,*  
 And namly to tak on hande  
 To bere þe crowne þan of Scotlande;  
 And bad hym þar of haf na dreide;  
*For kynge he sulde be made in deide.*<sup>111</sup>

The passage in the Cotton MS does not focus as much on Macduff's role as a kingmaker.

Instead, the passage cites Malcolm's "stark hart and stoutnes" as the qualities that merited him the crown. A "stark hart" referred to Malcolm's strength and courage, especially in battle; while "stoutnes" referred to his bravery;<sup>112</sup> both qualities evidenced Malcolm's martial prowess and chivalric virtues. The Wemyss MS, with its lack of comment on Malcolm's qualities, showed how the only reason Malcolm would become king was because Macduff decided it so. But this provides little reason as to why Macduff's decision to choose Malcolm as king was arrived at; instead, it attributed Macduff's choice of Malcolm as king to a lack of better choices, since

<sup>110</sup> Mason, "Kingship, Counsel and Consent," 265-6.

<sup>111</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xviii, ll. 2105-14, p. 291 (Cotton MS).

<sup>112</sup> *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, "Stark, adj." [http://www.dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/stark\\_adj\\_adv](http://www.dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/stark_adj_adv); and "Stoutness," <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/stoutnes>

Malcolm's legitimate brothers declined the crown. This passage is followed by the "advice to princes" passage where Malcolm tested Macduff's loyalty by feigning a lack of morality. The Wemyss MS did not alert to the reader that Malcolm was trying to test Macduff here, so when the two passages were read consecutively, it was not until the end of the advice-to-princes passage that Malcolm's true motives were revealed. This could make the reader question whether Macduff knew anything about Malcolm's character before deciding to make him king: if Malcolm was truly lecherous, greedy and false, Macduff's choice of king was certainly questionable. However, the Cotton MS solved this issue by providing a context for Macduff's choice: Malcolm's brothers did refuse to become kings, but Malcolm was also of "stark hart and stoutnes," which Macduff knew about beforehand. Additionally, the line allowed the reader to suspect that Malcolm's insistence on his poor qualities was merely a ruse to test Macduff's loyalties, just as Fordun had suggested in this passage in the *Chronica*. The differences in this passage in both manuscript copies suggest that the Wemyss MS was an earlier recension, written closer to the events of 1412-13 when Sir John was given safe conducts to England to help negotiate James's release, since it reflected a desire to showcase Macduff's kingmaking and king-choosing role. The revisions to this passage in the Cotton MS reflected a desire to construct Malcolm as a man who, despite his illegitimacy, had the chivalric qualities that ensured his competency as king. It also provided a more specific context for Macduff's choice of Malcolm as king. The representation of Malcolm as having qualities that merited kingship complemented the *Cronikyl*'s assertion that the lack of these qualities resulted in tyranny. This passage mostly represented the editorial changes made in the *Cronikyl* to enhance the narrative, eliminating any possibility of questioning Macduff's decision. In both manuscripts, Macduff's political agency

contributed significantly to the notion that the nobility decided who was the best candidate for kingship.

Wyntoun replicated the dialogue between Macduff and Malcolm found in Fordun, where Malcolm tests Macduff's loyalty by lying to the thane. This dialogue, included in William Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1606-7), exemplified the continental tradition of "advice for princes" literature. Sally Mapstone has argued that in the case of *Macbeth*, it was the prince (Malcolm) who advises the noble (Macduff) not to make him king due to his lack of morality.<sup>113</sup> In this passage, though, it was Malcolm who tested Macduff for traces of "falsheid."<sup>114</sup> In a rare show of agency before becoming king, Wyntoun's Malcolm wanted to ensure that he could trust the political community that wanted to make him king. With this dialogue exchange between prince and noble, Wyntoun emphasized contemporary political notions that deemed the contractual and reciprocal nature of Scottish kingship as one that depended on the prince's kingly qualities and on the nobles' good judgment in their choice. Macduff's heroic efforts to oppose tyranny and his choice of a qualified king for Scotland paralleled Wemyss's involvement in the return of James I to Scotland from captivity.

What is more telling about Wyntoun's portrayal of Macduff and Malcolm in this respect is that Sir John was not the only knight of Wemyss to have held a similar role. A close examination of the service provided by the knights of Wemyss to the kings of Scots highlights a longer tradition of ambassadorial services that went back to at least the thirteenth century. Sir John's uncle, Sir David Wemyss, had been one of the knights that helped negotiate David II's

---

<sup>113</sup> Sally Mapstone, "Shakespeare and Scottish Kingship: A Case History," in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1998), 158–83.

<sup>114</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, l. 2240, p. 296.

ransom after the Battle of Neville's Cross in 1346. Sir David gave his son, another David Wemyss, as hostage in exchange for the king's release. Earlier, on 19 June, 1296, Sir Michael of Wemyss promised to serve Edward I of England.<sup>115</sup> Later on 28 August of the same year, he submitted to King Edward.<sup>116</sup> In March 1304, Sir Michael hosted King Edward at his castle in Wemyss,<sup>117</sup> but by 1306 Wemyss had changed allegiance from Edward to Robert Bruce, which prompted Edward to burn Wemyss's castle to the ground. Sir Michael's involvement in the First War of Independence and his connections to the king of England and leading English lords would have been well known by his descendants in the fifteenth century. Wyntoun seems to have known this, and he documented other important historical events in which the knights of Wemyss were involved.

Book VIII of the *Cronykil* mentioned that David Wemyss and Michael Scot of Balwearie were the two knights that brought Margaret Maid of Norway to Scotland in 1290.<sup>118</sup> The association between a knight of Wemyss and the return of Margaret Maid of Norway was first made in the *Gesta Annalia* I, where the chronicler wrote that it was Michael Wemyss and Michael Scot who were sent to Norway because they were "distinguished by their knowledge and their character."<sup>119</sup> While there is no historical source, apart from these chronicles, that a knight of Wemyss was sent as ambassador to Norway in 1290, Sir David and Sir Michael Wemyss, along with Sir Michael Scot, were witnesses to a quitclaim for the mill of Tarvit (1300

---

<sup>115</sup> Amanda G. Beam et al., "The People of Medieval Scotland, 1093 – 1314," PoMS, 2012, <http://db.poms.ac.uk/record/factoid/69301/>. #69301: "Michael of Wemyss annuls and renounces any alliances made with the king of the French and performs fealty to the king of England,"

<sup>116</sup> PoMS 79235, <http://db.poms.ac.uk/record/factoid/79235/#>

<sup>117</sup> RPS, A1304/1 Letter from King Edward to Sir Nicholas de la Hay, sent from Wemyss and dated 5 March 1304.

<sup>118</sup> Wyntoun, VIII, ll. 83-92.

<sup>119</sup> GAI, lxix, 306.



x 1306).<sup>120</sup> This confirms at least, that the Wemyss knights and Sir Michael Scot of Balwearie knew each other personally. According to Wyntoun, Sir Michael and Sir David Wemyss, Sir John's uncle, took part in the siege of Loch Leven Castle in 1335.<sup>121</sup> David II gave Sir David Wemyss some of the lands resigned by Duncan IV Earl of Fife, lands that Sir John inherited.<sup>122</sup> Sir John's involvement in the return of James I to Scotland was not an isolated incident: it was one that had a precedent in the history of the Wemyss knights' service to the crown. Portraying Macduff in an ambassadorial role while reducing Malcolm's agency further tied Wemyss's experience to the content of the chronicle he commissioned.

Fordun's account of Macbeth's death served to counter English notions that it was Earl Siward, not Malcolm Canmore, who killed Macbeth and placed the young Scottish prince on the throne:

Earl Siward, Earl of Northumbria, at King Edward's command, engaged Machabeus [Macbeth], king of the Scots, despoiled him of his life and his kingdom and then set up Malcolm, the son of the king of Cumbria, as king. This is how *William* [of Malmesbury], ascribing none of the praise for the victory in the battle to Malcolm, assigned it all to Siward; while the truth is, that the victory was entirely owing to the former [Malcolm] alone, with his men and his standard-bearer.<sup>123</sup>

Fordun used Macbeth's death to discredit the English notion that Malcolm was made king of Scots by English intervention alone. This is not surprising, since Fordun responded to the strong anti-English sentiment found in Scotland in the late fourteenth century. Thus, the threat to Scotland's sovereignty as a kingdom and the overall anti-English climate in Scotland warranted such a response.

---

<sup>120</sup> *PoMS* 75115, <http://db.poms.ac.uk/record/factoid/75115/#>

<sup>121</sup> Wyntoun, VIII, xxvii, ll. 4150-8.

<sup>122</sup> Penman, *David II*, 111.

<sup>123</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), V: vii, 192.

But Wyntoun changed this account of Macbeth's death. With the blessing and help of Saint Edward, Macduff and Malcolm went into Birnam Wood with a host of soldiers who used branches to disguise themselves as they came upon Dunsinane Hill. Macbeth, aware of the situation, fled to Lumphanan where Macduff chased him:

Bot zit [yet] a knycht in to þat chase  
 Followit Makbeth and nerrest wes  
 Makbeth turnyt till him agane  
 And said: Lurdane þov prekis in vane  
 For þov art nocht he, as I trow,  
 That to þe dede sall put me now  
 That man wes zit [yet] neuer borne of wif  
 Off powere to reif [strip] me my lif  
 The knycht þan [then] ansuerd him agane  
 And said: I wait þov [thou] spekis certane  
 For I wes neuer of woman borne  
 Off my moder for I wes schorne [cut]  
 Now sall þi tressoune heire tak end  
 For to þi fader I sall þe send  
 That is þe deuill for he þe gat  
 The knycht wiþ suerd him slew wiþ þat<sup>124</sup>

By transferring the responsibility of Macbeth's murder from Malcolm to Macduff's knight, Wyntoun further eliminated Malcolm's political agency and his capacity to win the throne of Scotland by his own accord. Fordun's account placed Malcolm as Macbeth's killer to contradict William of Malmesbury's view that Malcolm held his crown from the king of England.<sup>125</sup> Wyntoun eliminated the participation of both Earl Siward and Malcolm Canmore in the killing of Macbeth, making the matter of choosing and making kings of Scots reside in the actions of the Scottish landed elite, in this case, of Macduff's knight. The *Cronikyl* then used Macbeth's death to comment on ideas of sovereignty as derived from the "community of the

<sup>124</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 2293-2308.

<sup>125</sup> Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), V: vii, p. 192.

realm,” not from the king himself, and that Scottish kingship in the late medieval period was of a contractual nature.

### **Malcolm Canmore, Illegitimacy, and Politics in the *Orygynale Cronikyl***

Malcolm Canmore’s illegitimate origin is one of the most prominent features of Wyntoun’s *Cronikyl*. The reader first encounters Malcolm as the illegitimate first-born of King Duncan and the miller of Forteviot’s daughter in chapter 17:

This myllare had a dochter faire  
 That maid to be king þat nycht repaire  
 And till hir fadir displesit it nocht  
 To be relevit þar throu he thoct  
 Off be king baith he and scho  
 His will be better wes þar to  
 Sa scho baire him a presand  
 That scho wist wes till him plesand  
 And he resaut it curtasly  
 Hir and hir presand thankfully  
 And chesit þare þat faire woman  
 To be fra þin his luffit lemman.<sup>126</sup>

King Duncan’s decision to part from his company after a day of hunting was a theme common to chivalric romances, yet his decision to “chesit þare þat faire woman [the miller’s daughter]” to make her his mistress was crucial to the development of Malcolm Canmore’s illegitimacy.<sup>127</sup>

What began as a casual sexual encounter culminated as a legitimate love affair between King Duncan and the miller’s daughter when he made her his mistress as he “wald haif put till hycht/ to gret stait and to meikle mycht,” giving her lands “in heritage.”<sup>128</sup> The inspiration for Wyntoun’s portrayal of Malcolm Canmore’s illegitimacy possibly stemmed from the particular political circumstances of the period in which he was writing.

<sup>126</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxvi, ll. 1653-1664.

<sup>127</sup> For hunting in medieval romances, see Purdie, “Rherotic and the Re-Shaping of History.”

<sup>128</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxvi, ll. 1671-2; 1697.

In the twelfth century, canon law dictated the requirements for a legitimate marriage; therefore the Church determined children's legitimacy.<sup>129</sup> The first distinction the Church made was between natural and spurious offspring: natural offspring were the result of a long-standing relationship between a man and a woman that were not in a regular marriage, while spurious offspring were the result of non-committed sexual liaisons.<sup>130</sup> Canon law limited marriage to within the permitted degrees of consanguinity, complicating marital prospects for Scottish couples in the medieval period. Many of these couples, if they were from the landed elite, would live together and reproduce first, and then they would solicit the Church for a dispensation to legitimize their offspring.<sup>131</sup> This was the case with Robert II of Scotland (r. 1372-1398) and his queen, Elizabeth Mure, whose children were the result of an irregular marriage. Robert and Elizabeth's marriage in 1336 was unrecognized by canon law because both parties were within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity. Robert requested a dispensation from Pope Clement VI and re-married Elizabeth in 1349.<sup>132</sup> The dispensation legitimized Robert II's sons: John Earl of Carrick (later Robert III), Robert Earl of Fife (later Duke of Albany), Walter lord of Fife (d. 1362), and Alexander Earl of Buchan. Thus, a natural-born son was the product of a very specific type of consensual relationship: it had to be long-standing and function as a marriage, though it was not sanctioned by the Church. It may be that Wyntoun's depiction of Robert II and Clement VI as cousins and as descended from the miller of Forteviot alludes to the approval of the marriage dispensation in 1349: this is the only historical relationship between both men. Natural

---

<sup>129</sup> Susan Marshall, "Illegitimacy in Medieval Scotland" (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2013), 11.

<sup>130</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 17-8.

<sup>131</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 17.

<sup>132</sup> Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings*, 8 and 19-20. According to Boardman, David II's proposal to have John of Gaunt proclaimed as his heir to the Scottish throne would clearly bypass Robert Stewart's sons with Elizabeth Mure as heirs. Robert, then, had an incentive to seek papal approval of his marriage to Mure.

sons could be legitimized by the Church with relative ease, and could inherit from their fathers.<sup>133</sup>

By the late fourteenth century, Robert II's oldest son, John Earl of Carrick, ascended the Scottish throne as Robert III.<sup>134</sup> Celtic custom did not bar illegitimate children from inheriting lands because of their kin-based social organization; furthermore, Irish and Scandinavian marital and royal customs did not prohibit inheritance by illegitimate offspring and Scottish politics were much influenced by both countries in this respect.<sup>135</sup> Such children could only inherit lands, however, if the father designated them as heirs from their conquest lands (i.e. lands acquired by a person during their lifetime), not their inherited or ancestral lands.<sup>136</sup> Thus, the lands King Duncan gave the miller's daughter "in heritage" were presumably conquest lands. Malcolm's younger but legitimate brothers would have inherited Duncan's kingdom.<sup>137</sup> Though the Wemyss MS provided the same description of the passage above as found in the other manuscripts of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*, one of the later lines refers to the miller's daughter as "woman": "Thus quhen þis king Duncane wes deid/This *woman* wes ryght will of reid."<sup>138</sup> The same passage in the Cotton MS reads, "Thus þis kynge Duncan dede/His *le(m)man* was wil of

---

<sup>133</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 17.

<sup>134</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 5.

<sup>135</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 14-5; 8; Alexander Grant, "Royal and Magnate Bastards in the Later Middle Ages: A View from Scotland," in *La bâtardise et l'exercice du pouvoir en Europe du XIIIe au début du XVIe siècle*, edited by É. Bousmar, A. Marchandisse, C. Masson and B. Schnerb, 313-68. *Revue du Nord*, hors-série, Collection Histoire, vol. 31. (Bruxelles: Publications des Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis, 2015), 313-68, at 319.

<sup>136</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 48.

<sup>137</sup> In Book VII: II, ll. 179-88 (Cotton MS), Wyntoun explained how William Bastard divided his assets between his sons: "Þis William Bastarde, þat tyme kynge/ þus ordanyt þir thre þar liffinge:/ Till Robert Curthois hallely/ þe duche he gaf of Normandy;/ For he was eldast in linage, /He gaf him þat was heritage. /Til William Rede he gaf Inglande,/ þar in yo b kings regnande;/ For he his son was myddillest,/ He gaf him þar for his conquest." In this case, all of William's sons were legitimate but according to Norman inheritance rules, the oldest son (Robert Curthose) received the ancestral lands, while the younger son (William Rufus) received the conquest lands.

<sup>138</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxvi, ll. 1691-2.

gud red.”<sup>139</sup> It is possible that the original passage was as it is found in the Wemyss MS but that the chronicler or the scribe changed the word “woman” to read “lemman” as a way of specifying the type of relationship between the king and his mistress at the time of his death. Wyntoun’s decision to cast Malcolm’s mother as King Duncan’s “lemman” reflected on irregular marriages involving the Scottish nobility, as was the case of Robert II and his children. King Robert’s long-standing relationship with Elizabeth Mure, and his status as king, made it easier for him to legitimize his marriage later on. In Chapter 17, Malcolm was a natural son of King Duncan because the miller’s daughter was portrayed as the king’s long-standing mistress. Malcolm, therefore, could easily be legitimized if the king needed to so do.

Wyntoun’s *Cronikyl* was written in a period when illegitimate sons inherited some important royal and noble offices in Scotland and by the fifteenth century, the Stewart dynasty implemented secular law and arbitration, where illegitimacy cases were concerned.<sup>140</sup> Alexander Grant has recently argued that the amount of illegitimate men of royal and magnate stock that occupied important positions in Scotland was considerable during the last quarter of the fourteenth century and first quarter of the fifteenth. According to Grant, Robert III, the Duke of Albany, and Alexander “The Wolf of Badenoch” were “the most significant bastards in Scottish history.”<sup>141</sup> Malcolm Canmore’s inheritance of the Scottish throne would not have been scandalous by fifteenth-century Scottish political and legal standards. Casting Malcolm as illegitimate reflects the disproportionate number of illegitimate sons occupying important political positions in Scotland at the beginning of the fifteenth century when Wyntoun was

---

<sup>139</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xvi, ll. 1651-2.

<sup>140</sup> Marshall, “Illegitimacy,” 50, fn. 191 (for Stewarts’ preference for secular law) and 58.

<sup>141</sup> Grant, “Royal and Magnate Bastards,” 323.

writing.<sup>142</sup> Yet Robert II's sons, Robert III and the Duke of Albany, were not the only notable Scottish nobles born illegitimate. Archibald "the Grim" Douglas, illegitimate son of Good Sir James Douglas, was favoured as third Earl of Douglas by Albany, and as Rhiannon Purdie has observed, this could have influenced how Macduff vouched for Malcolm's claim to the Scottish throne.<sup>143</sup>

In the *Cronikyl*, Wyntoun specified that "... as we fynd in his [Macbeth's] storyis/That he wes gottin on selcouth wiss": Macbeth was the son of Duncan's sister and the devil disguised as a handsome man.<sup>144</sup> Additionally, Macbeth "Syne wiþ his awne emys [uncle's] wif/ He lay, and with hir led his life/ And held hir baith his wif and queen."<sup>145</sup> Macbeth's descent from the devil made his moral corruption and incest believable. Wyntoun's portrayal of Macbeth as a spurious son, whose conduct reflects his parents' sins, was symptomatic of contemporary notions about illegitimacy, where natural children (such as Malcolm) could be legitimized with a dispensation, but spurious children (such as Macbeth and William Bastard) could not. It is not surprising, then, that the son of the Devil, who rose to "gret stait and to hicht"<sup>146</sup> did so through murder and

---

<sup>142</sup> Purdie, "Rhetoric and Re-Shaping of History," 58; Grant, "Royal and Magnate Bastards," 325-345; Alexander Grant, "Extinction of Direct Male Lines Among the Scottish Noble Families in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," in *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland*, ed. Keith J. Stringer (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985), 210-24. Purdie noted that "illegitimacy remained a significant obstacle in claiming an inheritance" (p. 52), but Grant's research showed how Scottish families were overall more successful than their English and continental counterparts in producing direct male heirs. Since Grant included illegitimate sons as direct heirs of Scottish nobles and gentry (though he does not specify the proportion of illegitimate sons that were made heirs), it is possible that illegitimacy would not have been such a hindrance to inheritance at least in fifteenth-century Scotland. The large proportion of direct male lines that died out during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Europe might be a reason why illegitimate sons inherited their father's lands in this period.

<sup>143</sup> Purdie, "Rhetoric and Re-Shaping of History," 58.

<sup>144</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, l. 1957.

<sup>145</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 1917-20.

<sup>146</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, l. 1957 (Wemyss MS). Alexander Grant has discussed how illegitimate children were seen as "kin-less," and of "corrupt stock" after the Gregorian reforms of marriage. Tracts such as the *Regiam Majestatem*, for example, stress the sinful conception of illegitimate men. However, while in theory the succession by bastards was forbidden, in practice, as shown elsewhere in this chapter, bastards

usurpation. Macbeth carried the sins of his father, confirming religious notions that the manner of conception determined the character and morality of a man.<sup>147</sup>

Portraying a king or a people as descended from the devil himself was not a common feature of medieval chronicles, but there are a few examples of this practice stemming from Scotland in the late medieval period. In the mid-fifteenth century *Scottis Originale*, Henry II of England was descended from the devil, which in the eyes of the chronicler, made him a tyrant.<sup>148</sup> By portraying the English king as descending from the Devil, the author of the *Scottis Originale* countered ideas of the nobility of the English past by deploying genealogy against England's constant claims of overlordship. The *Scottis Originale*'s purpose was to present the "uninterrupted independence and freedom of the Scots,"<sup>149</sup> and representing an English king as descended from the devil minimised his claims to the kingship and also explained his tyranny. It also represented King Arthur as the spurious son of King Uther and Igerne, and unworthy of the throne of Britain.<sup>150</sup> Similarly, the anonymous author of a sonnet titled *Ane anser to ane Ingliss railer praysing his awin genalogy* deflated English claims of Scottish overlordship by suggesting

---

could enjoy prominent careers in late medieval Scotland. See Grant, "Royal and Magnate Bastards," 313-316.

<sup>147</sup> Marshall, "Illegitimacy," 26-7.

<sup>148</sup> Dan Embree, Edward Donald Kennedy, and Kathleen Daly, eds., "The Scottish Originale," in *Short Scottish Prose Chronicles*, Medieval Chronicles 5 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), 111-36, at 131, fo. 303v (ll. 214-220) and fo. 98r (ll. 206-214, quoted): "And now þe Romanis has tane þar name & falsnes togidder. And euery man wndersud genologi of Ynglismen, þar suld few wonder of þam. Suppos þai be werray fals, and þar caus quhy: *þar king is cummyne dovn lyne be lyne fra þe Devill*, as þar awne cronikle callit Policornica propotis and beris witness of Henry þe Secund that slew Sanct Thomas of Canterbury, þat was þe emprys son, the quhilk emprice was weddit with þe Erll of Angeos, and he gat apon hir *þis Henry þe Tyrand, the quhilk was second fra þe Devill carnate*, as þar awne ald writ beris witness" (my emphasis).

<sup>149</sup> Introduction, in *Prose Chronicles*, 24.

<sup>150</sup> "The Scottis Originale," 123, fo.21r (first third of page): "The quhilk *Arthur was gottyn on ane other mannis wyf* be the Duk of Cornwell, Vter. And sa was Arthur, *spurrius & a huris sone*, sauf reverence, maid a king, and Mordrede, the sone of Loth of Louthiane, þar was rychtwys aire, for he was Scottis, was putt by [agayne] his rycht" (my emphasis).



that Brutus, the ancient ancestor from whom the English claimed descent, was descended from the Devil himself.<sup>151</sup> While both examples above date from after the composition of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*, between the 1460s and 1490s specifically,<sup>152</sup> they illuminate how descent was crucial in understanding the characteristics and virtues of a given king. Spurious children, such as Macbeth and Henry II of England, would exhibit the sins of their parents in their personalities and behaviour. Macbeth's descent from the Devil explained his immoral and tyrannical behaviour.

William the Conqueror is referred to as "William Bastard" in the *Cronikyl*. He is also referred to as such in the *Chronicle of Melrose* and this is most likely the origin of William's epithet in the *Cronikyl*.<sup>153</sup> Wyntoun's insistence that William was a bastard reflected his questionable character, that like Macbeth, later alienated the nobles that helped him attain the throne. According to the Wemyss MS, it was "through the favour of þe Scottis men" that William became king, but in the Cotton MS, this line reads "Withe the fauour of þe statis haille," a less scandalous attribution.<sup>154</sup> In Chapter 20 of the Wemyss MS, Wyntoun wrote that William came from Normandy after learning King Harald, "Off Denmark's be nacioun/Off traytouris generacioun" had usurped the English crown.<sup>155</sup> William was of "lauchfull and be lele lynnage,"<sup>156</sup> contradicting his portrayal as a bastard but constructing him as an acceptable monarch. William was welcomed as king until he lost his mind and with "outrageousse

---

<sup>151</sup> Katherine H. Terrell, "'Lynealy Discendit of þe Devill': Genealogy, Textuality, and Anglophobia in Medieval Scottish Chronicles," *Studies in Philology* 108, no. 3 (2011): 320–44, <https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2011.0013>.

<sup>152</sup> "Introduction," *Prose Chronicles*, 45.

<sup>153</sup> MS Cotton faustina B. IX, fo. 13v, 1051 AD: "Rex edwardus Willelmum comitem bastard Normannie ad se in anglia uenientem magno cum honore suscepit."

<sup>154</sup> Wyntoun VI: cxxiii, l. 111 (Wemyss); and VII: ii, l. 115 (Cotton).

<sup>155</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxx, ll. 2505–6.

<sup>156</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxx, l. 2520.

extorcionys” stole the lands and riches of the barons of England.<sup>157</sup> This is similar to the praise Wyntoun gave to Macbeth, who while he was born out of wedlock and was son of the Devil, was not initially a bad king.

Why did the *Cronikyl* give so much weight to specifying the type of illegitimate son Malcolm and Macbeth were? Wyntoun’s view of illegitimacy as a hindrance to kingship claims was rather nuanced. For in the early fifteenth century, illegitimacy was not an impediment for men to achieve kingship, as explained above. Wyntoun constructed Malcolm Canmore and Macbeth as illegitimate sons to comment on the political milieu of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century in Scotland, where men of illegitimate birth, such as Robert III and his brother the Duke of Albany, could lead the kingdom virtuously. It is not the only evidence of the *Cronikyl*’s use of contemporary social expectations and events to reconstruct the Scottish past and to reflect the present. King Duncan’s first-born son was Malcolm Canmore, but Malcolm was given two younger, legitimate brothers, information only found in the *Cronikyl*.<sup>158</sup> Fordun’s *Chronica*, as well as other twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources on Scottish kings, specify that Malcolm had one brother: Donald Bàn. However, the notion that King Duncan had three sons might have been inspired by Robert III’s offspring: David, Duke of Rothesay; a son named Robert who died in his infancy; and James I of Scotland. By Robert III’s death in 1406, James was the only surviving heir to the throne.

Wyntoun seemed well aware of the implications that an illegitimate origin could have for Malcolm Canmore’s reign. This is why Malcolm’s mother was important to Wyntoun: her relationship with King Duncan is what differentiated Malcolm from his illegitimately-born counterparts. Additionally, by departing from earlier characterizations of Malcolm’s origins,

---

<sup>157</sup> Wyntoun, VII: iii, l. 254 (Cotton MS).

<sup>158</sup> Wyntoun, VI: xvi, ll. 1605-8.

where Malcolm's mother was a relation of Earl Siward of Northumbria, Wyntoun eliminated any blood connection Malcolm Canmore could have had with England. Therefore, instead of being born as a Scottish prince whose relative Siward placed on the Scottish throne through the orders of Saint Edward the Confessor, Wyntoun's Malcolm was fully Scottish but unable to gain the throne through his own merits: his political agency was diminished.

While Malcolm's fantastical origin could have problematized Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders, especially in chapter 18 of the *Cronikyl*,<sup>159</sup> it nonetheless paralleled ideas about Scottish kingship and nobility in the early fifteenth century. Illegitimacy in early fifteenth-century Scotland was not an impediment to "gret stait and to meikle mycht," but illegitimate men required the support of the nobility to obtain power. However, these men required a virtuous nature to be considered worthy of ruling. In the *Cronikyl*, Macbeth and William the Conqueror, both kings of questionable morality, were initially good rulers. Macbeth dispensed justice accordingly, went on pilgrimage to Rome and even spread silver alms generously, while William was of a good lineage and put an end to Harold Godwineson's treachery and usurpation.<sup>160</sup> But their eventual descent into tyrannical behaviour was marked by their mistreatment of their nobility: Macbeth fought with Macduff, thane of Fife, Scotland's leading noble, over lands and oxen, while William disinherited England's nobility, stealing their lands.<sup>161</sup> In both cases, the disaffected nobles had no choice but to escape from their kingdoms: Macduff escaped to England, where Scotland's rightful heir resided, while the English nobles either escaped to Normandy or to Malcolm Canmore's court in Scotland, where the rightful heir to England

---

<sup>159</sup> Purdie, "Rhetoric and Re-Shaping of History," 52-3.

<sup>160</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 1935-6 (Macbeth); and VI: cxx, ll. 2511- 2520 (William).

<sup>161</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll. 1999-2030 (Macduff and Macbeth), and VII: ii, ll. 131-38 (Cotton MS). The Wemyss MS is missing two folios here.

lived.<sup>162</sup> Here is where we find the reason why Malcolm's illegitimacy was imperative to the narrative: Malcolm required the help and approval of Macduff of Fife, as representative of the political community of Scotland, to acquire the crown.

## Conclusion

Malcolm Canmore's unusual portrayal in *Orygynale Cronikyl* was the result of Sir John Wemyss's involvement in various political incidents in the first twenty years of the fifteenth century. The chapters concerning Duncan's murder, Macbeth's kingship and death and Malcolm's return to Scotland might have been taken from the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* but the changes that Wyntoun made to Fordun's narrative bore similarities to the struggles his patron had with Albany in the fifteenth century. The antagonistic relationship between the tyrannical Macbeth and Macduff of Fife bore strong resemblance to the deteriorated relationship between Wemyss and Albany in 1400 to 1402. Sir John Wemyss, his uncle Sir David Wemyss, and one of his ancestors, possibly another David Wemyss, who signed the Declaration of Arbroath, had roles in helping negotiate the return of kings of Scots to Scotland to either begin or resume their personal rules. The similarities with Sir John Wemyss's political actions in the fifteenth century are crucial to understanding Macduff's actions and Malcolm Canmore's political impotence in the *Orygynale Cronikyl*.

The *Cronikyl*'s most salient feature was the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore as an illegitimate son of King Duncan. Illegitimacy was usually an impediment to claiming inheritance, and it was particularly troublesome for an heir with royal ambitions to muster political support when they were of illegitimate birth. Yet Wyntoun wrote at a time when men whose birth was canonically illegitimate were ruling Scotland, even if they were legitimized

---

<sup>162</sup> Wyntoun, VI: cxviii, ll.2121-2 (Macduff); VII: ii, ll.163-7 (William, Cotton MS).

through papal dispensation years after their birth. Malcolm Canmore was portrayed as a natural son of King Duncan, and natural sons could be legitimized with relative ease. Wyntoun's differentiation between the portrayal of Malcolm's illegitimacy and that of Macbeth and William Bastard shows not only that Wyntoun was familiar with the different types of illegitimacy according to canon law, but that he made use of this differentiation to construct a case for Malcolm's right to become king. Macbeth's origins as the son of the Devil and William's origins as the bastard son of the Duke of Normandy signalled their status as spurious men. And men born in lower forms of illegitimacy, that is, those born as spurious children, not only could not be redeemed, but carried forward the sins of their fathers: Macbeth and William Bastard's illegitimacy explained their tyranny in the *Cronikyl*.

Malcolm's status as a natural son of a king made his claim to the Scottish throne a matter of gathering enough support from the political community of Scotland. This was the role of Macduff in the *Cronikyl*: as a representative of the "community of the realm," it was up to the thane of Fife to decide who would make the best king of Scots. By exploring the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl*, historians can ascertain the influence of contemporary political events in the construction of an ideal of the Scottish past. Malcolm's image in the *Cronikyl* might not be historically accurate or illuminate much about Scottish concerns in the eleventh century, but it certainly sheds a light on how Scots understood and manipulated their past to reflect their reality in the early fifteenth century.

## CHAPTER 5: MALCOLM CANMORE IN WALTER BOWER'S *SCOTICHRONICON* (1440s)

### Introduction

The second of the Fife-produced Scottish chronicles in this study, Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* (1440s), also positioned Malcolm's kingship within the framework of Western Christendom while positioning Fife as locus of Scottish politics and governance.<sup>1</sup> The *Scotichronicon* was commissioned by Sir David Stewart of Rosyth, a member of one of the Stewarts' cadet families, and its principal aim was to expand and continue Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum*.<sup>2</sup> As abbot of Inchcolm and trained at the University of St Andrews, Bower's affiliations with both the university and bishopric of St Andrews conditioned his use of sources and the outlook of his chronicle: like Wyntoun's *Cronikyl*, the *Scotichronicon* reveals a Fife-centric perspective on eleventh-century Scottish kingship.<sup>3</sup> The use of St Andrews-based sources accounts for the increased focus on Fife as origin-point of eleventh-century Scottish kingship, history, and historiography.<sup>4</sup> Yet Bower's inspiration for his account of Malcolm Canmore was not confined to the use of St Andrews' sources alongside his main inspiration, Fordun. It also represented broader fifteenth-century interpretations and ideals of what Scottish kingship should

---

<sup>1</sup> John MacQueen, "The literature of fifteenth-century Scotland," in *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Wormald, 184-208.

<sup>2</sup> Watt, "Composition of the Chronicle," *Scotichronicon* 9, 210-14, at 210.

<sup>3</sup> Walter Bower was born in Haddington, East Lothian in 1385 and appears to be related to an Alexander Bowmaker, who was a canon of St Andrews and affiliated with the University. Bower joined the Augustinian canons at St Andrews around 1400, training under Prior James Bisset of St Andrews Cathedral. He was also trained at the University of St Andrews, earning a Bachelor of Decrees or canon law by 1417. For a complete biography of Walter Bower, particularly his studies at the University of St Andrews, see D.E.R. Watt, "Biography of Bower," in Bower, *Scotichronicon*. 9, 204-8; D. E. R. Watt, "A National Treasure? The 'Scotichronicon' of Walter Bower," *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 44-53. See also Reid, "The Prehistory of the University of St Andrews," 237-267; Marjorie Drexler, "The Extant Abridgements of Walter Bower's 'Scotichronicon,'" *The Scottish Historical Review* 61, no. 171 (April 1, 1982): 62-67, at 62.

<sup>4</sup> Watt, "Sources," at 244-5.

aspire to be, and how Malcolm Canmore's kingship exemplified these ideals. Bower's Malcolm Canmore continued to reflect contemporary political and literary values of kingship that were to be emulated by fifteenth-century Scottish kings for the benefit of the kingdom as a whole.

But what was the ideal kingship that Bower sought to promote in the *Scotichronicon*? In "Bower on Kingship," Sally Mapstone suggested that Bower, influenced by the fractious nature of crown-magnate relations during his lifetime, advocated a more authoritarian Stewart kingship.<sup>5</sup> As we have seen in Chapter 4, fifteenth-century Scottish treatises on kingship lacked radical notions about the deposition of tyrannical kings; rather, as Roger Mason has argued, Scottish political theorists refrained from promoting political dissent by eliminating suggestions of regnal deposition in their writings.<sup>6</sup> Bower, writing in the early years of James II's reign (r. 1437-1460), hoped that the young king would someday read the *Scotichronicon* and thus designed it with advisory aims.<sup>7</sup> The murder of James I at the hands of some of his nobles and the convoluted minority of James II inspired Bower's stance on the need for a more authoritarian Scottish kingship.

Recent research by Michael Brown has provided an alternative view of Bower's portrayal of Scottish kingship. Examining Bower's portrayal of James I in the last book of the *Scotichronicon*, Brown has suggested that Bower's interpretation of James's kingship was more ambiguous, as he tried to conflate his personal and political experience with the king with those

---

<sup>5</sup> Sally Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," in *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, ed. D. E. R. Watt, New ed., 9 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987), 321-38, at 322; see also Sally Louise Mapstone, "The Advice to Princes Tradition in Scottish Literature, 1450-1500" (unpublished PhD thesis, St Hilda's College, University of Oxford, 1986), 5 and 19-23; and Boardman, "Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland," at 23.

<sup>6</sup> Mason, "Kingship, Tyranny, and the Right to Resist," 125-51.

<sup>7</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 323.

of his patron, Sir David Stewart of Rosyth.<sup>8</sup> Similar observations can be made about Bower's portrayal of Malcolm Canmore's kingship. The *Scotichronicon*, therefore, revealed the importance of expanding and transmitting the content of Fordun's *Chronica* for a Fife-based audience that supported an authoritarian kingship. Bower's political concerns, his affiliations with the ecclesiastical and lay elites of St Andrews, and his desire to write an even more comprehensive Scottish historical narrative influenced his portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Scotichronicon*.

While Bower transmitted the content of Fordun's account of Malcolm's kingship without substantial changes, his incorporation of a chapter on the attributes of kingship reframed Fordun's original material about Malcolm to suit the political and literary milieu of the middle of the fifteenth century.<sup>9</sup> Another unique feature of Bower's portrayal of Malcolm Canmore in the *Scotichronicon* was his incorporation of additional material from the Dunfermline version of the *Life of Saint Margaret*, material that re-associated Saint Margaret's deeds with Malcolm's kingship. While, as Claire Harrill has observed, Margaret is portrayed as subordinate to Malcolm,<sup>10</sup> Bower did have an interest in presenting Malcolm and Margaret as strong dynastic founders whose power base was centred at Dunfermline.<sup>11</sup> The first section of this chapter will discuss Bower's use of his sources, most of which have been examined in previous chapters of this study. The incorporation of historical material pertaining to the earls of Fife enhanced Malcolm's connection to this earldom. The second section of the chapter will analyze the

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael Brown, "'Vile Times': Walter Bower's Last Book and the Minority of James II," *The Scottish Historical Review* 79, no. 208 (2000): 165–88.

<sup>9</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, VI: 50.

<sup>10</sup> Harrill, "Politics and Sainthood," 246–7. Harrill noted that Bower presented Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic equals in charity, but Margaret was simultaneously presented as having limited political and ecclesiastical power.

<sup>11</sup> Boardman, "Royal Mausoleum."



addition of a chapter about good kingship to the narrative concerning Malcolm's reign, arguing that Bower composed this chapter to re-frame Malcolm as an exemplar of good kingship to be emulated by the Stewarts. Lastly, this chapter will consider Bower's incorporation of material from the Dunfermline Compilation to explore the connection between kingship, sainthood, and Fife in the *Scotichronicon*.

### **Bower's use of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum* and other sources**

Bower's interpolations of material about Malcolm Canmore can be summarized as follows. For Book IV's account of Malcolm's accession to the throne, Macbeth's tyranny and subsequent involvement of Macduff of Fife, Bower incorporated information from one or more sources containing details about Macduff of Fife.<sup>12</sup> It is unclear, however, if this lost source or sources relate to what Watt calls "Source S" or to the *Historia* listed in the Great Register of St Andrews: what is known is that Wyntoun consulted both these sources but that Bower did not consult Wyntoun when compiling sources to write the *Scotichronicon*.<sup>13</sup> Bower's additions about Macduff of Fife have already been discussed in Chapter 4, above.

The second major source that Bower used to develop Fordun's portrayal of Malcolm Canmore was the Dunfermline Compilation, which was used for the chapters on Malcolm's kingship found in Book V. From the Dunfermline Compilation, Bower included more information on Malcolm's illiteracy and Margaret's charitable works in Chapters 23 and 24 of the *Scotichronicon*.<sup>14</sup> While it is evident that Bower was using the information found in the Dunfermline *Vita* for these chapters, the passages in question originated in Turgot's *Life of Saint*

---

<sup>12</sup> See Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 54; V: 6, 7.

<sup>13</sup> Watt, "The Sources," 245-9.

<sup>14</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 23-24.

*Margaret*. Bower also used the Dunfermline Compilation's *miracula* of Saint Margaret: he added Miracle 7 at the Battle of Largs.<sup>15</sup> He expanded Fordun's brief account of the translation ceremony of Saint Margaret's relics at Dunfermline in 1250 to include information specifically about Malcolm Canmore.<sup>16</sup> Finally, Bower included information found in the *Verse Chronicle* to several chapters in both Books IV and V, although it is not certain whether he incorporated the *Verse Chronicle* directly from a copy of the *Chronicle of Melrose* or did so from an independent copy.<sup>17</sup> Additionally, Bower incorporated some material from Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus florum* into Book V, Chapters 7 and 9; these chapters describe Macbeth's death in battle and Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne, respectively.<sup>18</sup>

Bower's use of Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus florum* deserves closer scrutiny. Bower cited Alan of Lille's *De conquestione nature* (i.e. *De planctu nature*) through the *Manipulus florum* to question English sources' reliability when recounting Scottish events.<sup>19</sup> In the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, John of Fordun questioned the accuracy of William of Malmesbury's account of the Battle of Lumphanan of 1056. According to Malmesbury, Siward "installed Malcolm son of the king of the Cumbrians as king in that same place."<sup>20</sup> After quoting Malmesbury, Fordun added that "See how William ascribes everything to Siward, depriving Malcolm of all the glory in the victory, when in actual fact Malcolm alone with his own men and standard-bearer was

---

<sup>15</sup> See Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 15, 336-9.

<sup>16</sup> See Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 3, 296-9; Tod, "Narrative of the Scottish Nation." 97.

<sup>17</sup> For Bower's use of the *Chronicle of Melrose*, see John and Winifred MacQueen, "Introduction to Books III and IV," in *Scotichronicon* 2, xx-xxi. The MacQueens refer to the *Verse Chronicle* as *Cronicon Elegiacum*.

<sup>18</sup> Chris L. Nighman, "Scotichronicon: Libri 5 & 6," The *Manipulus/Scotichronicon* Project, 2016, <http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/Scotichronicon/5.9/index.html>.

<sup>19</sup> "Invidia u," In *Manipulus/Scotichronicon* Project, <http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/Scotichronicon/InvidiaV.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 6, 18-9: "Ibidem Malcolmum filium regis Cumborum regem instituit." This evolution of this quote has been explained in detail in Chapter 2, "The Chronicle of Melrose."

responsible for the whole victory.”<sup>21</sup> Bower expanded on Fordun’s comments by criticizing English historians for their envy: “I am afraid that the historians of the all-too envious English are fatally infatuated *in considering another nation’s success as an adversity and another’s adversity as a success.*”<sup>22</sup> By using this particular phrase, Bower simultaneously chastises English chroniclers for their envy of other nations and for their inaccurate rendition of Scottish history. For Bower, envy and inaccuracy are long-standing characteristics of English historiography that Scottish chroniclers, like Bower,<sup>23</sup> sought to correct.

### **Malcolm Canmore and good kingship**

Walter Bower’s concern with good kingship and governance is apparent in his incorporation of Chapter 50 into Book IV of the *Scotichronicon*. This chapter was strategically positioned between King Duncan’s accession and murder, and Macbeth’s accession to the throne and eventual expulsion of Malcolm Canmore and Donald Bane from the kingdom.<sup>24</sup> Chapter 50, titled “The duty of a king is threefold,” outlined a king’s three main functions: providing suitable and just laws, bringing to justice those who violate these laws, and granting mercy where appropriate.<sup>25</sup> But kingship is a reciprocal endeavor, and for good kingship to be established at any time, subjects ought to provide the king with “honor, fear and love;”<sup>26</sup> Bower’s concept of good kingship and governance was, therefore, contractual at its core.<sup>27</sup> The establishment of just

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 18: “Ecce quomodo Willelmus, nullam Malcolmo victorie laudem ascribens, Siwardo totum attribuit, cum in veritate solus ille cum suit et | vexilligero, tocius victorie causa fuit.”

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 18: “Vereor ne admodum *invidiorum Anglorum historici* fataliter infatuentur, quibus aliena prosperitas adversa, aliena adversitas, prospera judicatur” (my emphasis).

<sup>23</sup> Bower, “Prologue,” *Scotichronicon* 9. In the Prologue, Bower claimed that Edward I destroyed Scottish chronicles when he invaded Scotland in 1296.

<sup>24</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 49 and 51.

<sup>25</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 50, 423.

<sup>26</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 50, 423.

<sup>27</sup> Mapstone, “Bower on Kingship,” 327.

laws was to be in agreement with the nation, an idea that had been featured in the *Dunfermline Vita*.<sup>28</sup> It was the king's duty to make subjects comply with laws by providing justice by rigorous means but the king was also to forgive and provide mercy in an attempt to keep his subjects' loyalty and attachment.<sup>29</sup> By using Chapter 50 to outline appropriate kingly conduct and the rules of good governance, Bower provided Scottish kings with clear instructions for effective rule. The content of Chapter 50 complemented several chapters on tyranny found originally in Fordun's *Chronica*: mainly Chapter 47 on treachery as the worst vice, placed before the account of Malcolm II's kingship, and Chapter 8 in Book V, which excused subjects deserting an "unlawful king" in battle and was inserted immediately after the account of Macbeth's death at Malcolm's hands.<sup>30</sup> Fordun's placement of these chapters before and after his account of Macbeth framed Macbeth's kingship as an example of the perils of a tyrant ruler; Bower's inclusion of Chapter 50 helped highlight Malcolm's kingship as an example of exceptional rule. Moreover, placing Chapter 50 between Fordun's accounts of Duncan's death and Macbeth's usurpation of the throne contrasted the kingships of Macbeth and Malcolm Canmore as exemplars of inappropriate and appropriate kingship.<sup>31</sup> The dialogue between Malcolm and Macduff, where Malcolm admitted to having three vices, was contextualized within Fordun's notion of treachery as the worst vice and Bower's notion of justice-provision as central to good kingship.

The portrayal of Malcolm Canmore's kingship in the *Scotichronicon* exemplified Bower's concern with proper governance, showing how Malcolm fulfilled his role as king appropriately. Bower's use of the advice-for-princes genre provided a format for his observations on good

---

<sup>28</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 327 and 332. See also Chapter 2, "Dunfermline Compilation" for a discussion of Malcolm's provision of five self-regulating laws.

<sup>29</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 50, 423.

<sup>30</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2, IV: 47 and *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 8.

<sup>31</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 328-330 for the comparison between Macbeth and Malcolm's treachery.

kingship, tyranny and noble dissent. For example, Macbeth's tyranny and usurpation contrasted with Malcolm Canmore's potential for mediocre kingship, but while Macbeth was a usurper that should be deposed, Malcolm was a legitimate king who should be tolerated, unless he interfered in ecclesiastical affairs. Thus, poor kingship by legitimate kings was not to be desired, but it was also not cause for deposition.<sup>32</sup> As Mapstone has observed, good kingship was about the ability of kings to regulate their own conduct.<sup>33</sup> Malcolm Canmore's potential for disastrous kingship was averted because he regulated his own conduct: with Macduff's help, Malcolm vanquished Macbeth and brought justice and peace to the Scots. Mapstone's conclusions about Bower's ideal kingship resonate with, and support, Mason's assertions on how Scots rejected the deposition of poor but legitimate kings as a way of maintaining the peace and unity of Scotland after the Wars of Independence. The episodes concerning the provision of Macduff's law (Chapter 9), the deaths of Macbeth and Lulach (Chapters 7 and 8), and Malcolm's treatment of the treacherous knight (Chapters 11 and 12) showed Malcolm's adherence to the threefold duty of Scottish kingship. Malcolm Canmore's kingship and behavior were, therefore, a mirror for princes such as James II.

The primary example of Malcolm's provision of law is found in Book V, Chapter 9 of the *Scotichronicon*, when he guaranteed Macduff several privileges for his service. The account of Malcolm's rewards to Macduff should not be understood as a historically-accurate rendition of eleventh-century politics and crown-magnate relations. Instead, Malcolm's provision of Macduff's law was intended to show the king as a law-giver who rewarded the efforts and loyalty of his noblemen. Malcolm first tested Macduff's loyalty in Book V, Chapters 1 to 6 of the *Scotichronicon*; in fact, Malcolm only agreed to Macduff's request to return to Scotland when

---

<sup>32</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 329-30.

<sup>33</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 336.

“he had proved to the full that Macduff loathed treachery above all else, and he was now certain of his loyalty:”<sup>34</sup>

[...] Since I was unsure up to this point whether you were loyal or disloyal, I was afraid that you, like certain evil men from time to time, as you are aware, had urged my return with ambivalent lies as they did, in order that I might be handed over to my enemies. Therefore I wished to examine you with these various tests, and because you have passed the test, and are known to hate the ignominy attached to deceit and treachery, I consider, and always will consider more superabundantly than you imagine, that you are loyal.<sup>35</sup>

As Bower’s Chapter 50 outlined, kings were bound to provide law, mercy and justice to their subjects, but the subjects were bound to provide the king with their honour, fear and love.

Macduff’s loyalty to Malcolm, which he proved first by loathing treachery and later by helping Malcolm recover his throne, guaranteed the king’s reciprocity through the provision of legal protections for Macduff and his descendants. Bower’s portrayal of Malcolm and Macduff’s relationship placed the prince at the centre of political power, from where loyalty and justice are dispensed; this crown-centric attitude was later emulated by James II.<sup>36</sup> Yet although the relationship between Malcolm and Macduff exemplified crown-magnate relations in late medieval Scotland, which were characterized by a balance of power between both parts achieved through mutual cooperation,<sup>37</sup> during his reign, James II sought to position himself as the “focal point” of the kingdom’s “service and loyalty.”<sup>38</sup> Malcolm’s kingship exemplified the benefits of

---

<sup>34</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 6, 14-5: “[...] quoniam ipsum super omnia detestari perfidiam ad plenum expertus, et effectus de fidelitate iam securus [...]”

<sup>35</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 6, 14-5: “[...] nichil actenus [certum agnoscens] an fidus esses vel infidus, expavi ne tu, sicut aliquando quidam perversi, quod non nescis, fictis ambagibus, sicut et illi quod emulis traderer, michi reditum hortatus fueras. Idecirco te talibus volui variis questionibus experiri. Et quia probatus odire nosceris doli notam et prodicionis, superhabundancius habeo quam estimas, et semper habebo, te fidelem.”

<sup>36</sup> Stevenson, “Contesting Chivalry,” 198-9; McGladdery, *James II*, 1-3.

<sup>37</sup> Jennifer M. Brown, “The Exercise of Power,” in *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Jennifer M. Brown (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1977), 33–65; and Stevenson, “Contesting Chivalry.”

<sup>38</sup> Stevenson, “Contesting Chivalry,” 199.

maintaining loyalty and devotion to the king, elevating the king's role in the scheme of crown-magnate relations. Malcolm's law-giving role was conditional on his subjects' loyalty; here, Bower emphasized the centrality of law-giving to the exercise of good kingship.<sup>39</sup> Malcolm became the focus of his nobles' service and loyalty, which aligned with James II's aims for Scottish kingship.<sup>40</sup>

Malcolm's position as the focus of law, order and peace in the kingdom was made evident by Bower in how he recovered his throne from Macbeth and Lulach. Although Macbeth had been able to successfully usurp the Scottish throne and rule despotically, the rightful king inspired loyalty within the kingdom. As Bower, repeating Fordun's account, related, "For all the people that Macbeth led out to battle knew full well that Malcolm was their true lord; therefore, they refused to fight a battle against him, and fled away and deserted the field of battle at the first sound of trumpets."<sup>41</sup> Moreover, Book V, Chapter 8 stated that subjects of a tyrannical king are exempt from fighting for such a king, specifying that "[...] refusing to submit any longer to their distressful subjection under a man of no higher rank than themselves, they seized the opportunity, and by their flight gave [Malcolm] the chance of definitely recovering the kingdom."<sup>42</sup> Here, Scottish magnates recognized Macbeth was not of royal stock: his lower origins could explain his tyrannical behaviour. Malcolm's legitimacy as king was unquestioned and was acknowledged by his people; this recognition gave Malcolm the authority to enact royal justice by killing Macbeth and Lulach for their treachery and usurpation. More importantly,

---

<sup>39</sup> Mapstone, "Bower on Kingship," 327; Mapstone, "The Advice to Princes Tradition in Scottish Literature, 1450-1500," 23; Brown, "'Vile Times'," 171.

<sup>40</sup> McGladdery, *James II*, 150-1.

<sup>41</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 7, 18-9: "Omnis enim populus ab eo bellandum productus Malcolmun non ignorabat verum sibi dominum; ideo resistere sibi bello renuens, primo lituorum stripitu campum reliquit fugiendo."

<sup>42</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 8, 20-1: "[...] anxiam itaque sub viro contribule propriam subieccionem amplius subesse dedignans, occasione sumpta locum illi fugiendo dedit regnum indubie recipiendi."

subjects had the moral obligation of military defection when under tyranny as it allowed the rightful king to recover his kingdom. While, according to the account, Malcolm had military help from Siward of Northumbria to oust Macbeth from the throne, victory was attributed to Malcolm by virtue of his legitimacy as king, not to Siward or the English because of their military aid. As Bower and Fordun specified, “[...] that Macbeth’s people would not have fled from the battle, if Malcolm had not been there, even if King Edward had been present with his forces along with Siward.”<sup>43</sup> Thus, Malcolm brought Macbeth and Lulach to justice for their usurpation with the help of the Scottish people, who recognized Malcolm as true king and who facilitated both kings’ deposition by refusing to fight against Malcolm. While legitimate kings were responsible for enacting law and order in the kingdom, such provision was conditional upon the subjects’ loyalty to the rightful heir to the throne.

The depositions of Macbeth and Lulach were violent in manner, but Malcolm had not always provided justice through violent means. Malcolm guaranteed the kingdom’s peace by providing mercy to a treacherous knight. Book V, Chapters 11 and 12 contain the story of Malcolm’s encounter with a traitor.<sup>44</sup> The origin of the story is found in Ælred of Rievaulx’s *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, which was then copied and expanded into the Dunfermline *Vita* sometime between 1154 and 1285, and later into the *Gesta Annalia* I, from where Fordun took his material. There are some minor, but important differences between Fordun’s and Bower’s transmission of these chapters. In the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, Fordun included information about Malcolm’s coronation in Scone, while Bower decided to present this material earlier in the

---

<sup>43</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 7, 18-9: “[...] quod populus Machebedicus, absente Malcolmo, de bello non fugisset, eciam si cum Suardo rex Eadwardus cum suis presens affuisset.”

<sup>44</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 11-12, 30-35. These chapters are copied from the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*’s chapters 9 and 10; see Fordun, *Chronicle* (trans.), V: ix-x, 194-6.



narrative.<sup>45</sup> As a result, Chapter 11 of the *Scotichronicon* began by describing Malcolm's character, instead of his coronation. The title of Chapter 9 in the *Chronica* is "De successione Malcolmi regis in regnum, et ejus pugna cum quodam proditore" ("Accession of King Malcolm to the kingdom—He fights with a Traitor"), while Bower changed the title of Chapter 11 to read "A duel between King Malcolm and a treacherous *knight*."<sup>46</sup> Interestingly enough, Bower did not change the content of the chapter to convert the traitor into a knight; instead, the addition to the chapter's title might imply to the reader that knights could be "summis proceribus," or "chief nobles" of the kingdom.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the text itself differentiated between noblemen and knights, stating that Malcolm "[...] summoned all his nobles and knights to his presence, and quickly proceeded to go out hunting."<sup>48</sup> It is possible that Bower changed the title of the chapter to appeal to his patron, Sir David Stewart of Rosyth, who enjoyed a fruitful political career during James I's reign and after his death: he also had strong links with the earls of Douglas and with Queen Joan, James I's widow.<sup>49</sup> As a literary patron with strong connections to the Stewart regime, Sir David would have been familiar with fifteenth-century chivalric romances; as Katie Stevenson has argued, by the fifteenth century, knights were the core of the king's army and were regularly rewarded with incentives for their service.<sup>50</sup> Although royal promotion of chivalric

---

<sup>45</sup> Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 11, 30.

<sup>46</sup> See Fordun, *Chronica*, V: ix, 206; *Chronicle* (trans.), V: IX, 194; and Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 11, 30-31: "De quadam pugna regis Malcolmi cum quodam milite proditore." Andrew of Wyntoun's version of this story also states repeatedly that the adversary is a knight; see Wyntoun, VII: i.

<sup>47</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 11, 30 (l. 15) and 31 (l. 18).

<sup>48</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 11, 30 (ll. 22-23) and 31 (ll. 27-29): "[...] ad se cunctis *proceribus et militibus* in venando spaciatur ire festinate."

<sup>49</sup> Brown, "'Vile Times,'" 175-8; Alan Borthwick, "Bower's Patron, Sir David Stewart of Rosyth," in *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower ; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, ed. D. E. R. Watt, New ed., vol. 9, 9 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987), 354-62.

<sup>50</sup> Katie Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424-1513* (Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2006), 25 and 142.

culture in Scotland did not begin fully until the reign of James II, James I was invested in including knights in his army without actively promoting chivalric values.<sup>51</sup> James II later used chivalric culture as political and royal propaganda, as a way of binding Scottish nobility to the king's service.<sup>52</sup> In a similar manner, Bower's Malcolm Canmore bound the treacherous knight again into his service by dispensing royal mercy and socio-political advancement to guarantee his subject's loyalty. Therefore, the king guaranteed the kingdom's peace by positioning himself at the head of crown-magnate relations as the main source of law and order in the kingdom.

Bower included several episodes of Malcolm's political career that cast doubts over the king's behaviour; most of these episodes concerned Anglo-Scottish relations or foreign politics.<sup>53</sup> Michael Brown has shown how Bower's experience at James I's court conditioned his portrayal of the king, and how he was, at times, unwilling to fully praise James's authoritarian style of rule;<sup>54</sup> while Malcolm's kingship was not depicted as being as unabashedly authoritarian as James's, it was similarly marked by Bower's ambiguity about Malcolm's foreign policy, particularly his interactions with Northumbrians and with the Norman elites. What emerges is a picture of Malcolm Canmore that allowed the king to have both virtues and flaws without compromising the ideal of a strong, authoritarian kingship. More importantly, Malcolm's flaws were not irredeemable: Bower was the first and only chronicler in this study to portray Malcolm Canmore as a saint.

---

<sup>51</sup> Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland*, 172-4; Stevenson, "Contesting Chivalry," 197-214, at 198.

<sup>52</sup> Stevenson, "Contesting Chivalry," 197-214.

<sup>53</sup> For example, see Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 18-19, 54-9; V: 21, 62-5; V: 25, 74-6.

<sup>54</sup> Brown, "'Vile Times,'" 169.

### Malcolm, the “saint”

The method Bower used to reimagine Malcolm Canmore as a saint-king depended mostly on interpolating additional information about Malcolm and Margaret found in the Dunfermline *Vita* to the material originally found in the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. Bower expanded Fordun’s Chapter 18, on Malcolm and Margaret’s deeds, into two chapters: Chapter 23, titled “The virtuous works of the Saints Malcolm and Margaret,” and Chapter 24 as a continuation of this account.<sup>55</sup> Fordun excluded information about Malcolm’s illiteracy and his emulation of Margaret’s devotional behavior, choosing to give Malcolm a protagonist role in the charity work the royal couple did in Scotland. Fordun also attributed some of Margaret’s charitable works to Malcolm, relegating the queen to a secondary place and limiting her influence in the kingdom.<sup>56</sup> But Bower included Malcolm’s imperfections. In Chapter 23, he included the passage from the Dunfermline *Vita* that mentioned Malcolm’s illiteracy, omitting the passage that detailed Malcolm’s five laws in Scotland and his role as interpreter for Margaret’s ecclesiastical reforms.<sup>57</sup> In fact, he explicitly portrayed Malcolm as a barbarian reformed by the intervention of his wife by prefacing his additions about Malcolm with a quote from St Paul: “Through his Christian wife a heathen man is sanctified.”<sup>58</sup> By combining Fordun’s positive assessment of Malcolm’s kingship with Turgot’s portrayal of the king as reformed barbarian, Bower made Malcolm’s transformation into a reformed barbarian, and then a saint, even more compelling.

Nonetheless, Bower did not explicitly portray Malcolm as a barbarian anywhere in the *Scotichronicon*. He did, however, include some of Malcolm’s sins. Bower’s portrayal of the relationship between Malcolm and the Northumbrians was an example of Malcolm’s bellicosity

---

<sup>55</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 23-24, 70-4: “De Sanctorum Malcolm et Margarite virtuosus operibus.”

<sup>56</sup> Harrill, “Politics and Sainthood,” 245-6.

<sup>57</sup> See Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 23-4.

<sup>58</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 23, 70-1: “Per mulieres fidelem sanctificabitur vir infidelis.”

and sinful behaviour, information that was reminiscent of twelfth-century Anglo-Norman accounts of Malcolm's reign. While Bower did follow Fordun's account, he took greater liberties, adding information about Northumbrians and about the Normans in England to the *Scotichronicon*.<sup>59</sup> Bower's account was mostly laudatory of Malcolm's reign, and his depiction of Scoto-Northumbrian relations in the narrative was mostly favorable towards Malcolm without glossing over Malcolm's sins. Most of Malcolm's behaviour towards Northumbrians is conditioned by his relationship to Edgar Ætheling and his conflicts with the Normans. For example, in Book V, Chapter 17, the narrative justified Malcolm's plundering of Northumbria by ascribing it to Malcolm's loyalty towards Edgar Ætheling.<sup>60</sup> Moreover, Malcolm's raiding of Northumbria served to extend his protection over Edgar Ætheling and his family.<sup>61</sup> Northumbrian loyalty was with Malcolm and the Scots; in Chapter 21, certain Northumbrians betrayed William the Conqueror by crossing into Scotland and pledging allegiance to Malcolm, giving him hostages.<sup>62</sup> King William sent his brother Odo to punish the treacherous Northumbrians, but Malcolm retaliated by wasting Northumbria. Furthermore, Malcolm helped Northumbrian nobles to hold the city of York, from where both the Northumbrians and the Scots

---

<sup>59</sup> See for example, Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 13, 38-9.

<sup>60</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 17, 53: "For Edgar's sake he harried the neighbouring provinces of England [i.e. Northumbria] with plundering and arson."

<sup>61</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 17, 55: "In 1070 King Malcolm laid England waste as far as Develand or Cleveland, and at that time he extended his protection to Edgar the Ætheling and his sisters Margaret and Christina or Christiana, when he found them fleeing from the king of England [...]" The same information was added by Bower to Chapter 18 from another source: "In another place I found written: 'In 1067 St Margaret was united in matrimony with King malcolm in the thirteenth year of his reign. He laid waste England as far as Cleveland, and returning by Wirwida which is called Wearmouth, he entered Scotland, and found before him Edgar the Ætheling and his sisters Margaret and Christina hiding in a ship near Culross; and he married Margaret.'" (V: 18, 55).

<sup>62</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 21, 63 and 65.

would plan and execute attacks against the Normans.<sup>63</sup> Bower, following Fordun's narrative, specified that Malcolm was responsible for the enslavement of Northumbrians:

With hostile intent he removed every living thing as booty and pillage, and everything that he did not remove from human view, he savagely did away with by fire and sword from the face of the earth. He abducted droves of people without number so that in his kingdom there was hardly to be found any house or hut at all which did not contain prisoners of male or female sex. In the account of these prisoners who will be able to expound how many and how great they were whom the blessed queen [Margaret] and consort of the king restored to liberty by paying ransom, after they had been abducted from the peoples of England by enemy violence, and reduced to slavery?<sup>64</sup>

The *Chronica gentis Scotorum* conflated the information about Malcolm's raids in Northumbria found in the *Historia regum* with the *Life of Saint Margaret's* passage that detailed Margaret's role in liberating English slaves from bondage in Scotland.<sup>65</sup> By including this information in the *Scotichronicon*, and later adding the quote from St Paul in Chapter 23, Bower explicitly identified Malcolm's enslavement of Northumbrians as a sin. Malcolm's sins were, therefore, clearly addressed by Margaret's intervention, as she dedicated part of her charitable work to identifying and liberating Northumbrian slaves in Scotland. Moreover, Bower did not discuss Malcolm's problematic behavior after Chapter 24, which continues to detail the charitable work of the dynastic couple. In the *Scotichronicon*, therefore, it is apparent that, while Malcolm's kingship was laudable in its own merits, it was not without sins, but these sins were remedied by the intervention of Saint Margaret. Difficult political decisions might require Scottish kings to take controversial measures. Yet, it was possible for kings to commit sins, especially political

---

<sup>63</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 21, 65.

<sup>64</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3, V: 18, 56-7: "[...] animancia queque predis et rapina hostiliter abstulit, cunctaque visui humano que non abstulit, flammis et ferro de superficie terre crudeliter consumpsit. Innumerabilium itaque catervas hominum abduxit, ita quod in regno suo domus ferme vel casa nequaquam extiterat, que virilis sexus aut feminei captivos non tenebat. Quorum autem enumerando, quis | explicare poterit quot et quantos benedicta regina regis conjunx, dato precio, libertati restituerit, quos de gentibus Anglorum abducens captivos hostilis violencia redigerat in servos?"

<sup>65</sup> See Fordun, *Chronica*, V: xvi, 214.

ones, without meriting deposition. Malcolm's treatment of the Northumbrians was a collateral damage justified by Malcolm's attempts at helping Edgar Ætheling recover the English throne from the Normans. Therefore, in this case, it was possible to pardon kings' sins when those sins led to political victories.

The sanctification of Malcolm Canmore was apparent in Bower's additions to Fordun's account of the translation of Saint Margaret's relics in June 1250 at Dunfermline Abbey.<sup>66</sup> The account of the translation ceremony was a heavily-interpolated version of the translation account found in Chapter 49 of the *Gesta Annalia* I, which recounted that Alexander III, his mother and the earls, barons and clergymen of the kingdom translated the bones of Saint Margaret "out of the monument where they had lain through a long course of years; and these they laid, in the deepest devoutness, in a shrine of deal, set with gold and precious stones."<sup>67</sup> Bower added that, when the attendees opened Margaret's tomb, the sanctuary filled with the smell of spices and flowers. Bower described the rest of the events of that translation as "a miracle, sent by God":

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.<sup>68</sup>

After attempting to move the body by bringing more helpers, one of the attendees proclaimed to the audience that "it was perhaps not God's will that the bones of the holy queen be translated

---

<sup>66</sup> For the translation ceremony account, see Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 3, 297.

<sup>67</sup> As included in the main text of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. See *GAI*, xlix, 295: "[...] de monumento lapideo, in quo per multa annorum curricula quieverunt, honorifice levaverunt, et in scrinio abiegeno, auro gemmisque preciosis redimito, cum summa devotione collocaverunt [...]"

<sup>68</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 3, 296-7: "[...] deportaretur usque ad cencellariam [sic] portam corpori viri sui regis Malcolmis jacetis sub testudine archualia a parte boreali navis ecclesie eque oppositam, brachia mox ferencium reddebantur stupida, et preponderis gravitudine ulterius non poterant feretrum cum reliquiis amovere. Sed velint nolint coacti sunt stacionem facere et onus ocus ad solum reponere."

before her husband's tomb had been opened, and his body raised and honored in the same way."<sup>69</sup> This particular miracle was revealing: Malcolm was to be honored as a saint, just as his wife, but only due to Margaret's insistence. Commenting on the translation ceremony, Claire Harrill has argued recently that Margaret's power was limited by Malcolm's authority as king: in this instance, she was limited in her "mobility."<sup>70</sup> However, in this passage, it is not Malcolm who is limiting Margaret's mobility, but God himself, showing that Bower considered both king and queen as saints. God's desire that both monarchs were translated together shows how Malcolm and Margaret were seen as a holy dynastic couple, but that Malcolm's sanctity derived from his marriage to Margaret, not necessarily from his deeds. Alexander III, obeying the advice given at Dunfermline, moved Malcolm's bones and placed them, along with Margaret's, in the new shrine. Malcolm and Margaret would, from that day onwards, be venerated as saints, and "there God in his mercy has often worked all manner of miracles through [the merits of] the holy queen."<sup>71</sup> Although Malcolm is a saint "by association" in the *Scotichronicon*, Bower recognized the saintly image of the founders of the Canmore dynasty during the mid fifteenth century.

Bower's interest in the historical and religious significance of Dunfermline stemmed from his knowledge of Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders; Steve Boardman has argued that "[o]ne by-product of canonization may have been the increasing tendency of late medieval Scottish sources to treat Malcolm and Margaret as the starting point of a 'new' sanctified royal

---

<sup>69</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 3, 296-7: "non esse forte voluntatis divine ut ossa sacre regine *antea* transferantur quam viri sui bustum aperiatur et corpus eius simili honore sublimetur" (my emphasis).

<sup>70</sup> Claire Harrill, "The Proper Place for a Queen? St Margaret of Scotland at Dunfermline Abbey," in *Gender and Mobility in Scotland and Abroad*, vol. 4, Guelph Series in Scottish Studies (Guelph: Centre for Scottish Studies, 2018). I thank Professor Elizabeth Ewan for providing me access to an earlier draft of this chapter.

<sup>71</sup> Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5, X: 3, 298-9: "Ubi per illam sanctam reginam multimoda miracula divina multociens operata est clemencia."

dynasty.”<sup>72</sup> Saint Margaret was buried at Dunfermline and King Malcolm’s remains were moved from Tynemouth to Dunfermline by order of his son, Alexander I (r. 1107-1124).<sup>73</sup> Subsequent kings of Scots from the Canmore dynasty were also buried at Dunfermline: Malcolm’s son David I in 1153 and his great-grandson Malcolm IV in 1165.<sup>74</sup> While William the Lion and Alexander II chose not to be buried at Dunfermline, its status as a “royal mausoleum” and as a pilgrimage site was reinstated with the canonization of Margaret in 1249 and the translation of her relics in June 1250.<sup>75</sup> Yet, this interest diminished in the late fourteenth century. Additionally, Bower’s interest in Dunfermline could be partly explained by contemporary fashion: there was a renewed interest, palpable in the middle of the fifteenth century, in Dunfermline’s “glorious past” as the site where the sanctified Canmore dynasty was born.<sup>76</sup> James II, for example, confirmed Dunfermline Abbey’s grants because of its status as Margaret’s resting place.<sup>77</sup> By including and expanding the passage about the translation of Margaret’s relics in 1250, Bower alluded to the status of Dunfermline Abbey as both a royal mausoleum and origin point for the Canmore dynasty.

## Conclusion

The *Scotichronicon* is the final text in the historiographical evolution of Malcolm’s portrayal, one that reiterated the importance and centrality of Malcolm’s reign to asserting the potency and sovereignty of Scottish kingship as a whole. Bower saw Malcolm’s kingship in a broader context, while simultaneously highlighting the importance of Fife as the site where the

---

<sup>72</sup> Boardman, “Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,” 143.

<sup>73</sup> Durham, *HR*, 159 (AD 1093); Malmesbury, *GRA*, ii, 494.

<sup>74</sup> Boardman, “Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,” 141.

<sup>75</sup> Boardman, “Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,” 142-3.

<sup>76</sup> Boardman, “Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,” 139-49.

<sup>77</sup> Boardman, “Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,” 139; *Reg. Dunferm.* no. 434, 320-40.



Canmore dynasty emerged. Fife, in fact, was the site where good kingship and sainthood converged. Bower's Fife-centric narrative of eleventh-century politics was the product of his addition of one or more sources that stressed the political agency of Macduff of Fife in relation to Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne. A comparison of the accounts of Malcolm's return to Scotland found in both Wyntoun's *Cronikyl* and Bower's *Scotichronicon* suggests that both chroniclers shared the same Fife-produced source (or sources); while Steve Boardman's study of the St Andrews Chronicle is limited to its contents on late medieval Scottish politics, it is likely that this chronicle contained an account of Macduff of Fife that stressed his increased political agency. Likewise, the *Historia* of the Great Register of St Andrews might have been the source of additional information about Macduff.

Bower also added information from the Dunfermline *Vita*, but not about Malcolm Canmore. In fact, Bower's account of Malcolm Canmore's kingship seldom deviates from Fordun's own account, but Bower is more interested than Fordun in adding information about Saint Margaret and her miracles. Bower explicitly alludes to Malcolm as a "saint" by the intervention of his wife. His expansion of the account of the translation of Margaret's relics in June 1250 at Dunfermline Abbey shows not only his interest in portraying Dunfermline as a royal and holy site, but more specifically, Bower is also interested in presenting Malcolm Canmore as a saint. However, Malcolm's new-found sanctity is derived from Margaret, not necessarily from his own deeds and merit. Malcolm's new status as "saint" along with his wife, Saint Margaret, marked the closing of the third phase of evolution of Malcolm's historiographical portrayal.

### CONCLUSION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MALCOLM III CANMORE TO SCOTTISH HISTORIOGRAPHY

This study has examined 350 years of medieval Scottish historiography to understand how historical accounts of Malcolm III shaped medieval Scots' understanding of the eleventh-century past. In turn, this thesis has also illuminated how historical narratives of the medieval period have shaped modern understandings of Malcolm III's kingship. What emerges from this study is an appreciation of the influence that portrayals of Malcolm III and his reign had on developing ideas of independence, identity, and kingship during the central and late Middle Ages in Scotland. To medieval Scots, Malcolm III was not a peripheral or secondary figure: he was the key to defining ideals of Scottish regnal sovereignty and independence.

The evolution of Malcolm III's historiographical portrayal occurred in three main developmental stages. The earliest stage appeared circa 1100 and ended at c. 1173-4, and comprised of historical and hagiographical narratives composed by Northumbrian authors that shared and/or desired to establish a close connection between Northumbria and the Canmore dynasty. In this stage, Malcolm was portrayed as a reformed barbarian who functioned as the *locus* of Queen Margaret's sanctity. He was the object of Margaret's civilizing and evangelizing efforts, serving as an example of the benefits of incorporating English and European religious culture into Scotland. There was a latent tension between attempts by Northumbrian chroniclers to rehabilitate Malcolm's image and the existing Anglo-Norman depictions of Malcolm's (and Scottish) military brutality in twelfth-century chronicles. Such tension was also apparent in Ælred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, which traced the ancestry of Henry I of England and David I of Scotland to Anglo-Saxon royal roots. Ælred portrayed Malcolm as an Normanized king of Scots, a paragon of royal mercy that King David could emulate. Both

Turgot of Durham and Ælred of Rievaulx were examples of Northumbrian writers with close ties to the Canmore dynasty that were desirous of establishing Malcolm as a “reformed barbarian.” They disputed with contemporary Anglo-Norman chronicles that pictured Malcolm’s military brutality in order to foster stronger religious and political ties between the Scottish kings and Northumbria. The *Chronicle of Melrose*, composed during the Young King’s Rebellion of 1173-4, broke with this trend. By relying on the *Historia regum Anglorum*’s portrayal of Malcolm III as a barbaric king of Scots who repeatedly invaded and devastated Northumbria without provocation, the *Chronicle of Melrose* established Malcolm III as a king of Scots by English intervention. Malcolm was considered a client king of Edward the Confessor, a portrayal conditioned by the breakdown of Anglo-Norman relations that were the result of William the Lion’s participation in the Young King’s rebellion. This event saw King William humiliated and forced to acknowledge Henry II’s overlordship. Thus, the state of Anglo-Norman and Scoto-Northumbrian relations determined the character of Malcolm’s portrayals during the twelfth century.

Political tensions arising from the Treaty of Falaise of 1174 influenced the second stage of Malcolm’s historiographical portrayal. In this stage, dated from c. 1173-4 to c. 1285, Scottish chronicles depicted Malcolm as a “partner in rule” to Saint Margaret, a royal and dynastic equal to the queen, whose kingship brought Scotland into a new era that saw improvements in royal administration and law. While Saint Margaret remained the matriarch of a powerful dynasty of saintly extraction that blended Scottish and Anglo-Saxon royal blood, Malcolm was seen as the driving force behind the administrative and legal improvements experienced in the Scottish kingdom from his reign to the thirteenth century. Malcolm became the locus of law, order and modern royal administration in Scotland, a model of exceptional kingship that his descendants,

particularly Alexander II and III, ought to emulate. Moreover, there was no trace of the ambiguity and fluidity that characterized twelfth-century images of Malcolm III: he was portrayed unequivocally as a dynastic founder.

How was this transformation accomplished? The three historical sources examined in Chapter 2, the additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose*, the Dunfermline Compilation and the *Gesta Annalia* I, established Malcolm as king of Scots by hereditary right, as a provider of law and order, and as a civilized monarch interested in charitable works. In fact, the *Gesta Annalia* I altered some of the content of the Dunfermline Compilation to enhance Malcolm's agency by altering the language used to describe Malcolm's kingship. Chroniclers, therefore, sought to increase Malcolm's political agency to present the king as a dynastic and royal equal to his wife. The focus on royal administration and legal provision mirrored the interests of the reigns of Alexander II and III in the thirteenth century, and the insistence on Malcolm's "hereditary right" (*jure hereditario*) to the Scottish throne sought to dispel questions about the Canmore kings' sovereignty and independence. At a time when the English kings were increasingly intent on forcing Alexander III to submit to their overlordship, establishing Malcolm III as a dynastic equal with unquestionable regnal sovereignty was a historiographical tactic designed to support the independence of the Canmore dynasty in the late thirteenth century.

The third stage in the development of Malcolm Canmore's historiographical image dated from the late fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries. This stage saw the first appearance of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative in John of Fordun's *Chronica gentis Scotorum* (c. 1370s). Further examination of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative shows that the narrative's focus was on Malcolm's accession to the Scottish throne, not on Macbeth's tyranny: if the evidence from the thirteenth-century additions to the *Chronicle of Melrose* is considered, it is evident that

Macbeth was not as historiographically significant during the period under study as previously thought by medievalists and that his vilification was merely a by-product of historiographical attempts to enhance Malcolm's right to rule Scotland in the eleventh century. Moreover, while A. A. M. Duncan argued that it was possible that this story first emerged in the late thirteenth century as a "romance," an examination of the language and content of the narrative in Fordun's *Chronica* suggests that it was probably conceived sometime after 1306 at St Andrews and that it was part of a propaganda campaign that aimed at establishing Robert Bruce as the rightful king of Scots by questioning the legitimacy of John Balliol's reign. The addition of Macduff of Fife was inspired by the legal dispute between the historical Macduff of Fife, a son of Earl Colbán of Fife, John Balliol and William Fraser, bishop of St Andrews, between 1291 and 1296. Macduff's arrival at Westminster to request the intervention of Edward I in the dispute culminated with the latter's invasion of Scotland in 1296, an event traditionally understood to have begun the First Scottish War of Independence. Additionally, while Fordun's portrayal of Malcolm's reign was based on the content of the *Gesta Annalia* I, the content was amended and interpolated to present Malcolm not as Margaret's partner in rule, but as her superior. Malcolm's treatment of Edgar Ætheling and his family suggested that Edgar Ætheling and Saint Margaret depended on Malcolm politically, not that Malcolm depended on Saint Margaret for political and religious purposes. As in the first two stages, Malcolm Canmore's portrayal was influenced by contemporary political events that reflected changing notions of Scottish kingship, regnal sovereignty and national independence.

Andrew of Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronikyl* and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* represented the evolution of the Malcolm-Macbeth-Macduff narrative in the first half of the fifteenth century. Commissioned by two Fife knights, Sir John Wemyss of Leuchars and

Kincaldrum and Sir David Stewart of Rosyth respectively, these two histories placed Scotland within a wider world history context. Nonetheless, they were also very concerned with local affairs: the importance of Fife, and particularly St Andrews and Dunfermline, to Scottish history was well documented by both chroniclers.<sup>1</sup> Malcolm's reign was understood to have begun a new era in Scottish history, one where Scottish kings moved towards more modern, continental modes of kingship, acquired the refinement of Anglo-Norman culture, intermarried with the Wessex dynasty, and redefined crown-magnate relations thanks to the relationship between Malcolm and Macduff of Fife. While Wyntoun was more interested in the political agency of Macduff of Fife, Bower was concerned with Dunfermline as the site where royal sainthood in Scotland emerged.

Despite these similarities, both chroniclers portrayed Malcolm in different ways because they had different historiographical aims. Wyntoun, writing sometime in the 1410s, was concerned with the relationship between royal uncles and nephews, the death of David Stewart, Duke of Rothesay in 1402, and the conflict between his patron, Sir John Wemyss, and the Duke of Albany, Governor of Scotland. For Wyntoun, Malcolm Canmore had a reduced political agency because he was dependent on his nobility, represented by Macduff of Fife and Macduff's knight, to successfully acquire his throne. Bower, writing after the murder of James I, was more concerned with expanding Fordun's original history to construct an account of appropriate kingly rule that would serve as a guide to good kingship that James II could potentially consult. Both Wyntoun and Bower were concerned with tyranny and usurpation: the portrayal of Macbeth became a cautionary tale against tyrannical rulers. Both chroniclers also demonstrated how the political community of Scotland had the obligation to help maintain peace throughout the

---

<sup>1</sup> Dauvit Broun suggested the importance of St Andrews as a history production centre during the central and later Middle Ages in Scotland in "A new look," 20.

kingdom. Malcolm's kingship became an example of the cooperation between kings and nobles that characterized crown-magnate relations in late medieval Scotland. Thus, the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore was conditioned by contemporary trends in historiography, political theory, and kingship and governance.

Previous studies have emphasized the importance of Malcolm's historical reign without delving further into the reasons why this reign was so important in medieval Scottish history. Yet this thesis addresses this question. Medieval Scots saw Malcolm as a political innovator that merged both the Scottish and Anglo-Saxon royal houses into a new dynasty: the Canmores. The Norman kings of England especially from Henry I onwards, considered themselves descended from Wessex royalty because of their marriage to Malcolm's daughter, Edith-Matilda. Later Scottish kings, like Robert I, derived their right to rule both from claiming descent from Malcolm's descendants and from the support of the political community of Scotland.<sup>2</sup> In the early fifteenth century, Andrew of Wyntoun sought to trace a direct line between Malcolm III and Robert II, emphasizing the connection of the Stewarts to the Canmores. Malcolm served as the dynastic ancestor from whom the Canmore, Bruce, and Stewart dynasties derived their right to rule Scotland. The significance of Malcolm's portrayal to evolving ideas of kingship, sovereignty, and identity during the longer medieval period cannot be underestimated.

Specific changes to the portrayal of Malcolm III during the medieval period show how Scottish historiography moulded Malcolm to represent evolving ideas of kingship and identity. Twelfth-century Scottish kings emphasized their descent from Saint Margaret of Scotland, and by default, from the Anglo-Saxon House of Wessex, which gave them rights to both the English

---

<sup>2</sup> Robert I's charters often omitted any mention of John Balliol's reign, instead mentioning Alexander III as "ancestor" or "predecessor." See A.A.M. Duncan, ed. *Regesta Regum Scottorum V: The Acts of Robert I, 1306-1329* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988), e.g. nos. 9, 15, 24, 45, among others.

and Scottish thrones. But deriving regnal identity from Saint Margaret became a perilous affair when William the Lion lost his regnal sovereignty: the *Chronicle of Melrose*, reflecting on the aftermath of the Treaty of Falaise of 1174, invented a precedent for the loss of Scottish regnal sovereignty by re-casting Malcolm as a client king of England, placed on the throne by Siward of Northumbria at Edward the Confessor's command. While the monks of Melrose might have self-identified as Englishmen who were affected by the constant attacks of the Scottish army, by the thirteenth century they felt Scottish, and the version of the events of 1054 found in the *Chronicle* was problematic for sustaining the independence of the Scottish crown, and in particular, of the Canmore dynasty. As the self-identification of the monks of Melrose shifted from English in the twelfth century to Scottish in the thirteenth, the monks revised the portrayal of Malcolm III in the *Chronicle of Melrose*. This is how Malcolm was re-imagined as a Scottish king by "hereditary right," a hereditary right recognized by both Earl Siward and King Edward when they helped Malcolm recover the throne from the "usurper" Macbeth. This historiographical shift signalled how crucial was Malcolm's regnal sovereignty to the independence of Scotland and hegemony of the Canmore dynasty. Malcolm's image was deployed against English claims of overlordship and to support his descendants' increased territorial control over their kingdom.

The Canmore dynasty during the thirteenth century no longer relied solely on Saint Margaret's ancestry to sustain their hegemony and independence. The Dunfermline Compilation and the *Gesta Annalia* I are examples of how thirteenth-century Scottish chroniclers were preoccupied with presenting Malcolm as Margaret's dynastic equal. Since Alexander II and III derived their right to rule Scotland from Malcolm, not from Saint Margaret, it was imperative that Scottish histories reflected the independence of Malcolm's reign. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Scottish chroniclers focus on the antecedents to Malcolm's accession to the



Scottish throne because demonstrating Malcolm's regnal independence and the support of the political community of his hereditary right provided a precedent for Scottish independence and for Robert I's claim to the Scottish throne. It was during the late medieval period where shifting ideas of Scottish kingship, a kingship that was sustained by the support of the political community of the kingdom, provided a focus on the relationship between Malcolm Canmore and Macduff of Fife. In the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, *Orygynale Cronikyl*, and *Scotichronicon*, Macduff is a co-protagonist of the "Macbeth" narrative. The importance of the earl of Fife as kingmaker and leading nobleman in the eleventh century is not reflective of eleventh-century historical fact, but of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century ideas of crown-magnate cooperation. During the longer medieval period, Malcolm III's portrayal evolved along with evolving ideas of kingship, identity and sovereignty, demonstrating the importance of his reign to medieval Scots.

Although this research has shown how Malcolm's portrayal evolved in the central Middle Ages and why, it does not answer every query about Malcolm III and his historiographical images. Further avenues for study include a more thorough look into twelfth-century Northumbrian perspectives of Malcolm's reign, the relationship between Malcolm's portrayal and twelfth-century ideals of chivalric masculinity, the interplay between kingship, dynasty and sanctity, and a deeper investigation into the role of Macduff of Fife as kingmaking agent in Scotland and its reflections of ideas of conciliar governments and magnate power. Rather, this research should be understood as a template for further investigation into Malcolm's historiographical portrayals, as the beginning of further enquiries about Malcolm III and his dynasty, the place they held in Scottish historiography, and on how medieval Scots understood their own regnal past. More research needs to be conducted in order to understand more fully the importance of Malcolm's reign to Scottish historiography.

Medieval Scottish historians were “fascinated” with the kingship of Malcolm III Canmore, as this study has argued. Malcolm’s reign was interpreted in the medieval period as a high point in medieval Scottish history, as the point in time when Scotland’s kingship was modernized by intermarriage with the house of Wessex and by incorporating contemporary notions of law, kingship and governance. Malcolm’s legacy was not restricted to the success of his kingship and of his line, the Canmore dynasty. It was Malcolm’s *image* as the founder of a saintly dynasty, an innovator in law and governance, a vanquisher of tyranny and usurpation, a just and merciful monarch, and an ally to his nobility that made him important. As a literary figure, Malcolm III defined what medieval Scottish kingship should ideally be at different points in time. Malcolm’s reputation as dynastic founder and exemplary monarch helped Scottish historians assert and sustain the sovereignty of the Scottish crown when English kings threatened such sovereignty. Malcolm’s kingship was politically important during the late eleventh century, but it was made even more crucial after his death. Malcolm III was never a peripheral or secondary character in Scottish history: he was central to sustaining ideas of Scottish kingship and identity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources: Manuscripts

British Library. MS Cotton Faustina B. IX (The Chronicle of Melrose). Consulted from Broun, Dauvit, and Julian Harrison, eds. *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition. Vol. 1, Introduction and Facsimile Edition. Vol. 1.* Scottish History Society (Series); 6th Ser., v. 1. Woodbridge, England; Rochester, NY: Scottish History Society; Boydell Press, 2007.

Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid. MS II/2097 (The Dunfermline Compilation), seen in microfiche form at University of St Andrews, Special Collections.

## Primary Sources: Printed

Anderson, Alan Orr, trans. *Early Sources of Scottish History, A.D. 500 to 1286.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1922.

Anderson, Alan Orr. *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers, A.D. 500 to 1286.* Paul Watkins Medieval Studies. London: D. Nutt, 1908.

Anderson, Joseph, ed. *The Orkneyinga Saga.* Translated by Jón A. Hjaltalín and Gilbert Goudie. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1873.

Bower, Walter. *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt.* Edited by D. E. R. Watt. New ed. 9 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987.

Darlington, R. R., P. McGurk, Jennifer Bray, and P. McGurk, eds. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester: Volume II: The Annals from 450 to 1066.* Clarendon Press Oxford Medieval Texts, 1995.

Duncan, A.A.M., ed. *Regesta Regum Scottorum V: The Acts of Robert I, 1306-1329.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988.

Durham, Symeon of. *Simeon of Durham's History of the Kings of England.* Translated by Joseph Stevenson. Repr. Church Historians of England. Lampeter: Llanerch Publishers, 1987.

———. *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et collectanea.* Edited by John Hodgson-Hinde. Vol. 1. Durham; London; Edinburgh: Andrews and Co.; Whittaker and Co.; T. and W. Boone; Bernard Quaritch; Blackwood and Sons, 1868.  
<http://archive.org/details/operacollect00simerich>.

Embree, Dan, Edward Donald Kennedy, and Kathleen Daly, eds. "The Scottish Originale." In *Short Scottish Prose Chronicles*, 111–36. Medieval Chronicles 5. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012.

Fantosme, Jordan. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle.* Edited and translated by R.C. Johnston. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Fordun, John. *Johannis de Fordun Chronica gentis Scotorum.* Edited by W. F. (William Forbes) Skene. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871.

Fordun, John of. "III. Johannis de Fordun Capitula Ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa." In *Johannis de Fordun, Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, edited by William F. Skene, 1:406–37. The Historians of Scotland. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872.

———. *John of Fordun's Chronicle of the Scottish Nation.* Edited by W. F. (William Forbes) Skene. Translated by Felix James Henry Skene. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872.

- Fraser, William. *Memorials of the Family of Wemyss of Wemyss*. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1888.  
<http://archive.org/details/memorialsoffamil01fras>.
- Freeland, Jane Patricia, trans. *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*. Cistercian Fathers Series; No. 56. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2005.
- Hinde, John Hodgson, ed. *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia: Historia Regum. Eadem Historia Ad Quintum et Vicesimum Annum Continuata, per Joannem Hagulstadensem. Accedunt Varia*. Surtees Society 51. Edinburgh, 1865.
- Homer. *The Illiad, with an English Translation*. Translated by A. T. Murray. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Kleineman, 1924.
- Hudson, Benjamin T. *Prophecy of Berchán: Irish and Scottish High-Kings of the Early Middle Ages*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996.
- Innes, Cosmo, ed. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*. Searchable Text Edition. Vol. 1. Burlington, ON; St Andrews: TannerRitchie Publishing and University of St Andrews, 1844.
- , ed. *Registrum de Dunfermlyn: Liber Cartatum Abbatie Benedictine S. S. Trinitatis et B. Margarete Regine de Dunfermlyn*. The Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable, 1842.
- Malmesbury, William of. *William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England: From the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen. With Notes and Illustrations*. H. G. Bohn, 1847.
- Nighman, Chris L. "Scotichronicon: Libri 5 & 6." The Manipulus/Scotichronicon Project, 2016.  
<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/Scotichronicon/5.9/index.html>.
- Palgrave, Sir Francis, ed. *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland, and the Transactions between the Crowns of Scotland and England*. Vol. I. The Commissioners on the Public Records of the Kingdom, 1837.
- Rievallensis, Aelredus. "Genealogia Regum Anglorum." In *Patrologia Latina*, edited by Jacques Paul Migne, 195:711–38, 1885.
- Scotus, Marianus. *Mariani Scoti, poetae, mathematici, philosophi et theologi eximii, monachi Fuldensis, Historici Probatissimi, Chronica*. Basil: Apud Ioannem Oporinum, n.d.
- Skene, William F. *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, and Other Early Memorials of Scottish History*. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1867.
- Stones, Edward Lionel Gregory, ed. *Anglo-Scottish Relations 1174-1328; Some Selected Documents, Edited and Translated by E.L.C. Stones*. London: Thomas Nelson & Son, 1965.
- . *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland, 1290-1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause*. Glasgow University Publications. Oxford, England: Published for the University of Glasgow by the Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Turgot. *Life of St. Margaret Queen of Scotland*. Edited by William Forbes-Leith. Edinburgh: W. Paterson, 1884. <http://archive.org/details/lifeofstmargaret00turgoft>.
- Vitalis, Ordericus. *The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy*. Translated by Thomas Forester. Vol. III. London: H. G. Bohn, 1854.
- Whitelock, Dorothy, David C. Douglas, and Susie I. Tucker, eds. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961.
- Worcester, John of. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester: Volume II: The Annals from 450 to 1066: The Annals from 450-1066 Vol 2*. Edited by R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk. Translated by Jennifer Bray. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1995.

- Wyntoun, Andrew of. *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun Printed on Parallel Pages from the Cottonian and Wemyss Mss., with the Variants of the Other Texts*. Edited by F. J. Amours. Scottish Text Society. Edinburgh: Printed for the Society by W. Blackwood and sons, 1903.
- Wyntoun, Andrew of. *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland. by Andrew of Wyntoun. Edited by David Laing*. Edited by David Laing. The Historians of Scotland, V. 2, 3, 9. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872.

### Primary Sources: Websites

- Beam, Amanda G., John Bradley, Dauvit Broun, John Reuben Davies, Matthew Hammond, and Michele Pasin. *The People of Medieval Scotland, 1093 – 1314*, 2012. <http://db.poms.ac.uk/record/factoid/69301/>.
- Clover, Helen, and Margaret Gibson, eds. "A Letter from Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury (1070-1089)." In *Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979. <https://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/23738.html>.
- "English Translation of the Magna Carta." British Library. Accessed January 26, 2017. <https://www.bl.uk/magna-carta/articles/magna-carta-english-translation>.
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid, trans. "Annals of Tigernach." CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010. <https://celt.ucc.ie/published/T100002A.html>.
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid, trans. "Annals of Ulster." CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010. <https://celt.ucc.ie/index.html>.
- "'Parsenere' (N.)." Dictionary of the Scots Language. Accessed January 14, 2014. <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/parsenere>.
- "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: April 1413 | British History Online." Accessed January 14, 2018. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol9/pp2-6>.
- "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: July-December 1423 | British History Online." BHO. Accessed January 14, 2018. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol10/pp294-316>.
- "Rymer's Foedera with Syllabus: May 1412 | British History Online." Accessed January 14, 2018. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol8/pp733-745>.
- "The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum of Nennius. Appendix 1: IV. Duan Albanach." CELT: The Corpus of Electronic Texts, 2010. <https://celt.ucc.ie/published/T100028/text033.html>.
- Records of the Parliament of Scotland. Accessed January 14, 2018. <http://www.rps.ac.uk/>.

### Secondary Sources: Unpublished Ph.D. Theses

- Drexler, Marjorie Jean. "Attitudes to Nationality in Scottish Historical Writing from Barbour to Boece." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1979.
- Gilbert, John M. "Hunting Reserves in Medieval Scotland." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1975.
- Harrill, Claire Louise. "Politics and Sainthood: Literary Representations of St Margaret of Scotland in England and Scotland from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham, 2016.
- Hunt, K. J. "The Governorship of the First Duke of Albany." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1999. <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/6904>.

- Mapstone, Sally Louise. "The Advice to Princes Tradition in Scottish Literature, 1450-1500." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, St Hilda's College, University of Oxford, 1986.
- Marshall, Susan. "Illegitimacy in Medieval Scotland." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2013.
- Nelson, Jessica Alice. "From Saint Margaret to the Maid of Norway: Queens and Queenship in Scotland, c.1067-1286." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 2006.
- Tod, Murray Andrew Lucas. "The Narrative of the Scottish Nation and Its Late-Medieval Readers: Non-Textual Reader Scribal Activity in the MSS of Fordun, Bower, and Their Derivates." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Glasgow, 2005.

### Secondary Sources: Printed and Websites

- Anderson, Marjorie Ogilvie. *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973; Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973.
- Bannerman, John. "Macduff of Fife." In *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S Barrow*, edited by Alexander Grant and K. J. Stringer, 20–38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- . "The King's Poet and the Inauguration of Alexander III." *The Scottish Historical Review* 68, no. 186 (October 1, 1989): 120–49.
- Barrell, A. D. M. *Medieval Scotland*. Cambridge Medieval Textbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Barrow, G. W. S. *David I of Scotland (1124-1153): The Balance of New and Old*. The Stenton Lecture 1984 18. Reading: University of Reading, 1985.
- . *Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- . "Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland." In *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages*. London; Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992.
- . *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988.
- . *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages*. London; Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992.
- . *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1980.
- . "The Earls of Fife in the 12th Century." *PSAS* lxxxvii (March 1952): 51–62.
- . *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century*. Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- . "The Kings of Scotland and Durham." In *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, edited by David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich, 311–23. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994.
- Bartlett, Robert. *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225*. The New Oxford History of England. Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- . *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*. Reprint edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- . *The Miracles of St Æbbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Beam, Amanda G. *The Balliol Dynasty, 1210-1364*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008.

- Bell, David N. "Ailred of Rievaulx." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Accessed November 21, 2016. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8916?docPos=1>.
- Birkett, Helen. *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics*. York: York Medieval Press, 2010.
- Boardman, Stephen. "Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the 'Anonymous Chronicle.'" *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 23–43.
- Boardman, Stephen I. *Barbour's Bruce and Its Cultural Contexts: Politics, Chivalry and Literature in Late Medieval Scotland*. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2015.
- . "Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum." In *Royal Dunfermline*, edited by Richard Fawcett, 139–53. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2005.
- . *The Early Stewart Kings: Robert II and Robert III, 1371-1406*. The Stewart Dynasty in Scotland. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1996.
- Boardman, Steve. "A People Divided? Language, History and Anglo-Scottish Conflict on the Work of Andrew of Wyntoun." In *Ireland and the English World in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Brendan Smith, 112–29. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009.
- . "A Saintly Sinner? The 'martyrdom' of David, Duke of Rothesay." In *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland*, 87–104. Studies in Celtic History. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010.
- . "Late Medieval Scotland and the Matter of Britain." In *Scottish History: The Power of the Past*, edited by Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay, 47–72. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Borthwick, Alan. "Bower's Patron, Sir David Stewart of Rosyth." In *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, edited by D. E. R. Watt, New ed. Vol. 9. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987.
- Braudy, Leo. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003.
- Broun, Dauvit. "A New Look at Gesta Annalia Attributed to John of Fordun." In *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland: Essays Presented to Donald Watt on the Occasion of the Completion of the Publication of Bower's Scotichronicon*, edited by Barbara E. Crawford, 9–30. Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1999.
- . "Attitudes of Gall to Gaedhel in Scotland before John of Fordun." In *Miorun Mòr Nan Gall, "The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander"? Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern*, edited by D. Broun and M. D. MacGregor, 49–82. Glasgow: Centre for Scottish and Celtic Studies, University of Glasgow, 2009. <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/8835/>.
- . "Becoming a Nation: Scotland in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries." In *Nations in Medieval Britain*, edited by Hirokazu Tsurushima, 86–103. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010.
- . "Becoming Scottish in the Thirteenth Century: The Evidence of the Chronicle of Melrose." In *West Over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300*, edited by Beverly Ballin Smith, Simon Taylor, and Gareth Williams, 31:19–32. The Northern World. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "Charting the Chronicle's Physical Development." In *The Chronicle of Melrose: A Stratigraphic Edition. Introduction and Facsimile Edition. Vol. 1*, edited by Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison, Vol. 1. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.

- . “Contemporary Perspectives on Alexander II’s Succession: The Evidence of King-Lists.” In *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49*, edited by Richard D. Oram, 79–97. Northern World ; v. 16. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2005.
- . “Creating and Maintaining a Year-by-Year Chronicle: The Evidence of the Chronicle of Melrose.” In *The Medieval Chronicle VI*, edited by E. Kooper, 141–52. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- . *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- . “The Birth of Scottish History.” *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 4–22.
- . *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*. Studies in Celtic History. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1999.
- . “The Welsh Identity of the Kingdom of Strathclyde 900–1200.” *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 111–180. <https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2004.55.2.111>.
- Brown, Jennifer M. “The Exercise of Power.” In *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century*, edited by Jennifer M. Brown, 33–65. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1977.
- Brown, Michael. “Aristocratic Politics and the Crisis of Scottish Kingship, 1286–96.” *The Scottish Historical Review* 90, no. 1 (April 1, 2011): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2011.0002>.
- . *Disunited Kingdoms: Peoples and Politics in the British Isles 1280-1460*. Medieval World. Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education, 2013.
- . “Introduction.” In *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542 : Essays in Honour of Norman Macdougall*, edited by Michael Brown and Roland Tanner, 1–14. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008.
- . “‘Vile Times’: Walter Bower’s Last Book and the Minority of James II.” *The Scottish Historical Review* 79, no. 208 (2000): 165–88.
- Campbell, James. “Bede [St Bede, Bæda, known as the Venerable Bede] (673/4–735), monk, historian, and theologian,” Oxford National Dictionary of Biography, online edn 24 May 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1922>.
- . “Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past.” In *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History*, 209–28. London: Hambledon Press, 1986.
- Carpenter, David. “Scottish Royal Government in the Thirteenth Century from an English Perspective.” In *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286*, edited by Matthew Hammond, Studies in Celtic history:117–60. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013.
- . *The Struggle for Mastery: The Penguin History of Britain 1066-1284*. Penguin (Non-Classics), 2005.
- Carpenter, David X. “Morel of Bamburgh, Archil Morel, and the Death of King Malcolm III: A Case of Mistaken Identity.” *Northern History* 52, no. 2 (September 1, 2015): 314–23. <https://doi.org/10.1179/0078172X15Z.00000000094>.
- Chadwick, Nora K. “The Story of Macbeth.” *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 4, no. 2 (1949): 189–216.
- Commander, Eleanor. “Andrew Wyntoun, Historiographical Propagandist: The Four Kingdoms in His ‘Original Chronicle.’” In *Rhetoric, Royalty, and Reality: Essays on the Literary Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, 7:1–16. Mediaevalia Groningana New Series. Paris, Leuven, Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005.



- Cowan, Edward J. "The Historical MacBeth." In *Moray: Province and People*, edited by W. David H. Sellar, 117–41. Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1993.
- Craigie, W. A. "The St. Andrew MS. of Wyntoun's Chronicle." *Anglia* 20 (1898): 363–80.
- Dalton, Paul. "Scottish Influence on Durham 1066-1214." In *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, edited by David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich, 339–52. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994.
- Dean, Lucinda H. S. "Projecting Dynastic Majesty: State Ceremony in the Reign of Robert the Bruce." *International Review of Scottish Studies* 40 (2015): 34–60.
- Donnelly, Joseph. "The Earliest Scottish Charters?" *Scottish Historical Review* 68, no. 1 (1989): 1–22.
- Drexler, Marjorie. "The Extant Abridgements of Walter Bower's 'Scotichronicon.'" *The Scottish Historical Review* 61, no. 171 (April 1, 1982): 62–67.
- Duncan, A. A. M. "A Question about the Succession, 1364." In *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vol. 12, 1–57. Edinburgh: Pillans & Wilson, Ltd. for the Scottish History Society, 1994.
- . "Before Coronation: Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century." In *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon*, edited by David J. Breeze, Thomas Owen Clancy, and Richard Welander, 139–68. Monograph Series (Society of Antiquaries of Scotland) No. 22. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003.
- . "'Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense': David II and Edward III, 1346-52." *Scottish Historical Review* 67, no. 2 (1988): 113.
- . "Sources and Uses of the Chronicle of Melrose, 1165-1297." In *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland, 500-1297: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the Occasion of the Ninetieth Birthday*, edited by Simon Taylor, 146–85. Dublin: Four Court Press, 2000.
- . "The Earliest Scottish Charters." *Scottish Historical Review* 37 (1958): 103.
- . *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and Independence*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- . "Yes, The Earliest Scottish Charters." *Scottish Historical Review* 78, no. 205, Part 1 (April 1999): 1–38.
- Dutton, Marsha L. "Aelred of Rievaulx: Abbot, Teacher, and Author." In *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167)*, 76:17–47. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Fawcett, Richard. "Dunfermline Abbey Church." In *Royal Dunfermline*, edited by Richard Fawcett. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2005.
- Forte, A. D. M. "A Strange Archaic Provision of Mercy: The Procedural Rules for the Duellum under the Law of Clann Duib." *Edinburgh Law Review* 14 (2010): 418–50.
- Fraser, James E. "'A Swan from a Raven': William Wallace, Brucean Propaganda, and 'Gesta Annalia' II." *The Scottish Historical Review* 81, no. 211 (April 1, 2002): 1–22.
- . "'Like a Swan from a Raven': The Historiographical Image of William Wallace, 1297-1582." MA, University of Guelph, 1999.
- Freeman, Elizabeth. "Aelred as a Historian among Historians." In *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx*, edited by Marsha L. Dutton, 76:113–48. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2017.

- Gillingham, John. "Foundations of a Disunited Kingdom." In *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, edited by K. J. Stringer and Alexander Grant, 48–64. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- . "Women, Children and the Profits of War." In *Gender and Historiography. Studies in the Earlier Middle Ages in Honour of Pauline Stafford.*, edited by Janet L. Nelson, Susan Reynolds, and Susan M. Johns, 61–74. London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012.
- Given-Wilson, Chris. *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England*. Hambleton, London, New York: A&C Black, 2004.
- Goldstein, R. James. "'I Wil My Proces Hald': Making Sense of Scottish Lives and the Desire for History in Barbour, Wyntoun and Blind Hary." In *A Companion to Medieval Scottish Poetry*, edited by Priscilla Bawcutt and Janet Hadley Williams, 35–48. Cambridge: Boydell, 2006.
- . *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland*. Regents Studies in Medieval Culture. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.
- Grandsen, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England, c.550- c.1307*. Vol. I. 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Grant, Alexander. "Extinction of Direct Male Lines Among the Scottish Noble Families in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." In *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland*, edited by Keith J. Stringer, 210–24. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985.
- . "Murder Will Out: Kingship, Kinship and Killing in Medieval Scotland." In *Kings, Lords and Men in Scotland and Britain, 1300–1625: Essays in Honours of Jenny Wormald*, edited by Stephen Boardman and Julian Goodare, 193–226. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
- . "Royal and Magnate Bastards in the Later Middle Ages: A View from Scotland." In *La bâtardise et l'exercice du pouvoir en Europe du XIIIe au début du XVIe siècle*, edited by É. Bousmar, A. Marchandise, C. Masson and B. Schnerb, 313–68. Revue du Nord, hors-série, Collection Histoire, vol. 31. Bruxelles: Publications des Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis, 2015.
- Grant, Alexander, and K. J. Stringer, eds. *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S Barrow*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- Green, Judith A. "Forest Laws in England and Normandy in the Twelfth Century." *Historical Research* 86, no. 233 (2013): 416–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12003>.
- Hammond, Matthew, ed. *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286*. Vol. 32. Studies in Celtic History. Boydell Press, 2013.
- Harrill, Claire. "The Proper Place for a Queen? St Margaret of Scotland at Dunfermline Abbey." In *Gender and Mobility in Scotland and Abroad*, Vol. 4. Guelph Series in Scottish Studies. Guelph: Centre for Scottish Studies, forthcoming.
- Head, Dominic, ed. *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Higgitt, John. *Scottish Libraries*. Vol. 12. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues. London: British Library in association with the British Academy, 2006.
- Hingst, Amanda Jane. *The Written World: Past and Place in the Work of Orderic Vitalis*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

- Hudson, Benjamin. "The Scottish Gaze." In *History, Literature and Music in Scotland, 700-1560*, edited by R. Andrew McDonald, 29–59. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Huneycutt, Lois. "The Idea of the Perfect Princess: The Life of St. Margaret in the Reign of Matilda II (1100-1118)." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 12 (1989): 81–97.
- Huneycutt, Lois L. "Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos." In *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, edited by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean, 126–46. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- . *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*. Woodbridge, UK ; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Huntingdon, Joanna. "St Margaret of Scotland: Conspicuous Consumption, Genealogical Inheritance and Post-Conquest Authority." *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 33, no. 2 (2013): 149–64.
- Kaeuper, Richard W. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Keene, Catherine. *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective*. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- . "The Dunfermline 'Vita' of St. Margaret of Scotland: Hagiography as an Articulation of Hereditary Rights." *Arthuriana* 19, no. 3 (October 1, 2009): 43–61.
- King, Andy, and Michael A. Penman. *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*. Woodbridge; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2007.
- Kingsford, C.L. "Marianus Scotus [Moelbrigte] (1028–1082), Benedictine Monk and Chronicler." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18057;jsessionid=60755236C14CA09D3CE0CF45581DA587>.
- Lee, SangDong. "Recreating the Devotional Space of Dunfermline Abbey Between Ca. 1124–1180." *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 46 (2015): 31–56.
- Lyall, R. "'A New Maid Channoun'? Redefining the Canonical in Medieval and Renaissance Scottish Literature." *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26, no. 1, 1–18. (January 1, 1991).  
<https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol26/iss1/3>.
- Lyall, R. J. "Lost Literature of Medieval Scotland." In *Bryght Lanternis: Essays on the Language and Literature of Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, edited by J. Derrick McClure and Michael R. G. Spiller, 33–47. Lyall. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989.
- MacQueen, Hector L. "Canon Law, Custom and Legislation: Law in the Reign of Alexander II." In *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49*, edited by Richard D. Oram. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . *Common Law and Feudal Society in Medieval Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- Mapstone, Sally. "Bower on Kingship." In *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower ; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, edited by D. E. R. Watt, New ed., 321–38. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press-, 1987.
- . "Shakespeare and Scottish Kingship: A Case History." In *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, edited by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood, 158–83. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1998.

- Mason, Roger A. "Beyond the Declaration of Arbroath: Kingship, Counsel and Consent in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scotland." In *Kings, Lords and Men in Scotland and Britain, 1300-1625: Essays in Honour of Jenny Wormald*, edited by Stephen Boardman and Julian Goodare, 265–82. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
- McDiarmid, Matthew. "The Northern Initiative: John of Fordun, John Barbour and the Author of the 'Saints' Legend." In *Literature of the North*, edited by David Hewitt and Michael Spiller, 1–13. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1982.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings, 1058-1266*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell, 2003.
- . *The Kingdom of the Isles*, 1997.
- McDonald, Russell Andrew. "Old and New in the Far North: Ferchar Maccintsacairt and the Early Earls of Ross, c.1200-74." In *The Exercise of Power in Medieval Scotland, c.1200-1500*, edited by Stephen I. Boardman and Alasdair Ross. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.
- . "'Treachery in the Remotest Territories of Scotland': Northern Resistance to the Canmore Dynasty, 1130-1230." *Canadian Journal of History* 34 (1999).
- McGladdery, Christine. *James II. The Stewart Dynasty in Scotland*; 2. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1990.
- McKim, Alice. "Gret Price off Chewalry: Barbour's Debt to Fordun." Edited by G. Ross Roy. *SSL* 24 (1986): 7–29.
- McNamara, Jo Ann. "Imitatio Helenae: Sainthood as an Attribute of Queenship." In *Saints: Studies in Hagiography*, edited by Sandro Sticca, 141:51–80. Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies. Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1996.
- McQueen, Alison A. B. "Parliament, the Guardians and John Balliol, 1284-1296." In *The History of the Scottish Parliament, Volume 1: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1235-1560*, 1:29–49. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Meehan, Bernard. "Symeon of Durham (Fl. c. 1090-c.1128)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006 online edn 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25556>.
- Neville, Cynthia J. *Land, Law and People in Medieval Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- . "The Beginnings of Royal Pardon in Scotland." *Journal of Medieval History* 42, no. 5 (2016): 559–87.
- Oram, Richard. *Alexander II, King of Scots: 1214-1249*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012.
- . *David I: The King Who Made Scotland*. Stroud: History, 2008.
- Partner, Nancy F. *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Penman, Michael. *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2014.
- . "'Sacred Food for the Soul': In Search of the Devotions to Saints of Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, 1306–1329." *Speculum* 88, no. 4 (2013): 1035–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0038713413002182>.
- . "The Bruce Dynasty, Becket and Scottish Pilgrimage to Canterbury, c. 1178- c. 1404." *Journal of Medieval History* 32, no. 4 (2006): 346–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmedhist.2006.09.003>.

- Penman, Michael A. "Christian Days and Knights: The Religious Devotions and Court of David II of Scotland, 1329–71." *Historical Research* 75, no. 189 (2002): 249–272.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.00150>.
- . *David II, 1329–71*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell, 2004.
- Penman, Michael, and Roland Tanner. "An Unpublished Act David II, 1359." *The Scottish Historical Review* 83, no. 215 (2004): 59–69.
- Prestwich, J. O. "Orderic Vitalis." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006 online edn 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20812?docPos=1>.
- Purdie, Rhiannon. "Malcolm, Margaret, Macbeth and the Miller: Rhetoric and the Re-Shaping of History in Wyntoun's Original Chronicle." *Medievalia et Humanistica*, New Series., 41 (December 2015): 45–63.
- Reid, Norman H. "Crown and Community under Robert I." In *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays Presented to G.W.S Barrow*, edited by Alexander Grant and K. J. Stringer, 203–22. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- , ed. *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III, 1249–1286*. John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1990.
- . "The Prehistory of the University of St Andrews." In *Medieval St Andrews: Church, Cult, City*, edited by Michael Brown and Katie Stevenson, 237–67. Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2017.
- Royan, Nicola. "Hector Boece and the Question of Veremund." *Innes Review* 52, no. 1 (2001): 42–62. <https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2001.52.1.42>.
- Scott, William W. "John of Fordun's Description of the Western Isles." *Scottish Studies* 23 (1979): 1–13.
- Shed, Norman F. "Jocelin, Abbot of Melrose (1170–1174), and Bishop of Glasgow (1175–1199)." *The Innes Review* 54, no. 1 (June 1, 2003): 1–22.  
<https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2003.54.1.1>.
- Smith, Katherine Allen. "Saints in Shining Armor: Martial Asceticism and Masculine Models of Sanctity, ca. 1050–1250." *Speculum* 83 (2008): 572–602.
- Stevenson, Katie. *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424–1513*. Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2006.
- . "Contesting Chivalry: James II and the Control of Chivalric Culture in the 1450s." *Journal of Medieval History* 33, no. 2 (2007): 197–214.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmedhist.2007.04.005>.
- . *Power and Propaganda: Scotland 1306–1488*. The New History of Scotland 3. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Stringer, K. J. "Kingship, Conflict and State-Making in the Reign of Alexander II : The War of 1215–17 and Its Context." In *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214–49*, edited by Richard D. Oram. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "The Scottish 'Political Community' in the Reign of Alexander II (1214–49)." In *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093–1286*, edited by Matthew H. Hammond. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Stringer, Keith J. "The Emergence of a Nation-State, 1100–1300." In *Scotland: A History*, edited by Jenny Wormald, 38–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Taylor, Alice. "Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland: The Dunfermline Compilation." *Historical Research* 83, no. 220 (May 1, 2010): 228–52.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2281.2009.00496.x>.

- . “Homo Ligius and Unfreedom in Medieval Scotland.” In *New Perspectives on Medieval Scotland, 1093-1286*, edited by Matthew H. Hammond, 85–116. Studies in Celtic History 32. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013.
- . “Leges Scocie and the Lawcodes of David I, William the Lion and Alexander II.” *Scottish Historical Review* 88, no. 2 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.3366/E0036924109000869>.
- . *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124-1290*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Terrell, Katherine H. “‘Lynealy Discendit of þe Devill’: Genealogy, Textuality, and Anglophobia in Medieval Scottish Chronicles.” *Studies in Philology* 108, no. 3 (2011): 320–44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2011.0013>.
- . “Subversive Histories: Strategies of Identity in Scottish Historiography.” In *Cultural Diversity in the British Middle Ages: Archipelago, Island, England*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 153–72. New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Thomson, R. T. “Malmesbury, William of (b c. 1090, d. in or after 1142).” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29461?docPos=1>.
- Thomson, Rodney M., Emily Dolmans, and Emily A. Winkler, eds. *Discovering William of Malmesbury*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2017.
- Truax, Jean. *Aelred the Peacemaker: The Public Life of a Cistercian Abbot*. Cistercian Studies Series 251. Collegeville, Minnesota: Cistercian Publications, 2017.
- Walker, David M. *A Legal History of Scotland I: The Beginnings to A.D. 1286*. Vol. 1. 9 vols. Edinburgh: W. Green and Son, 1998.
- Wall, Valerie. “Malcolm III and the Foundation of Durham Cathedral.” In *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, edited by David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich, 325–37. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994.
- Watson, Fiona J. *Under the Hammer: Edward I and Scotland, 1286-1306*. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1998.
- Watt, D. E. R. “A National Treasure? The ‘Scotichronicon’ of Walter Bower.” *The Scottish Historical Review* 76, no. 201 (April 1, 1997): 44–53.
- . “The Sources.” In *Scotichronicon / by Walter Bower; General Editor, D.E.R. Watt*, edited by D. E. R. Watt, New ed., 234–58. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987.
- Webster, Bruce. “John of Fordun and the Independent Identity of the Scots.” In *Medieval Europeans*, 85–102. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26610-4\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26610-4_5).
- Wingfield, Emily. “‘Qwhen Alexander Our Kynge Was Dede’: Kingship and Good Governance in Andrew of Wyntoun’s Original Chronicle.” In *Premodern Scotland: Literature and Governance 1420-1587*, edited by Joanna Martin and Emily Wingfield, First edition., 19–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- . *The Trojan Legend in Medieval Scottish Literature*. D.S. Brewer, 2014.
- Woolf, Alex. *From Pictland to Alba, 789-1070*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

**APPENDIX A: BRITISH LIBRARY FAUSTINA B. IX: THE *CHRONICLE OF MELROSE*, TEXT BY  
SCRIBE 3 (1173 X 4)**

(fo. 12v)

Anno m<sup>o</sup>. xxx<sup>o</sup>. iiii<sup>o</sup>. Obiit Malcolmus rex scottorum. **Cui Machethad successit.**<sup>1</sup>

Anno m<sup>o</sup>. xxx<sup>o</sup>. ix<sup>o</sup>. hyemps extitit asperima. Obiit. Brithmarus licefeldensis episcopus. cui  
Wlsius successit. Hardecnutus rex danorum flandriam deuectus ad matrem suam emmam uenit.

(fo. 13r)

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. Macbeth rex scottorum rome argentum spargendo distribuit. Obiit dorobernensis  
archiepiscopus cui Rodbertus lundonie episcopus genere normannus successit. Hermannus  
Wiltoniensis episcopus aldredus wigornensis episcopus romam ierunt.

(fo. 13v)

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. iiii<sup>o</sup>. Dux northimbrorum Siwardus iussu regis Edwardis scotiam cum multo  
exercitu intrans prelium cum rege scottorum mache[ ]th committens illum fugauit. et  
malcolmun<sup>2</sup> ut rex iusserat regem constituit. Rex edwardus misit aldredum Wigornensum  
episcopum ad imperatorem ut per eum reciperet fratraelem suum edwardum qui in ungaria  
exulauerat.

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. v<sup>o</sup>. Siwardus dux northimbrorum eboraci obiit. cuius ducatus tostio fratri haroldi  
ducis datus est. Non multo post algarus filius leofrici comitis sine culpa a rege edwardus  
exlegarus hyberniam mox petiit. et xviii<sup>o</sup>. piratis nauibus adquisitis. et auxilio regis walensium  
griffini maxime fretus. tandem suum comitatum recuperauit. combusta prius ciuitate herefordensi

---

<sup>1</sup> This portion of the text was reconstructed following the *Historia Regum Anglorum* attributed to Symeon of Durham; see Durham, *HR*, 1039 AD.

<sup>2</sup> Omitted: “son of the king of the Cumbrians.”

et monasterio sancti alberti regis et martyris et quibusdam canonicis occisis. et cccc<sup>tis</sup>. vel eo  
amplius ceteris.



**APPENDIX B: BRITISH LIBRARY FAUSTINA B. IX: THE *CHRONICLE OF MELROSE*, WITH  
THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ADDITIONS BY SCRIBES 27 AND 28**

(fo. 12v)

Anno m<sup>o</sup>. xxx<sup>o</sup>. iiii<sup>o</sup>. Obiit Malcolmus rex scottorum. & *dunecanus nepos eius ei successit.*<sup>3</sup> **Qui  
senis annis rex erat albanie. A finleg natus percussit eum macabeta. Wulnere letali rex aput  
elgin obit.**<sup>4</sup>

Anno m<sup>o</sup>. xxx<sup>o</sup>. ix<sup>o</sup>. hyemps extitit asperima. Obiit. Brithmarus licefeldensis episcopus. cui  
Wlsius successit. Hardecnutus rex danorum flandriam deuctus ad matrem suam emmam uenit.  
***Obiit. Dunecanus rex scottorum. Cuius regnum macbet sibi usurpauit.***<sup>5</sup> **Ergo Rex macabda  
[in margin:].x scocie vii. Que fit annis In cuius regno fertile tempus erat // Hunc tamen in  
lufanant truncauit morte// crudeli; Duncani natus nomine malcolomus**<sup>6</sup>

(Fo. 13r:)

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. Macbeth rex scottorum rome argentum spargendo distribuit. Obiit dorobernensis  
archiepiscopus cui Rodbertus lundonie episcopus genere normannus successit. Hermannus  
Wiltoniensis episcopus aldredus wigornensis episcopus romam ierunt.

(fo. 13v)

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. iiii<sup>o</sup>. Dux northimbrorum Siwardus iussu regis Edwardis scotiam cum multo  
exercitu intrans prelium cum rege scottorum mache[ ]th committens illum fugauit. et  
malcolmum<sup>7</sup> ut rex iusserat regem constituit. Rex edwardus misit aldredum Wigornensum

---

<sup>3</sup> Scribe 27.

<sup>4</sup> Scribe 28, using the *Verse Chronicle* (on margin).

<sup>5</sup> Scribe 27.

<sup>6</sup> Scribe 28 using the *Verse Chronicle*.

<sup>7</sup> Omitted: "son of the king of the Cumbrians."

episcopum ad imperatorem ut per eum reciperet fratraelem suum edwardum qui in ungaria exulauerat.

Anno. m<sup>o</sup>. L<sup>o</sup>. v<sup>o</sup>. Siwardus dux northimbrorum eboraci obiit. cuius ducatus tostio fratri haroldi ducis datus est. Non multo post algarus filius leofrici comitis sine culpa a rege edwardus exlegarus hyberniam mox petiit. et xviii<sup>o</sup>. piratis nauibus adquisitis. et auxilio regis walensium griffini maxime fretus. tandem suum comitatum recuperauit. combusta prius ciuitate herefordensi et monasterio sancti alberti regis et martyris et quibusdam canonicis occisis. et cccc<sup>tis</sup>. vel eo amplius ceteris.

¶ *Lulach quatuor menses et dimi(diem) regnauit.*<sup>8</sup> Mensibus infelix lulach tribus existerat rex, Armis eiusdem malcolomi cecidit, fata uiri fuerant in stratbolgin aput esseg. Heu sic incaute; rex miser occubuit hos in pace uiros tenet insula iona sepultos. In tumulo regum; iudicis usque diem.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Scribe 27.

<sup>9</sup> Scribe 28; text continues in lower right margin.

**APPENDIX C: DUNFERMLINE COMPILATION, FOS. 23R-25R**

**Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid II/2097(Microfiche, St Andrews University Library)**

(fo. 23ra)

De malcolmo seniore rege scocie: sponso *sancte* margarite

(fo. 23rb):

Anno ab incarnatione deum millesimo quinquagesimo sexto suscepit malcolmus filius duncani regnum scocie iure hereditario.<sup>1</sup> Et regnauit . xxx vi. annis feliciter. Anno ad ab incarnatione deo m<sup>o</sup> . lx<sup>o</sup> vii<sup>o</sup>. audiens rex malcolmus nauem cum tali familia tam prope eum applicuisse. Ad nauem pergit. Et uirginem margaritam educens. Secundum formam ecclesie eam apud dunfermlyn desponsauit. Hec fuit prima desponsacio. Que rite facta fuit in terra scocie. Rudes enim erant scoti ante aduentum beate margarite. Et legem dei perfecte non nouerunt. Genuit ad rex malcolmus ex ea sex filios. S. eduardum. Edmundum. Ethelredum. Edgardum. Alexandrum. Et omnium regum streninssimum atque urba nissimum dauid. Et duas filias. Stilbus matildam reginam anglie cognomina bonam reginam. Et Mariam comitissam bononie. De quibus singulis postea in loco suo dicetur. Qualis uero uel quanti meriti fuerit beata margarita regina scocie apud de non. Uitam et miracula eius legentibus manifestum est. Agatha uero mater eiusdem et cristina soror eius apud nouum castrum super tyn sponse Christi consecrate fuerunt.

De morte malcolmi regis et sancta margarite regine.

(23va):

Malcolmus uero rex anno regni sui . xxx vi<sup>o</sup> . cum praedam magnam fecissbus in Anglia. Ex inprouiso lancea percussus occisus est apud alnewyk ydus nouembris. Et filius eius primogenitus

---

<sup>1</sup> This information is also found in the *Chronicle of Melrose*; see Cotton MS Faustina B. IX, fo. 13v, 1056 AD.

stilbus eduardus lancea percussus. xvii<sup>o</sup> kalendas decembris fatiscens apud edwardys ley iuxta gediwerth. 7 sepultus est in ecclesia sancta trinitatis de dunfermlyn iuxta patrem suum ante altare sancta crucis. Que cum audisset felicis memorie margarita regina. Nno quod ueri con est spiritu praestituit. Confessione facta et communion in ecclesia deuote precept deo se precibus commendans. Animabus sanbus celo reddidit. xvi<sup>o</sup> kalendas decembris in castro puellarum. Cuius corpus per posticum ex occidental parte eiusdem castri delatum est. et per gratiabus dei densissima nebula propter insidias donaldi fratris regis malcolmi protectum; quem eam dominum uiueret rapere uoluit in uxorem donet apud dunfermlyn peruentiuem. Ub quali decuit honore sepulta est contra altare sancta crucis.

**APPENDIX D: COMPARISON OF CHAPTER ORDER IN THE *GESTA ANNALIA I* AND THE *CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM***

| <b>Gesta Annalia I</b>  | <b>Fordun, Book V</b>  |
|---|--|
| N/A   | 1. De Macduf suadente Malcolmo Canmor reditum ad regnum        |
| N/A   | 2. De variis exemplis per Malcolmum positis                    |
| N/A   | 3. De responsis Macduf ponentis exemplum imperatoris Octaviani |
| N/A   | 4. De secunda tentatione Malcolmi                              |
| N/A   | 5. De tertia temptatione Malcolmi se falsissimum esse          |
| N/A   | 6. Quod Malcolmus de sua fidelitate securus jam effectus       |
| N/A   | 7. De regressu Malcolmi in Scociam                             |
| N/A   | 8. Quod auctor excusat populum cujuslibet regni                |
| 15. De quo rege magnanimo aliquid...                          | 9. De successione Malcolmi regis in regnum                     |
| 15. De quo rege magnanimo aliquid...                          | 10. De eadem pugna...  |
|   | 11. De morte regis Anglorum Edwardi                            |
| 11. Audiens autem haec Willelmus                              | 12. De causis, quibus Willelmus Bastard venit in Angliam       |
|   | 13. De misera et proditoria vita qui vivebant Anglorum gentes  |
| 12. Cernens itaque Eadgarus Ethelinge.../ 13. Nuncii autem... | 14. De felici Scotois applicatione Edgari Ethlinge in Scocia   |
| 14. Rex ergo ubicumque Margaretam viderat...                  | 15. De conjugio Malcolmi regis et sanctae Margaretae           |
| 16. Huic magnanimo viro regi Scociae Malcolmo...              | 16. De filiis et fialiabus qod de Margareta genuit             |
| 17. Eo denique tempore Willelmus Bastard...                   | 17. Quod Northumbrenses regi Malcolmi datis obsidibus          |
| 18. De illius magnifici regis Malcolmi                        | 18. De Malcolmi regis et reginae virtutum                      |
|   | 19. De obitu Willelmi Bastard                                  |
| 19. Haec et opera pietatis hiis similia idem rex exercens...  | 20. De fundatione Dunelmensis ecclesiae per malcolmum          |
| 20. Quod ut audivit regina...                                 | 21. De morte Sanctae Margaretae                                |

**APPENDIX E: CHANGES MADE TO THE *GESTA ANNALIA I* IN JOHN OF FORDUN'S *CHRONICA GENTIS SCOTORUM*, CHAPTERS 9-16 (SELECTIONS)**

Note: Additions by Fordun are placed in <brackets>. Changes in word choice are underlined. Omissions from the *Gesta Annalia I* (*GAI*) are marked with footnotes; words that have changed in order are marked in *italics*.

**De successione Malcolmi regis in regnum, et ejus pugna cum quodam proditore. – Capitulum ix.**

<Prostratis ubique cunctis hostibus, vel ad suam deductis pacem, idem saepedictus Malcolmus, apud Sconam, praesentibus regni majoribus, in throno regali positus est, et in omnium Scotorum gloriam, et honorem, eodem Aprili mense, die sancti Marci coronatus, ac eodem, videlicet, anno Domini millesimo LVII, et imperatoris Henrici quarti primo, qui quidem imperavit annis L. Rex vero XXXVI regnavit, et sex mensibus. Erat enim rex satis humile corde, fortis et animo, corporis viribus praepotens, et audax, non temerarius, ac multis aliis dotatus virtutibus, ut in sequentibus apparebit. Primis regni sui novem annis, Edwardo rege vivente, firmam pacem Anglis et communionem, et usque adventum Willelmi Bastard, observabat. Anno dicti regis Edwardi XIII, fratris sui filius regis quondam Edmundi Irnside, cui nomen Edwardus, ex Hungaria venit in Angliam, uxorem secum ducens Agatham, Edgarum filium, et duas filias, Margaretam, postea Scotorum reginam, et Cristinam sanctimoniam, quem rex patruus ac totius Angliae populus exultantes receperunt, de quibus prolixior sermo fiet postmodum suo loco.>

<Turgotus.><sup>1</sup> De rege Scotorum <Malcolmo Canmor> magnanimo, *dignum aliquid dicendum*<sup>2</sup> *duximus*, ut cujus fuerit cordis, quanti <vel> animi, unum *ejus opus* hic exaratum legentibus declarabit. Relatum est aliquando sibi, quendam de *suis summis proceribus* illum<sup>3</sup> occidendum cum suis hostibus convenisse. Imperat rex haec nuncianti silentium, siluit, et ipse, proditoris, qui

---

<sup>1</sup> Here begins *GAI* ch. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Omitted “hic.”

<sup>3</sup> Omitted “de eo.”

forte tunc aberat, expectans adventum. Qui cum ad curiam cum *apparatu magno* regi *venisset insidiaturus*, rex ei suisque vultum solitum atque jocundum praetendens, finxit se nihil audisse vel scrivisse, quae mente corde tenus recolebat. Quid plura? Jubet ipse rex omnes venatores suos summon mane convenire cum canibus. Et jam *aurora noctem* abegerat, cum rex, *ad se vocatis, proceribus cunctis*, et militibus, in venando spaciaturum ire festinat; venit <interim> ad quandam planitiem latam, quam in modum coronae densissima silva cingebat, in cujus medio colliculus unus quasi turgescere videbatur, qui diversorum colorum floribus pulchra quadam varietate depictus, fatigatis quandoque militibus ex venatu gratum praebebat accubitus. In quo cum rex ceteris superior constitisset secundum legem venandi, quam *tristram vulgus* vocat, singulis cum canibus, et sociis singular loca delegat, ut obsessa undique bestia, ubicumque eligeret exitum, <mortis> *exitum inveniret*. Ipse vero rex *seorsum ab aliis solus abcessit cum solo, suum secum retinens proditorem*.<sup>4</sup> <And yai war hande for hande.>

### **De morte regis Anglorum Edwardi, et quod proceres fratrem Margaretae Edgarum regem fecissent, etc.—Capitulum xi**

Willelmus. Rex Edwardus, pronus in senium <eo> quod ipse non susceperat liberos, et Godwini videret invalescere filios, misit ad regem Hunorum, <sed Turgotus dicit ad imperatorem,><sup>5</sup> ut filium <sui> fratris Edmundi <Irnsyde> Edwardum cum omni familia sua mitteret, futurum ut aut ille aut filii sui succedant *hereditario* <jure><sup>6</sup> *regno* Angliae; orbitatem suam cognatorum suffragio *debere sustentari*.<sup>7</sup> <Igitur> continuo <postquam advenerat,> apud Sanctum Paulum

<sup>4</sup> *GAI* reads: “Ipse vero rex, suum secum retinens proditorem, seorsum ab aliis solus cum solo abcessit.”

<sup>5</sup> Information taken from *GAI*: 10, p. 414

<sup>6</sup> *GAI*: 10, p. 414: “Edwardi junioris, filii Edmundi Irnsyde, cui regnum *hereditario jure* debebatur, regem constituere moliuntur.”

<sup>7</sup> Copied from *GRA*, ii: #228, p. 382; interpolations from information found in *GAI*, ch. 10, p. 414.

Londoniae fato defunctus est, <Edgaro filio superstito cum sororibus praenominatis, quem> pro genere regno proximum rex proceribus commendavit.<sup>8</sup> Rex demum, postquam exactis in regno non plene XXIII annis,<sup>9</sup> obiit vigilia Epiphaniae;<sup>10</sup> in crastino quidem, adhuc recenti...

**De causis, quibus Willelmus Bastardus venit in Angliam; et de sancto Paterno Scoto.—**

**Capitulum xii.**<sup>11</sup>

Audiens autem Willelmus <Bastard>, comes Normanniae,<sup>12</sup> quod Haroldus *Edwardi consobrini sui regnum* usurpasset, variis<sup>13</sup> causis stimulates, in Angliam venit. Prima prorupto foedere,<sup>14</sup> <quod simul pepigerant juramento, quod ei tunc castrum **Doroberniae**, et **post mortem Edwardi regnum** Angliae sibi daturum **firmavit**, quod itaque **filiam** suam adhuc **impubem** duceret uxorem promisit.<sup>15</sup>> Etiam quia *pater* <suus> Godwinus cognatum suum Alfredum<sup>16</sup> cum pluribus Anglis et Normannis apud Hely proditorie perimerat, <omnibus comitibus, praeter decimos, de capitalis. Etiam> quia <Godwinus ipse> Robertum archiepiscopum, et Odonem consulem cum omnibus Francis<sup>17</sup> *exterminasset ex Anglia*.<sup>18</sup> Hiis igitur et aliis causis irritatus, *undecunque collectis viribus transfretavit in Angliam*, et eundem Haroldum levi bello et facili *II*

<sup>8</sup> Beginning with “pro...commendavit,” this passage was copied from *GRA*, iii: #338, p. 408.

<sup>9</sup> Phrase copied from *GAI*, ch. 10, p. 414.

<sup>10</sup> Phrase copied from *GAI*, ch. 10, p. 414.

<sup>11</sup> First part is *GAI*, Chapter 11.

<sup>12</sup> Omitted: “cui cognomen Bastard.”

<sup>13</sup> Changed from “tribus de causis...”

<sup>14</sup> Changed from “scilicet,” omitted “quia Godwinus.”

<sup>15</sup> This information is found in *GRA*, ii, 228 (p. 384): “Ibi Haroldus, et ingenio et manu probatus, Normannum in sui amorem convertit; atque, ut se magis commendaret, ultro illi tunc quidem castellum **Doroberniae** quod ad jus suum pertineret, et **post mortem Edwardi regnum Anglicum**, sacramento **firmavit**: quare et **filiae**, adhuc **impubis**, desponsione, et totius patrimonii amplitudine donates, familiarum partium habebatur.”

<sup>16</sup> *GAI* reads: “Prima scilicet, quia Godwinus, ejusdem pater, et filii sui cognatum suum Alveredum...”

<sup>17</sup> Omitted: “idem Godwinum.”

<sup>18</sup> Omitted: “Tertia, quod, filiam suam, in uxorem ductam, omittens, regnum, quod sibi, ut asseruit, jure cognationis debebatur, in perjurium prolapses invasisset.”



*idus Octobris apud Hastings regno simul et vita privavit, anno Domini MLXVI,*<imperatoris Henrici, regisque Malcolmi decimo. Istius imperatoris anno secundo Padbrunna, Germaniae civitas, cum ecclesia majori combusta est. In monasterio autem monachorum ejusdem civitatis Scotus erat quidem, Paternus nomine, multo tempore reclusus, qui saepius hoc incendium praedixit.> <Petrus Damianus. In quadam urbe Teutonica erat quidam servus Dei, nomine Paternus, juxta monasterium in cellula reclusus, cui revelatum est, quod, nisi populus per poenitentiam citius Deum placaret, infra triginta dies tota civitas incendio periret. Promulgata est visio, sed noluerunt converti. Ille quidem petiosa quaeque monasterii auferri jussit, ut essent salva. Tandem a septem Urbis regionibus subito ignis exoritur, et totam urbem cum monasterio in cineres combussit. Cumque vero ad cellulam viri Dei [ignis pervenisset, et rogaretur exire, noluit, sed omnia judiceo Dei] committens, cum sua cellula cumbustus est.><Adventus anno Willelmi Bastard in Anglia visa est cometa: unde versificator sic ait:

Anno milleno sexageno quoque seno  
Anglorum metae crines sensere cometae.>

**De felici Scotis application Edgari Ethlinge in Scocia, et suae sororis Margaretae, postea Scotorum reginae.—Capitulum xiv.**

<Turgotus.> Cernes autem Edgarus Ethlinge, rex Anglorum undique perturbari, ascensa navi cum matre<sup>19</sup> et sororibus *in patriam reverti*,<sup>20</sup> qua natus fuerat, conabatur.<sup>21</sup> Sed summus imperator, qui *ventis imperat* et mari, *mare commovit*,<sup>22</sup> et in spiritu procellarum exaltati sunt

---

<sup>19</sup> Omitted: “sua.”

<sup>20</sup> Omitted: “in.”

<sup>21</sup> Omitted sentence: “Et hoc consilio matris suae, quae cum liberis suis insidias adversariorum suorum sub protectione parentum studuit declinare.”

<sup>22</sup> Omitted: “et conturbavit illud.”

fluctus ejus, Saeviente<sup>23</sup> vero<sup>24</sup> tempestate, omnes in desperation vitae positi, sese Deo commendant, et puppim pelago committunt. Igitur post plurima pericula, et immanes labores, miserturs est Dominus desolatae familiae suae, quia ubi humanum, deese <videtur> auxilium <ad> *divinum necesse est recurrendum*,<sup>25</sup> <innumeris> *tandem quassati pelago* periculis, *coacti sunt in Scociam* applicare. Applicuit igitur illa sancta familia<sup>26</sup> quodam loco qui<sup>27</sup> sinus sanctae Margaretae<sup>28</sup> <deinceps> ab incolis appellatur.<sup>29</sup> <Nec><sup>30</sup> hoc casu contigisse, sed <etiam> summi Dei providentia *credimus ibidem advenisse*.<sup>31</sup> Igitur in dicto sinu praefata *commorante familia, cunctisque*<sup>32</sup> rei finem cum<sup>33</sup> timore<sup>34</sup> expectantibus, nunciatum est regi<sup>35</sup> Malcolmo <suum> adventum, qui tunc ab eodem loco haud procul cum suis manebat <et ad navem nuncios dirigens> rem inde veram sciscibatur. Nuncii<sup>36</sup> autem illic venientes, et *magnitudinem navis praeter solitum*<sup>37</sup> admirantes, regi quae viderant *festinant quantocius* indicare. Quibus auditis, rex plures et prudentiores prioribus de summis suis proceribus illac dixerit. At illi sicut<sup>38</sup> nuncio regie majestatis suscepti, virorum proceritatem, mulierum venustatem, ac *familiae totius* industriam non sine admiratione diligentius considerantes, gratum apud semetipsos inde

---

<sup>23</sup> GAI: “Desaeviente.”

<sup>24</sup> GAI: “itaque.”

<sup>25</sup> Changed from “subvenire.”

<sup>26</sup> Omitted: “in.”

<sup>27</sup> Omitted: “nunc.”

<sup>28</sup> Omitted: “reginae.”

<sup>29</sup> Omitted two sentences: “In hoc autem sinu eiusdem, ut credimus, matronae a periculo maris multi postea liberati sunt. Et merito, ut illa, quae tot et talia naufragia maris passa est, naufragantibus subvenire non desistat.”

<sup>30</sup> Changed: “Et ideo non...”

<sup>31</sup> Changed from “applicuisse.”

<sup>32</sup> Changed from “omnibus.”

<sup>33</sup> changed from “in.”

<sup>34</sup> Omitted: “Dei.”

<sup>35</sup> Omitted: “Scociae.”

<sup>36</sup> Here begins GAI, ch. 13.

<sup>37</sup> Omitted: “videntes et...”

<sup>38</sup> Changed from “ut.”

colloquium conferunt. Quid plura? Eventum rei, et rerum seriem, et causam nuncio ad hoc destinati dulci alloquio et eloquenti dulcedine investigant. Illi autem, ut novi hospites et advenae, <eis humiliter> *exponuit* <et> *eloquenter*. Reversi autem nuncii, cum seniorum reverentiam, juvenum vero prudentiam, matronarum maturitatem, et juvenularum venustatem suo regi nunciassent, quidam subintulit dicens, Vidimus ibi quandam <dominam> quam, ob formae incomparatam speciem, et eloquentiae *jocundae facunditatem* tamen<sup>39</sup> ob ceterarum fecunditatem virtutum, *illius familiae, iudicio meo*, dominam, suspicans tibi, <rex> annuncio, de cujus mirabili venustate et moralitate mirandum magis <censeo><sup>40</sup> quam narrandum. Nec mirum, si illam dominam crediderint, quam dominam non solum illius familiae, sed etiam <post fratrem> Angliae totius<sup>41</sup> heredem, ymmo regni sui participem futuramque reginam divina praedestinaverit providentia. Rex autem<sup>42</sup> audiens illos Anglos et ibidem adesse,<sup>43</sup> propria persona illos visitat et alloquitur, et unde venerunt, aut quod vadant plenius explorat. Anglicam enim linguam simul et Romanam aequae ut propriam plene didicerat, cum post patris sui mortem quindecim<sup>44</sup> annis *in Anglia mansisset*, ubi forte de cognitione hujus sanctae familiae aliquid audierat, unde<sup>45</sup> cum eis nuncius ageret et benignius se haberet.

**De conjugio Malcolmi regis et sanctae Margaretae, et quod omnes Anglorum profugos, etc.—Capitulum xv.**

---

<sup>39</sup> Changed from “tum.”

<sup>40</sup> Omitted: “est admirandum...”

<sup>41</sup> Omitted: “regni.”

<sup>42</sup> Omitted: “Malcolmus.”

<sup>43</sup> Omitted: “in.”

<sup>44</sup> Changed from “XVII.”

<sup>45</sup> Changed from “quare.”

<Item Turgotus.> Rex igitur utcunque Margaretam viderat, et eam de regio semine, simul et imperiali <genitam> esse didicerat, ut eam in uxorem duceret petiit, et optinuit, tradente eam Edgardo Ethilinge fratri suo, magis suorum quam sua voluntate, ymmo Dei ordinatione. Nam sicut olim Hester Assuero regi pro *suorum salute concivium* divina providentia, ita et haec illustrissimo regi *Malcolmo*<sup>46</sup> *copulata*<sup>47</sup> <fuit> *in conjugium*. Nec tamen captiva, ymmo multis abundans divitiis, quas patri suo Edwardo, tanquam heredi, rex Angliae suus patruus prius dederat, quas etiam ipse Romanus imperator Henricus, sicut ante Paulo praediximus non minimis honoratum muneribus, in Angliam misit, quarum partem permaximam haec sancta regina secum in Scotia transtulit. Attulit etiam plures sanctorum reliquias omni lapide vel auro preciosiores. Inter quas fuit illa sancta crux, quam nigram vocant, omni genti Scotorum non minus terribilem quam amabilem pro suae reverentia sanctitatis. Nuptiae quidem factae sunt non procul a sinu maris quo applicuit, et magnifice celebratae anno Domini millesimo LXX,<sup>48</sup> loco qui dicitur Dunfermlyn, quem tunc temporis rex habebat pro oppido. Erat enim locus ille naturaliter in se munitissimus, densissima silva circumdatus, praruptis rupibus praemunitus. [*In cujus medio erat venusta*] planicies, etiam<sup>49</sup> rupibus et rivulis munita,<sup>50</sup> quod de ea dictum esse putaretur, non homini facilis, vix adeunda feris.

Willelmus. *Omnes Anglorum profugos*<sup>51</sup> *Malcolmus libenter recipiebat*, tutamentum singulis quantum poterat impendens: Edgarum<sup>52</sup> <cum Stigando Cantuariensi et Baldredo Eboracensi

---

<sup>46</sup> Missing “Scotorum, regis Dunecani filio.”

<sup>47</sup> Changed from “copulaur.”

<sup>48</sup> Changed from 1067 to 1070.

<sup>49</sup> Changed from “ita.”

<sup>50</sup> Changed from “circumdata.”

<sup>51</sup> Changed from “perfugos.”

<sup>52</sup> From “Willelmus” to where this footnote is placed, information comes from *GRA*, iii., #249, p. 422.

archiepiscopis, sed<sup>53</sup>> Edgarum praecipue, cujus sororem pro antiqua memoria nobilitatis jugalem sibi fecerat. Ejus causa conterminas Angliae provincias rapinis et incendiis infestabat.<sup>54</sup> <Eboracum unicum rebellionum suffugium.<sup>55</sup> Ipse *Malcolmus rex*<sup>56</sup> cum suis, et<sup>57</sup> Edgarus<sup>58</sup> Marchierus, et Weldeofus cum Anglis et Danis nidum tyrannidis saepe fovebant, saepe duces illis trucidabant, quorum singillatim exitus si commemoravero fortasse superfluuus non ero.<sup>59</sup>> Hii duo Stigandus et Aldredus cleri principes Londoniae fuerant cum Edgarus iste, filius Edwardi, filii Edmundi Irnside, post regis Edwardi mortem, post itaque Willelmi victoriam [...]

**De filiis et filiabus, quos de Margarita genuit, etc.—Capitulum xvi.**

<Turgotus.> Huic illustrissimo viro regi Scotorum Malcolmmo ab incarnationis dominicae anno MLXX, suaeque regnationis XIII, <quidam tamen scripserunt anno Domini MLXVII>, Margareta, sicut praemissum est, matrimonio copulatur. <Cristina vero soror ejus in Christi sponsam benedicitur.> Genuit autem ex ea sex filios, scilicet, Edwardum, Edmundum, et Etheldredum, Edgardum, Alexandrum, et omnium regum strenuissimum et urbanissimum David: et duas filias, Matildem postea reginam Angliae, cognomento bonam, et Mariam comitissam Bononiae, de quibus singulis postea in loco suo dicetur. Qualis enim, vel quanti meriti fuerat illa

<sup>53</sup> Addition not in *GRA* passage cited.

<sup>54</sup> *GRA* iii, #249, p. 423; missing rest of sentence: "...non quod aliquid ad regnum illi profuturum arbitraretur, sed ut Willelmi animum contristaret, qui Scotticis praedis terras suas obnoxias indignaretur." ("not that he supposed, by so doing, he could be of any service to him, with respect to the kingdom; but merely to distress the mind of William, who was incensed at his territories being subject to Scottish incursions.") [English trans. P. 262].

<sup>55</sup> *GRA*, iii, #248, p. 422, missing rest of sentence: "... civibus pene delevit, fame et ferro necatis: ibi enim..." ("and destroyed its citizens with sword and famine."), p. 422.

<sup>56</sup> *GRA*, iii, #248, p. 422, missing: "Scotorum."

<sup>57</sup> Changed from "Ibi."

<sup>58</sup> Missing "et."

<sup>59</sup> Missing rest of sentence: "licet fastidii discrimen immineat, dum relatori, si forte secundum dictores suos mentiatur, difficilis sit regressus ad veniam."

beata regina<sup>60</sup> Margareta apud Deum et homines, vitam ejus laudabilem, *et mortem*,<sup>61</sup> *ac miracula* liber inde confectus legentibus declarabit.<sup>62</sup> <Haec ille.<sup>63</sup>> Saepissime autem rex boreales Angliae provincias, a primo regnationis<sup>64</sup> tempore<sup>65</sup> Willelmi Bastard <usque post etiam ejus obitum,<sup>66</sup>> valida manu ingressus, omnia vastando circumquaque destruxit, animantia quaeque<sup>67</sup> praedis et rapina hostiliter abstulit, cunctaque visui humano <que non abstulit<sup>68</sup>> flammis et ferro de superficie terrae crudeliter consumpsit.<sup>69</sup> Innumerabilium itaque catervas hominum<sup>70</sup> abduxit, ita quod in regno suo domus<sup>71</sup> ferme <vel casa<sup>72</sup>> nequaquam existerat, quae virilis sexus aut feminei<sup>73</sup> captivum <seu captivam> non tenebat. Quorum autem enumerando quis explicare poterit quot et quantos benedicta regina regis conjux dato pretio liberati restituerit, quos de gentibus Anglorum abducens captivos hostilis violentia redigerat in servos? Continuis autem excidiis et depraedationibus<sup>74</sup> rex Angliam intrans, Northumbriam ultra flumen These vastavit. <Tandem cum *nobilibus*> totius <Northumbriae concordatus, omnem> patriam,<sup>75</sup> *episcopo Walcherio Dunelmensi* cum aliis<sup>76</sup> pluribus<sup>77</sup> apud Gatished occisis, <praeter casta

---

<sup>60</sup> Missing “Scociam.”

<sup>61</sup> Missing “preciosam.”

<sup>62</sup> Changed from “manifestat.”

<sup>63</sup> Changed from “Turgotus.”

<sup>64</sup> Omitted: “suae.”

<sup>65</sup> Omitted: “et maxime.”

<sup>66</sup> Changed from “post adventum.”

<sup>67</sup> Changed from “vero.”

<sup>68</sup> Changed from “placentia.”

<sup>69</sup> Omitted: “et.”

<sup>70</sup> Omitted: “captivatum.”

<sup>71</sup> Changed from “aedes.”

<sup>72</sup> Changed from “militantes.”

<sup>73</sup> Omitted: “vel.”

<sup>74</sup> Omitted: “depopulando.”

<sup>75</sup> Omitted: “exceptis quibusdam, castris,…”

<sup>76</sup> Changed from “ac.”

<sup>77</sup> The word “nobilibus” earlier in the sentence is here in the original sentence.

quaedam> in deditione accepit,<sup>78</sup> omnesque provinciales ad pacem suam et fidem redegit. Et licet<sup>79</sup> Malcolmus pro duodecim villis in Anglia existentibus homo Willelmi Bastard devenerit,<sup>80</sup> provocatus tamen per quosdam Northmannos<sup>81</sup> hominum illud abjecit, et tales irruptiones pessimas et strages eis importabiles <non> immerito cumulavit. <Willelmus. Circa annum Henrici quarti duodecim, hinc Scotis hinc Francis Angliam incursantibus, Anglis tanta fame consumuntur, ut quidem humanam carnem, et multi carnibus equinis vescuntur.

---

<sup>78</sup> Changed from “recepit.”

<sup>79</sup> Omitted: “ante retroactis annis...”

<sup>80</sup> Omitted: “tunc regis Angliae”

<sup>81</sup> Changed from “Anglos”; missing after that word: “fines regni sui invadentes.”