Miracle collection for canonisation: The Miracula of St Margaret of Scotland

LEE Sang-Dong

Introduction

Margaret (*c*.1045-1093), who was a Saxon princess, had fled to Scotland in 1068, along with her mother and a sister and a brother, Edgar Atheling (*c*.1051- 1126),[1] and married King Malcolm III of Scotland at Dunfermline, Scotland in 1070. When she became a queen of Scotland, the Celtic church in Scotland involved none of the reformed monastic style of western Christendom,[2] although there were other monastic communities in Scotland such as those at Coldingham, Old Melrose, Dunkeld, St Andrews, Brechin and Iona etc.[3] The Celtic features of the Scottish church influenced religious practices such as worship, observation, organization and even architecture.[4]

---

1) Edgar Atheling could have been inaugurated to be an heir of Edward the Confessor after the sudden death of his father, Edward the Exile (1016-1057). However, he could not have sat on the throne because of the Norman Conquest of England in 1066 (Alan Macquarrie, 'St Margaret of Scotland' in *The Saints of Scotland: Essays in Scottish Church History AD 450~1093* (Edinburgh, 1997), 212).

2) G.W.S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots* (2nd edition, Edinburgh, 2003), 151. Since the Celts lived in a scattered rural world and they had a long tradition of migration, each church seems to have been considered an independent one: they "saw bishops and priests much more as wandering evangelists than as settled ministers exercising pastoral and administrative functions within a fixed area (Ian Bradley, *The Celtic Way* (London, 1993), 23-4)." For the Celtic Christianity see Donald E. Meek, *The Quest for Celtic Christianity* (Edinburgh, 2000).

3) Ian B. Cowan and D. E. Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland* (London, 1976), 2-3.

4) For example, marriage was not a strict system but could be a kind of polygamy, a custom dating back to pre-Christian Irish society. The laity confessed infrequently to clerics, and in consequence, they received communion only occasionally. The Scots were not interested in receiving communion even at Easter. The reformists criticized the Eucharist, which was performed in the Scottish church, as a 'barbarous rite' (G.W.S. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306* (Edinburgh, 2003), 71). Furthermore, children might be allowed communion, which was not an uncommon practice in the Celtic church. Adoption of the date of fasts also followed the Irish system: "the Scots began their Lent four days after Ash Wednesday and reckoned the six Sundays before Easter as fast days, another archaic observance in line with the unreformed Irish church (*Ibid,* 71-2)." The Scottish church venerated several saints of Irish origin such as Fáelán, Colmán, Findbarr, Finán, Donnán of Eigg, Moluoc of Lismuoc, Maelrubha

These characteristics of the Scottish church might have left Margaret shocked and denied her association with it because she had grown up at courts familiar with Roman church practices. Therefore, she tried to provide the Scottish church with the reformed monastic style, although the reality of Margaret's contribution to the reform of the Scottish church has been much debated by historians.[5]

No matter what her accomplishment has been argued, she was venerated as a saint by monks of Dunfermline Priory/Abbey, which she had founded in 1070 shortly after her marriage, by requesting that Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, send Benedictine monks to the church at Dunfermline: non-Celtic monasticism was brought into Scotland.[6] However, St Margaret was not listed in the Catalogue of the Saints until she was officially canonized by the Catholic Church on 16 September 1249.[7]

In fact, the process of St Margaret's canonisation was begun with the request of King Alexander II (r. 1214-1249) that Pope Innocent IV launch a canonisation process for Queen Margaret in 1245. The request was conveyed to the pope by David de Bernham, bishop of St Andrews, who attended a General council in Lyon on 24 June 1245.[8] On 27 July 1245 the pope commanded the bishops of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane to investigate Queen Margaret's life and miracles pertaining to her.[9] On 13

---

of Applecross. There were also Irish origins to dignitaries such as the ab (abbe), "the head or abbot of a monastic church of Irish type, holding an office that had usually become secularized before the twelfth century (*Ibid*, 72-3; Alan J. Wilson, *St Margaret, Queen of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2001), 79-85)."

5) For the discussion of Margaret's influence on the reform of Scottish church see G.W.S. Barrow, 'From Queen Margaret to David I: Benedictines and Tironensians', *Innes Review*, xi (1960), 27-8; A. R. MacEwan, *A History of the Church in Scotland* (London, 1913), 160; J.H.S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (London, 1960), 37, 44; Cowan and Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland*, 4-5; Macquarrie, 'St Margaret of Scotland', 223; Richard Oram, *David I: The King Who Made Scotland* (Stroud, 2004), 27-9.

6) Turgot, *The Life of St Margaret*, 29; *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. H. Clover and M. Gibson (Oxford, 1979), 160-3.

7) *Registrum de Dunfermelyn liber cartarum Abbatie Benedictine S.S. Trinitatis et B. Margarete Regine de Dunfermelyn* (Bannatyne Club; Edinburgh, 1842*)* [hereafter, *Registrum de Dunfermelyn*], no. 290.

8) D.E.R. Watt, *Medieval Church Councils in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2000), 87-8.

9) *Registrum de Dunfermelyn,* no. 281. Generally speaking, the investigation for canonisation in the thirteenth century was carried out in two aspects, the life and the miracle. The investigation of the first was limited and a few witnesses were examined. On the other hand, miracles attributed to the candidate were tested completely (André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2005), 47; Robert Bartlett, *The hanged man: A story of miracle,*

August 1246 the pope sent a letter to the bishops of Glasgow and St Andrews to complain about the investigation reported by the bishops of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, informing them that the names and the statements of the witnesses were not included in the report, and instructing them to make further investigation.[10] Rejection of an enquiry and request for reinvestigation was not uncommon in the thirteenth century canonisation process,[11] just as the examination of St Edmund of Canterbury held in 1244 did not meet Innocent IV's demands, and the pope commanded the commissioners to collect detailed and substantial evidence of four or five miracles rather than bring inadequate evidence together.[12] After reinvestigation of St Margaret's case, an examination of the life and miracles of St Margaret was conducted under the supervision of 'H.', cardinal priest of St. Sabina in Rome. On 16 September 1249 the pope eventually declared her canonisation.[13]

As mentioned above, the miracles of St Margaret were investigated with the strict and complicated procedure, which was a trend begun in the earlier thirteenth century as a part of the innovation of the canonisation process during the reign of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216). This paper purposes to analyse the miracle collection of St Margaret of Scotland in the relationship with the canonisation process, particularly, to discuss who collected and wrote the *Miracula*, and when they did. For the purpose, in the first place it is necessary to understand the general context of canonisation process, in particular, concerning the miracle collections.

Miracle collection for canonisation: overview

Anglo-Norman hagiography was designed for a saint to be accepted, and to establish and sustain a cult in the Post-Conquest era, as R. W. Southern argued that "after the Conquest, important questions of cults and the proofs of the efficacy of saints and relics required a record to be made of past and present miracles."[14] However,

memory and colonialism in the Middle ages (Princeton, 2004)).

10) *Registrum de Dunfermelyn,* no. 285.

11) Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages,* 33-57.

12) *Registrum de Dunfermelyn,* no. 279.

13) *Ibid,* no. 290.

14) R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970), 172. Some scholars

as Rachel Koopmans puts, English miracle collectors in the twelfth century might have recorded stories for succeeding generations to remember and pray for them, and were perhaps less concerned about their contribution to sustaining or promoting the cult of saints.[15] In fact, the success of the cult depended on its relationship with the laity. The laity's interest in the cult and their tendency to circulate stories concerning the cult were crucial points in its development. Pilgrims visited the shrine to perform penance, seek general intercession and favour for good harvest, businesses, family etc. Moreover, they came to the shrine to seek miracles and give thanks to God and to the saint, who performed miracles.[16] Since lower class people often could not read or write, they distributed the stories orally. Therefore, hagiography describing the virtues of a saint would be written not for them but for literate groups, who could later tell these stories to those unable to read. In this context, miracles were a more effective way than a saint's virtuous life to promote the cult.

Therefore, it is reasonable that there would be no miracle collection aimed at or used for a petition for a saint's canonisation in the twelfth century, with the exception of the collections composed by Osbert of Clare, monk and prior of Westminster (d. after 1139). Osbert's *Life of Edward the Confessor* would be the first English collection used to request a canonisation. However, the collection was close to a mere collection of Osbert's letters, and it does not display the characteristics of later canonisation dossiers such as "the bulk or notarialese".[17] In the document relating to the process of

---

suggest different opinions from that of Southern. For example, Susan Ridyard argues that 'the inspiration for post-Conquest hagiography lay···with Norman churchmen who perceived the usefulness of the English saints and who realized that those saints could be successfully utilized only if their history was fully documented and their function effectively publicised (Susan J. Ridyard, 'Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxon' in R. Allan Brown ed., *Anglo-Norman Studies 9* (1987), 205-6).' Monika Otter insists that 'the need for such texts was greatly stimulated by the need to reassert rights and privileges, and generally to re-establish historical continuity, after the disruption caused by the Norman Conquest', and she argues furthermore that 'there was also a more general desire to fill in the historiographical gaps, to consolidate in writing what was previously oral or sparsely documented local traditions (Monika Otter, *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill, 1996), 22).'

15) Rachel Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Pennsylvania, 2011), 97.

16) Diana Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage* (Hampshire, 2002), 44-77.

17) Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate,* 99. For the attempts of canonisation of St Edward see B. W. Scholtz, 'The Canonisation of Edward the Confessor', *Speculum* 36 (1961), 38-60; Edina Bozoky, 'The Sanctity and Canonisation of Edward the Confessor' in Richard Mortimer ed., *Edward the*

canonisation, to convince commissioners, notaries wrote the contents relevant to the miracles in detail: "names, places, professions, dates, types of illness, lengths of illness, nature of healings, and then, compulsively and insistently, witnesses to all those names."[18] In the same vein, *Life of St. Margaret* written by Margaret's chaplain Turgot (d. 1115), which focused on the virtuous life of St Margaret along with only one miracle story concerning St Margaret's gospel book - the book, which was fallen into the river, was discovered lying open at the bottom of the river without any damage[19] - was designed to encourage later followers, particularly literate elite groups, to remember and emulate her life rather than to prepare for the request of canonisation.

Moreover, the canonisation process required further criteria on which to judge the credibility of miracles, as Vauchez's research on the canonisation procedure of Thomas Cantilupe, bishop of Hereford (*c*.1218–1282, canonised in 1320) found,: being "performed by good agents and ordained for the glory of God", miracles shall "strengthen faith", and be followed by "invocation of the name of God."[20] This seems to correspond to the thirteenth-century trend emphasising "the food of the word of God" for the salvation of Christians by the papal/church Council.[21]

In fact, the collectors of miracles did not record all miracles lay person reported. They would not have recorded miracles if they had any doubt. The collectors would utilize their own criteria in their selection and examination of the tales. For example, Benedict of Peterborough, who collected the miracles of St Thomas Becket from mid-1171 to 1173, classified stories into three groups: "the miracles which we saw with our own eyes, or we heard from those ill people already healed and their witnesses, or

Confessor: The Man and the Legend (Woodbridge, 2009), 173-86.

18) Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate,* 206.

19) Turgot, *Life of St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland*, ed. William Forbes-Leith (Edinburgh, 1884), 66-8; Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, D.E.R. Watt, *et al* eds., 9 vols. (Aberdeen, 1987-1999) [hereafter, *Chron. Bower*], iii, 79; *Early Sources of Scottish History: 500-1286,* ed. A.O. Anderson, 2 vols. (London, 1922) [hereafter, *ESSH*], ii, 59-88. For the secondary studies on St Margaret and Turgot's *Life of St Margaret* see Valerie Wall, 'Queen Margaret of Scotland (1070-93): Burying the Past, Enshrining the Future' in Anne Duggan ed., *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge, 1997), 27-38; Lois L. Huneycutt, 'The Idea of the Perfect Princess: The Life of St Margaret in the Reign of Matilda II (1100-18)' in M. Chibnall ed., *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xii (Woodbridge, 1990), 81-97.

20) Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages*, 496.

21) Medieval Sourcebook: Twelfth Ecumenical Council: Lateran IV 1215, canon 10 accessed on http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/lateran4.asp.

those things we learned from the testimony of religious men, who had seen them with their own eyes."[22] Benedict sought "proofs", demanded "witnesses", got upset "when people failed to tell him their stories" and even made "trips outside of Canterbury to investigate certain miracles." His criteria played a key role as an example to other miracle collectors in a period of time before, as discussed below, the canonisation procedure became complicated and strict.[23]

The canonisation procedure was established from the beginning of the twelfth century. For example, when Pope Calixtus II (d.1124) visited Cluny in 1120, he was asked to canonise St Hugh. After reading the text describing the saint's life and miracles, the pope demanded that witnesses be called to answer questions.[24] However, in the last decade of the twelfth century, there was not yet a formal requirement and standard for the text describing the life and miracles of a candidate. Since the procedure was still simple, witnesses were asked just a few basic questions.[25] The development of the examination of miracles began *c.* 1200 alongside the renovation of the canonisation process during the reign of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216). He made the process of canonisation both more complicated and stricter in stating an uncompromising investigation of miracles, which were, along with the virtue of a candidate, the most important criteria in receiving canonisation. Because he believed that miracles may also possibly have a diabolical origin, he insisted that miracles should be examined more strictly.[26]

This approach to miracles and canonisation, on the juridical plane, seems to become more apparent after the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The relevant canon was 62 of the Council, which had been initially announced at the synod of Mainz of 813 and already contained in the *Decretum* of Gratian stating, that "let no one presume to venerate publicly new ones [relics] unless they have been approved by the Roman pontiff." Although canon 62 did not specifically mention the right of canonisation, as N. Hermann-Masquard has pointed out, the pope's right to approve the cult of new

22) Benedict of Peterborough, *Miracula S. Thomae Cantuariensis*, ed. J. *C.* Robertson, vol. i (Rolls Series; London, 1875), 7.
23) Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate*, 160-1.
24) Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages*, 33-4.
25) *Ibid,* 35; Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate,* 124.
26) Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages*, 36-49.

relics meant that he could control the veneration of the relics of 'uncanonised' saint s.[27] Moreover, since a relic played a significant role in encouraging the cult relating to the relic and the religious community to house the relic, the control of the cults of new relics could help distinguish significant cults possessing valuable or numerous relics from the lesser-known cults housing less valuable relics.

From the thirteenth century, miracles were investigated more strictly by the collectors to meet the strict requirements of the canonisation process. For instance, if the examination had satisfactory results, they would be recorded in the collection. The tests were carried out to confirm whether miracles which had occurred in the shrine or in front of the collectors were real or not. Those who had once lost eyesight were asked to name things or identify colour or follow lighted candles. Cripples had to walk around before the collectors.[28] The healing miracles which happened out of the church were examined more strictly, because patients' afflictions could be easily exaggerated. In addition, a few healings happened immediately when the patients visited the shrine of a saint. By medieval standards, it would not be uncommon that healing miracles transpired a certain time later after visiting the shrine. For example, as Finucane pointed out, the collectors of St Wulfstan of Worcester's posthumous miracles recorded that a healing miracle happened all at once and, unlike others, after a delay.[29]

To examine miracles which occurred outside shrines more thoroughly, witnesses were necessary. In other words, those who came to report miracles were required to bring friends or family to support their accounts and answer collectors' questions. The witnesses had to give an oath and testify about the miracles which they had observed from beginning to end. The dubious or important cases sometimes led collectors to summon witnesses or order them interviewed by local clergy: on occasion collectors themselves visited to ascertain whether pilgrims' statements were true or not. Some pilgrims brought letters along with their witnesses, because written confirmation was

---

27) *Ibid,* 29; N. Hermann-Masquard*, Les reliques des saints: formation coutumière d'un droit (Paris, 1975),* 101; Medieval Sourcebook: Twelfth Ecumenical Council: Lateran IV 1215, canon 62 accessed on http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/lateran4.asp.

28) Ronald C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: popular beliefs in Medieval England* (London, 1995), 100.

29) *Ibid,* 76.

considered more reliable than oral testimony. Apart from an individual pilgrim's efforts to have his/her miracle accepted, bishops and clerics themselves sent collectors testimonials about their local miracles.[30] Since the flow of pilgrims into a church generated income and promoted the cult of a saint, bishops and clerics tried to draw the pilgrim's attention to their local shrines by publishing reports of a number of miracles at their local churches. In this context, the translation, which St Margaret's remains were moved from the nave to the choir in 1180 and rested until the year 1250, was presumably carried out by the monks of Dunfermline themselves, can be understood as coinciding with the development of St Margaret's cult; as a result, the demand to provide the shrine with more space, the desire of pilgrims to access the shrine easily, and, in the end, the wish of monks to promote the cult of St Margaret.

Bartlett, in his book *The Hanged Man*, demonstrates how the process of canonisation became stricter and complicated since Pope Innocent III innovation. He describes an inquiry of 1307 to investigate whether the candidate, Thomas de Cantilupe, bishop of Hereford, who died twenty five years earlier, could be regarded as a saint or not: "three commissioners, entrusted with the task by Pope Clement V had been empowered to hear testimony about the bishop's life, the general reputation he enjoyed, and the miracles he had performed after death."[31] As Bartlett points out, many witnesses of the same miracle were summoned to give testimony before the representatives dispatched by the pope, which demonstrates how the process of canonisation was an attempt to examine the miracles with due consideration.

St Margaret's Miracula

Thanks also to Bartlett, a fifteenth-century manuscript copy of a collection of miracles attributed to Margaret [Madrid Biblioteca Real, MS II. 2097], which had been brought from England to Spain by a Spanish ambassador in the seventeenth century and which remained in Madrid, was discovered. In fact, the collection of St Margaret's miracles had escaped scholars' attention because it had not been edited and placed in

30) *Ibid,* 101. For the inquiry on miracles in the canonisation process see Bartlett, *The hanged man.*

31) *Ibid*, 1.

a solitary manuscript. The composite manuscript contains five items: (1) an interpolated version of the *Vita S. Margarete*, which was originally written by Turgot between 1100 and 1107; (2) a collection of miscellaneous historical material named the 'Dunfermline Continuator' by its editor, Donald Watt; (3) the *Miracula S. Margarite Scotorum regine*, 'The Collection of St Margaret's Miracles'; (4) Jocelin of Furness' *Vita S. Vallleui abbatis de Melros* written between 1207 and 1214, which is a hagiography of Waltheof, abbot of Melrose (*c.*1095–1159), the son of earl Simon of Northampton and Matilda, who later married earl David of Huntingdon, the future king of Scots; (5) miscellaneous pieces known as the *Dunfermline Chronicle*, which may have been, as Dauvit Broun has insisted, a source used by John of Fordun's *Gesta Annalia* compiled *c.*1363-84. The composite manuscript was copied out during the reign of James III (1460-88),[32] possibly coinciding with mid-fifteenth-century building works commissioned by the abbot at Dunfermline.[33]

As mentioned above, the collection of St Margaret's miracles was indispensable for the canonisation process of the saint. However, it is not sure when the *Miracula* were collected. Some chapters, however, suggest specific times: miracles mentioned in chapters 9 and 42 transpired in 1180 and 1257 respectively. Chapter 7 mentions the miracle concerning the battle of Largs in 1263. Other chapters merely give hints. For instance, chapter 2 mentions that "the body [of St Margaret], as were proper, is kept entombed next to the high altar with great honour to the present day."[34] Since the

32) Alice Taylor, 'Historical writing in twelfth-and thirteenth-century Scotland: the Dunfermline compilation', *Historical Research*, vol. 83 (2010), 229-30; Robert Bartlett ed., *The miracles of St Æbba of Coldingham and St Margaret of Scotland* (Oxford, 2003) [hereafter *Miracula*], xxxi-xxxiv. For Waltheof see Helen Birkett, 'The Struggle for Sanctity: St Waltheof of Melrose, Cistercian in-house cults and canonization Procedure at the turn of the thirteenth century' in Steve Boardman and Eila Williamson eds., *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland* (Woodbridge, 2010), 43-60; Helen Birkett, 'Promoting Sanctity: The *Vita S. Waldevi*, Canonization and Cistercian Saintly Cults' in *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (York, 2010), 201-26. For Dauvid Broun's argument see Dauvid Broun, 'A New Look at *Gesta Annalia* Attributed to John of Fordun' in Barbara E. Crawford ed., *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* (Edinburgh, 1999), 20.

33) For the building works in the fifteenth century see Nick Bridgland, 'Dunfermline Abbey: Cloister and Precinct' in Richard Fawcett ed., *Royal Dunfermline* (Edinburgh, 2005), 94-7; Fawcett, 'Dunfermline Abbey Church' in *Royal Dunfermline*, 52.

33) Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 10.

34) *iuxta magnum altare, ut dignum fuerat, usque in presens seruatur cum maximo honore*

tomb mentioned in this chapter was the 1180 shrine, and the relics of St Margaret were still buried there at the moment when the miracle was recorded, this particular miracle happened and was written down between the 1180 translation and the 1250 translation. Chapter 16 states that "they tied him [a sailor, William possessed by a demon] up securely and brought him bound to the place where the queen had lain for eighty years."[35] The period of time between 1180 and 1250 is, of course, only 70 years, but St Margaret had lain in her original tomb in the nave from 1083 until the 1180 translation. Therefore, the tomb mentioned in the chapter could not have been the 1180 shrine. Instead, it was presumably the original tomb in the nave. If that is the case, the miracles would have happened before 1180.

As Bartlett points out, accounts of miracles in the first eight chapters, including the miracle about the battle of Largs in 1263, were reliant on eye-witnesses. In addition, the collector of the *Miracula* assures us in chapter eight, "I can inform readers categorically that, up to this point, I have placed nothing in this little book except what I have seen with my own eyes. What now follows I have learned from trustworthy information...." If the author's account in chapter eight can be accepted, and given the descriptions of miracles in 1257 and concerning the battle of Largs in 1263, the collection was completed after at least 1263.[36] However, if it can be accepted that the collection was completed after 1263, a question, as Bartlett argues, is raised: why does the *Miracula* not mention St Margaret's canonisation of 1249 and the translation of the saint of 1250, which were the most significant events in St Margaret's cult and the history of Dunfermline? As Bartlett puts, there are two possibilities. Firstly, a collector(s) in the thirteenth century might have valued of local miraculous cures above the recognition of outside authority such as papal bulls and royal visits. Other possible theories: the earlier miracles had been collected for a petition of St Margaret's canonisation before 1249 and additional accounts were added later,[37] given that it was essential to collect miracles to secure St Margaret's canonisation.

The account of chapter provides us with a clue to suggest that the latter

---

tumulatum (*Miracula*, 76-7).

35) *Quem firmiter ligauerunt et ad locum quo predicta regina per octoginta annos requieuit ligatum dimiserunt* (*Ibid,* 108-9).

36) *Ibid,* xxxiv-xxxv, 86-95, 140-5.

37) *Ibid,* xxxv-xxxvi.

possibility is more convincing. The collectors of St Margaret's *Miracula* seemed to have tried not to record untrue stories, which likely illustrates the collectors' awareness of their need to meet the requirements of the canonisation procedure, as the statement mentioned:

> ..... In all things we have avoided the stain of falsehood and made the effort in our account to keep a certain distance from the things that occurred, lest we should presumptuously go beyond the bound of truth, which God forbid! But we certainly wish to proclaim the more manifest miracles in the course of our composition...[38]

If that is the case, it is more convincing that the miracles were initially collected in preparation of her 1249 canonisation. Additionally, the *Miracula* itself was perhaps written down *c.*1263, potentially drawing on earlier written sources such as materials relating to the 1180 translation, which might have been collected by the monks of Dunfermline in preparation.

To this point, it has discussed when the *Miracula* presumably wrote down. Now it will examine who collected and wrote them. Rachel Koopmans's analysis of English miracle collections also provides a value insight into when some of miracles of St Margaret were collected. According to Koopmans, the earlier collections were less interested in stories about the laity: consequently, they contained few stories about them. However, collections recorded between *c.*1140 and *c.*1200 demonstrate that the attention of collectors had shifted from the stories circulated in their own conversational groups to those told by the laity.[39] In other words, the collections of the early twelfth century seem to "reflect the experiences and difficulties from cloister

---

38) ···. *Nos autem in omnibus mendacii maculam fugientes, studuimus ex hiis que gesta sunt simper aliquid in relacione nostra retrahere, ne presumeremus-quod absit-modum ueritatis excedere. Hoc pro certo uolentes manifestiora tamen in nostre ordinacionis textu enodare miracula,* ···..(*Ibid*, 90-1).

39) The miracle collections composed between *c.*1140 and *c.*1200 which Rachel Koopmans has analyzed are as follows: the collection relating to miracles on Farne Island, the William Chronicle, the collections for St Æbbe, St Godric, Saints of Hexahm, St Oswine, St Cuthbert, St William of York, St John of Beverley, St Wenefred, St Gilbert of Sempringham, St Guthlac, St William of Norwich, St Æthelthryth, St Edmund, St Frideswide, St Edward, St Bartholomew, St Erkenwald, St Ithamar. St Becket, St Anselm, the hand of St James (Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate,* 112-38).

monks: ill abbots, ill monks, ill friends and relatives, lawsuits, aggressive nobles, troubled young monks, thieves, property disputes, lost books, cruel schoolmasters, and so on." On the other hand, the collections of the later twelfth century tend to pay attention to tales of the laity such as those of "sick children, ill husbands, ill wives, work accidents, shipwrecks, drownings, troubled young women, difficult pregnancies, lost coins, even diseased animals."[40] That is, while the collections of the early twelfth century seem to focus on the tales of cloister monks, the collections of the later twelfth century tend to pay attention to the stories of the laity.

If the proviso that these trends could be adapted to the miracle collection of St Margaret can be accepted, it might be suggested with caution when the miracles occurred. In chapters 10, 11, 14, 15, 28, 32, 34, 36 and 37 of Bartlett's edition, monks experienced miracles. In chapter 41, a priest received a miracle.[41] The miracle in chapter 31 happened to 'Gregory, a prior of Dunfermline', who, as Bartlett suggests, may be Prior Geoffrey who was abbot from 1238 to 1240.[42] Therefore, it might be suggested cautiously that adapting Koopman's criteria, with the exception of the miracle of Chapter 31 these miracles noted above perhaps happened around the mid-twelfth century, presumably, prior to 1150 when Dunfermline Abbey became the parish church. Namely, it was the year 1150 when 'David's church' was consecrated[43] and, in consequence, the 'nave' of 'David's church' could be used as a parochial church. As a result, more lay visitors could come to the church. It also assumes that the laity had little opportunity to receive miracles attributed to St Margaret until the abbey became the parish church in 1150. Additionally, miracles occurring before *c.*1150 and their subsequent recording might have played a role in supporting the building scheme of David I. In other words, through the collecting of miracles the monks at Dunfermline Abbey presumably intended to display the holy power of St Margaret and, in consequence, to promote the cult of the saint in service of David's building plan at Dunfermline.

If Koopman's criteria could adapt to St Margaret's *Miracula*, the miracles which nine monks - nine out of 44 persons receiving miracles in the *Miracula* of St Margaret.

40) *Ibid,* 112-4.
41) *Miracula,* 94-97, 96- 99, 106-7, 122-125, 128-129, 130-133, 132-135, 134-5, 138-141.
42) *Ibid,* 126-7, note. 68.
43) *A Scottish chronicle known as the Chronicle of Holyrood*, ed. M. O. Anderson (Edinburgh, 1938), 35.

- had experienced presumably occurred prior to 1150. That is, the *Miracula* included the lesser number of miracles being occurred around *c*. 1150, while more miracles being happened after the second half of the twelfth century were recorded. This pattern indicates that the *Miracula* possibly put its priority on the recent tales, which would have related to the requirement of canonisation process. In addition, the pattern of miracles - the recipients seemingly all monks - is likely to reflect not only fewer lay benefactions to Dunfermline Abbey but also David's strong patronage to the abbey and the effort of monks at Dunfermline to encourage the cult of St Margaret.

Turning to the collectors, although some of St Margaret's miracles are likely to be occurred prior to 1150, it is still unknown when and who collected and wrote them down on the *Miracula*. Actually most chapters of the *Miracula* made no mention of author, which, consequently, makes it possible to suggest that most miracles of St Margaret were written by an anonymous author or authors. However, some chapters specify a monk of Dunfermline as an author of *Miracula* chapters: "I have learned from trustworthy informants, who are still monks in our church (ch. 8)"; "I myself, who am telling you about this miracle, and two of the brethren with me, came cautiously to the sick man…(ch. 16)"; the miracle which occurred "in the dining hall" was testified by "us who were there (ch. 22)"; a miraculous cure was seen "as we were celebrating the service (ch. 23)."[44] Although the charters mentioned of authors, they were still unable to be identified. Instead, these statements make it possible to draw a suggestion that the miracles of St Margaret were perhaps recorded by various anonymous authors - [perhaps] the sacristan, who maintained 'all ornaments, utensils and furnishing of the church'[45] may also have kept the relics and collected/recorded miracles. However, given the cohesion and style of the composition of the collection, as Bartlett points out,[46] the collection seems to have been written or re-written *c*.1263 by one author. If that is the case, miracles occurring before *c*.1150, such as those in chapters 10, 11, 14, 15, 28, 32, 34, 36 and 37, were likely copied or edited by a monk in the mid-thirteenth

44) *Miracula,* xxxvii, 91-3, 108-9, 116-7, 118-9.

45) *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, ed. David Knowles and Christopher N. L. Brooke (Oxford, 2002), 122-7. In addition, a monk generally sat near the shrine not only to record miracles happening there but also to collect the offerings (Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind*, 94). However, the evidence from these four chapters (8, 16, 22, 23) suggests that miracles of Dunfermline were not collected in this manner.

46) *Miracula,* xxxvii.

century, when the petition for the canonisation of St Margaret was prepared.

If so, why were no more miracles collected in the *Miracula* of St Margaret after 1263?

The simple answer would be that since St Margaret had already been canonised, the monks of Dunfermline might simply not have needed to collect miracles any more. In addition, let us seek an answer in the broader context of canonisation process. Generally speaking, miracles attributed to a candidate and his/her life were taken into consideration in the canonisation processes. The "depositions at the process of canonisation distinguished according to their content (1185-1417)" analysed by André Vauchez has found that the candidate's biography held relatively little value in the investigation of a candidate for canonisation in the thirteenth century. The commissioners entrusted by the pope were more interested in miracles associated with candidates. On the other hand, from the last third of the thirteenth century the emphasis on miracles became less common, so that after 1300 over 70% of dispositions at the processes were relevant to the moral life of a candidate.[47] Thus the last third of the thirteenth century seems to mark a turning point in the process of canonisation. In addition, according to Vauchez's study on the process of canonisation applied between 1185 and 1417, in five of seven processes held between 1185 and 1300, and in only four of twelve between 1301 and 1417, at least 10% of miracles were performed after the candidate's death.[48] This shift can also be understood in the context of the development of the process of canonisation from the fourteenth century, the sainthood of a candidate was determined by a candidate's reputation and life, not necessarily candidate's miracles. Given that this trend appeared in the last third of the thirteenth century, it might explain why no more miracles were collected in the *Miracula* of St Margaret after 1263, alongside the explanation that the canonisation of 1249 led to the monks of Dunfermline not to have needed to collect miracles any more.

47) Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages,* 500-1.
48) *Ibid*, 502-3.

Conclusion

St Margaret died in 1093 and her process of canonisation began in 1245. Given that canonisation processes in the thirteenth century put the value of the miracles above the life of a candidate, it is natural to think that the miracle collection of St Margaret played a significant role in the process. The miracles seemed to have initially collected in preparation of her 1249 canonisation, and then the *Miracula* itself was perhaps written down *c.*1263, potentially drawing on earlier written sources. In addition, the miracles of St Margaret, which were perhaps recorded by various anonymous authors, were likely copied or edited by a monk in the mid-thirteenth century, when the petition for the canonisation of St Margaret was prepared. Then, the collection seems to have been written or re-written *c.*1263 by one author, given the cohesion and style of the composition of the collection.

Apart from this trend of the thirteenth century concerning the canonisation procedure, it was inevitable for the commissioners to focus on the miracles, because St Margaret died one and a half centuries before the process was carried out and, in consequence, it was not possible to summon witnesses to testify about her life and reputation. Moreover, as far as the *Miracula* were concerned, every miracle attributed to St Margaret in the collection happened after her demise. This corresponds with the trend of thirteenth-century canonisation processes emphasising miracles performed in the lifetime of a candidate rather than miracles occurring after his/her death. Given that people who experienced miracles were required to attend the inquiry as witnesses, the miracles performed during St Margaret's lifetime could not be used as reliable evidence. This might be one of the reasons why the miracle collection of St Margaret contained more relatively recent tales.