

## THE SONS OF EADMUND IRONSIDE, ANGLO-SAXON KING AT THE COURT OF SAINT STEPHEN.

### SAINT MARGARET OF SCOTLAND.

Eadmund Ironside died shortly after his agreement with Canute, King of Denmark, deciding the boundaries of his realm. His decease took place on 30th November 1016. The widowed Queen, Ealdgyth remained behind with her two small sons, Eadmund and Edward. Canute's wicked adviser Eadric, desired to persuade his king to cause the two little orphans also to be put out of the way as their party might cause trouble in the future. Canute, however, was incapable of such an outrage, since after the death of Eadmund Ironside the entire kingdom was already under his sceptre, and he had no wish to sully his name with the blood of children. He dispatched the two boys to Sweden, with the command that the heirs to Eadmund's throne should be killed there. The King of Sweden (Olaf) was a devout Christian, whose soul revolted at the idea of a murder which the formidable Canute himself had found too difficult to undertake. He caused the two small boys secretly to be taken to Hungary, to the court of Saint Stephen. Presumably they were taken through Russia in 1017 or 1018. The chronicles register nothing more concerning Eadmund and Edward for a period of about forty years. We merely know that the King of Hungary received the Anglo-Saxon princes cordially and educated them with deep affection. Eadmund, the elder prince, however, died young. In due course Edward married. His wife, Agatha, bore him three children: Margaret, Christine and Edgar. The three children were educated in Hungary till 1057 when — after an exile of well-nigh four decades — Edward was permitted to return to England with his family. So much is known of the sojourn in Hungary of the sons of Eadmund. No-

where can we find contemporary records of the manner in which the Princes came to the court of the King of Hungary, who brought them, whether accompanied by their mother or not, whether they were in communication with anyone in distant England, where, in 1054 only, did attention towards the surviving Edward begin to be apparent. For, in the meantime, the tempest of events had swept across the whole of England. Canute the Great and his family had become extinct. In 1042, after long years of exile in Normandy, Edward the Confessor came to the throne of England.

But Edward the Confessor was without issue and again the English throne lacked an heir. Incalculable tempests and dangers awaited England once more. Then, in this anxious time, attention was called to the Prince living in the far-off land, in Hungary. The head of the national party, Aldred, Bishop of Worcester, went to Cologne as ambassador to Henry III Emperor of Germany with the request that he should negotiate with the King of Hungary for the return of Prince Edward and his family. Bishop Aldred was received with pomp and splendour in Cologne and detained there for about a year. Finally, however, he was obliged to leave the city without accomplishing the task he had undertaken.<sup>1</sup> No records betray the reason why the powerful Emperor of Germany did not comply with the request of the King of England. It is possible that he cherished certain secret aims of his own in Hungary with regard to Prince Edward. Be that as it may, the English prince and his family did not reach England until 1057 after the death of Emperor Henry III. Since his return we find much more information concerning the fate of this royal family.

Soon after his return to England, Edward, heir apparent to the throne of England, died before he was able to see his uncle King Edward the Confessor. His family lived in England for years, presumably in the society of the Hungarian gentlemen who in 1057 had escorted the future King of England and had remained in the retinue of the widowed princess and her children. According

---

<sup>1</sup> "MLIV. Aldredus Wigorniensis episcopus... magnis cum xeniiis regis fungitur legatione ad imperatorem. A quo simul et ab Herimanno Coloniensi archi praesule magno suspectus honore, ibidem per integrum annum mansit; ex regis ex parte imperatori suggestit, ut legatis in Hungariam remissis, inde fratrualem suum Eadwardum regis videlicet Eadmundi Ferreilateis filium reduceret, Angliamque venire faceret..." (Florence of Worcester. — Mon. Hist. Brit.) — "Daes ilcan geres for Aldred biscop to Colne ofer sae, *thaes kynges aerende*..." Anglo-Saxon Chron. Anno XLIV. Mon. Brit. I, 322.



to Scottish records they accompanied the bereft family to Scotland where they ultimately settled.

For Agatha and her children were also obliged to flee after the Battle of Hastings (1066). According to the English custom of hereditary succession, Edgar, born in Hungary was the rightful heir, and therefore just as much in the way of the ambitions of William the Conqueror as were his father and uncle, the princes exiled in Hungary, in the way of those of Canute the Great. Thus Edgar the last hope of the English party, was obliged to flee, although he was supported in his claim by powerful lords and ecclesiastical dignitaries. He was the only and last scion of the dynasty of Cerdic and Alfred the Great, the only legal heir to the throne of England. Under the leadership of Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, the English party had proclaimed him king on two occasions, though had never crowned him. Finally, however, they were obliged to admit that they could not hope for the liberation of England by a young king not exceptionally bright in mentality. Later on, Edgar paid homage to William and thus the last male descendant of Cerdic "dragged on a sluggish and contented life as the friend and pensioner of Norman patrons".<sup>2</sup>

When, after Hastings, the royal family was obliged to contemplate flight, it once again turned towards Hungary. Agatha and her children disappointed in their hopes, boarded a ship in order to return to the land of the Magyars, but fate decided otherwise. Fortunately for Scotland and even for England, the tempest drove their ship back to the coast of Scotland.

They anchored near the harbour which is still called Margaret's Hope and landed there. King Malcolm III (Canmore) of Scotland who rode out to meet them, fell so much in love with the beautiful, gentle Margaret, that he sought her hand in marriage. After a period of hesitation Margaret accepted him. Of the three children Margaret alone was destined for a vocation in history. Her brother Edgar, as we have seen, never played a significant role, while his sister Christine, after Edgar's reconciliation with William the Conqueror, entered the convent of Romsey in the South of England and took the veil. Apparently she was a personage of consequence as Queen Margaret entrusted her with the education of her children. Anselm, the famous Archbishop of Canterbury was personally acquainted with her.

---

<sup>2</sup> Freemann, *The History of the Normann Conquest of England, its causes and its results.* II, 370.

Of the three children it is Margaret whose name still lives in history. Her importance lies not only in the fact that the reforms started in the ecclesiastical and political life of Scotland during the reign of Malcolm were due to Margaret's gentle influence; that she ennobled the still austere morals and customs, that according to contemporary evidence also she was the true civilizer of her second country.<sup>3</sup> Scotland reveres her national saint in the princess who had drifted there from Hungary, but her importance has extended far beyond the boundaries of her small country.

England — as it is well known — split into two large parties after the Norman Conquest: the contention between the Norman conquerors and the English conquered and their hatred of each other threatened the unfortunate country with a new war, and devastation. The English national party had abandoned all hope. They had been disappointed in Edgar, and there was no other male-descendant of the old famous Wessex dynasty of Cerdic and Alfred the Great, while the rule of the foreign conqueror seemed unbearable. This tension which might have proved fatal was brought to an end by the marriage of Margaret's daughter Matilda to King Henry I of England, son of William the Conqueror (11th November 1100). This marriage produced the conditions necessary to the reconciliation of Normans and English: the Norman usurpers became rightful claimants to the throne. English history is justified in emphasizing that in effect and consequences, no marriage was more important than that of Henry I and the daughter of Margaret.

Another more remote though none the less significant consequence of this marriage was that the crown of Alfred the Great passed through Margaret as a heritage to the powerful dynasty of the Plantagenets, which guided the destiny of England for 331 years. Margaret's grand-daughter, also named Matilda, was mother of Henry II the first Plantagenet king (1154—1189), thus the blood of Cerdic and Alfred the Great, continued to flow in the veins of this famous dynasty to the end of the Middle Ages.

This is the great historic background, showing the con-

---

<sup>3</sup> "Se forewitola Scyppend wiste on aer hwaet he of hyre habban wolde. Forthan the heo sceolde on than lande Godes lof geeacnian & thone Kyng gerihtan of tham dweliandan paedhe & gebogean hine to beteran wege & his leode samod..." (Anglo-Saxon Chron. MLXVII. Cott. Tiber. B. IV.). Simeon of Durham: "Cujus studio et industria Rex ipse, deposito morum barbarie, factus est honestior atque civilior..."



sequences, of the marriage of Margaret to the King of Scotland, consequences which influenced English history for centuries.

The aforesaid render it possible for us to understand the exceptional interest which followed the flight of the two small Anglo-Saxon princes, the return of Edward's family after long years of exile, the subsequent fate of the family and the sublime figure of Queen Margaret. The romantic nature of this subject caught the fancy of the first recorder of the story, one of the writers of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, to such an extent that he related the return of Edward and his family from distant Hungary, in the form of a poem, and even after centuries had passed certain writers were inspired by the exceptional nature of the story.<sup>4</sup>

This famous episode of English history interests us Hungarians more closely also, for many reasons, though we are least acquainted therewith in its relations to Hungary in spite of the literature extant on the subject.<sup>5</sup>

But even this literature is not uniform in conception as especially two phases are not clear: 1. Whether the Princes after leaving Sweden, found refuge in Russia or in Hungary.<sup>6</sup> 2. Who, and whose daughter was Agatha, the mother of Saint Margaret? Not even English historical science can answer the latter question. Even Freeman, that great expert in the history of the Norman Conquest, is obliged to be satisfied with vague generality. Our endeavour now is to give a comparatively satisfactory reply to these two questions on the basis of the inadequate data at disposal by examining the substance and value of the records on this subject.

In Hungarian chronicles and historical registers — as it is well known — no trace whatever is to be found of any mention of the princes living in exile in Hungary. Of the German

<sup>4</sup> E. Bulwer Lytton, *Harold, the Last of the Saxon and Ch. Kingsley Hereward the Wake*. In Hung. lit.: Bartók'y, József, *Bertalan vitéz históriája*.

<sup>5</sup> Kropf L., *Kik voltak az angol-szász hercegek Szent István udvaránál s mi lett belőlük?*: Századok, 1887, 783—92. — But the question is known in Hungary since Cornides, *Regum Hungariae qui Seculo XI. regnavere genealogiam illustrat*. Posonii et Cassoviae, 1778. See also: Katona, *Hist. Crit. Reg.* II, 97—108; Tud. Gyűjt. 1833. VII, 123—4; Krit. Lapok 1836. 131—6; Századok, 1878. 668—9; Fest Sándor, *Skóciai Szent Margit magyar származása*: Budapesti Szemle 1935.

<sup>6</sup> According to Karácsonyi's opinion the princes were brought up in Russia. — *A magyar nemzet áttérése a nyugati kereszténységre*. 1927. 109—10.

chroniclers, Adamus Bremensis alone has any knowledge, very slight and partly erroneous, of the Princes, while in Sweden we seek in vain for anything more than brief, vague statements. All our information with regard to this question is derived from the English chronicles. Here, however, we find surprisingly rich material, rich in variations, deviations and errors. A critical revision of the data and a cautious consideration there of may direct us to the right path among the contradictions, but to bring to the surface the historical probability from all that which the imagination of later centuries has added to the fabulous material, would be possible only by basing our arguments upon nothing but our oldest, contemporary or paulo post records, and avoiding the later, frequently highly coloured, contradictory records. These latter have no weight from the standpoint of literary credence; they are almost entirely automatically accepted notes completely disturbing the general historical consciousness. From the view-point of historical credence we have found value, and more or less authority with reference to the Princes and the origin of Agatha, merely in the knowledge afforded by the English chronicles up to the middle of the XII century, since these records were made by a generation contemporary with Margaret's children. Of the later records we shall discuss at the most, merely such versions as contain certain new features. We find two types of the aggregate notes on this subject: 1. Agatha, mother of Saint Margaret, related to the Emperor of Germany. 2. Agatha, daughter of the King of Hungary. We shall discuss both types in their historical order.

### I. Agatha, related to the Emperor of Germany.

In order to understand the importance of our emphasizing this bond of relationship, it should be known that English politics in the decades before the battle of Hastings, consciously sought connection with the German Empire. The first signs of this were noticeable in the time of Canute the Great, when in 1036 this powerful English King gave his daughter Gunhild in marriage to Conrad's son, who subsequently became Henry III Emperor of Germany. Although Gunhild died on 18th July 1038, before her husband had worn the imperial crown, and although the last scion of the short-lived dynasty of Canute the Great died a short time after, English politics consistently sought the friendship of the German Empire, especially at the time when (since 1046) Henry



III occupied the imperial throne. We all know the extent of the power of the German Emperor in that period. Even the occupation of the Holy See depended on his will and his power must have been especially great when his relative Pope Leo IX was the head of Christendom. In this time we read how diligently England sought connections with the cognate Germans, with the Empire of Henry III. English ecclesiastical dignitaries visited the synods convened by the Pope (Rheims, Mainz), German priests were invited to England, to whom high distinctions and prelatie power were afforded. German friendship was consistently and judiciously sought for when it was necessary to counterbalance Edward the Confessor's Normanophil policy. This opposition policy was represented by the national party, the head, soul and leader of which was Aldred, Bishop of Worcester, later (from 1060 onwards) Archbishop of York. This remarkable man was not only a prelate but also a politician, ambassador and even a soldier. In 1054 he went to Rome. As we have already mentioned, Edward the Confessor sent him to Henry III Emperor of Germany, to request his assistance in persuading the King of Hungary to allow Edward, his heir, to return to England. In 1058, one year after Edward had arrived home with his family, Aldred went to the Holy Land, and what is more, he travelled by way of Hungary. „Aldredus Wigorniensis episcopus... Herimanno cujus supra meminimus reddito, mare transiit et per Hungariam profectus est Hierosoliman; quod nullus archiepiscoporum vel episcoporum Angliae eatenus dinoscitur fecisse" said Florence of Worcester (in the year MLVIII), with regard to this journey. After the Battle of Hastings he still remained at the head of the national party whose candidate for the throne was Edgar, the son of Edward who had died soon after he returned from Hungary. For a long time he fought for the rights of Edgar, and was persuaded to abandon this cause only when the complete hopelessness of the case was apparent. Florence of Worcester relates further: "Aldredus autem Eboracensis archiepiscopus, et iidem comites cum civibus Lundoniensibus, et butsecarlis clitonem Eadgarum, Eadmundi regis ferrei-lateris nepotem, in regem levare voluerunt, et cum eo se pugnam inituros promiserunt: sed dum ad pugnam descendere multi se paraverunt comites suum auxilium ab eis retraxerunt et cum suo exercitu domum redierunt".

It was impossible to repress the victorious career of William the Conqueror, and the tragedy of historical events caused Aldred himself, leader of the national party, to place the English crown

upon his head... "ab Aldredo Eboracensium archiepiscopo in Westmonasterio consecratus est honorifice..." (Florence of Worcester). Nevertheless though he had crowned William and had frequently sojourned at his court he never stooped to be his instrument. When the Danish fleet broke into the North of England, Aldred desperate owing to this new misfortune that had befallen his country, died of a broken heart in September 1069. England lost one of her greatest and most loyal sons in him.

We must emphasize the above events in the life of the Bishop of Worcester, later on Archbishop of York, before we establish that in England no one could be better acquainted with the English heir to the throne and his family exiled in Hungary than Aldred, and that there is no other English statesman of that period who knew the motive forces and persons of the time so well as the prelate who possessed such a wide sphere of vision and who had travelled so much. Thus there is a special significance in all that was chronicled at his See in Worcester, concerning the royal family just returned from Hungary. As it happens the very first notes on this subject were written in Worcester and there is no doubt whatever that they originated in the environment of Aldred. Two chronicles speak of our Edward and his family. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and that of Florence of Worcester. In the Worcester version of the former we find the following record expressed in verse:

MLVII. Her com Eadward Atheling to Englelende. Se waes Eadwerdes brothor sunu Kynges. Eadmund cing Irensid waes geclypod. For his snellscipe. Thisne aetheling Cnut haefde forsend on Ungerland to beswicane. Ac he thaer getheh to godan man swa him God udhe & him well gebyrede, swa he begeat thæs caseres maga to wife &e bi thaere faegeterne bearnteam gestrynde. Se waes Agathas gehaten... (Anglo-Saxon Chron. Tiber. B. IV.)

This is the first historical record the authority of which we have no cause to doubt, since we know that the notes in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle are mostly derived from contemporaries, and witnesses of the events recorded. To illustrate with a single example the authenticity of the information afforded by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles on contemporary events, let it suffice to quote the following from the records of 1087 regarding William the conqueror: „,thonne wille we be him awritan swa we hine ageaton

<sup>7</sup> Mon. Brit. 614—15.



the him onlocodan, othre hwile on his hirede wunedon" (Anglo-Saxon Chron. In course of the year 1087).

On the basis of this we may consider the above quoted to be the oldest record bearing on this matter. According to this record, Agatha, the mother of Saint Margaret, was the Emperor's relation ("caseres maga"). No mention is made of Hungarian origin. But the emphasis on the relationship with the Emperor from the English standpoint, and especially that of the national party, appears natural. This party, as we are aware, consistently sought friendship with the powerful German Emperor, while the head of the party, as we remember, was Aldred Bishop of Worcester. Our first record was written in Worcester.

Thus Agatha was related to the Emperor. By the Emperor, originally we must understand Henry II, St. Stephen's brother-in-law, but later on the English chronicler, as we shall see, confused the two Henrys (II and III). In place of Henry II or Saint Henry, they thought of the much better known Henry III. Let us repeat that the emphasis on the relationship to the Emperor was important from the English standpoint. Agatha's close connection with the powerful family was a good recommendation for her children, especially for Edgar the Crown Prince, who, as we have seen, was Aldred's nominee to the throne for a long time. Blood relationship with the Emperor lent exceptional weight to Edgar's Cause, perchance that is the reason why the national chronicles of the English lay so much stress on this relationship and do not mention Agatha's parents of whom, without doubt, something must have been known in the environment of Worcester. The second instance to be mentioned in connection with the records of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is that the Edward who returned to England in 1057, as stated by the chronicle, was brought up in Hungary ("he thaer geteh to godan man"). We emphasize this here, since the only German record in the chronicle of Adamus Bremensis, as we shall see, gave cause and opportunity to erroneous conclusions.<sup>8</sup> For the time being we can accept only so much that Agatha was related to the Emperor and that Prince Edward was brought up in Hungary. The next record in order of time, once more leads us towards Worcester, proving that in consequence of Aldred's ambassadorial travels the most information on Edward's family was available at this place. The name of this chronicler, was Florence of Worcester. The title of the

<sup>8</sup> Gesta Hammaburg. Eccl. Pontif.: Mon. Germ. Hist. VI, 342.

book: *Chronicon ex chronicis*. Thus the chronicle of the monk of Worcester is admittedly a compilation. His chief source was Marianus, an Irish chronicler, who, however, knew nothing of the Anglo-Saxon princes who found refuge in Hungary.<sup>9</sup> Besides this, Florence took material from the Venerable Bede, from Asser and from other sources unknown to us and related events up to 1117. He died in 1118. It is plausible that he obtained everything referring to the Princes who had fled to Hungary, from the Worcester chronicles which, when all is said and done, can be traced to the information of Aldred, Bishop of Worcester. We shall quote word for word all that Florence knew of the sons of Eadmund Ironside: "Dedit etiam consilium (i. e. King Canute) Edricus ut clitunculos Eadwardum et Eadmundum, regis Eadmundi filios necaret. Sed quia magnum dedecus sibi videbatur ut in Anglia perimerentur parvo elapso tempore ad regem Suuavorum occidendos misit. Qui licet foedus esset inter eos, precibus illius nullatenus voluit acquiescere; sed illos ad regem Hungarorum, Salomonem nomine, misit nutriendos, vitaeque reservandos. Quorum unus, scilicet Eadmundus, processu temporis ibidem vitam finivit: Eadwardus vero Agatham, *filiam germani imperatoris Henrici*, in matrimoniam accepit; ex qua Margaretam Scotorum reginam, et Christinam sanctimoniam virginem, et clitonem Eadgarum suscepit." Later on he relates Bishop Aldred's ambassadorial mission to Cologne in the interest of the Anglo-Saxon Prince's return: "et regis ex parte imperatori suggestit, ut legatis Hungariam missis, inde fratrualem suum Eadwardum, regis videlicet Eadmundi Ferrei-lateris filium, reduceret, Angliamque venire faceret". We know the final aim of Aldred's travel to Cologne from this very chronicle of Florence of Worcester. Finally, (in course of the year MLVII) he renders account of Edward's return to England. "Clito Eadwardus, regis Eadmundi Ferrei lateris filius ut si mandaratus patris rex Eadwardus, de Hungaria, quo multo anno, ut praediximus, in exilium missus fuit Angliam venit. Decreverat enim rex illum post se regni haeredem constituere: sed ex quo venit parvo post tempore vita decessit, Lundoniae".

It is evident that Florence of Worcester tells us much more than the reticent Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. From him we learn for the first time that Canute the Great sent the young princes to Sweden, and that from there they came to the court of the King of Hungary. According to Florence they were brought up here.

<sup>9</sup> Mariani Scotti *Chronicon: Mon. Germ. Hist. V*, 481—564.



We become acquainted with their names too: Eadmund died young, Edward lived to marry. His wife Agatha was "*filia germani imperatoris Henrici*". This ambiguity in the expression fatally misled the chroniclers of the Middle Ages, as well as the modern historian. We believe that this ambiguity is chiefly responsible for the fact that we do not yet know Agatha's parentage. Naturally we must not interpret the word "germanus" as „German”.<sup>10</sup> There is no question of her being a daughter of the German Emperor, as that in itself would be an impossibility. Henry II lived in saintly matrimony, and had no children. To quote the words of John Capgrave, a late chronicler: "Hujus Henrici uxor dicta est santa Chunegundis... ex consensu utrorumque virgines permanserunt".<sup>11</sup> Therefore we must take the other meaning of the word "germanus", "brother, close relation, brother-in-law". Thus we can interpret the sentence in the following sense only: Edward married Agatha, daughter of a close relation (brother, brother-in-law?) of Emperor Henry, and through her begat Margaret, Queen of the Scots, Christine the nun, and Edgar Atheling". The question here is how to explain the word "germanus". According to the definition of the *Thesaurus Linguae (Lipsiae 1919)*: *Germanus* pertinet ad *affinitatem*, *propinquitatem*, *similitudinem*; while *affinitas* meant affinity or relationship derived from marriage. Therefore the "germanus" of Emperor Henry could signify his own brother, but could also mean his brother-in-law, our sainted King Stephen. For, as is well known, the indication of relationship in the chronicles of the Middle Ages is not very precise, and the interpretation of the word *germanus* as *brother-in-law*, — lacking other weighty arguments — would be just as for-fetched and mistaken as it would be to interpret the word *germanus* as brother.<sup>12</sup> Here we must be

<sup>10</sup> Compare the meaning of the word "*germanus*" in Aelred's chronicle: "Imperator... Eadwardum cum uxore sua Agatha *germani sui filia* liberisque eius, Edgar Edeling, Margareta atque Christina... ad Angliam mittit". — *Patrologia CXC*. 734.

<sup>11</sup> *Liber de Illustribus Henricis: Script. Rer. Brit.* VII, 15.

<sup>12</sup> The word "germanus" was used in the sense of brother-in-law by Aildred who compiled his short chronicle two or three decades after Florence of Worcester. "Rex Hungarorum... Edwardus filiam *germani sui* Henrici imperatoris in matrimonium junxit..." (733) and "Imperator Edwardum cum uxore sua Agatha *germani sui filia* liberisque ejus ad Angliam mittit..." (734). From these two apparently contradictory narratives it is evident that Ailred calls the Emperor of Germany and the King of Hungary brothers-in-law, as Henry II, Emperor of Germany and Saint Stephen, truly, were. Those who

satisfied with what the chronicler tells us, that the Anglo-Saxon prince married Agatha, a close relation of the Emperor. For the time being, to interpret anything more in the quoted phrase would be a one-sided, hasty conclusion. A comparison with other — serious and authentic — records shall decide whether we accept the word "germanus" to mean brother or brother-in-law.

In the writings of Florence of Worcester it is also conspicuous that instead of Saint Stephen he put Solomon as King of Hungary: „illos ad regem Hungarorum *Salamonem* nomine, misit nutriendos, vitaeque reservandos". The event itself must have taken place either in 1018 or a short time later, so whence the error, the confusion of the name of Saint Stephen with that of Solomon? We are not satisfied by the explanation to be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*, that the name of the King of Hungary was indicated by his initial S and that this deficient sign confused the chronicler. We believe that there is a different reason for the confusion of the two names. We remember, that — according to our data — direct news could have been taken from Hungary to England in 1057 and 1058. In the former year Edward himself made the journey with his family and suite, while in the latter, Aldred, Bishop of Worcester, travelled through Hungary to the Holy Land. What was known in England of the fate and rôle in Hungary of the exiled Prince was learnt in connection with the return of the royal family and Aldred's visit to Hungary. After all, it was their narratives that formed the source of the records in the chronicles, chiefly, as we have seen, in Worcester. In our discussion up to the present we have been supported by the Worcester records only. In 1057 and 1058, Solomon the late-born son of Andreas I King of Hungary, as is well-known, was placed

---

translated the word "*germanus*" as "brother" put the younger brother of King Henry II, Bruno, later Bishop of Augsburg (1006—1029) as Agatha's father. This erroneous idea has been current since Suhm (*Hist. of Danm.* III, 726). The basis of this is the historical fact that for a time (from 1003) Bruno lived at Saint Stephen's court. Suhm's onesided explanation "*germanus*" in the sense of "brother" was taken over by Lappenberg (*Gesch. von England* I, 463—4) and the *Mon. Germ.* also (compare XIII, 116. 126). Thorpe shares this opinion; we, however, are not able to accept it. History tells nothing of Bruno's family; nothing of any children. But our principal reasons for not sharing Suhm's opinion and the opinion of those who follow him are *a*) because Bruno's alleged daughter would have been considerably (at least 12 years) older than Edward and *b*) because this relationship would no-wise be rendered consistent with the records of Ordericus Vitalis, Gaimar and chiefly Ailred, to be discussed later.



in the centre of interest. In 1057, the year when Edward journeyed to England with his family, Andreas I caused his son little Solomon, to be crowned King of Hungary,<sup>13</sup> while in 1058 (the year when Aldred passed through our country) he caused him to be betrothed to Judith (also a minor, elder sister of Henry IV Emperor of Germany). The coronation and later on, the betrothal of Solomon to the sister of the German Emperor was certainly an event of which, in connection with the return of Edward, the Crown Prince, something must have been heard and known in the distant country of England, especially at Worcester in the environment of Aldred. It was through this coronation that Solomon's name drifted into public consciousness as that of the King of Hungary. That the later English chronicler, naturally unaware of the coherence of Hungarian historical events, should put Solomon as the Hungarian King who had received the Princes into his court, is a mistake the cause of which is not at all difficult to understand for a person well acquainted with similar errors in the chronicles of the Middle Ages.<sup>14</sup>

Besides the two Worcester records already described, we have one chronicle dealing with the period in question (up to about 1150), the famous *Gesta Regum* of William of Malmesbury (died in 1143); perhaps the most famous and most widely circulated *gest* of the first half of the XII century, in which we can also find the story of the Anglo-Saxon princes dwelling in Hungary. In the first two volumes of this work which was famous for a long time, there are comparatively few additions from Mal-

<sup>13</sup> It is a matter of interest that the child Solomon was crowned king according to the English coronation order. The Vienna Pictorial Chronicle quotes the "Esto Dominus fratrum tuorum" passage spoken at the time of his coronation (from the coronation anthem beginning with the line: "Omnipotens deus det tibi de rore celi"). This anthem occurs not only in Egbert's but also in Ethelred's order. Ethelred was grandfather to the Prince Edward brought up in Hungary, who left Hungary for England in 1057 in the very year when the minor Solomon was crowned king. Bartoniek Emma, *A magyar királyavatáshoz: Századok* 1923, and P. E. Schramm, *Die Krönung bei den Westfranken und Angelsachsen von 878 bis in 1000: Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stift. für Reichsgesch. Kanon. Abt.* 1934—1935.

<sup>14</sup> The English chronicles, as is well known, frequently confuse Henry II and Henry III. — Compare also the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle XLVI: "On dham ylcan geare gefor Cona se casere". The editor of the Chronicle "can account for this extraordinary appellation bestowed on emperor Henry III only by supposing it extracted by the simple scribe from the word Franconia, Henry III being of the Franconian line of emperors" (*The Anglo-Saxon Chron.* II, 159).

mesbury's hand. The third volume, however (1066—87), is a first-class source of history. But neither does William of Malmesbury know much concerning Eadmund and Edward's sojourn in Hungary; all his new statements are erroneous. "Filius ejus (i. e. of Eadmund Ironside) Edwinus et Edwardus missi ad regem Swevorum ut perimentur sed miseratione ejus conservati, Hunorum regem petierunt; ubi dum benigne aliquo tempore habiti essent, major diem obiit minor *Agatham reginae sororem* in matrimonium accepit". He also speaks of Edward's coming to England, the fate of his children, of Edgar "vario Lusu fortunae rotatus", of Christine the nun and of Margaret Queen of the Scots.<sup>15</sup> Several errors are evident in the work of this otherwise very serious and reliable gest writer. The names of the princes according to him are *Edwin*(!) and Edward; they could not have travelled alone (Hunorum regem petierunt) as they were quite small. His greatest mistake, however, is the statement that Agatha was a younger sister of the Queen of Hungary. History knows nothing whatever of any sister of Gisela, Queen of Hungary but even if she had one this sister would have been 20—22 years older than Edward. Henry, father of Queen Gizella, died in August 995. Thus in 1017, when our Edward could hardly have been more than 1—2 years of age, Malmesbury's Agatha must have been at least 22 years old. But if Agatha had been a sister of Queen Gizella then she would have also been a sister of the Emperor Henry II and it is absolutely certain that William of Malmesbury would have emphasized this relationship. Our well-informed gest writer undoubtedly made a mistake here.

Summarizing the aforesaid, we can establish that the best information concerning the princes who took refuge in Hungary was gleaned in the environment of Aldred Bishop of Worcester. Thence came our first knowledge of the fate of Eadmund and Edward, of Edward's marriage with Agatha. These records merely stress Agatha's relationship to the German Imperial House, obviously because friendship and relationship with the powerful empire served far-reaching aims for the English national party and for Aldred himself in his political conception. Agatha was related to Emperor Henry II but as time passed, the much wider known, powerful Henry III was thought to be her kinsman. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (also Cott. Tiber. B IV. MLXVII) proudly

<sup>15</sup> Willelmi Malmesburiensis Monachi Gesta Regum Anglorum atque Historia Novella: Patrologia 179; Script. Rer. Brit. 90. I, 218.



emphasizes this relationship when writing of the origin of Queen Margaret, Agatha's daughter: "Of geleafullan and aedhelan cynne heo waes asprungon; hire faeder waes Eadward aedheling Eadmundes sunu Kynges and hire modor cynn gaedh to Henrice casere the haefde anweald ofer Rome"...

In the eyes of the chroniclers of Worcester, Agatha's relationship with the German Emperor was of chief importance, one entry mentions her vaguely as the Emperor's relative, while the other calls her the daughter of the Emperor's near relative. (Was he his brother, or his brother-in-law?) Thus here we have either a vague or a ambiguous explanation and in this manner the large number of contradictions that we find in the later chronicles bearing on the subject of Agatha's or Margaret's parentage do not take us by surprise. In the second half of the XII century, in the XIII and XIV centuries the chronicles were only able to gather vague (*caseres maga*), ambiguous (*filiam germani imperatoris Henrici*), or erroneous (*Malmesbury: reginae sororem*) information from the sources hitherto discussed, from which it is impossible to establish Agatha's parentage.<sup>16</sup>

## II. Agatha, daughter of the King of Hungary.

The sources hitherto examined emphasize merely Agatha's relationship with the German Emperor. From these alone we could draw no conclusions as to her being of Hungarian descent, and those who up to this time have expressed an opinion on the subject, either from an English or a German standpoint, have reached no satisfactory result just because in their discussions they did not rely on the entirety of the sources available, but for the most part drew their conclusions from the records treated hitherto. These, however, are confronted by narratives quite

---

<sup>16</sup> Despite such unusually rich material we cannot find a more significant feature in the later chronicles. Simeon of Durham's (cca. 1130) famous *Historia Regum Anglorum et Danorum* (*Script. Rer. Brit.* 75. I—II) recounts exceptionally many and interesting things about Margaret and her husband Malcolm King of Scotland, but he takes the text dealing with the role in Hungary of the two Anglo-Saxon princes word for word from Florence of Worcester's Chronicle. The same lack of historical value is to be found in the later records on this question, which are all, without exception second-hand records. For this reason we shall not deviate from our subject to render the material of the later chronicles in detail. Instead we refer the reader to the *Script. Rer. Brit.* and to Roger Twysden (*Hist. Angl. Scriptores X. Londini MDCLII*). The more conspicuous deviations will be dealt with in a separate note.

independent of each other, which do not emphasize Agatha's relationship with the German Emperor, but indubitably declare her to be the daughter of the King of Hungary. The contrast, as we have already mentioned, is merely apparent, since as daughter of our first King, Agatha at the same time would be a relative, i. e. niece of the German Emperor Henry II, brother-in-law of Saint Stephen. According to their various sources of information the chroniclers and gest writers introduced Agatha, wife of Edward who returned to England, in various relations. About the same time when Florence of Worcester stressed her relationship with the Imperial House of Germany, William of Malmesbury wrote down his erroneous intelligence, other stories were also extant of the widow who had suffered countless afflictions, and her three children, one of whom, the future Saint Margaret, was already renowned far beyond the boundaries of her country.

The sources which recount Agatha's descent from the King of Hungary, originate in Normandy and the North of England. The records are from Ordericus Vitalis, Gaimar and Ailred. It was to the interest of neither of these to emphasize the German connection to such an extent as to obscure the Hungarian descent, as it had happened in the Worcester environment, and therefore these *sine studio* records claim our serious attention. We shall proceed to discuss all notes of interest to us in their proper order.

Ordericus Vitalis himself acquaints us with the most important incidents of his own life. He was born in England (1075) whence at the age of ten he went to the Saint Evroul Monastery in Normandy. He wrote his great historical work, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* between 1124 and 1142. In his monastery he had access to manuscripts and chronicles<sup>17</sup> while at the same place he also had occasion to hear something of the world abroad. For the peaceful Abbey of Saint Evroul was a place where aged warriors and knights who had taken part in the Crusades, in expeditions of William the Conqueror or his sons, were pleased to rest. Pilgrims to the Holy Land found shelter in the monastery which maintained constant connection with England and Italy. Even if there are errors and exaggerations in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, there is no doubt that here we have to deal, for the most part, with reliable historical material as Ordericus Vitalis was not only a diligent collector of facts, well informed of the

<sup>17</sup> *Orderic Vital et l'Abbaye de Saint Evroul*. Alençon, 1922. *Ouvrages consultés per Orderic Vital*, 40—61.



events of his time and the period just before it, but also a good arranger always seeking connections among the various events. Naturally the sister and brother, Queen Margaret of Scotland and Edgar, who played such an important rôle after 1066, are frequently mentioned. Margaret's husband, King Malcolm, at war against the Norman Conqueror, was also fighting for the cause of his brother-in-law Edgar and thus we may also read of the Scottish-North-English events in the History of Ordericus Vitalis. In connection with the death of Malcolm and Margaret he also recounts the parentage of the Queen of Scotland. "Haec nimirum filia fuit *Eduardi regis Hunorum* qui fuit filius Edmundi cognomento Irnesidae" — "et exsul conjugem accepit cum regno *filiam Salamonis regis Hunorum*".<sup>18</sup> But we are again fully informed of the fact in the following extract, also taken from the *Historia Ecclesiastica*: "Canuthus... Eduardum vero et Edmundum filios Edmundi, elegantes albeoles, in Daciam relegavit, ut Sueno regi Danorum fratri suo, ut eos interficeret, mandabit. At ille generosos et innocentes pueros nequiter necare contempsit, sed orta occasione regi Hunorum illos quasi nepotes suos obsides dedit. Ibi Eadmundus clito immatura morte obiit, *Eduardus vero Dei mutu filiam regis in matrimonium accepit et super Hunos regnavit*. Edgardum vero Adelinum, et Margaritam reginam Scotorum et Christianam sanctimoniam genuit."

In this well known narration of Ordericus Vitalis we shall call special attention to three interesting points: 1. Edward marries the daughter of the King of Hungary. 2. The name of the King of Hungary is Solomon. 3. Edward ruled over the Hungarians.

It is in the work of Ordericus Vitalis that we read for the first time that Agatha was the daughter of the King of Hungary.<sup>19</sup> This statement of the Anglo-Norman chronicler, as we have already mentioned, is not at all contradictory to the Worcester records hitherto discussed, it is rather a completion of the same. The environment of Aldred — true to the Germanophil policy of the national party — accentuated the relationship with the Emperor ("caseres maga", "filia germani imperatoris Henrici") while the

<sup>18</sup> Orderici Vitalis Angligenae Uticensis Monachi *Historia ecclesiastica: Patrologia CLXXXVIII.*

<sup>19</sup> Compare: (Margaret) "Hae... filia fuit Eduardi regis Hunorum..." "Edgarum Clitonem filium Eduardi regis Hunorum... Regem statuerunt..." "Hic corpore speciosus, lingua disertus, liberalis et generosus, utpote Eduardi regis Hunorum filius..." Ordericus Vitalis.

Anglo-Norman monk dwelling far away from England, who was separated by almost half a century from the time when their interest obliged the national party to emphasize the relationship of Edgar Atheling, their candidate for the throne, with the powerful Emperor, did not stress this relationship when speaking of Agatha's parentage, but recounted it according to his own knowledge: "Eduardus... filiam regis in matrimonium: accepit"... and further on (Margaret) „filia fuit Eduardi; ... qui exsul conjugem accepit cum regno filiam *Salamonis regio Hunorum*". The genealogical tree is the same, only it was viewed from one branch in Worcester and another in the cloisters of Saint Evroul.

It is more difficult to explain Ordericus Vitalis' mistake. Why does he also put Solomon as the King of Hungary who received the princes at his court? This mistake, as we can remember also occurs in the work of Florence of Worcester: „qui illos ad *regem Hungarorum Salamonem nomine*, misit nutriendos..."

This error is common to Florence and to Ordericus Vitalis. We believe it to have been derived from a common source. We have attempted to explain why Florence put forward Solomon instead of Saint Stephen, and have found it probable that the events of 1057 (coronation of the child, Solomon) and of 1058 (his betrothal to the elder sister of the German Emperor) may have afforded a reason for the name so well known at the time to have eclipsed the name of Saint Stephen, our King. Let us mention once again that Bishop Aldred, was able to bring fuller information to Worcester of the family and kindred of Edward who arrived in England in the year 1057, since he himself had visited Hungary in 1058. We believe that the largest number of records concerning the exiled princes and their role in Hungary were to be found in Worcester, and that both the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Florence of Worcester ascertained from the Worcester records nothing but the brief statement that Edward's wife Agatha was a relative of the German Emperor. However, from the quoted words of Ordericus Vitalis we seem able to conclude that there must have been more records on the subject in Worcester. Essentially he tells the same story as Florence:

„Canut... parvo elapso tempore ad regem Suavorum occidendos misit..."

„qui illos ad regem Hungarorum, *Salamonum* nomine, misit

„Canuthus filios Edmundi in Daciam relegavit, et Sueno regi... ut eos interficeret, mandavit..."

„at ille generosos et innocentes pueros... orta occasione regi Hu-



nutriendos, vitaeque reservandos..."

norum illos quasi nepotes suos obsides dedit..."

(Later: accepit cum regno filiam Salamonis regis Hunorum...")

„Ibi Eadmundus clito immatura morte obiit..."

„Quorum unus, scilicet Eadmundus processu temporis ibidem vitam finivit..."

„Edwardus vero Agatham, filiam germani imperatoris Henrici in matrimonium accepit..."

„Eadwardus vero dei mutu filiam regis in matrimonium accepit..."

„ex qua Margaretam Scotorum reginam, et Cristinem sanctimonialem virginem, et clitonem Eedgarum suscepit..."

„Edgarum vero Adelinum, et Margaretam reginam Scotorum, et Christianam sanctimonialem genuit..."

(Florence of Worcester)

(Ordericus Vitalis)

The narration is the same; the mistake with the name Solomon is common. The alteration made by Ordericus Vitalis, however, is that he does not introduce Agatha as the relative of the German Emperor, but as the daughter of the King of Hungary. He must have based his assertions on fuller data, and we believe these data to have been in Worcester where Ordericus Vitalis also collected material for his great historical work. He himself tells us that the Englishman Joannes Wigorniensis completed the chronicle of Marianus, by adding a description of events which took place later on, in the times of William the Conqueror, Rufus and Henry I.<sup>20</sup> He was commanded to do this by Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester.<sup>21</sup> Ordericus Vitalis saw the chronicle in Worcester. "Unum eorum Wigorniae vidi in Anglia et altrum | that of Engelbertus mentioned in the note | Cameraco in Lotharingia..."

Here we must elucidate the words of the Norman-English historian. As he himself states, he saw, with his own eyes, the chronicle of Marianus of Ireland<sup>22</sup> i. e. the work which Florence

<sup>20</sup> "Joannes Wigoriensis a puero monachus, natione Anglus... in his quae Mariani Scoti Chronicis adjecit, de rege Guillelmo, et de rebus quo sub eo vel sub filiis ejus Guillelmo Rufo et Henrico usque hodie contingerunt, honeste deprompsit". 302—3.

<sup>21</sup> "Quam (vid. historiam) prosecutus Joannes acta fere centum annorum contexuit, jussuque venerabilis Wlfstonn pontificis et Monachi superdictis Chronicis inseruit, in quibus multa ad Romanis et Francis et Alemannis, aliisque gentibus, quae agnoviit, utiliter et compendiose narratione digna reseravit. Ex huius opusculis Engelbertus, Gemblacensis monachus, quaedam praeclara decrepsit..."

<sup>22</sup> For Marianus Scotus's (Moelbrigte) biogr. see *Dict. of Nat. Biogr.*

of Worcester had completed by the addition of his own records. As we remember it was Florence of Worcester who mentioned Solomon as the King of Hungary who welcomed the refugee Anglo-Saxon Princes at his court. But the name Solomon is also used by Orderius Vitalis, who doubtless took the erroneous appellation from the Worcester records. He himself informs us of the fact that he made use of data found there. "Haec ideo huic chartae gratis indidi ut istos codices avidi lectores inquirant quia magnum sapientiae fructum ferunt et vix inveniri possunt. A modernis enim editi sunt et adhuc passim per orbem diffusi non sunt". He refers to a monk named John who continued the Marianus chronicle seen by Ordericus Vitalis. We are not acquainted with this John; Florence of Worcester was the first continuator of Marianus' chronicle; Joannes must have been a later continuator or perhaps a copier of the same.

Ordericus is also acquainted with the exiled princes, and with Agatha, Edward's wife. In his writings, however, she is not *filia germani imperatoris Henrici*, but *filia regis Hunorum*. Perhaps Ordericus Vitalis ascertained from records of Worcester unknown to us, and probably lost, that the two conceptions of relationship are identical, in other words that Agatha was not only *filia germani imperatoris Henrici*, not only daughter of a near relation of the Emperor Henry (his brother-in-law?), but as such, also *filia regis Hunorum*, daughter of the King of Hungary. Ordericus Vitalis could have obtained his knowledge of this relationship from the Worcester records, and also the error with the name Solomon found its way into the *Historia Ecclesiastica* from the same source. As far as we know, nowhere else does this name occur in any known and discussed chronicle of the time. Thus when all is said and done, the information of Ordericus Vitalis may also have been derived from Worcester. We find this a very important feature since it was there that the most was known and again there that the most reliable information was to be obtained regarding the exiled princes in consequence of Aldred, Bishop of Worcester's memorable ambassadorial journey to Cologne, his travels in Hungary, and his championship of the cause of the young Edgar Atheling. I consider the record of Ordericus Vitalis as a deliberate completion of Florence of Worcester's information on the subject.

But while Florence deemed the relationship with the German Emperor to be of importance, Ordericus Vitalis who had sailed to England from Normandy, and who had studied the Worcester



chronicle (about 1136), recorded Agatha's direct descent. Florence mentioned her imperial uncle, while Ordericus considered it natural to mention her father and not merely a relative. It is due to his critical procedure that now we know more precisely who is the "*filia germani imperatoris Henrici*" mentioned by Florence. Ordericus's reply to our question is „*filia regis Hunorum*". Both chronicles essentially say the same thing, but they viewed her descent from different points.

Nevertheless there is still a surprising feature in the record of Ordericus Vitalis: „Eduardus (Agatha's husband) . . . super Hunos regnavit . . ." He writes of his son, Edgar Atheling also, quite consistently as the son of the King of the Huns.

Ordericus Vitalis' record in this form seems rather naive, although a contemporary rhymed chronicle written in North England in the old French language states the same thing. Edgar(!) married the elder daughter of the King of Hungary and as the King had no son he transferred the hereditary right to the crown to his son-in-law.

„Li reis sa fille a Edgar donat;  
 Veaux sa gent cil l'epusat;  
 E li reis fist a tuz saver,  
*Après son jur sait Edgar heir . . .*  
 Puis k'il n'ad fiz, de li hair fist,  
 Pur sa ainé fille k'il prist."<sup>23</sup>

Thus in two — apparently independent — records we can read the same version which naturally may not be taken literally. However, there must have been some sort of foundation for the rumour.

Very conspicuous was the conduct of the Emperor Henry III, when Bishop Aldred requested him to negotiate with the Hungarian King in the interest of the return of Edward. We remember that the affair made no progress and that the English prince was unable to return home until after the death of the Emperor. It appears that the powerful Emperor had certain views for Edward, who through his wife Agatha was related to the deceased Henry II. The order of hereditary succession, the perpetual insecurity could at any time have served as a pretext for Henry III to interfere with the internal affairs of Hungary, in the question of succession to the throne. There exists a record

<sup>23</sup> *Estoire des Engles . . . Maistre Geoffrei Gaimar: Mon. Hist. Brit. 764—830. and Script. Rer. Brit. 91. I—II.*

showing that the German Emperor set up a pretender against Aba Samuel. This pretender was a relative of the Emperor, his name, however, is not mentioned in the chronicle. Is it possible that this pretender, whose power soon came to an end, could have been our Edward?<sup>24</sup> May this have been the basis of the record of Ordericus Vitalis according to which the Anglo-Saxon "super Hunos regnavit"? We do not know but we do not consider it impossible that the Hungarian King may have presented certain territory to Edward and that this donation formed the basis of the rumour that the exiled prince ruled over the Hungarians.

To the above expounded records of Ordericus Vitalis we shall now add certain appropriate verses from the chronicle written in Old French by Geoffrey Gaimar of North England. We know very little of the chronicler himself. The language betrays his Norman origin and he lived in the north of England (Lincolnshire?) somewhere about 1140. He wrote his rhymed chronicle on the request of Custance wife of Ralf Fitzgilbert. This Fitzgilbert was a friend of Walter Espec, founder of the Abbey of Rievaulx in Yorkshire. It was from him, with the mediation of Custance, that Gaimar received a book. This indirect connection with the Abbey of Rievaulx must be emphasized, because it was in this abbey that through Abbot Ailred, more was known of Queen Margaret of Scotland and her parentage than in any other monastery. As a matter of fact, Gaimar has very much to say about the Scottish Royal Family, but he also recounts the fate of the Anglo-Saxon princes who fled to Hungary, at conspicuous length and with a certain romantic colouring. There is no other English chronicle of the time that knows so much of the sons of Eadmund Ironside, as that of Gaimar. Surprising details and changes of fortune alternate in colourful description, from which — as compared with other sources — we can obtain the most extensive picture of the rôle played by the princes in Hungary, if we can believe all that Gaimar tells us. But the historical value of his work is doubtful, though we are aware that besides the known sources, as for instance the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, he also obtained material for his rhymed chronicle from records unknown to us, which probably originated in the North of England. Since he also obviously endeavours to create a certain poetical effect, we may quote Gaimar with suitable caution only, notwithstanding his assertion of having taken his material from an older book.

<sup>24</sup> The Cambridge Medieval History. III, 280.



In his work the two princes are sent abroad upon the Queen's advice. The two boys Eadgard(!) and Aethelred(!) are entrusted to a Danish noble named Walgar,<sup>25</sup> who takes them to Denmark. They remain there twelve years, before being taken by Walgar to Hungary. They travel through Russia for five days until they reach the city of Gardimbre, where the Hungarian King and his wife meet them.

K'en sul cinc jurs passant Susie,  
E vint en terre de Hongrie,  
Le siste jur est arivez  
De Suz Gardimbre, la citez:  
Li reis i ert e la raine  
A ki Hungrie estait acline...

Walgar who places the two princes in their care is known to them (Walgar estait lur conissanz). They are also aware that the princes are heirs to the throne of England. The Hungarian King affectionately receives the two boys and causes them to be educated at his court. Edgar the elder, a few years later marries the King's daughter and — as we have already mentioned — the King promises his kingdom to Edgar. The daughter of this Edgar and his wife is Margaret the "precious pearl", wife of King Malcolm of the Scots.

„De cest Edgar e de sa femme,  
Eissit la preciose gemme,  
Margarete l'apelat l'om,  
Raine en fist rei Malcolm...”

But our poet and chronicler also speaks rather fully of the fate of her brother and sister...

Gaimar tells us an interesting episode from the life of King Edward the Confessor while that king was still living in Normandy. He states that King Edward came to Hungary, in order to aid his nephews, the rightful heirs to the Hungarian throne, in their wars against the people of Velescane(!)

Eadward... Alez estait en Hungrie,  
A ses cosinz en aie,  
A une guere k'i avaiant:  
Cels de Velescane la fesaient.

<sup>25</sup> We find it worthy of mention that the Norse name Walgard was rather frequent at the end of the X century and in the beginning of the XI cent. See G. W. Dasent, *The Story of Burnt Njal or life in Iceland at the end of the tenth century*. Edinburg 1861. I, 78—102. 207—8.

If this episode not mentioned elsewhere has really any historical basis, then it would be the only proof that the Anglo-Saxon princes living at the Hungarian court maintained any connection with their English relations.<sup>26</sup> Yet, though certain names and certain details are surprising in Gaimar's chronicle, we cannot attribute any historical authenticity to them. Certainly the most interesting is that which corresponds with Ordericus Vitalis: 1. Agatha is the daughter of the King of Hungary, 2. The Anglo-Saxon prince is heir to the Hungarian throne. In the latter instance we do not know where and when imagination began to spin its gay-coloured yarn. The poetical motive offers itself: the prince living in exile, in a distant land marries the daughter of the king of a powerful country. The complementary stroke is a matter of course: with the hand of the daughter he gains also a country and a crown . . .

We have now exhausted our first records dealing with the origin of Agatha, which records are partly valuable as sources of information. They all take their origin from the times of the generation after Saint Margaret, that is to say, from the times when the children of the saintly Scottish queen were still alive. Our information dated from this period, in any case, is more authentic, than the later, second-hand, often richly coloured records which have no historical value whatever. Up to the present we have remained in the period discussed (up to about 1150) when investigating the origin and pondering the value of records mentioned hitherto, and we are seeking a reply to the question which arises involuntarily: What could the Royal Family, Saint Margaret and her children have believed of their own material ancestry? What did they know of Agatha's parentage? Chance comes to our aid; we really do find an authentic first-hand remark, from which — I believe — we can conclude, with virtual

<sup>26</sup> Compare Walter Map's narration: "Cnut took as hostage Emma, the newly-made widow of Ethelred. But he was able by no inquiry to discover their children, Alfred and Edward for a certain knight, in accord with the will of the Highest, had snatched them away, from the tumult and the whirlwind. Placing them secretly in a boat, he pushed them out upon the sea, and entrusted them to divine wisdom after he had decorated them with tokens of royalty, and had put with them a brief relation of their identity and relationship. On the second day, they were found drifting by *merchants of Pannonia* and were ransomed by the King of Hungary and sent back to the duke, their uncle". — *Walter Map's Book De Nugis Curialium*. Engl. by Fred. Tupper and Marbury Bladen Ogle. London, 1924. 264—5. — ("These young princes became the subjects of romance". 343.)



certainty, the opinion of the royal family regarding their origin on the maternal side. The remark which forms the final basis of our conclusion, is from the pen of the famous Ethelred or Ailred, Abbot of Rievaulx.<sup>27</sup> What connection had he with the Royal House of Scotland that we can attribute such importance to his enlightenment and entries? A few data will illustrate Ailred's relations with the royal family. Saint Margaret, as it is generally known, had six sons. Of these sons three in succession wore the Royal Crown of Scotland. Chronologically the last to rule was David, Margaret's youngest son who seemed most worthy of her. (He reigned from 1124 till 1153.) Ailred the later Abbot of Rievaulx grew up in the court of King David, together with the King's son Henry and his step-son Waltheof. We know his relations with his royal patron not only from his own words, but also from a confirmation thereof in a biography written by Walter Daniel, one of his pupils, which has subsequently come to light and was made known several years ago. Up to that date it had escaped the attention of hagiography.<sup>29</sup> Walter Daniel was an inmate of the Monastery of Rievaulx during Ailred's abbacy for seventeen years, so that his information is an authentic complement to all that Ailred himself states on the subject of his relations to the King and court. As the basis of all this the likeness of the famous abbot is before us. He came of a distinguished family ("illustri stirpe procreatus") and was presented at the court of King David very early in life, at the age of fourteen. (In 1124.) Here, as we have already said, he was brought up with the King's son and step-son. We can calculate almost ten years as the period Ailred spent at the Royal court. He entered the Monastery of Rievaulx in either 1133 or the year after. He became Abbot in 1147. King David intended to make him Bishop of St. Anrews but Ailred

<sup>27</sup> Canonized in 1191. His works in the Patrologia CXCIV: Beati Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis opera omnia. — His life in Acta Sanctorum. Jan. II. p. Margaret's first biographer was the much disputed Turgot, a monk of Durham later Archbishop of St. Andrews. This biography with which we are acquainted from the Act. Sanctorum was written at the command of Queen Matilda, daughter of Saint Margaret and certainly ought to contain authentic data on Margaret's maternal parentage. But the biography, mentions merely her father Edward or rather Eadmund. — Thus the Acta Sanctorum betrays nothing of Margaret's maternal origin, her paternal descent seemed important only, i. e. that St. Margaret was a descendant of the ancient royal house. Queen Margaret, as it is well known, was canonized in 1250.

<sup>29</sup> F. M. Powicke, *Ailred of Rievaulx and his biographer Walther Daniel*: Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Vol. 6.

was satisfied with the abbacy of the Cistercian Monastery, which he rendered famous for a long time after, by his exemplary life, moral sublimity and humility. There is a couplet of the XIII century in which Nicholas a monk of Rievaulx likens the canonized abbot to St. Maurus, St. Benedict and to St. Bernard.

„Maurus erat maturis moribus et Benedictus  
Exemplo: similis Bernardo coelibe vita...”

Regarding the intimate footing on which Ailred lived with his king we find information — besides in his own confession — also in the works of his biographer. Of the life of David's abbot, Walter described his court life, his rôle there, and especially his relations with the King. His words run as follows:

"Denique (i. e. Ailred) vitam prefati Regis luculentissimo stilo composuit sicut postmodum declarabimus. A quo tanto amore complexus est ut eum faceret magnum in domo suo et in palacio gloriosum, ita ut rebus preesset multis, mancipiis plurimis et omnibus palatinis quasi dominus alter et secundus princeps haberetur, egrediens et ingrediens ad imperium regis, in universis fidelis bonis tamen familiaris... Unde Rex vehementer amabat enim, et magis ac magis de die in diem ad altiora provehere cogitabat in tantum ut eum episcopatu nobiliasset primario terre sue nisi ad cisterciensem religionem cicius advolasset. Erat tamen cum eo *echonomus domus regalis* et preter illum nichil agebatur intus vel foris, omnibus per omnia placens et in nullo unquam delinquens. In tantum enim servebat spiritum *in regali triclinio positus* ut magis monachus putaretur quam secularis... ministerii officialis discipulus... Hinc est quod sepe dum staret coram Rege ad prandium fercula distribuens et particiones dividens ciborum unicuique convescencium prout volebat, ut in hac parte, videlicet mense regalis dapifer summus... ventrium negocia oblivisceretur..."

This small chapter torn from Walter's biography illustratively shows us Ailred's relations with the King. As we also know from his own pen, the King put so much confidence in him as to seek his advice not only in economic and ecclesiastical matters but also on political and domestic problems. Later another crowned head: Henry II the powerful King of England, was also pleased to act on his advice.

Ailred also refers to certain things heard from King David himself: "quod *ex ore saepe nominandi et nunquam obliviscendi*



David regis audivi . . ." he says when quoting a gracious deed of the Kings sister Matilda; and with the words "rege David referente cognovi unum ejus opus", confirms the story which the King told him of his father Malcolm who, as we already know, was the husband of Saint Margaret. Therefore Ailred must have been so familiar with the Royal House of Scotland and its relationships that from him we can doubtless obtain trustworthy data of the origin of Saint Margaret, mother of King David. That which Ailred states in this respect, he must have heard from his royal friend personally and that must be absolutely true and authentic. Does Ailred know anything about the maternal origin of Margaret? In the letter of his work entitled *Genealogia Regnum Anglorum*, he addresses Prince Henry, later Plantagenet king, encouraging the ruler of England to be worthy of his great relative, King David, whose last hours and death he recounts — non historiando sed lamentando. On his death-bed lies the gracious king for whose consolation his mother, Queen Margaret's cross is brought. "Erat autem crux . . . Salvatoris nostri imaginem habens de ebore densissime sculptam, et aureis distinctionibus mirabiliter decoratam. *Hanc religiosa regina Margareta, hujus regis mater, quae de semine regio Anglorum et Hungariorum exstitit oriunda, allatam in Scotia quasi munus haereditarium transmisit ad filios*".

According to Ailred's testimony, the Royal family considered Margaret to be descended from English and Hungarian kings, and this — we believe — is a decisive argument in favour of the correct interpretation of the relevant records of the chronicles discussed.

According to these, we regard Agatha as St. Stephen's daughter, and Saint Margaret as his granddaughter. This — we believe — is the only possible equalization of the oldest records, every version and apparent contradiction of which, on the basis of this supposition is brought to a common denominator. Regardless of William of Malmesbury's obvious errors, the well informed sources, strictly speaking, all tell the same story, though each in a different setting. The record that Agatha was the Emperor's (i. e. Henry II) kinswoman (caseres maga; Anglo-Saxon Chronicle), also daughter of the Emperor's near relation (brother-in-law?) that is to say of Saint Stephen, King of Hungary (filia germani imperatoris Henrici, Florence of Worcester) can be traced back to Worcester records, which, when all is said and done are derived from the environment of Aldred. We must also trace back to the Worcester records the ascertainment of Ordericus Vitalis according

to which Agatha was the daughter of the King of Hungary. Complete harmony is to be found between the Worcester records and the writings of Abbot Ailred, confidant of King David, son of Queen Margaret, which tells us that the saintly Queen of Scotland "de semine regum Anglorum et Hungariorum exstitit oriunda..." And although, not being acquainted with their sources, we cannot attach an exaggerated importance to the records of Gaimar's rhymed chronicle, yet, as they must have known something in the North of England — (also through connections with the Abbey of Rievaulx) — of the returned royal family, we find historical interest in the chronicle to a certain extent, especially in the parts which do not occur elsewhere. As we have seen, Gaimar also believes the King of Hungary to be Agatha's father. Supported by the entirety of the sources discussed we are able to establish that these oldest records, notwithstanding their apparent errors, are all completely equalised in the supposition that Agatha was the daughter of Saint Stephen King of Hungary. As such she would be niece of Henry II Emperor of Germany, her relationship with whom the first records of Worcester deemed it necessary to emphasize. Ordericus Vitalis substitutes these records with others — apparently also derived from information gained in Worcester — stating that Agatha was the daughter of the King of Hungary. It was in Worcester that the most was known about the royal family, through the medium of Bishop Aldred, and as the relevant communications of the History of Ordericus Vitalis disclose, in Worcester they must also have been aware that the niece of the German Emperor, was also the daughter of the King of Hungary. "Caseres maga" (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle) = "filia germani imperatoris Henrici" (Florence of Worcester) = "filia regis Hunorum" (Ordericus Vitalis). These three differently expressed definitions of relationship, prove of the self-same Agatha that her ancestry and relations were well-known in Worcester.

The conclusions we have been able to draw from the Worcester records, are in perfect harmnoy with the knowledge of Saint Margaret's family regarding her origin. Also according to the evidence of Ailred, King David's confidant, Saint Margaret was descended from the royal blood of English and Hungarian kings. Thus we obtain completely uniform answers from the places where the most reliable knowledge was available concerning the origin of Saint Margaret and Agatha.

On the basis of these oldest records we may reconstruct the



history of the princes exiled in Hungary as follows: Canute the Great sent the Princes Eadmund and Edward to Sweden, in order that they should be assassinated there, but the King of Sweden caused them to be sent to Hungary. Probably their way led through Russia, perhaps touching Kiew, the great political and commercial centre. The wanderings of the Norsemen are indicated by archaeological remains and these show the route of ancient communication between the Scandinavian states and Russia, especially South Russia. But there are miscellaneous archaeological findings, especially of money, which bear witness to intercourse between Hungarians and Norsemen also in the X and XI centuries. Saint Stephen's sword itself may be such a memorial of our ancient connections with Sweden. If we rely on these findings, we may accept Paulsen's conclusions<sup>30</sup> that the Hungary of the XI century must have been in direct trade connection with the Norsemen. We have no written records, unless we quote Gaimar's rhymed chronicle, stating that the King of Hungary was previously acquainted with Walgar who brought the little princes to Hungary. Be that as it may, Hungary's indirect and direct connection with Sweden, and the renown of the gracious King of the young Christian country makes us understand why the young princes were sent from Sweden to Hungary instead of elsewhere.

According to the aforesaid, they could have reached our country through Russia, though again of the sources discussed it in in Gaimar's chronicle only that we find mention of the journey in Russia lasting five days, while the versions traced to Worcester (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Florence of Worcester and Ordericus Vitalis) have nothing to say of the route taken. The German Adamus Bremensis alone mentions Russia as the Princes' place of exile: "Frater Adelradi Emund vir bellicosus, in gratiam victoris veneno sublatus est; filii eius in Ruzziam exilio dampnati . . ."<sup>31</sup> But the well informed Worcester version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle contradicts this record of Adamus, stating that Prince Edward grew up in Hungary ("he thaer getheh to godan man); so also Florence of Worcester: "illos ad regem Hungarorum . . . misit *nutriendos* . . ." and later on: "Clito Eadwardus . . . de Hungaria, *quo multo anno, ut praediximus, in exilium missus*

<sup>30</sup> Archaeologia Hungarica. Acta Archaeologia Musei Nat. Hung. XII. Paulsen, *Magyarországi viking-leletek az észak- és nyugateurópai kultúrtörténet megvilágításában.*

<sup>31</sup> M. Adami Gesta Hammaburg. Eccl. Pontif.: Mon. Germ. Hist. VI, 342. Adamus wrote his chronicle about 1069—75.

*fuit, Angliam venit...*" The record of Adamus Bremensis may be based merely on the princes' reaching Hungary through Russia. However, the supposition that the princes had lived for a longer period as exiles in Russia is shown to be unsound by the information and testimony afforded by the oldest English records.<sup>32</sup>

So the two Anglo-Saxon princes came to the court of the Hungarian King, Saint Stephen. Eadmund the elder died soon,<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> This erroneous idea has been haunting English, German and Hungarian literature since the publication of Suhm's work. Its supporters generally refer to Adamus Bremensis and, of the English writers, to the comparatively recent Roger de Hoveden. The latter tells the familiar story as follows: "Iste praefatus Eadmundus habuit quemdam filium Eadwardum nomine, qui mox, patre mortuo, timore regis Cnuti aufugit ad regnum *Dogorum*(!) quod nos melius vocamus Russiam. Quem rex terrae *Malescoldus nomine*(!), ut cognovit quis esset, honeste retinuit. Qui de nobili progenie obidem duxit uxorem, de qua natus est Eadgarus Adelung et Margareta, quare fuit postea regina Scotie et Christiana soror eius..." (Mon. Germ. XXVII, 147. 1). We believe this later compilation, so full of errors, to be unsuitable as a source of information. The remaining copies of the Hoveden chronicle use the expressions "rex Rugorum" or "rex Hunorum" in place of "rex Dogorum"... (Freemann II. Appendix 668—73). Hoveden has knowledge of *one* prince only, who "timore regnis Chnuti aufugit...", the boy at the age of one or two years could not have fled alone etc. etc. Opposite the Worcester records, the supposition that the princes were brought up in Russia falls to pieces... See Karácsonyi's error in *A magyar nemzet áttérése a nyugati kereszténységre*. 1927. 109—10.

<sup>33</sup> The mistaken statement that Eadmund married the daughter of the King of Hungary (Lappenberg, *Geschichte von England* I, 463—4), seems to go back to Ailred's record. Then Robert of Gloucester (between 1260—1300) and the Scottish Wyntoun borrowed it from him. To illustrate the lack of historical foundation in this version and consequently in the theory based upon the late variation, let us quote once more the oldest Worcester records according to which Eadmund died young, as Ordericus Vitalis has it "imatura morte". The principal argument, however, which overthrows Lappenberg's opinion is that Ailred's records on the subject are second-hand, contradictory, and valueless as a source of information. Ailred himself stated that the short chronicle of his Genealogy was merely a compilation. ("Sicut igitur in veracissimis et antiquissimis historiis vel chronicis potui reperire..."). We conjecture that he obtained the material referring to Edward's marriage from the chronicle of Simeon of Durham, who on the other hand had simply copied Florence of Worcester's records. Ailred was interested in the history of the monastery of Durham, and found no difficulty in gaining access to Simeon's chronicle. It is probable that it was from the said chronicle that his entry on Edward's marriage was derived: "Rex Hungarorum... Edwardo filiam germani sui Henrici imperatoris in matrimonium junxit..." This as we have seen is impossible as Henry II Emperor of Germany, had no children. But later on Ailred says: "Imperator Edwardum cum uxore sua Agatha germani sui filia liberisque ejus ad Angliam mittit..." According to this, in the former sentence Agatha is daughter of the German Emperor, while in the latter she



while Edward married Agatha the daughter of the Hungarian King (Saint Stephen) and in 1057 returned to England with his wife and three children Margaret, Christine and Edgar in order to take his place on the English throne after the death of Edward the Confessor. As we must have learned, he died soon after his return to London, while of his children, Saint Margaret stepped into the eternal life of history.

This is the summary of that which we can ascertain or conclude by a critical comparison and consideration of the oldest and most authentic records. We do not learn much from them of how and where Eadmund Ironside's orphan children lived in Hungary, when Eadmund died or when Edward married, but we do learn that the last descendent of the greatest English King of the Middle Ages, of King Alfred the Great, legal heir to the English throne, only hope of the English nation, found refuge at the court of Saint Stephen in the decades of devastating storm. Our King received the exiled Princes with kindness and affection, caused them to be educated and gave his own daughter Agatha in marriage to one of them, i. e. to the surviving Edward. This historically and — I believe — convincingly provable marriage is also an explanation of what may otherwise be incomprehensible, i. e. that Edward the Anglo-Saxon Prince remained in Hungary with his family even after the death of Saint Stephen, until 1057

---

is daughter of the King of Hungary. It is apparent that Ailred was misled by Florence's ambiguous expression "*filia germani Henrici imperatoris*", and he could not make anything of this relationship. Therefore Ailred's compiled chronicle with its errors and contradictions is not at all capable of showing us the way in this complicated genealogical question. As a source of information that part of his work only has any value which is personal knowledge, as his above quoted record: "*Margareta, hujus regis mater, quae de semine regis Anglorum et Hungariorum exstitit oriunda*" is not a second-hand datum but is surely in harmony with what the Royal Family knew of her paternal and maternal descent. Ailred frequently had the opportunity of hearing of Margaret's descent from the Hungarian royal house, from his royal patron King David, but was not able to reconcile it with Florence of Worcester's and Simeon of Durham's ambiguous words: "*filia germani imperatoris Henrici*". It is possible that he sought some explanation of the relationship of the English and Hungarian royal families by the marriage of Eadmund to the daughter of the King of Hungary "*Rex Hungariorum... Edmundo filiam suam dedit uxorem*". To our knowledge, this is the first record of any marriage of Eadmund so early deceased. This error — it appears — was started by Ailred. After Florence's ambiguous words Ailred's involuntary or intentional note on Eadmund's marriage confused the entire genealogical question even more. We cannot be surprised that the chroniclers of the Middle Ages were unable to see clearly in the question of Agatha's origin.

when the heir to the English throne was summoned back to England. This relationship with the Hungarian Royal House also explains why — as is related by later for the most part North-England and Scotch chronicles, — after the Battle of Hastings, when the Cause of the family seemed hopeless and lost, the widowed Agatha desired to return to Hungary with her children. If she had been a German princess, as was thought by later chroniclers on the basis of Florence of Worcester's ambiguous record, it would have been more comprehensible for her to have fled to the German Emperor for protection. This royal marriage between Edward and the daughter of Saint Stephen also helps us to understand why so many Hungarian nobles, — even the natural son of Andrew I King of Hungary, it is said — accompanied the family to England and later on to Scotland.<sup>34</sup>

Not merely the comparison of the first records, but also the coherent logic of the facts all seem to prove that Saint Margaret's mother Agatha was truly Saint Stephen's daughter. This is the final conclusion we have reached from all that which we know on this complicated genealogical question, and it is in this conclusion that all the entangled threads of the question of her descent meet. The comparison of the oldest five records contradicts all other suppositions.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> "Giffurd, Maule, Borthuik also, Fethikran, Creithoun, all thir and no mo, Fyve of thir last, als far as I can spy, Come with this Edgar *out of Ungary.*" Hector Boece, *The Buik of the cronicles of Scotland*: Script. Rer. Brit. 6. II. See also *De origine Moribus et rebus gestis Scotorum libri decem.* Authore Joanne Lesleo, Episcopo Rossensi, Romae MDLXXVIII: "Venere etiam *ex Ungaria* cum Agatha complures, ut Crychtoun, Fodringhame, Giffert, Maulis, Brothrik, et alii; inter quos Bartholomaeus Leslie, generis nobilitate animique insita magnitudine praestans..." — *The Genealogy of the Most Noble and Ancient House of Drummond.* By the Hon. William Drummond. 1681. (New edition Glasgow 1889.)

<sup>35</sup> As we are aware there is no mention in the Hungarian chronicles of any Anglo-Saxon princes having stayed in Hungary, Püspöknádasd in Baranya country, Margaret's alleged birthplace did belong to the "terra Britannorum" it is true, but, up to the present we have not yet been able to discover the meaning of this expression. For reference to the Andrew II document, which mentions the "British Land", vide *Hasznos Mulatságok* 1828. I, 331—35. Compare with Katona, *Hist. Crit. Reg. Hung.* IV, 239. Less remotely, Joseph Rézbányai has dealt with the question of the place of Margaret's birth (Kath. Szemle 1896. 68—97) but, as yet, we have no other positive clue for the support of this theory except the above mentioned expression to be found in the Andrew II document. Here we may speak of possibility or probability only.