

## II.

### NOTICES OF THE BURIAL OF KING MALCOLM III. IN THE MONASTERY AT TYNEMOUTH IN 1093, AND OF THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF HIS REMAINS. BY JOHN STUART, Esq., F.S.A. Scot.

At a recent meeting of our Society a paper was read by the Rev. Dr Chalmers, containing a Notice of a Tomb in the nave of the Abbey Church of Dunfermline, opened in 1849; and the conclusion there arrived at was, that this tomb had most probably contained the remains of Edward, son of King Malcolm III., supposed to have been buried beside his father, before the Altar of the Holy Cross.

Having examined most of the authorities connected with the burial of Mal-

colm at Tynemouth and his translation to Dunfermline, I have thought the results sufficiently interesting for being presented to the Society.

Malcolm was slain on the 13th November 1093, and, according to the *Addimenta* to Matthew Paris,<sup>1</sup> his body was interred in the Priory of Tynemouth in a way befitting his rank, at the instance of Robert de Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, the founder of the Priory. According to Simeon of Durham, its carriage to Tynemouth was less honourable; for he relates, that after the dispersion of Malcolm's troops, and when no one remained to cover his remains, the body was laid on a cart by two poor men, and was by them carried to Tynemouth.<sup>2</sup>

Different statements occur as to whether Malcolm's son Edward was slain with him or not. Fordun says that this prince died at Edward Isle (or Redwere, as in Hearne), in Jedwood Forest, three days after his father, and was buried at Dunfermline, near his father, before the Altar of the Holy Rood.

Fordun also, while he regards it as apocryphal, gives the common account of Malcolm's death at the siege of Alnwick, viz., that one of the garrison, under pretence of rendering the place and giving up the keys on the point of his lance to the King, ran his spear through the eyes of the monarch, and killed him, from which exploit the soldier took the name of Pierce-eye, and so began the illustrious lineage of Percy. According to Matthew Paris,<sup>3</sup> Malcolm and his son were intercepted and suddenly slain on a raid into England. Simeon of Durham<sup>4</sup> says that the King, with his son Edward and many others, were slain on the Alne. William of Malmsbury says that both Malcolm and his son were slain by the Earl of Northumberland.<sup>5</sup> The *Saxon Chronicle*<sup>6</sup> agrees that both were slain. Our own Wyntoun says,

Malcolme swá oure Kyng of were  
In England past wyth hys powere  
And wástyð all Northwंबरland  
As he til Alnevik wes rydand  
There he deyð slayne of cáas  
And hys sonne that wytht hyme was  
Edward the eldast swa bathe thai  
Ware slayne in Alnevyke on á day.<sup>7</sup>

William of Malmsbury, in speaking of Robert Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, relates that Malcolm fell by the men of the Earl rather through fraud than force,<sup>8</sup> and the expression of Matthew Paris also leads to the conclusion,

<sup>1</sup> P. 199.

<sup>3</sup> P. 17. Lond. 1640.

<sup>6</sup> P. 424. Edit. of English Hist. Soc.

<sup>7</sup> B. vii., ch. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Twysden, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> P. 216.

<sup>6</sup> P. 409. Transl. by Giles.

<sup>8</sup> P. 494.

that the King fell into an ambush and was killed unexpectedly.<sup>1</sup> From this fact probably arose the legend quoted by Fordun. The Chronicle of Alnwick contains an account of the King's death, and states that he was wounded by Hamond, then constable of Eustace de Vesci (pregenitor of the Percys), with a lance, as stated by Fordun.<sup>2</sup> At all events Malcolm fell near a spring, in land called Quarrellflat (afterwards given to Alnwick Abbey, but now within the Manor of Alnwick), to which his name was for ages afterwards attached, it being called Malcolm's Well. Eustace de Vesci, who succeeded his father in 1185, appears from the Chronicle of Alnwick Abbey to have founded upon the above-mentioned spot the chapel and hospital of St Leonard, for the soul of Malcolm, grandfather of the donor's wife. The well is not now known, but the spot where the hospital stood is marked by a modern cross with this inscription, "King Malcolm's Cross decayed by time was restored by his descendant, Elizabeth Dutchesse of Northumberland 1774." The pedestal and capital of the old cross still remain among the adjoining trees.<sup>3</sup>

In the year 1247, while new foundations were in the course of being dug for additional buildings at Tynemouth, two skeletons were discovered, one of a tall person, the other of one of lesser stature. Ralph de Dunham, who was at that time Prior of Tynemouth, supposed these skeletons to be the remains of Malcolm and his son Edward, but he seems to have been ignorant of all the circumstances connected with the death and burial of these personages. It appears that about the same time Ralph de Dunelmo, a monk of Kelso, had come to Tynemouth, where he was hospitably entertained by the convent. During his stay the prior related to him the finding of the skeletons, with his conjecture as to their being the bones of Malcolm and his son, but he requested his guest that if on his return home he could find notice in any authentic record of the mode of the king's death or the place of his burial, he would communicate the result to him by letter. The answer of the monk of Kelso is preserved in a volume which belonged to the prior to whom it was addressed, and having been given by him to the convent, is now in the Harleian collection in the British Museum. A copy from another source is printed in Wat's<sup>4</sup> edition of Matthew Paris. It has been printed in the Miscellany of the Bannatyne Club, and by Mr Gibson in his History of Tynemouth.

In this curious letter the monk of Kelso states that he has found in a book, which he calls the History of the Danes, that King Malcolm and his eldest son

<sup>1</sup> "Interceptus et subito interfectus," Matt. Par., p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Harl. MSS., No. 692, fol. 155. Ap. Gibson, vol. i., p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Gibson's Tynemouth, vol. i., p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Additamenta, p. 199, vol. i., p. 223; vol. ii., App. No. 84.

Edward, with their forces, were slain by the soldiers of the Earl of the Northumbrians. He proceeds to recognise the plain judgment of God in the death of the king in the county of Northumberland, which he had so often wasted, and he recounts five occasions on which the king had laid it waste. "For a fifth time," says he, "with the greatest force he could raise he invaded Northumberland for its final desolation; but near to the river Alne, he was slain by Morell, a most valiant knight, with his son Edward, whom he had appointed heir of the realm after himself. His army was either destroyed by the sword, or those who escaped the sword were drowned in the floods, which, by reason of the winter rains, were more than usually swollen. But the body of the king (the hundreds of his own followers being slain, and none of his followers remaining who would cover it with earth) was placed by two of the country people on a cart, and they in Tinemuth interred it;" and he concludes, "these things I have thought proper to signify to you, because his body appears to be interred with you; whose soul, if it please you, aid with prayers, and cause his bones to be deposited in a more fitting place, as you promised." The date of this letter probably was 1257, from a passage in Matt. Paris' history, who under that year remarks, "In this year were found the bones of Malcolm,<sup>1</sup> king of Scots, and his son Edward, during the preparation of certain new foundations at Tynemouth a Priory of St Albans." Mr Gibson in reference to this matter adds, "It is probable that Prior Ralph did piously cause the bones of the royal Malcolm to be deposited in a more fitting place within the conventual church; and the canopied tombs that face each other at the eastern end of the chancel, on one of which a recumbent effigy remains, have been conjectured to be the monuments of the Prior's religious attention to his promise."<sup>2</sup>

From these statements it would appear, that in the time of Prior Ralph de Dunham, neither written nor oral tradition in the monastery at Tynemouth preserved the memory of the circumstances of Malcolm's death, and but a doubtful recollection of his interment there; while the brethren at Kelso, a monastery founded about 1128, by David the son of Malcolm, were unable to give any farther information until reference was made by Ralph the monk, to a record, by him called the "History of the Danes." I cannot say what history this may have been, but I observe that the words used by Simeon of Durham in describing the death of Malcolm, are almost literally repeated in the letter of brother Ralph, as well as the sentences recounting the apparent judgment of God in it, and the five occasions in which the monarch had wasted Northumberland. The difference consists in slight amplifications in the monk's letter. Thus one

<sup>1</sup> Wat's edit., p. 815.

<sup>2</sup> Gibson, vol. i., p. 84.

of Malcolm's raids is said by Simeon to have occurred during the reign of Edward, when Tosti, Earl of York, had proceeded to Rome. The letter interjects the words "Egelullinus being Bishop of Durham," and Tosti is correctly called Earl of the Northumbrians. Malcolm's third invasion is said by Simeon to have occurred during the reign of William; while Ralph adds, "under Walcherus the Bishop," and in narrating the fifth raid, when Malcolm was slain near the Alne, Ralph adds, "by Morell, a most brave knight."<sup>1</sup> Leland says of Simeon's work, that it was compiled out of fragments from the libraries of various monasteries which the ravages of the Danes had spared.

There is no doubt that the chronicles of Simeon of Durham to the year 1129, and a continuation of them from that date to the death of king Stephen (probably by John of Hexham), were used by the compiler of the *Annals of Melrose*,<sup>2</sup> and the brethren of Kelso may also have had a copy of this work. Roger of Hoveden's work was also incorporated in the *Chronicles of Melrose*,<sup>3</sup> and as it almost literally corresponds with the monk's letter, I am inclined to think that the *History of the Danes* may have been a copy of Roger's *Annals*.

The person by whom Malcolm was slain, according to the letter of the Monk, was a knight called Morell, and the *Saxon Chronicle* says that he was killed by Morcel of Bambrugh, steward of the Earl of Northumberland,<sup>4</sup> "et Malcolmi Regis susceptore"—meaning apparently godfather of the king—or, as Hailes supposes, godsib or gossip of the king, from both having stood godfathers together. It may be noted also that Matilda, queen of Henry I., and daughter of the slain Malcolm, gave to the Church of St Alban and St Edwin the lands of Archi Morell<sup>5</sup> for the good of her father's soul, a name which suggests some connection with that of Moræl of Bambrugh. Her charter, which is dated before 1107, with her husband's deed of confirmation, are printed in Gibson's *History*.<sup>6</sup>

Fordun states that after the lapse of many years the remains of King Malcolm were removed by Alexander I., his son, from Tynemouth, and were buried at Dunfermline. Malcolm was killed in 1093, and his son Alexander I. died in 1124, so that the interval could not have much exceeded 30 years. Fordun here seems to quote from William of Malmesbury, whose work *Gesta Regum Anglorum* is supposed to have been written between 1114 and 1123,<sup>7</sup> where

<sup>1</sup> Notice of Simeon quoted by Selden, Preface, p. ii., Ap. Twysden.

<sup>2</sup> *Monumenta Brit.*, Pref., p. 88, § 232.

<sup>3</sup> *Cronica de Mailros*, Pref., p. xi.

<sup>4</sup> Trans. by Giles, p. 469.

<sup>5</sup> In other deeds called Archil Morell, Gibson's *Tynemouth*, vol. i., p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. ii., p. 15 of Appendix.

<sup>7</sup> William of Malmesbury, Preface, p. 9, Eng. Hist. Soc.

it is said of Malcolm's body—"humatusque multis annis apud Tinemuthe nuper ab Alexandro filio Scotiam ad Dumfermline portatus est."<sup>1</sup>

In the *Additamenta* to the History of Matthew Paris, under the year 1257, while speaking of Robert de Mowbray, the founder of Tynemouth, who died in 1206, it is related, as before noticed, that he overcame and slew Malcolm king of Scotland, and on account of his royal degree caused the body of the king to be honourably interred in the church of Tynemouth, which he had founded. And the Scots having afterwards boldly<sup>2</sup> demanded the body of their king, the body of a certain countryman of Sethtune was given to them instead, and so the malapertness<sup>3</sup> of the Scots was deceived.

It does not appear from this statement at what time the demand of the Scots was made, as after relating the burial of the king the writer goes on "*afterwards* the Scots," &c., and Fordun says that the king, having lain for many years at Tynemouth, *afterwards* was carried to Dunfermline, vol. i., p. 274.

If we could trust this account of Matthew Paris, it would appear that the royal remains never were removed from Tynemouth; and from the other evidence adverted to, we are led to believe that they were removed to a more honourable resting place there by Prior Ralph de Dunham about the year 1247.

The body given up by the English to the Scots as that of Malcolm, according to Fordun and William of Malmesbury, was interred at Dunfermline by Alexander I., and as it would seem before the Rude altar in the nave of the church.

In the year 1246 it appears that, after reports following on two commissions issued to examine into facts, Queen Margaret<sup>4</sup> was canonized by authority of Pope Innocent IV., and on the 19th June 1250, the remains of the sainted queen were translated to a more honourable place in the Choir of the Church of Dunfermline. Their former resting place is thus described by Wyntoun,—

" Befor the Rwde Awtare wyth honoure  
Scho wes layd in haly sepulture  
Thare hyre lord wes layd alsua  
And wyth thame hyre sownnys twa  
Edwarde the fyrst and Ethelred."<sup>5</sup>

According to this author, the parties who were to transfer the body to its new site—

" Wyth all thare powere and thare slycht  
Her body to rays thai had na mycht

<sup>1</sup> William of Malmesbury, vol. ii. p. 424. The author of the *Chronicon Rythmicum* (generally said to be Ailred of Rievaulx) says that Malcolm was the first king buried in *Scotland*. Chron. de Mailr., p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> Frontose.

<sup>3</sup> *Improbitas*, p. 199, *Addit.*

<sup>4</sup> *Regist. Dunferm.*, Pref., p. 13, and authorities there cited.

<sup>5</sup> B. vii., c. 3.

Na lyft hyr anys owt of that plas  
 Quhare scho that tyme lyand was  
 For all thare devotyownys  
 Prayeris and gret orysownys  
 That the persownys gadryd there  
 Dyd on devot manere ;  
 Quhill fyrst thai tuk wpe the body  
 Of hyr lord that lay thare-by  
 And bare it bene into the quere.  
 Lastly syne on fayre manere  
 Her cors thai tuk wp and bare ben  
 And thame enteryd togydder then."<sup>1</sup>

The account of the " Translation " given in the Breviary of Aberdeen, in the service for her festival, is rather more circumstantial than that of Wynthoun. It begins by stating that as it had been the custom of the holy fathers to translate the relics of saints for their more honourable worship in the Church of God, and that the days of their translation might be had in reverence by the clergy and people, the devout veneration of the Scotch nation was not contented till the relics of St Margaret were transferred from their humble place of rest below ground to greater veneration, and were uplifted from the tomb of stone in the Church of Dunfermline, where they had now rested 167 years.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, on 13th June in the year 1250, King Alexander III., at the persuasion of the people, came to Dunfermline, with his mother, Queen Johanna, and a great concourse of clergy and laity; and after prayers and fasts, with many imposing ceremonies they raised the relics of St Margaret from the tomb of stone in which they reposed, and placed the same in a case of silver adorned with gold and gems. Thereafter, while this shrine was in the course of being carried, by the hands of princes and earls, in procession, from the said tomb in the lower church to the choir of the same, and had come to the narrow part of the chancel (or chancel arch), opposite to where at that time the bones and relics of King Malcolm lay, in the north part of the nave of the outer church, under a vaulted arch, straightway the arms of the bearers were oppressed with the weight, and the shrine could be moved no farther, even although additional strength was employed. Every one being surprised, they then betook themselves to prayer, when a voice, supposed to be of heavenly birth, was heard to say,—“ The relics of St Margaret can in noways be carried farther until

<sup>1</sup> B. vii., c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> A mistake for 157. Breviarium Aberdonense. Pars Estiv. ap. Fest. Transl. S. Marg. Regine.

those of her husband are first raised." This having been done, both shrines were carried without farther difficulty to the place, where, says the Breviary (dated in the beginning of the sixteenth century), they are still held in veneration. Fordun's<sup>1</sup> account varies slightly from that in the Breviary, although probably it had been the foundation of the latter. He says that when the sacred remains which had been placed in the outer church were raised, and placed in a shrine of fir ornamented with gold and gems, and were in the course of being carried, by the sacred hands of the bishops and abbots, to be reinterred in the choir before the high altar, and the procession was moving to the playing of organs and the melodious voice of the choir, and had come even to the entrance of the chancel, opposite to the body of her husband King Malcolm, lying under a groined roof at the north part of the nave, the bearers became unable to move, from the great weight of the shrine, nor could they, with additional strength, get the shrine to advance, till, on the suggestion of a bystander, they opened the tomb of the king, and, having placed his bones also in a shrine, they were both removed without farther obstacle, and each sarcophagus laid in the mausoleum prepared for that purpose.<sup>2</sup>

It is difficult to say what this new church was, but it seems most probable that it consisted rather in the enlargement and decoration of the existing choir than the erection of a new building.<sup>3</sup> A bull of Innocent IV. in 1250 narrates, that although the church, after its consecration, had been augmented by the erection of a nobler structure, yet as it was shown that the old walls, for the most part, still existed in their former state, he therefore dispensed with the reconsecration of the church. This was only a few years after Queen Margaret's technical admission into the number of the saints, and it is not unlikely that the additions to the choir may have been made with the view, at least partly, of doing honour to the contemplated translation of the queen's remains from the nave.

It seems impossible to reconcile the discrepancies in the various accounts now quoted. That Malcolm was buried at Tynemouth is unquestionable. One would have expected that the recollections of an event so memorable would have been more forcibly impressed on the history of the monastery; and it is easier perhaps to understand the complete oblivion of all the circumstances which occurred, on the supposition that the royal remains were removed at no long period after their first interment, rather than that they

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii., p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Scotichron. lib. x., chap. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Chart. Dunferm., p. 284.



should have remained to call forth the inquiries and remarks of succeeding generations.

I may advert, in conclusion, to the subsequent translations of the relics of the sainted Margaret and of her husband.

At the time of her death the castle of Edinburgh, in which she was resident, was under siege by Donald Bane, and her body was conveyed by stealth through a postern which Wyntoun calls the "west yhet," down the steep western side of the Castle rock, and from thence to Dunfermline. We have heard of her translation in 1250 from the nave to the choir of the church. Here her body remained, for the religious veneration of the people, along with that believed to be the body of Malcolm, till the time of the change of religion in the middle of the sixteenth century. According to Papebroch's Appendix<sup>1</sup> to the Life of the Saint and Queen, her head was brought to the castle of Edinburgh at the desire of Queen Mary, who was in it at the time, and on her flight into England in 1567 it was removed to the house of the Laird of Dury, where it was preserved for many years by a Benedictine monk, but in the year 1597 was by him given up to the Missionary Jesuits. One of these, John Robie, conveyed it to Antwerp. There John Malder, Bishop of Antwerp, after proper examination, issued his letters, on 15th September 1620, authenticating the head as that of Margaret, and granting leave for its being exposed to public veneration. After seven years the relic was translated to the Scots College at Douay, where, by permission of Herman, Bishop of Arras, and his successor Paul Boudot, it was again exposed, as a genuine relic, to public veneration. Pope Innocent X., by a brief, dated 4th March 1645, granted a plenary indulgence to those who should visit the Church of the College on the festival of St Margaret; and this grant was confirmed by his successors at various times afterwards. It is believed that this relic disappeared amid the tempest of the French Revolution.

With regard to the other remains of Queen Margaret and her husband, if we may believe the accounts given by Papebroch, which he seems to have partly, if not wholly, derived from a statement by George Con in his treatise "*De duplici Statu Religionis apud Scotos*,"<sup>2</sup> they were, after much labour, acquired by Philip II., King of Spain, and by him placed in the Church of St Laurence at the Escorial, with the inscriptions "St Malcolm, King, St Margaret, Queen," on the urns containing them. Bishop Gillies recently informed me that, in the hope of having the relics of the sainted Margaret again restored to a Scottish shrine, he had invoked the aid of the present Pope in an application to the Spanish government for their restoration, but, as I understood, they could not be found, or at all events identified.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix II.

<sup>2</sup> P. 56.